

The American Sentinel 8 (1893)

January 5, 1893

"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 8, 1 , pp. 1-3.

TO-DAY the AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon the eighth year of its publication. Each year of the seven, now in the past, has been one of success and of the greatest encouragement; but the year that is just past has been more so than perhaps all the others put together. And the year to come we expect to be no less full of success and encouragement than the one just gone; indeed it promises to be even more eventful.

THE SENTINEL was established to expose the evil designs and mischievous workings of the National Reform movement, and to warn against the dangers to Government and people, to State and Church, which lay wrapped up therein. True, from the first the people would not believe what we said in this respect; but we never cared for that: what we are here for is to set forth what we know to be the truth on this subject. Whether men will believe it or not is their affair.

WE have declared from the beginning that the combined churches would take possession of the Government to use it for their own purposes; and that the chief purpose for which they would use the Government would be to compel the observance of Sunday, at the dictation of the arbitrary will of the Church, in making void the law of God and establishing the living image of the Papacy. Let us now survey the field of the SENTINEL'S notice and see where we stand to-day; bearing in mind at the same time the fact that the people who publish the SENTINEL have known, and have published, more than forty years that that which has come would come.

IT would seem that all people in the United States would be glad of the opportunity to rejoice evermore that by its supreme law this Nation is pledged to religious freedom. It would seem that everybody ought to be glad of the opportunity to herald to all the world the fame of a nation under whose protection all people might dwell wholly unmolested in the full enjoyment of religious rights, and the liberty to worship or not to worship according to the dictates of their own consciences.

SUCH, however, is not the case. As religious bigotry knows no such thing as enlightenment or progress; as ecclesiastical ambition

never can be content without the power to persecute; so, from the beginning, complaint has been made against the character of the United States Constitution as it respects religion, and constant effort has been made to weaken its influence, undermine its authority, and subvert its precepts.

From the very beginning, this feature of the Constitution has been denounced as foolish, atheistical, the strictly national sin, the cause of epidemics, etc., particularly by ministers of such religion as had not sufficient power of truth to support itself, and doctors of a divinity so weak and sickly that it could not protect itself, much less protect and bless its worshippers, or anybody else.

OCTOBER 27, 1789, "The First Presbytery Eastward in Massachusetts and Hew Hampshire," sent to President Washington an address in which they complained because there was no "explicit acknowledgment of the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent, inserted somewhere in the Magna Charta of our country." In 1803, Samuel B. Rylie, D. D., of the University of Pennsylvania, preached a sermon in which he inquired: "Did not the framers of this instrument . . . in this resemble the fool mentioned in Ps. 14:1, 3, who said in his heart, 'There is no God?'"

IN 1812, President Dwight, of Yale College, preached a sermon in the college chapel, in which he lamented the failure of the Constitution to recognize a god, and declared that "we commenced our national existence, under the present system, without God." The next year he recurred to it the saying that "the grossest nations and individuals, in their public acts and in their declarations, manifestoes, proclamations, etc., always recognize the superintendency of a Supreme Being. Even Napoleon did it." Of course Napoleon did it. It is such characters as he that are most likely to do it; and then, having covered himself with the hypocritical panoply, to ruin kingdoms, desolate nations, and violate every precept of morality and every principle of humanity. Yes, Napoleon did it; and so did Charlemange before him, and Clovis, and Justinian, and Theodosius, and Constantine, to say nothing of hundreds of the popes. But the fathers of this Republic were not such as any of these, the noblest pledge of which is the character of the Constitution as it respects religion; for all of which every Christian can most reverently thank the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

IN 1819, on a thanksgiving day appointed by the governor of Pennsylvania, Dr. Duffield preached a sermon at Carlisle, in which he

declared the Constitution "entirely atheistical." Other such testimonies as the foregoing might be given to a wearisome extent, but with one more these must suffice. In 1859, Prof. J. H. McIlvane, D. D., of the College of New Jersey—Princeton College—published an article in the *Princeton Review* for October, in which he really lamented that "the practical effect" of the Constitution as it is, with respect to religion, "is the neutrality of the Government with respect to all religion;" and seemed to be much grieved "that no possible governmental influence can be constitutionally exerted for or against any form of religious belief." So far, however, all these criticisms and denunciations had been merely individual. Though they were strongly seconded and promoted by the legislative, judicial and executive authorities in almost all the States, there was as yet no organized attack upon the Federal Constitution, or regular war upon its principles.

IN 1863, however, such an organization was effected and such a war was begun. In February of that year, "a convention for prayer and Christian conference" was

2

held in Xenia, Ohio, to consider in particular the state of the country. The convention met February 3, and on the 4th, Mr. John Alexander, then of Xenia, now of Philadelphia, presented for the consideration of the convention, a paper in which he bewailed the "human frailty and ingratitude" of the makers of the Constitution, and deplored the national sin of which they and all their posterity were guilty, because they had well-nigh legislated God out of the Government; and closed by declaring that "the most important step to be taken," was "to amend the Constitution so as to acknowledge God and the authority of his law," and proposing the following "as an outline of what seemed to be needed":—

WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, [recognizing the being and attributes of Almighty God, the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, the law of God as the paramount rule, and Jesus, the Messiah, the Saviour and Lord of all,] in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity [*sic.*], provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The convention approved the spirit and design of the paper, and ordered its publication. The following July 4, "a few delegates" met in Pittsburg, issued an address to the country, and formed a plan for the

calling of a national convention, which met in Allegheny, January 27, 1864. It is reported as "an earnest, prayerful, and most encouraging meeting." It adopted a series of resolutions, and

A MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS

which latter is worth quoting, as showing the rapid growth of their designs upon the national Constitution. It runs as follows:

To the Honorable, the Senate and House of Representatives, in Congress assembled:

We, citizens of the United States, respectfully ask your Honorable bodies to adopt measures for amending the Constitution of the United States, [humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler among the nations, and his revealed will as the supreme law of the land, in order to constitute a Christian government], and in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, [and secure the inalienable rights, and the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to ourselves, our posterity, and all the people,] do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

"And further: that such changes with respect to the oath of office, slavery, *and all other matters*, should be introduced *into the body of the Constitution*, as may be necessary to give effect to *these amendments in the preamble*. And we, your humble petitioners, will ever pray," etc.

Resolved, That a special committee be appointed to carry the memorial to Washington, lay it before the President, and endeavor to get a special message to Congress on the subject, and to lay said message before Congress.

At this same meeting also

A PERMANENT ORGANIZATION WAMS EFFECTED

first called "The National Association to Secure the Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States," with John Alexander as president, and Zadok Street, a Quaker, as vice-president. The name of the association was afterwards shortened to what it has been ever since—"The National Reform Association." And such is the origin, organization, and aim of this regular war upon the Constitution and principles of our Government. From the first, churches and colleges throughout the land have been open to the

dissemination of the nefarious doctrines of the association which have thus rapidly permeated society. The association worked alone, though steadily gaining influence and power, until 1885, when it secured the alliance of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Through this alliance it readily secured the further alliance, in 1887, of the National Prohibition Party. In 1888, it secured the alliance of the American Sabbath Union; and through this, in 1889, it secured that which it had been earnestly seeking ever since 1881,—an alliance with the Catholic Church.

Possessing thus the weight and influence of almost all the religious and religio-political elements of the country, the association, in 1888,

BEGUN ITS DIRECT ATTACK UPON THE CONSTITUTION

Through Senator Henry W. Blair, a resolution was introduced in Congress to amend the Constitution with a recognition of Christianity as the national religion. With this also and as a consequence of it, there was also introduced by Senator Blair, his bill establishing the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath and the Lord's day. While Senator Blair remained in Congress, these propositions were diligently, and even dishonestly, urged upon the Government. Other bills to the same purpose as the Blair Sunday bill were also urged upon Congress in the same way. When Senator Blair was left out, his proposed amendment went with him; but the National Reform combination went on without it to secure their main object—Sunday observance by national law—though they knew it to be unconstitutional, as the Constitution stands.

Thus stood the association and its legislative efforts at the beginning of 1892. And before the year was two-thirds gone, they had

SECURED ALL THEY EVER ASKED

only not altogether in just the way they asked it. They had asked that this be made "a Christian Nation." February, 29, 1892, the Supreme Court of the United States officially and unanimously declared that "this is a Christian Nation," and justified all the evil accompaniments of that mischievous phrase, even to the divinity of Christ,¹¹ the inspiration of the Scriptures, Sunday laws and all. Of this a long-time representative National Reformer, in the *Christian Statesman*, November 19, 1892, breaks forth as follows:—

CHRISTIAN POLITICS

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION THE GREATEST OCCASION FOR THANKSGIVING

[Department edited by Rev. Wm. Weir, Washington, Pa., District Secretary of the National Reform Association.]

"This is a Christian Nation." That means Christian Government, Christian laws, Christian institutions, Christian practices, Christian citizenship. And this is not an outburst of popular passion or prejudice. Christ did not lay his guiding hand there, but upon the calm, dispassionate, supreme, judicial tribunal of our Government. It is the weightiest, the noblest, the most tremendously far-reaching in its consequences of all the utterances of that sovereign tribunal. And that utterance is for Christianity, for Christ. "A Christian Nation!" Then this Nation is Christ's nation, for nothing can be Christian that does not belong to him. Then his word is its sovereign law. Then the nation is Christ's servant. Then it ought to, and must, confess, love, and obey Christ. *All that the National Reform Association seeks, all that this department of Christian politics works for, is to be found in the development of that royal truth.* "This is a Christian Nation." It is the hand of the second of our three great departments of national government throwing open a door of our national house, one that leads straight to the throne of Christ.

Was there ever a Thanksgiving day before, that called us to bless our God for such marvelous advances of our Government and citizenship toward Christ?

"O sing unto the Lord a new song, for he hath done marvelous things; his right hand and his holy arm hath gotten him the victory. Sing unto the Lord with the harp, with the harp and the voice of a psalm."
WILLIAM
WIER.

The National Reformers had declared that this movement was an effort to change that feature of our fundamental law which declares that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and establish the divine will as the authority in government with themselves the interpreters of that will. This Sunday legislation by Congress the National Reform combination secured, under threats such as this:—

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 for the World's Fair, except on conditions named in these resolutions.

CONGRESS YIELDED

To these threats Congress yielded, and submitted to the dictation and demand which was thus made; and openly confessed that it did so *because* of the alternative conveyed in the threats. Now it is an undeniable truth, and but the statement of a *principle*, that, "To permit a church,—any church—to dictate, before hand, 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 the church the governing power instead of the people." This is precisely what the combined church power of the National Reformers, did under threats; and Congress yielded to the threats and surrendered to the dictation. It follows, therefore, inevitably, that the National Reformers have thus deprived the people of all the authority which the people had retained in their own hands, and have made themselves the governing power instead of the people. Their effort has succeeded. They *have* "changed that feature of our fundamental law, which declares that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

They have also established the divine will as the authority in government, with themselves as the interpreters of that will, and the governmental power as the executive of their interpretation. They had long demanded that "The Government" should "simply set up the moral law and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it." In the matter of

CLOSING THE WORLD'S FAI

on Sunday, in *Congressional Record*, July 10, 1892, page 6614, the National Reformers and Congress made the following record:—

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 kind-

3

ness 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 6695, 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 is not Sunday. . . .

The words "Sabbath day," simply means 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 [*sic.*] 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 assumed 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."

By this legislation, at the dictation 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 doing this Congress has also assumed to itself the prerogative of authoritative interpreter of the Scriptures 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.

But Congress did all this only at the dictation, under threats, of the combined churches, as led and managed by the National Reformers. The interpretation which Congress put upon the law of God is simply the interpretation which these church managers had put upon it long before. Congress was made simply the mouth-piece of the church managers, in putting into national law the construction which they had long ago determined should thus be put upon the moral law—this, too, a construction which makes void that law, and establishes the perverse will of man as of divine authority instead of the will of God as spoken, and written, and interpreted by the Lord himself.

In view of these things, no man can deny that so far as the Government is concerned, the National Reformers have secured just what they demanded, and so far have accomplished precisely what they aimed at. All that remains is for them to lay the governmental "hand on any religion that does not conform" to this which they have set up. And in the doing of it, they have caused this Nation to assume the place and the prerogatives of the governments of the Middle Ages, in enforcing the dogmas and definitions of the theologians, and executing the arbitrary and despotic will of the Church. And in so doing, they have set up the living likeness of the Papacy, the living image of the beast. Rev. 13:11-15.

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 8, 1 , p. 8.

A HEARING upon these resolutions has been arranged for January 10, 11, 12, and 13—four days—the time to be equally divided

between friends of the Constitution as it is, and those who would subvert it in the interests of a religious dogma. Thus do these measures not only again open up the whole question of Sunday closing of the great Fair, but the joint resolution introduced by Mr. Durborow on the 20th ult., brings prominently before the American people the much larger and more important question of the right of Congress to legislate upon religious questions.

THIS resolution, which recites in its preamble, that provision of the Constitution which provides that "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" should have the hearty support of every patriotic citizen of this Republic. The leaders and managers of the Sunday law cause in general, and of this Sunday closing crusade in particular, have arrogated to themselves the titles, "The best people of the land," and "The law abiding people of the country;" but the truth is as shown in the history of the so-called National Reform movement given in the first article in this number of the SENTINEL, that for years they have waged a persistent and relentless warfare against the Constitution—the fundamental law of the land. They should now be stripped of the garments of hypocrisy with which they have clothed themselves, and be made to stand forth in all their hideous deformity, as subverters of the Constitution, and the enemies of both civil and religious liberty.

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 to 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.*

THE National Reform Association, the ringleader in this whole religious combination for political purposes, has been working for nearly thirty years for national Sunday legislation. But knowing that Sunday is religious, and religious only, its managers argued from the first that such legislation would be unconstitutional, as the Constitution stands; and, therefore, for nearly thirty years they have advocated and demanded an amendment to the Constitution which should declare this to be "a Christian Nation," and so create a basis

for national legislation recognizing Sunday as "the Christian Sabbath." And they are demanding the same thing still.

THUS, by their own arguments for nearly thirty years, we know that the ringleaders in this Sunday closing crusade 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 first session of the Fifty-second 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, to prevent Congress from undoing its unconstitutional work, and vote themselves the law-abiding people of the Nation!

BUT instead of being the "law-abiding people of the land," they are the arch law-breakers of the land. Their action is as much worse than that of the average law-breaker, 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 those supreme law-breakers strike at the very existence of social order, by breaking down the chief governmental safeguard of a nation.

THESE facts should be fearlessly set before the committee having in charge the "resolution to repeal the religious legislation pertaining to the World's Columbian Exposition," and Congress should be asked to undo, as far as possible, the evil that has been done in yielding to the demands of these subverters of constitutional, republican government.

BUT it may be urged that these men represent a majority of the people of the Nation, and the majority should rule even if to do it they are compelled to subvert the Constitution, that constitutions represent simply the will of the majority, and that when they cease to express the popular will, they should be changed or overridden. The position

is not, however, tenable. In the first place, the National Reformers do not represent a majority of the people; but even if they did, it would not justify them in subverting the Constitution. Constitutions are made, not to be overridden by the majority, but for the protection of the minority. The minority has rights which the majority is bound to respect; and constitutions are largely for the purpose of defining and protecting those rights.

APROPOS to this subject is the article on another page, on "Limitations to Majority Rule." The saying that "the majority should rule" is true only of those matters which come properly within the sphere of civil government. But religious questions are outside that sphere, not by constitutional guarantee, merely, but by the law of our being which makes us individually responsible to the Creator. The Constitution of the United States did not create religious rights, but simply recognizes them. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are . . . endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." And of these rights, Hon. Richard M. Johnson, in his matchless report to the United States Senate on Sunday mails, January 19, 1829, said: "*They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which government can not deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotic power may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them.*" The men who override constitutions and trample upon natural rights are the worst of tyrants, no matter what their profession may be.

January 12, 1893

"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 8, 2 , p. 9.

MR. THOMAS K. CREE, of this city, has written to Secretary of the Treasury Foster protesting against issuing the souvenir coins to the Columbia Exposition, because the managers thereof are violating the law by keeping the Exposition open on Sunday. He cites the legal opening of the Exposition in October last, and says that since that time the Exposition authorities have opened the grounds on Sundays and charged an admission fee to visitors, which, he claims, is a direct violation of law. We are not at this writing informed what view of the matter the secretary takes.

WITH reference to the action of Congress in conditioning the appropriation of \$2,500,000 on the Sunday closing of the World's

Fair, it is sometimes urged that in granting money, Congress has the right to impose conditions. This is true, however, only within certain limits. Congress has no right to make any "law respecting an establishment of religion, or *prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*" And what Congress can not do directly it has not right to do indirectly. Having no constitutional right to compel conformity to a religious dogma, it certainly has no right to purchase such conformity; and the effort to do so is certainly ominous. Of this Sunday closing measure, we may well say, as, in 1829, a committee of the United States Senate said of the proposition to discontinue Sunday mails: "*If the measure recommended should be adopted, it would be difficult for human sagacity to foresee how rapid would be the succession, or how numerous the train of measures which would follow, involving the dearest rights of all—the rights of conscience.*"

IF Congress may impose Sunday observance upon the World's Columbia Exposition as a condition of receiving an appropriation, why not the same power impose either that or any other religious rite as a condition to receiving any thing from the Government? Might not Congress with equal propriety make the granting of public land, even to actual settlers under the Homestead law, contingent upon an agreement that such land should never be cultivated on Sunday? or even require that the applicant for a patent to one hundred and sixty acres of the public domain should be a member of some church? And might not similar conditions be required of the recipients of any thing of value from the Government? Our only guarantee that such things shall not be is the provision of the Constitution that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" and is that be disregarded, who can foretell the ultimate result? It would, indeed, "be difficult for human sagacity to foresee how rapid would be the succession, or how numerous the train of measures, which would follow, involving the dearest of all rights—the rights of conscience."

A CHICAGO paper inquires: "Will the Indian understand that this is a Christian Nation?" Well, scarcely, unless they have been furnish with copies of the Supreme Court decision of last February declaring it to be such. Their experience with the average Indian agent never would teach them anything of that kind. It is stated that the Government is now owing the Arapahoes and Cheyennes, about \$18 per head, and because of failure to pay this money these Indians are in danger of starvation.

It is further stated that of the money due to these Indians at the last regular payment (\$250,000) they received only \$187,500, the balance "having been absorbed in fees to pay lawyers for making out the allotment papers of each Indian." So says the *Chicago News*, which also adds the information that "the rations of beef have been suddenly and inexplicably reduced by one-half;" and that "as usual, the trouble lies with the agencies by which the contract was to be carried out—with the agencies which have the ration-giving in charge and with the system by which the Government, instead of putting the full amount of promised moneys right in the Indian's hands, lets him get it through a lawyer and a process of mulcting."

It is very evident that it will require something more than a decree of the Supreme Court, or even an act of Congress to make this a Christian Nation.

"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 8, 2 , p. 16.

WHILE this paper is being printed the hearing on Mr. Durborow's resolution "to repeal the religious legislation pertaining to the World's Columbian Exposition," is in progress. We hope to give a good report of the hearing next week. Prominent among the advocates of unconditional and absolute repeal of the Sunday-closing proviso is Jas. T. Ringgold, Esp., of the Law Department of the Baltimore University, and author of that excellent legal work, "The Law of Sunday." Our editor-in-chief, who has so often discomfited the Church and State cohorts, is also on the ground with his invincible logic and incontrovertible facts. The presence of these two men makes it certain that the report of this hearing will be, as Mr. Crafts remarked of the report of a former hearing, "mighty interesting reading."

January 26, 1893

"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 8, 4 , p. 25.

ARE the citizens of the United States aware of the present crisis in this country? There is a crisis. It involves the existence of the Government as it was established. It involves the question as to whether this is to continue to be a government of the people, or is hereafter to be a government by a religious hierarchy.

EVERY judicial precedent necessary to establish the authority of that hierarchy has been had. The decision of Feb. 29, 1892, by the

Supreme Court—the highest judicial authority known to an American citizen—completed the line of precedent and affirmed it. What remained?—That Congress should bow to judicial precedent and legislate upon religion! This had long been sought in vain. But no sooner was the series of judicial precedent made complete by the decision of the highest—the Supreme—Court, than the legislation was immediately had.

THAT legislation was the passage of the Sunday-closing proviso for the World's Fair, in the first session of the Fifty-second Congress. This piece of legislation was marvelously well calculated to secure the result desired. The effort from the beginning has been to secure some precedent, however small, for congressional legislation upon religion. Only a foothold was sought. The Fifty-second Congress, except it repeal this Sunday-closing proviso, will have the immortal ignominy of having granted this foothold. Is this Congress willing to so go down into history? There are few congressmen unable to comprehend the responsibility of this Congress in this matter. There are few who do not realize that responsibility, and deprecate it. But the responsibility can not be avoided or shifted.

WHY can not the burden of the future support, at least, of this religious legislation be shared with others? Why can not its repeal be left to the next Congress?—Because when the next Congress convenes, the people of the United States and of the world will have been for six months, subject to this law, *and it will have been for one month an historical precedent*. It would be *ex post facto* legislation, indeed, to call for its repeal then, when it had completed the full term for which it was enacted, and had gone into history. The Fifty-second Congress shares the burden of this—can share it—with none. Neither the next Congress nor any succeeding Congress can expunge the record. When this Congress shall have adjourned, the evil act will be past remedy, completed, irrevocable.

Do the congressmen of the United States know that this legislation is unconstitutional? This question cuts close, close, very close home. It raises an ugly alternative. It either impugns their intelligence, or it convicts them of having knowingly legislated contrary to a strict prohibition of the Constitution, the fundamental and supreme law. Which horn of the dilemma will they accept? Is it not much more honorable, more worthy, in every way more creditable, to acknowledge the error and repeal the erroneous legislation? True, it was not only insinuated, but openly said, in the late hearing, that

congressmen would hardly acknowledge by repealing the proviso that they had been in error in passing it. Was that insinuation a just one? Are congressmen made of such stuff as this? American manhood is of no such material. It is from their pretended friends and supporters that this accusation comes. Can it be just? The American people will not believe it. They will not believe that they have confided the highest public trust in the Nation to men so inferior in moral stamina that they will permit the principle upon which this Government was established to be subverted before they will admit that they have made a mistake, and, while yet they have time, undo the mistake before its consequences have become irremediable. Who is the friend? he who says, "Deny your wrong and conceal it?" or he who says, "Be a man, acknowledge the error and undo it?" The American people wait to see whether they have sent, to the Congress of the United States, men—or what?

IT has been said to those who would oppose all religious legislation—this as well as all, else—and upon constitutional grounds: "You have had your day; your plea is now outlawed. The law has been passed, and is on the statute books. These objections should have been made before Sunday closing became a law. They have no force now." Is it true that a constitutional objection is ever outlawed so long as the clause upon which it is based remains in the Constitution? Would it be proper for a robber to make the plea that the robbery had been committed and therefore no procedure could be had, that all action should have been taken previous to the commission of the deed? Is it then a fit claim that because the people have already been robbed of their constitutional rights they have, because the deed is done, no recourse, no right to object? Such a claim will not hold for a moment. It is, in such case, their right to object, always and everywhere. More, it is their duty to object, and to object without ceasing. Let all the people object, and let them make their objections known to their congressmen.

"How Christianity Became Part of the Common Law of England" *The American Sentinel* 8, 4 , pp. 26, 27.

THE following letter from Thomas Jefferson, which was published in the *Gospel Advocate*, Buffalo, N. Y., August 25, 1826, is specially interesting just now in view of the fact that the Supreme Courts of several of the States of the Union have, following the lead of the

English courts, decided that Christianity is part of the common law of their respective States; while, in the same general line, the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that this is a Christian Nation. Mr. Jefferson's letter, published originally in an English work, "Life and Correspondence of Major Cartwright," is as follows:—

Monticello, in Virginia, June 5, 1824.

Dear and Venerable Sir: I am much indebted for your kind letter of Feb. 29th, and for your valuable volume on the English constitution. I have read this with pleasure and much approbation; and I think it has deduced the constitution inherited by the English nation, from its rightful root, the Anglo-Saxon.

It has ever appeared to me, that the difference between the whig and the tory of England is, that the whig deduces his rights from the Anglo-Saxon source, the tory, from the Norman; and Hume, the *great apostle of toryism*, says, in so many words (note as to chap. 42), that in the reign of the Stuarts, it was the people who encroached upon the sovereign who attempted as is pretended to usurp upon the people; this supposes the Norman usurpations to be rights in his successors; and again (c. 59), the commons established a principle which is noble in itself, and seems specious, but is belied by all history and experience, *that the people are the origin of all just power!* And where else will this degenerate son of science, this traitor to his fellowmen, find the origin of just power, if not in the majority of the society? Will it be in the minority, or in an individual of that minority?

You will perceive by these details, that we have not so far perfected our constitutions as to venture to make them unchangeable—but still, in their present state we consider them not otherwise changeable, than by the immediate authority of the people, or a special election of representatives for that purpose expressly. They are till then the *lex legum*.

But can they be made unchangeable? Can one generation bind another, and all others in succession for ever? I think not. The Creator hath made the earth for the living, not the dead. Rights and powers can only belong to persons, not to things; not to mere matter unendowed with will—the dead are not even things. The particles of matter which composed their bodies make part now of the bodies of animals, vegetables, or minerals of a thousand forms. To what then are attached the rights and powers they hold while in the form of man? A generation may bind itself as long as its majority continues in life. When that has disappeared, another majority is in place, holds all the rights and powers their predecessors once held, and may change their laws and institutions to suit themselves; nothing then is unchangeable but the inherent and unalienable rights of man.

I was glad to find in your book a formal contradiction, at length, of the judiciary usurpation of legislative powers; for such the judges have usurped in their repeated decisions that Christianity is a part of the common law. The proof of the contrary which is adduced is incontrovertible, to wit, that the common law existed while the Anglo-Saxons were yet pagans; at a time when they had never yet heard the name of Christ pronounced, or knew that such a character had existed. But it may amuse you to show when and by what means they stole this law in upon us. In a case *quare impedit*, in the year book, 34 H. 6, fo. 38 (1458), a question was made, how far the ecclesiastical law was to be respected in a common law court? And Prisot, c. 5, gives his opinion in these words—"A tiel lies qu' ils de seint eglise ont en *ancien scripture*, coveint a nous a donner credence; car ceo common ley sur quels tous manners leis sent fondes. Et auxy, Sir, nous sumus obleges de conustre lour key de saint eglise: et semblablement ils sent obliges de conustre noetre ley. Ex, Sir, si peit apperer or a nous que l'evesque and fait come un ordinary fera en tied cas, adong, nous devons ceo adjudger loc, on auterment nesty," &c. See S. C. Fitch. Abr. Qu. Limp. 89, Bro. Abr. Qu. Imp. 12. Finch in his first book. C. 3, is the first afterwards who quotes this case, and misstates it thus—"To such laws of the Church as have warrant in *holy scripture*, our law gives credence," and cites Prisot, mistranslating "ancient scripture," into "holy scripture," where as Prisot palpably says "to such laws as those of holy church have an *ancient writing*, it is proper for us to give credence; to wit, to their ancient written laws." This was in 1613, a century and a half after the dictum of Prisot. Wingate, in 1658 erects this false translation into a maxim of the common law, copying the words of Finch, but citing Prisot. Wingtan max. 3, and Sheppard tit.—"Religion," in 1675, copies the same mistranslation, quoting the N. B. Finch and Wingate. Hale expresses it in these words, "Christianity is parcel of the laws of England," 1 Ventr. 293, 3 Keb. 607, but quotes no authority. By these echoings and re-echoings from one to another, it had become so established in 1728, that in the case of the King vs. Woolston, 2 Stra. 834, the court would not suffer it to be debated whether to write against Christianity was punishable in the temporal courts at common law! Wood, therefore, 400, ventures still to vary the phrase and says, "that all blasphemy and profaneness are offenses by the common law," and cites 2 Stra.; then Blackstone, in 1763, iv. 59, repeats the words of Hale, that "Christianity is part of the common law of England," citing Ventis and Strange; and finally Lord Mansfield, with a little qualification, in Evan's case in 1767, says, "that the essential principles of revealed religion are parts of the common law," thus engulfing Bible, Testament and all, into the common law, without citing any authority. And thus far we find this chain of authorities

hanging link by link one upon another, and all ultimately upon one and the same hook, and that a mistranslation of the words "ancient scripture" used by Prisot. Finch quotes Prisot, Wingate does the same; Sheppard quotes Prisot, Finch and Wingate; Hale cites nobody; the court, in Woolston's case, cites Hale; Wood cites Woolston's case; Blackstone quotes Woolston's case and Hale; and Lord Mansfield, like Hale, ventures it on his own authority. Here I might defy the best read lawyer to produce another script of authority for this *judiciary forgery*; and I might go on farther to show how some of the Anglo-Saxon priests interloped into the text of Alfred's laws, the 20th, 21st, 22nd, and 23rd chapters of Exodus, and the 15th of the Acts of the Apostles, from the 23rd to the 29th verses. But this would lead my pen and your patience too far. What a conspiracy this between Church and State !!!

Your age of eighty-four, and mine of *eighty-one* years, ensure us a speedy meeting. We may then commune at leisure, and more fully, on the good and evil, which in the course of our long lives, we have both witnessed; and in the meantime, I pray you to accept assurances of my high veneration and, esteem for your person and character.

THOS. JEFFERSON.

This letter was not published until after Mr. Jefferson's death, which occurred in July, 1826. In giving it to the American public, the *Gospel Advocate* said:—

Anything from the pen of the illustrious statesman, Thomas Jefferson, whose spirit has but recently departed "to be with God," must be interesting to the inquiring mind. With political matters we desire not to interfere, but the letter has a direct bearing on the subject of toleration, and therefore may be with safety published in a religious paper. We maintain that all men have equal rights in matters of conscience, and should have equal privileges guaranteed to them by the laws of our country. But that all do not enjoy these privileges is evident. . . .

"Judicial blindness" has not always been able to discriminate between Christianity and the dogmas of "orthodoxy"! Now if the reader will examine this subject it will be found that some of our courts, taking it for granted that Christianity is a part of the common law, and that "orthodoxy" is Christianity, have made a serious blunder! By so doing, they have, as with the besom of destruction, abrogated the rights of all but the "orthodox." . . . Perhaps we go too fast; they have not deprived all others of their rights; for those who are hypocritical enough to pretend to believe "orthodoxy"—whether they do believe it or not—are welcomed to participation in all the benefits enjoyed by the faithful!

Things have changed but little since the *Advocate's* comment was written. "Orthodoxy" is still favored by our courts; true, "orthodoxy" is not now just what it was sixty-six years ago, but the principle has not changed; judicial recognition of "Christianity" as a part of the common law, or of any other civil law, is just as mischievous as it ever was. Already the literary blunder that made "Christianity" a part of the common law of England has resulted in this country in the imprison-

27

ment of honest, conscientious citizens for quiet Sunday work; and the end is not yet, for in Henry County, Tennessee, on the last Monday in this month, seventeen Adventists out of a total church membership in that neighborhood of less than fifty are to answer before the District Court for their faith, and the prosecuting attorney threatens to prosecute every man, woman, and child of them until they quit their Sunday work.

"He Misunderstands Us" *The American Sentinel* 8, 4 , p. 29.

A PHYSICIAN in Tennessee who has received several copies of the SENTINEL from a gentleman in the State of Washington, writes us as follows:—

Green Brier, Tenn., Jan. 8, 1893.

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL: In your paper of October 13, 1892, you say: "The whole trouble is in the fact that the Government ever became involved in the support of denominational schools among the Indians or anywhere else. The Government can be impartial as between the sects only by letting religion and all religious questions entirely alone."

This expresses my idea on this great question now confronting the American people, so perfectly that I can not do better than to copy it entire.

In your issue, however, of December 1, under the head of "Religious or Political—Which?" you say: "To be sure the Bible is the rule for all, or should be," etc.

Now, my dear brother, you must allow me to say that this shows clearly just where *your intolerance* comes in. Does the Constitution of the United States—which is the magna charta of our liberties rather than any Bible—tell us that the Bible is the rule for all? Nothing of the kind. On the contrary, it distinctly disavows both in spirit and letter any commendation of any Bible, leaving the citizen to be guided by any Bible or no Bible, claiming only his allegiance to the Constitution or the laws made under it. I ask no other ground to stand upon, to successfully combat the audacious pretensions of

the Catholics on the educational question, or to join with you in protecting those who believe the seventh day to be the Sabbath. I readily concede you the field, when you undertake to prove from the Christian Bible that Saturday is the Sabbath, for I am fully settled in the conviction that all time is sacred—that one day is just as much so as another.

I believe the trouble now brewing on these subjects is the result of overtures from the Catholic party with leading Protestant clergy, and that nothing short of a union of Church and State in this country is aimed at, and hence want to see all religionists patriotic enough to stand on a platform free from sect entirely.

In this way only can we ride successfully the impending storm.

Yours respectfully,

V. FELL.

Our correspondent misunderstands our position. The SENTINEL does teach that the Bible should be the rule for all, and that all are under obligation to obey its teaching; but by this we do not mean that any human power has any right to require anybody either to believe or to obey the Bible. The obligation to accept the Bible as the rule of life, is purely a moral obligation, and civil government can, properly, have nothing to do with it.

February 16, 1893

"Editorial" *The American Sentinel* 8, 7 , p. 49.

NOW that Congress has gone beyond the Constitution on one point, for religion's sake, and has legislated to close the World's Fair on Sunday, it may, for the same reason, go beyond it on any or every point.

THE Congress of the United States had no right to put the Bible into its legislation and make it the basis of any legislative measure. The Constitution is the proper basis of congressional legislation, not the Bible. But the Constitution has been ignored and legislation had upon an assumed Biblical basis. To reach this the Constitution has been violated, the word of God has been blasphemed, and a statutory misinterpretation of a divine commandment has been had.

THE commandment says the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord; but in the face of this plain declaration the Senate of the United States has put its own interpretation upon that commandment, and has declared that the statement "the seventh day is the Sabbath" means "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday." Thus the

Congress of the United States has taken the fourth commandment from the Bible and put it into its legislation, and has put its own interpretation upon the divine statute.

IF Congress can do this in one case, can interpret the Bible in one point, it can do it in any case; it can interpret the Bible on every point. When Congress went beyond the Constitution in this, as it did, it put itself and the Government in line with all the Church and State governments that have ever been, and assumed to itself to be the interpreter of the Bible for all the people in the land, and for all who come into the land. More than that, it not only assumed to itself the right and the authority to interpret and enforce divine law as such, but in doing that it put the stamp of its legislative approval upon a given religious and doctrinal belief. It made an adherence to that belief and observance distinctively necessary to citizenship under this Government. It built a surer foundation for that line of judicial precedent in religious law for which there has never heretofore been any adequate basis.

THIS is not strictly an adequate basis, but it will no doubt be accepted as such, in connection with the Supreme Court decision that this is a "Christian Nation." It may be that the Supreme Court will be called upon during the coming year to state its position upon this definitely, and not in general terms. This may be brought about through the question of State rights, as to whether Congress has any jurisdiction within the municipality of Chicago by which it may enforce the Sunday-closing proviso, or lay any penalty for its non-observance. It may come through an appeal from the lower courts of some case brought under a religious statute or judicial precedent. However it may come it is not probable that the Supreme Court can long avoid the responsibility of defining directly the position which it has taken in the case of the Church of the Holy Trinity of New York. When that point is reached the Supreme Court will face an awkward alternative. It will be necessary either to antagonize openly the First Amendment to the Constitution, and indirectly the Tenth Amendment by assuming for Congress powers which have not been granted to it; or the opinion of Justice Brewer that this is a "Christian Nation," and in which the entire bench concurred, will have to be overruled.

THE possibilities, rather even the probabilities, of the continuance of the Sunday-closing contest as regards the World's Fair,—and of appeal to the highest court of Sunday-law cases on their merits,—are fraught with much that is uncomfortable to the occupants of the

Supreme Bench. Congress took the fatal step in haste last session. In shame at the position in which it finds itself and in fear of the Church party it refuses now to retrace its steps, or even consider the propriety of so doing. When the Supreme Court is put in a similar position what will be its attitude? Will it refuse to review or antagonize the Brewer decision and allow this revolution to take its course?

"Extract from Address of A. T. Jones Before the House Committee on World's Fair for Repeal of Sunday Legislation" *The American Sentinel* 8, 7 , p. 52.

THREE distinct considerations in the Constitution of the United States forbid Congress to touch this question. The first is well defined by George Bancroft in a letter which he wrote to Dr. Philip Schaff, August 30, 1887, which reads as follows:—

My Dear Dr. Schaff: I have yours of the 12th. By the Constitution no power is held by Congress except such as shall have been granted to it. Congress, therefore from the beginning, was as much without the power to make a law respecting the establishment of religion as it is now after the amendment has been passed. The power had not been granted and therefore did not exist, for Congress has no powers except such as are granted, but a feeling had got abroad that there should have been a bill of Rights and therefore to satisfy the craving, a series of articles were framed in the nature of a bill of Rights, not because such a declaration was needed, but because the people wished to see certain principles distinctly put forward as a part of the Constitution. The First Amendment, so far as it relates to an establishment of religion, was proposed without passion, accepted in the several States without passion, and so found its place as the opening words of the amendments in the quietest manner possible.

GEORGE BANCROFT.

This is shown by the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution which says that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." As no power has been granted to Congress on the subject of religion, that is reserved to the States or to the people. That is where we ask that this shall be left,—just where the Constitution has left it. It is a question reserved to the States. It is for the State of Illinois alone, so far as any State can have anything to say upon the subject, to say whether that Fair shall be opened or shut on Sunday. If the State of Illinois should not say

anything on the subject, it is still left with the people. It is for the people in their own capacity as such, to act as they please in the matter, without any interference or dictation by Congress.

Not only is that so on that point, but if the Constitution had not said a word on the subject of religion, there would have been no power in Congress to touch this question. But the people have spoken; the constitution has spoken and denied the right of the United States government to touch the question and has reserved that right to the States or to the people. Not only did it do that but it went further and actually prohibited the government of the United States from touching the question. This lack of power would have been complete and total without the prohibition, because the powers not delegated are reserved. But they went further and not only reserved this power but expressly prohibited Congress from exercising it. It is trebly unconstitutional for Congress to touch the question. It was so at the beginning of the government, and this is why we insist that this legislation shall be undone, and leave it where the Constitution has left it—to the States or to the people.

Mr. Houk,—a member of the Committee.—The language of the Constitution, I believe, is that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion.

Mr. Jones.—I am going to follow this question a little further and notice that amendment. The amendment does not read, as it is often misquoted, "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion;" but "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." There are two meanings in this clause. When the Constitution was made, all that it said upon this subject was that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." Some of the States had established religions at the time; I think all except Virginia. Virginia had released herself in a campaign directly touching this question. The first part of the clause was intended to prohibit Congress from making any law respecting any of these religions which were established already in those States, and the second part of the clause prohibits Congress from touching the subject of religion on its own part, in any way. In the State of Virginia from 1776—with the exception of the interval when the war was highest—to December 26, 1787, there was a campaign conducted over the same question that is now involved in this legislation. The English Church was the established

church in Virginia, and the Presbyterians, the Quakers, and the Baptists sent a memorial to the General Assembly of Virginia, asking that as the Colonies had declared themselves free and independent of British rule in civil things, so the State of Virginia should declare itself free from British rule in religious things and that they should not be taxed to support a religion which they did not believe, nor even any religion which they did believe. And the English Church was disestablished. Then a movement was made to establish the Christian religion and to legislate in favor of the Christian religion by passing a bill establishing a provision for teachers of that religion. Madison and Jefferson took the opposition to that bill, and by vigorous efforts defeated it, and in its place secured the passage of a bill establishing religious freedom in Virginia, which is the model of all the state constitutions from that day to this, on the subject of religion and the State.

Now then, that campaign in Virginia against the establishment of the Christian religion there, embodied the same principle that is involved in this legislation of today, and as that was distinctly shut out, so we ask that this shall be also and Congress and the Government step back to the place where it was before and where it belongs. Madison went right out of that campaign into the convention which formed the Constitution of the United States, and carried with him into that convention the principles which he had advocated in the campaign and put those principles into the United States Constitution, and the intention of all was, and is, that Congress shall have nothing at all to do with the subject of religious observances.

Washington in 1797, made a treaty with Tripoli, which explicitly declared that "the government of the United States is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion." And when Congress has legislated upon this question with direct reference to the Christian religion, therein again it has gone contrary to the express intent of those who made the Constitution and established the supreme law, as expressed in their own words. And for this reason we ask that the thing shall be undone and Congress put the government right back where it was before that legislation was established, and leave the question where it belongs.

The Constitution prohibits this legislation; and when the Constitution prohibits it, then ought not the legislation to be undone?

March 9, 1893

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 8, 10 , p. 73.

THE right of petition, appeal and remonstrance against wrong, was made a part of the fundamental law of this country. The exercise of this right may be, in the first instance, a privilege, but occasions will arise where dissent and remonstrance become a duty,—a test of the citizen's highest patriotism and noblest allegiance to his country, and to his God. Such a time has now come.

THE Fifty-second Congress has adjourned, leaving upon its records a piece of finished legislation, now past the possibility of repeal, directly antagonizing a provision of the First Amendment to the Constitution. Upon every citizen rests to-day the duty of dissent and remonstrance. Silence has been, and will be, accepted as consent. Dissent can now only be shown by remonstrance. He who does not dissent makes himself a party to the wrong and accepts the responsibility for its results. Did this matter cover a civil injustice only, it would no less demand the disapproval of every citizen, but it invades the realm of religion and of conscience; in it the Government assumes to itself divine right and dispenses the authority of divinity. To civil wrong is added the assumption of divine right. He who stands for the rights of man will dissent. He who fears his God must dissent.

RIGHTS which are held by no "subinfeudation, but by direct homage and allegiance to the Owner and Lord of all," are not to be valued lightly; and when by their infringement "the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it," is abridged or denied,—then divine power and human authority are brought into immediate conflict, and every conscience must answer to the injunction, "choose you this day whom ye will serve." Whether this authority be assumed by an individual, under the papal tiara, as vicegerent of God; or by an ecclesiastical aristocracy calling itself orthodox; or by a religious majority which claims that the voice of the people is the voice of God, the principle is the same. Submission to the usurper is disobedience to God. The usurpation, in either case, is by one who would be a god in the place of God, and obedience to such an one would be disobedience to the command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." They who are Christians, free in the freedom with which Christ Jesus has made them free, will dissent, and will choose this day to serve God rather than man; and, as men,

citizens, and Christians, will protest and appeal from the usurper to the Supreme Judge, the Lord of all the earth who will do right. A nobler resolve than this is not known to the human heart. A clearer duty does not exist in human experience.

May 25, 1893

"Forbidden by the Word of God" *American Sentinel* 8, 21 , pp. 162, 163.

WE are asked to explain why it is that if a theocracy was a good thing for the children of Israel it would not be an equally good thing now. This is not for us to say. God has said that there shall be a theocracy no more until He come whose right it is; and then the dominion will be given to him. It follows that anything claiming to be a theocracy since the passing away of the Jewish theocracy, could be only man-made, and without divine authority. The government of Israel was a true theocracy. That was really a government of God. At the burning bush, God commissioned Moses to lead his people out of Egypt. By signs and wonders and mighty miracles multiplied, God delivered Israel from Egypt, led them through the Red Sea, and through the wilderness, and finally into the promised land. There he ruled them by judges, to whom "in diverse manners" he revealed his will, "until Samuel the prophet."

In the days of Samuel, the people asked that they might have a king. Their request was granted, but only under earnest protest. "Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, Nay; but we will have a king over us; that we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight our battles. And Samuel heard all the words of the people, and he rehearsed them in the ears of the Lord. And the Lord said to Samuel, Hearken unto their voice, and make them a king. And Samuel said unto the men of Israel, Go ye every man unto his city."

God chose Saul, and Samuel anointed him king over Israel. But Saul failed to do the will of God, and as he rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord rejected him from being king, and sent Samuel to anoint David king over Israel; and David's house, and David's throne, God established for evermore.

When Solomon succeeded to the kingdom in the place of David his father, the record is: "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord

as king instead of David his father." 1 Chron. 29:23. David's throne was the throne of the Lord, and Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king over the earthly kingdom of God. The succession to the throne descended in David's line to Zedekiah, who was made subject to the king of Babylon, that perchance the kingship with the kingdom might stand. Zedekiah entered into a solemn covenant before God that he would remain a faithful subject of the king of Babylon. His name was Mattaniah at first, and when he entered into this covenant, the king of Babylon changed his name to Zedekiah, which means *The Justice of Jehovah*. Mattaniah gave his hand, and accepted this new name as the seal of the covenant with the king of Babylon, and in so doing pledged that if he should break that covenant, he would incur the judgment of the Lord.

Zedekiah did break this covenant, upon which the Lord said: "As I live, saith the Lord God, surely in the place where the king dwelleth that made him king, whose oath he despised, and whose covenant he brake, even with him in the midst of Babylon he shall die. . . . Seeing he despised the oath by breaking the covenant, when, lo, he had given his hand, and hath done all these things, he shall not escape. Therefore thus saith the Lord God; As I live, surely my oath that he hath despised, and my covenant that he hath broken, even it will I recompense upon his own head." Eze. 17:16-19. And in recompensing this evil upon the head of Zedekiah, the word of Samuel to the people was fulfilled when he told them, "If ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye *and your king*." For to Zedekiah, and to the kingdom forever after, God gave this testimony: "Thou profane, wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God: Remove the diadem, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same; exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; *and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him*." Eze. 21:25-27.

The kingdom was then subject to Babylon. When Babylon fell, and Medo-Persia succeeded, it was overturned the first time. When Medo-Persia fell, and was succeeded by Grecia, it was overturned the second time. When the Greek empire gave way to Rome, it was overturned the third time. And then says the word, "*It shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him*." And he whose right it is, is thus named: "Thou shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest and *the*

Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke 1:31-33.

But that kingdom is not of this world, nor will he sit upon that throne in this world. While Christ was here as "that prophet," a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, he refused to exercise any earthly authority or office whatever. When appealed to, to mediate in a dispute between two brothers in regard to their inheritance, he replied, "Man, who

163

made me a judge or a divider over you?" Luke 12:14. And when the people would have taken him and made him a king, he withdrew himself from them, and went to the mountain alone. John 6:15. The last night he spent on earth before his crucifixion, and in the last talk with Pilate before he went to the cross, he said, "My kingdom is not of this world." John 18:36. Thus the throne of the Lord has been removed from this world, and will be no more in this world nor of this world, until, as King of kings and Lord of lords, he whose right it is shall come again. And *that time* is the *end of this* world and the beginning of the world to come. This is shown by many scriptures, some of which it will be in order here to quote.

To the twelve disciples the Saviour said: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Luke 22: 29, 30. As to when this shall be, we are informed by the Word in Matthew, thus: "*In the regeneration* when the Son of man shall sit *in the throne of his glory*, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Matt. 19:23. And the time when he shall sit upon the throne of his glory, is stated by another passage in Matthew, thus: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then* shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations." Chap. 25:31, 32. By these scriptures and all others on the subject, it is evident that the kingdom of Christ, the kingdom of God, is not only not of this world, but is nevermore to be of this world. Therefore while this world stands, a theocracy can never be in it again. From the death of Christ until now, every theory of an earthly theocracy has been a false theory. And from now unto the end of the world, every such theory will be a false theory.

July 13, 1893

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 8, 28 , pp. 209, 210.

THE Sunday managers resorted to the United States courts and got swamped the first thing. "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

THEY called upon the courts to decide their question. The courts did decide the question. And now they refuse to accept the decision. They submitted their cause to the courts, and now refuse to accept the decision *because it was not on their side*.

WELL, then, as they are determined to have their own way anyhow, what in the world did they want with the courts in the first place? Ah! they only wanted to use the court as a tool in enforcing *their own decision* and their own will upon the people of the United States. And having failed in that, Bishop Merrill, for the Methodist Church and "other denominations," announced that they will pursue a course "that means that they will pursue a course "that means that the World's Fair will be a financial failure." Was there ever, or could there be, a clearer case of "rule or ruin"? It is true that Bishop Merrill has since discovered that he could not carry the whole Methodist Board with him in this, but this does not affect the principles involved, nor change *his* disposition. Neither have the "other denominations" changed their announced course.

THEY unsparingly denounced the Directory of the Fair as "anarchists" and their action as "violation of law," and "anarchistic in conception and rebellious in character," etc., etc., at their pleasure when the Directory opened the gates on Sunday in pursuance of what they supposed to be a proper interpretation of a law of which Judge Grosscup—the only judge of the lower court who was right—said that it was "so ambiguous that it required a construction of the law-officers of the Government; so ambiguous that of the three judges sitting, there is a difference of opinion between them respecting its effect." And now these very ones themselves openly and intentionally disregard the plain decision of the United States Court which they themselves called for.

NOW if the action of the Directory in construing a law "so ambiguous," was "anarchistic" and "rebellious," then what is this action of the church managers in intentionally disregarding the plain and unmistakable decision of this high court, whose jurisdiction they

themselves invoked? Judge Grosscup pertinently inquired: "Is the local corporation to be held to have known precisely what that act meant, when this court is divided as to what its meaning is?" But there is no room for any such inquiry in behalf of the action of the church managers in disregarding the decision of the court which is not at all ambiguous, and about which there was no division of the court. There was ample room for the Directory to act innocently in what they did. There is no room whatever for the church managers to act innocently in what they are doing in this matter.

THE Directory stated plainly beforehand that if the court decided that they were wrong they would accept it in good faith and conform to it in good faith. But neither before nor after, did the Sunday managers make any such statement. Instead of that they plainly declare that they will not do any such thing, but will make the Fair "a financial failure;" and all because that, in the law procedure which they had inquired, they have failed to accomplish their purpose to rule the country. Of course it is always understood that especially the party which initiates legal procedure shall accept in good faith the final decision. With the other party it is not necessarily so; for he may be dragged into it, and forced into court by the course of the initiative, and he is not bound to accept any decision because the whole procedure may be one of persecution, and therefore wrong from the beginning.

But with the initiative it is not so. It is in the nature of things, it inheres in the very idea of legal government, that the party who resorts to the law, the party who begins legal procedure, shall accept in good faith the final decision. Otherwise there is no use of legal government; violence becomes the only procedure, and might the only source of appeal. And that is anarchy indeed.

NOW it is the everlasting truth that the Sunday party did take the initiative, and have kept it, from the first inception of the act of Congress clear up to this final decision of the court. And now, instead of accepting the final decision in good faith, they do not accept it at all, but resort to violence. The party of the second part, the party that was dragged into the procedure and into court, freely announces beforehand that if the decision is against them, they will accept it in good faith, and so conform to it. The party of the first part, the party which takes and holds the initiative from the beginning, openly disregards and refuses to accept the final decision, and boldly announces their purpose to pursue such a course as will make the

Fair "a financial failure." And these are the ones who so scathingly denounce the course of the Directory as "anarchistic" and "rebellious"!

THE sum of the whole matter is this: It is essential to the very idea of existence of legal government that the party who takes the initiative in legal procedure shall accept in good faith, and so conform to the final decision; not to do so, but to act the same as though there had been no decision *after the final decision has been rendered*, is in itself to renounce legal government and is essentially anarchistic and rebellious. The Sunday-law party is and has been from the beginning, the party of the initiative in this legal procedure. This party instead of accepting in good faith the final decision, ignores it entirely and resorts to violence—the boycott—after that decision has been rendered; it therefore follows inevitably, and the demonstration is complete, that the action of the Sunday managers in this matter is truly the action, and the only one, which is indeed "anarchistic in conception and rebellious in execution." This

210

is the logic of the situation, and it is the exact truth. Their every action only further illustrates it; and their calling other people "anarchists," "rebels," "traitors," "atheists," and so on, can never disprove this abiding truth.

THIS is the same conclusion to which we were forced last year by the logic of their course in securing the act of Congress requiring the closing of the Fair. It is the only just conclusion that can ever be reached from the basis of ecclesiastical dictation or control in the affairs of the Government. And this for the plain and simple reason that on the part of the ecclesiastics it is never intended that they shall pay any respectful attention to any law or any decision that does not suit them. Therefore the only purpose for which they ever resort to either legislative or judicial procedure is that the governmental authority may be at their disposal with which to execute upon the people their arbitrary will. And this, in itself, is at once to sweep away all really just, or properly legal, government.

AND all this only makes the more manifest the divine wisdom which commands the total separation of the ecclesiastical and the civil powers, which forbids the Church to have any connection with the State. It also demonstrates the wisdom of the men who made the Government of the United States, in embodying in the Constitution and the supreme law of the divine idea for governments—the total

separation of Church and State. And this which has been done, and which is now being done, by the churches, is only a hint, and the beginning, of the sea of troubles into which the Government will be plunged, and indeed finally sunk by this gross disregard of the governmental principle established by our fathers, and announced by Jesus Christ.

SO long as the Church keeps herself entirely separate from the State, she can consistently and *rightly* disregard any and all legislative acts, judicial decrees, or executive power, put forth upon religious questions; because she ever denies the right of government to touch religion or any religious question in any way. But when she forgets her place and her high privilege, and herself actually invites governmental jurisdiction of religious observances, she then, by so doing, and in justice, forfeits her power of protest, and her right to disregard governmental commands in things religious, while in fact and in practice she refuses to let it go, so that whenever the Government does not do according to her will she openly and intentionally disregards the very authority which she herself has invoked. She thus becomes the chiefest example and source of lawlessness, and the swiftest instrument of governmental ruin.

AND this is what the Sunday leaders of the United States are; and this is the relation which they bear to the Government to-day. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 8, 28 , pp. 217, 218.

CHRISTIANITY is love only, not force,—"God is love." And "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son." "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." And "the love of Christ constraineth us."

CHRISTIANITY is all of faith, not of law,—"For whatsoever is not of faith is sin." And "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." "Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested . . . even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference."

CHRISTIANITY is freedom of choice, not arbitrary requirement,—"If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not." "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man

be lifted up; that *whosoever believeth in him* should not perish but have everlasting life." "Whosoever will may come." "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord." "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve."

CHRISTIANITY is dependence wholly upon the power of God, manifested through Jesus Christ, by his Spirit alone; not upon the power of man, manifested through government, by the sword or the bayonet. "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." "Your faith should not stand in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God." "Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men." "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds." "And I will save them by the Lord their God, and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by battle, by horses nor by horsemen." "This is the word of the Lord. . . . saying: Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

THE Sunday movement is force only, not love.

"*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 to the World's Fair, except upon conditions named in these resolutions." ²¹

"If temporary injunction is impossible to-day, let proclamation *and troops* hold gates closed until obtained." ³²

"The First United Presbyterian Church of Boston, distrusting both directory and commissioners, appeals to you to suppress Chicago nullification with Jacksonian firmness, and to guard the gates next Sabbath *with the troops*, if necessary." ⁴³

THE Sunday movement is altogether of law and not of faith at all. They worked steadily for thirty years to get a national Sunday-law, and everywhere they demand State Sunday-laws where there are none, and the rigid enforcement of them with increased penalties where they already exist. This is so entirely a part of the daily history and the public records of the whole country in the last few years that no particular quotation is needed; for all know that it is so. Their whole cry is, "Law, law, law," and all for "*the salvation of the Nation*."

THE Sunday movement is arbitrary requirement entirely with no shadow of freedom of choice. Sunday, as "the *Christian Sabbath*," must be unquestionably observed by all, whether they be Christians, Jews, Infidels, or what not. Even though a man be the most sincere

and devout Christian, and observes the seventh day, the day which the Lord himself appointed as the Sabbath, yet this counts nothing—he must observe Sunday, too, or else suffer the penalty of fine, and imprisonment till the fine is paid. These facts are also matters of daily occurrence and public record. Thus the Sunday movement, in behalf of what it calls "the Christian Sabbath," knows nothing but arbitrary requirement and compulsory procedure to secure its acceptance and observance.

THE Sunday movement is dependence wholly upon the power of man, manifested through law and by force alone; not upon the power of God manifested through Jesus Christ by his Spirit.

"What is now to be done? This is the question that is perplexing the supporters of the Sabbath. . . . From present appearances *relief* can be looked for *only at Washington*." ⁵⁴

"In this third fight . . . Attorney-General Olney . . . with President Cleveland, must be *our chief reliance*." ⁶⁵

IN a Sunday-law speech made in the Baptist Church, Cortland, N.Y., Sunday evening, June 18, 1893, "Rev." Addis Albro, State Secretary for New York, said: "In all this contest the right arm of power is the executive." And cited the President of the United States, the governor of a State, the sheriff of a county, the mayor of a city, and the president of a town, as the ones in whom the executive power is lodged.

"To HON. GROVER CLEVELAND,
"Washington, D. C.

"*Dear Sir:* As God in his providence has given you the highest office in the United States, *we appeal to you* in this decisive conflict *between the friends of God* and of good government on the one hand, *and the powers of darkness* and the enemies of our Christian American Sabbath on the other, *to use all the power* that has been delegated to you in the position you now hold, to keep and to close the gates of the World's Fair on the Sabbath,

218

not only the buildings but also Jackson Park. . . .

"I look upon the move as high treason against God's divine government and the accepted laws of the land, and in this request I voice a half-million people of Indiana, of whom a large per cent. will abandon their attendance at the Fair, if the gates are open on the Lord's day.

"Your humble servant,
"J. R. Day." ⁷⁶

This Mr. Day is the secretary of the Indiana division of the Christian Endeavor Society—that is, of *this kind* of Christian

endeavor. But what kind of *Christian* endeavor is that which appeals to a *man* to settle a conflict between them and the powers of darkness. What a delightful figure would be cut anyhow, by the President of the United States endeavoring to settle a decisive conflict between the friends of God and the powers of darkness!

"*Resolved*, That the Prohibition Party of Iowa, in State convention assembled, do most emphatically protest against such action [the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday], and that we ask President Cleveland to use the power vested in him to enforce the law of Congress *to prevent this sin against high heaven*, and rebellion against the Government of the United States." ⁸⁷

"In Wisconsin, when the mayor of the capital refused to prohibit a prize fight on the Sabbath, the governor ordered the troops to take possession of the stage and grounds, and bayonets prohibited lawlessness. *Let President Cleveland order the U. S. troops to guard the gates of the World's Fair on Sabbath, and keep them closed if need be.*" ⁹⁸

By the evidences presented in these notes, it is as plain as A B C to everybody that Christianity and the Sunday movement are two directly antagonistic things. The one is Christianity, the other is devilry. The one is salvation, the other is destruction. These are the two ways; which way do you take?

J.

July 20, 1893

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 8, 29 , pp. 225, 226.

WHERE are the Christians in the United States?

THIS is a pertinent question just now when those who not only profess to be Christians, but who profess to be the very representatives of Christianity itself, persist in the use of force, even to the employment of armed troops, to secure the recognition and observance of religious institutions.

OF course, the use of force, and armed force at that, has been involved in the Sunday-law movement from the beginning; and we have been telling the people so, all the time; but the people would not believe it. But now, when the Sunday managers have actually gone to the length of urgently and repeatedly calling for troops to secure and enforce Sunday observance at the World's Fair, is it not about time that the people began to believe that the terrible wickedness of a

religious despotism is in this Sunday movement, which has so long been going on before their eyes?

TRUE, they did not get the troops—and they have'nt [*sic.*] got the Fair shut either—but that is not to their credit. That they did not get the troops, did not take out of them the disposition to use the troops even now, if they could get them. Force is in the thing, in itself, and *armed* force is the straight sequence of any resort to any for at all. And the failure to get the troops that they so loudly called for, and especially their signal defeat in the courts, instead of taking out of them the disposition to use force to compel Sunday observance, will only increase their determination even to desperation, to secure their idolized Sunday at cost of any available or possible force.

THIS is demonstrated plainly enough by the fact that they called upon the United States courts to decide the question of Sunday closing, and when the courts decided for Sunday *opening*, they at once announced a general and determined boycott of the Fair. They voluntarily submit their cause to the courts, and themselves to decide their controversy; and then when the decision goes against them they refuse to submit to it. This demonstrates that they are determined to have their own way anyhow; and that the only thing that they called upon the courts for, was to have the courts to do their bidding only to execute their arbitrary will upon the people, precisely as they wanted the troops called out to do their bidding and execute by the bayonet their arbitrary will upon the people. Their whole course of procedure is all of a piece.

BUT the particular thing about which we are inquiring just now and in this connection is, Where are the Christians in the United States to positively discountenance and protest against this worse than a travesty, this entire subversion, of the Christian name and profession? Nor is it enough to discountenance only the extreme measures to which those have gone who have called for armed troops. There is no merit whatever in protesting against the use of troops to secure Sunday observance, so long as any countenance is given to Sunday *laws* of which armed troops are only the consequence.

ONE religious paper—*The Northwestern Christian Advocate*—has characterized as "zebraic zeal" the action of the Sunday managers who have called for the troops. But this same *Advocate* has sanctioned and actively aided this same zeal in these same individuals in every step which they have taken up to this one. To

secure the Act of Congress requiring the closing of the Fair, these same individuals used upon congressmen and senators threats of deprivation of office by loss of votes—the only force then at their command. And so far was the *Northwestern* or any other one of the family of *Advocates* from seeing in this, any manifestation of zebraic zeal, that they all actually took part in it. Yet this is the same zeal precisely that is now displayed by the same individuals, in invoking the additional force which they had gained by getting Congress to surrender to them the national power under the threats of the only force that was formerly at their command.

OF course nobody can deny that it is "zebraic zeal" or worse. But the point is that there is no strength in any protest against this particular exhibition of it while taking an active part in all the manifestations of the same zeal up to this. Where is the difference between the zeal that would put bayonets into the people, and the zeal that puts people themselves into jail for from thirty to sixty-four days, when both are done, to make them recognize the righteousness of Sunday laws? As it is "zebraic zeal" that calls for troops to compel the World's Fair folks to recognize Sunday; then what kind of zeal is it that compels a woman to pay a fine or go to jail to make her recognize Sunday? And when people and papers sanction the zeal that fines and imprisons men and women for following their honest occupations on Sunday, then where is the virtue in calling in question the zeal that would, by armed troops, keep men and women from finding honest enjoyment at the World's Fair on Sunday?

THE truth is, that the zeal that calls for or sanctions the *enactment* of Sunday laws *of any kind*, is precisely the same zeal that calls for and sanctions their *enforcement* by troops. For the last is in the first. And if you are not prepared to go all the way then do not start on that road. There is no half-way place, nor any other stopping-place. And above all, there is no stopping-place when the men who have gone so far are the very ones who have led all the way hitherto. And the zeal which has brought them to this is the same zeal that has inspired them all the way along. And if you find that you cannot go with them the full length, then you are to renounce the whole thing and not go with them at all.

THERE is no other remedy. There is no other course that Christians, or anybody else, can take as to this matter now. The

whole movement from beginning to end is antichristian, and this last step

226

demonstrates this before all people. And Christians must absolutely repudiate the whole thing or else be partaker of these evil deeds. For it is written, "Come out of her, *my people*, that ye be not partakers of her sins."

AND whoever is partaker of her sins, will be also partaker of her judgments and of her ruin. And her judgment hasteth greatly and her ruin is certain. "For her sins have reached unto heaven and God hath remembered her iniquities. . . . And she shall be utterly burned with fire, for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her."

OF the early times of the Reformation the historian relates that "Our portion of the reform was to seek alliance of the world, and in this alliance find a destruction full of desolation." And this is precisely what this alliance will find now, and all who will escape this destruction and desolation must turn away from this evil combination in all its details and take the course of that other portion of the early Reformation and the right course of all true reform. "Another portion looking up to God was haughtily to reject the arm of the flesh, and by this very act of faith secure a noble victory."

JESUS CHRIST has spoken: "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." The Sunday-law managers called upon the courts to securely *close* the Fair on Sundays, and the courts have opened the gates. From this they ought to learn the lesson which the Scriptures everywhere teach, that when those who profess to trust God turn to the powers of the earth they find just the opposite of what they expect—where they expect help they find hindrance; where they expect victory they find defeat; where they expect salvation they find destruction. "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, *in whom is no help.*"

BUT will the Sunday managers learn the lesson? No, no, no. They have gone too far. They will not turn back. This failure will only make them more determined and more desperate until they indeed get full power to carry out, by force, their arbitrary will. And the fuller their apparent victory, the more terrible will be their sure defeat. And as they will not turn from their evil course, all who will be Christians must turn away from them. "We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed; forsake her, and let us go every one to his own country; for her judgment reacheth unto heaven and is lifted up even to the

skies." "My people, go yet out of the midst of her, and deliver ye every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord." J.

"Is It Selfishness?" *American Sentinel* 8, 29 , p. 230.

THERE are many selfish people in the world, but they can never see themselves that they are selfish. They think that everyone else is selfish and is trying to deprive them of their rights, but they cannot see that by their actions they are continually depriving others of their inalienable rights.

How is it with the Sunday-law advocate? He complains that because the World's Fair is open on Sunday the rights of the "Christian people" of the country are infringed. He virtually says: "We, the Christian people of the land, have asked that the Fair be closed on Sunday, and our request should be granted; not only so, but every person should be compelled to keep the day we regard as sacred." It matters not to him how much his fellow-man's rights are infringed so long as his are not. There are thousands who do not believe in the sacredness of Sunday, but that makes no difference to the Sunday-law advocate. In his eyes the "insignificant minority" have no rights that should be respected. Is there any selfishness in this? Is there any Christianity?

Christians should be freest of all people, for the Author of Christianity says: "Whom the Son makes free is free indeed;" but is a man free when his conscience is tied by a certain set calling themselves Christians? He is not; he is a slave, and that of the worst kind; for if he persists in being loyal to God, then he must suffer the penalty. He is called a law-breaker; he is put into prison; and if he still persists in being free in matters of religion, then stronger measures must be taken. The Sunday-law advocate has gone even so far as to threaten the use of the sword and the bullet if he does not have his way. But Christ said, "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." But to them that are persecuted for His sake He says: "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven."

July 27, 1893

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 8, 30 , pp. 233, 234.

WHAT Is Protestantism?

THIS is a question of living interest and vital importance just now, to the people of the United States.

WHEN the point has been reached where professed Protestants call upon Congress and courts to decide religious controversies for them, and to enact laws enforcing their church dogmas, and where they insist upon calling out the troops to enforce upon the people at the point of the bayonet the recognition and observance of religious observances, then it is time, and it is proper too, to inquire, Is this Protestantism?

AT the second Diet of Spires, held in 1529, there was presented the *Protest*, which originated, and gave to those who made it, the title and name of *Protestants*. And in summarizing this protest the historian states its principles as follows:—

The principles contained in the celebrated protest of the 19th of April, 1529, constitute *the very essence of Protestantism*. Now this protest opposes *two abuses of man* in matters of faith; the *first* is the intrusion of the civil magistrate; and the *second* the arbitrary authority of the Church. Instead of these abuses, Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate, and the authority of the Word of God above the visible Church. In the first place, it rejects the civil power in divine things, and says with the prophets and apostles, *We must obey God, rather than man*. In the presence of the crown of Charles the Fifth, it uplifts the crown of Jesus Christ.—*D'Aubigne, Hist. Ref. Book XIII, Chap. VI. Page 521.*

The Sunday managers claim that Sunday is the Christian Sabbath, that it is the great charter of their religion, that it is indeed the very citadel of their faith. And they claim to be Protestants. Now did they oppose the intrusion of the civil magistrate into this great question of their religion? No, indeed. Everybody knows that so far were they from opposing any intrusion of the civil magistrate that they actually and by threat *required* the civil authority to intrude upon the discussion and decision of the question and the enactment of a law requiring its observance; and also required the courts to intrude themselves into it when the act of Congress was called in question; and further called upon the executive to further intrude the civil authority by force of arms. All this they have done before the eyes of all the people.

NOW as it is the very essence of Protestantism to *oppose* the intrusion of the civil magistrate in religious things; and as they did not oppose this, it plainly follows that they are not Protestants, and that

their movement and work is not Protestantism. As it is the very essence of Protestantism to oppose the intrusion of the civil magistrate in things religious, and as the people engaged in the Sunday movement, professing to be Protestants, not only did not oppose it, but actually required the whole magisterial power of the United States Government under threats to intrude there; it follows that the people who engaged in this Sunday-law movement are not Protestants at all, and that neither their movement nor their work is Protestantism in any sense.

SECONDLY, it is the essence of Protestantism to oppose "the arbitrary authority of the Church."

NOW, for Sunday observance in any way there is no authority but the arbitrary authority of the Church. The Sunday managers not only know this, but they openly say it. The American Sabbath Union itself in one of its own official publications, in answer to a call for a citation to a command of God for Sunday observance, plainly says: "We admit there is no such command." The Women's Christian Temperance Union, also in one of its own publications, inquiring about the change of day from the seventh to the first, says that Christ "did not command it." There are other such statements also—too many to cite here. Well then, as they know that there is no command of God for Sunday observance; and as the Church power only is that which requires its observance; this is proof in itself that the only authority for it is the arbitrary authority of the Church.

YET more than this. Even though Christ had commanded it, for the Church to require, and enforce upon men its observance by law—this would be nothing else than to assert the arbitrary authority of the Church. *Because*, Christ himself has said, "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge [condemn] him not." As therefore Christ leaves every man free to observe his words or not, for the Church to compel any man to do it, is to put herself above Christ and do what *he* does not do. And this, in itself, is only to assert the arbitrary authority of the Church. So that whether there be a command of God for Sunday observance or not, in this matter the result is the same; to do as the professed Protestant churches of the United States have done and are doing, in requiring Sunday observance of all by law, is nothing else than to assert the rightfulness of the arbitrary authority of the Church.

BUT it is *the essence of Protestantism* to oppose the arbitrary authority of the Church. Therefore, as the professed Protestants of

the United States have not opposed the arbitrary authority of the Church in this matter of Sunday observance, it plainly follows that they are not Protestants. And as it is the essence of Protestantism to oppose the arbitrary authority of the Church, and as these professed Protestants, not only did not oppose it, but actually asserted it and still maintain it, it unmistakably follows that they are not Protestants at all; and that neither their movement nor their work is Protestantism in any sense.

THIS proves that to oppose the Sunday movement in all its parts, to oppose Sunday laws in any and all their phases, to oppose and deny the right of congresses, or courts, or executives, to touch the question of Sunday observance, or any other religious question in any way, and to reject entirely the authority of any such action when it is asserted—*this* and this only *is Protestantism*. Even admitting that Sunday were the Sabbath, those who observe it can be Protestants only by opposing all intrusion of the magistrate into the question; by opposing all attempt of the Church to require its recognition or

234

observance by law, and by asserting their own individual right to observe it as they choose, without any dictation or interference from anybody. This alone is Protestantism.

THIS is the living, present, absolute truth. There is no discount on it at all. "Protestantism sets the power of conscience above a magistrate," even though the magistrate calls himself a Christian and a Protestant, and proposes to enforce the "Christian Sabbath." "Protestantism sets the authority of the Word of God above the visible Church," even though the Church," even though the Church calls itself Protestant. Protestantism "rejects the civil power in divine things, and says with the prophets and apostles: 'We must obey God rather than man,'" and that too *as God commands* it, and not as *man* commands it, nor as *man says* that God commands it. Protestantism opposes and rejects every human intrusion, whether of the magistrate or the ecclesiastic, between the soul and Jesus Christ, and everlastingly maintains the divine right of the individual to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience exercised at his own free choice.

THIS is Protestantism; and the AMERICAN SENTINEL is unqualifiedly and uncompromisingly Protestant. The religious people who publish it are the same. The excellent work in which the SENTINEL and the people who publish it are engaged is genuine

Protestantism. That work, as relates to this question, is the constant, unwavering, uncompromising, opposition to every form of Sunday legislation, or any other religious legislation, and to all interference or control of ecclesiastics in the affairs of Government. Protestants are needed to-day to protest against this apostate Protestantism which is now carrying things with so high a hand. Come along!

HERE are some words of as much solemn weight as ever, and as true to-day, and of this Sunday movement, as they ever were at any other time or of any other movement:

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

"The gospel of the reformers *had nothing to do with the world and with politics*. While the Roman hierarchy had become a matter of diplomacy and a court intrigue, the Reformation was destined to exercise *no other influence over princes and people* than that which proceeds from the gospel of peace.

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

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

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

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

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

"If three centuries have gone astray, it is because they were unable to comprehend so holy and so solemn a lesson."—*D'Aubigne, Id., Book XIV., Chap. 1.*

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 8, 30 , p. 240.

THE *Christian Statesman* says: "A greater peril to the Sabbath even than Sunday opening at Chicago, is the widespread Sabbath-breaking of Christians. It is the Achan that causes our defeats and

delays our victory." It is a truly deplorable thing that professed Christians so very generally disregard the Sabbath. Even the editors of the *Statesman* observe another day and heap contempt on the day the Lord sanctified and blessed. It is little wonder that the flocks go astray when the shepherds wander from right paths. The widespread agitation of the Sabbath question is rapidly destroying regard for Sunday, for it is revealing the fact that it is without divine authority. But as this becomes more apparent the demand for human law to bolster up the tottering institution becomes more imperative. Ephraim is joined to his idol.

A SECULAR paper remarks the "the seizure of an Aztec god at Xohiltepec, in Mexico, by the Catholic Archbishop, has stirred up the god's Indian devotees, who threaten to go on the war-path in his behalf. He is of stone, and in form is partly human, partly aquiline. We presume that the archbishop must have believed he had a right to seize the god of the Aztec religion; and yet it is a fact that, under the Constitution of Mexico, all religions are tolerated there, so that the Indians are as free to worship their god as the Chinese, for example, are to worship theirs." And then this paper, which is none other than the *Sun* of this city, shows its utter lack of appreciation of the real principle involved, by saying: "We do not see, however, that the Indians of Xohiltepec need to do battle for their god. They can make another."

A ZEALOUS Sunday preacher thinks that the Georgia railroads are in the hands of a receiver because the frown of God is upon them for running Sunday trains. It is, of course, a little difficult to prove a negative in such a case; but will the gentleman who advances the theory explain the accident to the Sunday school excursion train near East Aurora, N.Y., on Monday, the 17th inst., in which twenty-two persons were injured? Have Sunday schools become such wicked things that the Lord has to maim those who attend them? or was this particular school alone at fault? And while the gentleman is about it he might devote a little attention to the wind that demolished Sam Jones' tent wherein he was preaching on a recent Sunday. Is preaching in a tent on Sunday also wicked?

GOVERNMENTS have in past ages assumed to dominate the realm of conscience; the sequel is the history of the Inquisition. The thumbscrew, the rack, and the fagot are inseparable from the theory that civil government has any jurisdiction whatever in religious things. The advocates of religious legislation may affirm that they would not

carry it so far as that, but it is impossible for them to stop short of it without abandoning their theory. It is for this reason that we oppose all laws touching religious questions and controversies. They are the beginnings of intolerance. If Sunday were not regarded as sacred there would be no demand for laws enforcing its observance. It is not physical rest but spiritual worship that is the object of Sunday laws. It is therefore a matter that the State has no right to touch. It is for this reason that we oppose any and all Sunday laws.

August 3, 1893

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 8, 31 , pp. 241-243.

THE professed Protestant Church managers of the United States, knowing and confessing that there is no command of God for Sunday observance, and not being willing plainly to acknowledge the authority of the Catholic Church, which is the original authority that has commanded it, and yet desiring to make Sunday observance universal and a national institution in the United States *as a duty toward God*, were placed in an embarrassing dilemma. They were plainly in great danger of being obliged to go back to Rome.

THEY found by experience that the people of the United States are not inclined to accept, as the will of God, the bare statement of church authorities as unquestioningly as little birds take their food. Besides this, they found a small body of Christian people scattered all over the United States, who, they have said over and over, are exceedingly active and vigorous in telling the people everywhere, not only that Sunday is not the Sabbath, but that the seventh day is; not only that there is no command of God for observing the first day of the week, but pointing always to the plain command of God—"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God"—for the observance of the seventh day of the week. These things only increased the dilemma.

WHAT should be done? What *could* be done? Well, as they knew there was no command of God to keep the first day of the week; and as it was not according to Protestant profession to practice religious observances for which there is no "Thus saith the Lord"; and above all, as it would not do for *them* to cite the authority of the Catholic Church as of obligation upon the people; to escape their predicament they did this: They took the commandment of God, which says, "The

seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," and *interpreted* it to mean "the first day is the Sabbath," that thus they might have (?) a command of God for Sunday observance. Thus they hoped to find authority by which they could require Sunday observance by the people and so be saved from going back to Rome.

BUT lo! they found that this did not deliver them from their dilemma. Besides their forgetting that to presume to interpret the Word of God, is, in itself, to set up the claim of infallibility which leads straight back to Rome anyhow, they found that when they had set the example of interpreting the commandment of God to suit themselves, the people were not slow to follow the example in interpreting *the interpretation* to suit *themselves*. Thus their effort to escape proved doubly futile: first, in that their example in interpreting the commandment was followed to their detriment; and secondly, in that they had no more power to secure the recognition of their interpretation, than they had before to secure the observance of Sunday without the interpretation—no more power to secure the observance of Sunday after forcing it into the commandment of God where it does not belong, than they had before to secure the observance of Sunday as it is, in the commandment of Rome, where it does belong. Thus their effort to escape the dilemma only increased the difficulty.

WHAT next? Oh, they would have the national Government take up the question, and indorse their side of it as correct, and thus would get the power of the Government under their control with which to enforce upon the people their interpretation of the commandment of God, and so would effect their purpose to make Sunday observance a national thing *as a duty toward God*. And they have succeeded, so far as to get the Government to adopt their interpretation of the commandment. We have given the threatening resolution with which they flooded Congress by which they required Congress to do their bidding. We need not cite that again. But it is proper to print again the result, for the very important fact which it discloses.

THE official record is as follows:—

MR. QUAY.—On page 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 [this was the Bible—ED.] 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."—*Congressional Record, July 10, 1892, p. 6614.*

The discussion of this motion and amendment was opened by Senator Manderson, of Nebraska, to the following effect:—

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 this idea. . . .

The word "Sabbath-day" simply means 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."—*Id., July 12, p. 6694.*

This amendment to Senator Quay's amendment, as far as it inserted "the first day of the week commonly called Sunday," in place of "the Sabbath day," was adopted, and all further proceeding was conducted upon no other basis than that "the first day of the week commonly called Sunday" is the Sabbath, and that as such its observance is due to God.

FROM this official record, it is as plain as anything can be, that the Congress of the United States (for the House not only adopted this, but on its own part, on a direct issue by a vote of one hundred and

thirty-one to thirty-six decided that the seventh day is not the Sabbath, after deciding that Sunday is), in its official capacity, did adopt the interpretation which the churches had made, and did officially and by legislative action put that interpretation upon the commandment of God. Congress did define what the word "Sabbath-day" "means"; and that it "may be" one day or another, "Saturday or Sunday"; and did decide which day it should be, namely, "the first day of the week commonly called Sunday." This is as clearly an interpretation of the Bible as was ever made on earth.

AND, like all other human interpretations of the Scriptures, *it is wrong*. As witness this Word: "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."—Mark 16:1, 2. Thus the plain Word of God says that "the Sabbath was past" before the first day of the week came at all—yes, before even the "very early" part of it came. But lo! the Congress of the United States officially decides that the Sabbath *is* the first day of the week. Now, when the Word of God plainly says that the Sabbath *is past* before the first day of the week comes, and yet Congress says that the first day of the week *is* the Sabbath, which is right?

NOR is the Word of God indefinite as to what this distinction refers. Here is the Word as to that: "That day [the day of the crucifixion] was the preparation, and *the Sabbath* drew on. And the women also which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid. 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."—Luke 23:54-56; 24:1. Here it is plainly shown that the Sabbath day, according to the commandment, and the first day of the week, are two separate and distinct days entirely. And yet Congress gravely defines that "the Sabbath-day" "may be one or the other"! The Word of God plainly says that the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment, is past before the first day of the week comes at all. And yet Congress declares that the first day of the week is itself the Sabbath! Which is right? Is the Lord able to say what he means? or is it essential that his commandments shall be put through a course of

congressional procedure and interpretation in order that his meaning shall reach the people of the United States? And further, are not the people of the United States capable of finding out for themselves what the meaning of the Word of God is? or is it so, that it is necessary that Congress should be put between the people and God so as to insure to them the people and God so as to insure to them the true and divine meaning of His Word?

WHETHER these questions be answered one way or the other, it is certain that this is precisely the attitude which has been assumed by the Congress of the United States. Whatever men may believe, or whatever men may say, as to the right or the wrong of this question, there is no denying the fact that Congress has taken it upon itself to interpret the Scripture for the people of the United States. This is a fact. It has been done. *Then where is the difference between this assumption and that of the other Pope?* The Roman Pope assumes the prerogative of interpreting the Scripture for the people of the whole world. Congress has assumed the prerogative of interpreting the Scripture for the people of the United States. Where is the difference in these claims—except perhaps in this, that whereas the claim of the Roman Pope embraces the whole world, the claim of this congressional Pope embraces only the United States. And yet there is hardly room for this distinction; because this interpretation by Congress was intended to include, and to be of force upon, all the nations that took part in the World's Fair, and these were expected to be all the nations of the world. So that, practically, the two claims are so nearly alike, that it is only another illustration of the truth that there is no possibility of measuring degrees in the respective claims of rival Popes. There are no degrees in infallibility anyhow. That the Fair is not closed on Sunday out of respect to this interpretation, does not alter the fact that Congress has interpreted the commandment of God. Besides this, the decision that assured the opening of the Fair on Sunday distinctly excluded all consideration of the question on constitutional grounds.

AND to escape this claim and its direct consequence, was precisely the purpose which our fathers had in view when they forbade the Government to have anything to do with questions of religion or religious observances. At the very first step for religious freedom after the Declaration of Independence, which was the first step toward the result fixed in the national Constitution forbidding interference with religion, there was made this weighty statement: "*It*

is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects professing the Christian faith *without erecting a claim to infallibility which would lead us back to the Church of Rome.*" In this Sunday interpretation Congress did distinctly decide a question of preference between sects professing the Christian faith. Two different sects professing the Christian faith claim that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord." A greater number of sects professing the Christian faith claim that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is the Sabbath." And both base their claims upon the fourth commandment. Now Congress has definitely decided the question of preference in favor of the latter, and has declared that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," *is* the Sabbath of that commandment. Thus, Congress has done the very thing which our fathers forbade it to do that the people of this Nation might not be led back to Rome. Congress has done the thing which the founders of our Government declared it "*impossible*" to do, without doing that which would lead "back to the Church of Rome."

HOW certainly this result follows, can be seen at a glance: These professed Protestant churches had enough "influence" upon Congress to secure the decision of *this* question in their favor. And as soon as it was done they gladly and loudly proclaimed that "this settles the Sabbath question." Now, all questions between Catholics and these Protestants even, are not entirely settled. One of these, for instance, is on this very question of Sunday observance—not, indeed, *whether* it shall be observed, but *how* it shall be observed. Let this or any other question be disputed between them, and all the Catholic Church has now to do is to bring enough "influence" to bear upon Congress to get the question decided in her favor—and there you have it! the whole Nation is then delivered bodily over into subjection to Rome. And no Protestant who has had anything to do with this Sunday-law movement can ever say a word. For if the action of Congress settles a religious question when it is decided in their favor, they can never deny that such action as certainly settles a religious question when it is decided in favor of the Catholic Church. If they accept such a decision when it suits *them*, they must likewise accept such a decision when it suits the Catholics. And this other thing will as certainly come, as this has already come. And thus the Government and people of the United States will have been delivered into the hands of Rome by this blind procedure of apostate Protestantism. That which our fathers feared, and which they supposed they had

forever prevented, will have come. And the first and great decisive step has been taken, in this successful demand of the churches of the United States that Congress should interpret the Scripture, decide a religious dispute, and "settle" a religious question.

THAT it may be seen how well our fathers understood this, we give just three sentences from the documents and times of '76:—

It is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility which would lead us back to the Church of Rome.

Again:—

The impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, *setting up their own opinions* and modes of thinking *as the only true and infallible*, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greater part of the world and through all times.

And again:—

To judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, is an unalienable right, which, *upon the principles on which the gospel was first propagated, and the Reformation from Popery carried on*, can never be transferred to another.

Thus spoke Madison, Jefferson and their noble fellow-workers, at the time of the establishing of the United States Government. Upon these principles was the national Government founded. How entirely these divine principles have been forgotten both by American legislators and Protestant ecclesiastics, and how complete a revolution from these principles has been wrought, the facts presented in these notes in some measure show, and soon coming developments will fully demonstrate.

BUT even as the matter now stands,

243

every person in the United States is shut up to one of two things; either to assent to, or decidedly protest against, the right of Congress to interpret the Bible on this Sabbath question or any other. To assent to it, is to confess the infallibility of Congress and thus to put Congress in the place of God. To reject it, and protest against it, is to subject ourselves to the charge of "treason," "anarchy," "atheism," etc., etc., but at the same time is to maintain the fundamental principles of the Government of the United States, the fundamental principles of the Reformation in its purity, the divine principles of

Christianity itself as announced by the Lord Jesus, and the divine right of man to freedom before God. The historian of the Reformation has well said: "The establishment of the bible, had terminated only in slavishly subjecting man to man in what should be most unfettered—conscience and faith."—*D'Aubigne, book XIII, chap. VI*. Revolt from this thing before, was the emancipation of mankind. This is the only course now to take to be free. They would not serve the beast. Will you now worship this wicked image of the beast? Everybody in the United States is now shut up to this decision. Which way do you decide?

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 8, 31 , p. 248.

THE saying that "the majority should rule" is true only of those matters which come properly within the sphere of civil government. But religious questions are outside that sphere, not by constitutional guarantee, merely, but by the law of our being which makes us individually responsible to the Creator.

IT is now charged that the Mormons have raised a fund of \$1,000,000, with which they propose to buy Statehood for Utah. Well, why not? The other National Reformers less than a year ago induced Congress to engage in wholesale bribery of the Columbian Exposition in the interests of Sunday sacredness; if now the Mormons bribe Congress, who can condemn them? Not the Sunday boomers, surely.

THE closing of the World's Fair is at last an accomplished fact; but from a moral standpoint it is a barren victory to the churches that worked so hard for it. It is true that they now try to make it appear that the failure of Sunday-closing is an evidence of the great regard that the masses have for Sunday; but it is nothing of the kind. By threats of political boycott and by tricks unworthy of any but ward politicians, the Sunday managers secured the closing of such a large part of the Fair that few cared to go on Sunday; and thus by their own act they made impossible a free expression of the sentiments of the people regarding the day. Had the Fair been opened on Sundays just as on other days, and had no special influence been brought to bear on exhibitors to induce them to cover their exhibits on that day, and then the people had refused to attend in paying numbers, it would indeed have been evidence of great popular regard for Sunday; but under

the conditions created for the occasion it proves nothing, except that people do not propose to pay full price for less than half a show.

THE *Moon*, a newspaper printed in Battle Creek, Mich., has in its issue of July 19, this item of news:—

The Second Baptist Church of Battle Creek will hold a jubilee meeting on the fair grounds in Marshall next Sunday, for the benefit of the new church. The meetings will begin at 10 o'clock A.M. The best musical talent will be present. There will be plantation melodies and songs and instrumental music. The sermon on "A Damned Hot Day" will be preached at 2:30 o'clock P.M. Admission ten cents.

The *Moon* makes no comment, and it seems that none is needed. Such things make it very apparent that regard for Sunday as a sacred day is not in all the thoughts of the Sunday church managers; they know that it is no better than any other day; what they want is a monopoly of the day for their own purposes. If the World's Fair was filling their coffers, they would to a man be clamoring for Sunday opening, and instead of preaching about a single profanely hot day, they would be denouncing against all who opposed them the terrors of an uncomfortably warm "orthodox" eternity.

THE lie that the Seventh-day Adventists are parties to the Clingman suit to compel the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday has been again revived in Chicago. Seventh-day Adventists defend themselves in the courts when haled before them by others, but they never appeal to civil rulers to compel a course of action in accordance with their ideas. The managers of the Fair have decided to close it on Sunday for reasons which are satisfactory to them, and the Adventists do not regard it as any of their business. They would no more try to compel the opening of the Fair on Sunday by law than they would invoke the same power to close it on the Sabbath.

BEFORE Christianity can have practically as the National Reformers demand that it shall have, "an undeniable legal basis" in this country, it must be defined; that is, it must be decided what constitutes Christianity; and that definition will be the national creed just as the Nicene creed was the creed of Rome.

August 10, 1893

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 8, 32 , pp. 249-251.

SEEING that the churches, through the Congress of the United States, have gone as far as it is possible for human power to go toward changing the law of the Most High, it is well to inquire what this means.

SEEING that they have taken up the fourth commandment, and have taken out of it what the Lord distinctly and intentionally put there, and have put into it what the Lord never intended to be there, and which never could by any honest purpose be put there, it is proper to inquire what this amounts to.

THE Lord of heaven and earth, spake to men the fourth commandment with a voice that shook the earth; and afterward wrote it twice with his own finger on tables of stone. When he spoke it, and when he wrote it, he said plainly and distinctly: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." For forty years by three special acts each week he kept before the people in a way in which it was impossible to mistake, his own meaning of the statement that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Besides this, through the whole course of his revelation in the written word, and in the living Word in the life of Jesus Christ on earth, he always set before all people the great importance of this statement.

NOW all this being true, when the churches of the United States, through the Congress of the United States, deliberately declare and fix in the legislation of the Nation that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," *is*, and for the people of the United States and the world *shall be*, the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, it is important to study this high-handed procedure and see what its nature is. When the directory of the World's Fair acted contrary to the strict and literal letter of the act of Congress in this matter, these churches denounced it as "anarchy," "rebellion," "nullification," "treason," ect., etc. This too when there had been no official construction of the act of Congress which the United States courts plainly declared was exceedingly ambiguous. According to their own judgment then, what is this action of the churches and Congress, not only in disregarding, but in *deliberately changing*, the plain word of the statute of the Most High, when in every possible way he himself had given the authoritative construction of it? what is this then, according to their own showing, but anarchy, rebellion, nullification, treason, etc., etc.?

IF this is what the action of the directory was with respect to the law and Government of the United States, then what but this same, is

this action of the churches and Congress with respect to the law and government of the Most High? Shall the law and government of man be more sacred than that of God? Shall men tampering with the laws of man, be more guilty than their tampering with the law of God? Nay, shall they not in tampering with the divine law be as much more guilty as God is greater than man, and as his law is more sacred than that of man?

THERE is an instance in history which, with the comment of an eminent thinker, serves well as an illustration in this connection: Two hundred years ago the English colony of Ireland had a parliament of their own, subordinate however to the supreme authority of the Parliament of Great Britain. But, says the historian:—

The Irish Lords and Commons had presumed not only to re-enact an English act passed expressly for the purpose of binding them, but to re-enact it *with alterations*. The alterations were indeed small; but the alteration even of a letter was tantamount to a declaration of independence."—*Macaulay, History of England, middle of chapter XXIII.*

As the alteration "even of a letter" the supreme law, by a subordinate power, is "tantamount to a declaration of independence;" then what but a complete and defiant declaration of independence, is this action of the churches and Congress of the United States in altering by a presumptuous "interpretation," not merely a letter but the whole intent and purpose of one-tenth of the supreme law of the universe? Are the churches and Congress of the United States indeed independent of the Lord Almighty? Are they sovereign, and not subject with respect to the law of the Most High? Nay, nay. However sovereign and independent their action may declare them to be, they will yet find that in all these things wherein they have dealt so exceeding proudly, the Lord God is yet above them. Macaulay's further comment on the Irish incident is most fitting to this present case:—

The colony in Ireland was emphatically a dependency; a dependency, not merely by the common laws of the realm, but *by the nature of things*. It was absurd to claim independence for a community which could not cease to be dependent without ceasing to exist.

EVERYBODY can see the force of this parallel. Nor is it in any sense overdrawn. It is fitting in every sense and in every degree. There never was on this earth a more high-handed proceeding than this action of the churches and Congress of the United States in

changing so far as is in human power to change, the law and the Sabbath of the Lord God. The Sabbath of the Lord is not a matter merely of one *day* or another *as such*. It is a day it is true, and it is much more. The Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day as he made it, is an *institution* bearing the impress, the nature, of Divinity. It bears ineradicably stamped upon it the image and superscription of the Creator of all things as such. And to substitute another day for the Sabbath which God established, as the churches and Congress of the United States have done, is to counterfeit the spiritual coin of the realm of Jehovah and force men to accept it as the genuine. We do not say that these people know what they have done, or what they are still doing. Neither did the Church managers and Pontius Pilate, eighteen hundred and sixty years ago, know what they were doing when they rejected and crucified the Lord and demanded a murderer in his stead. They did not know what they were doing, *but they did it*. These do not know what they have done, *but they have done it*.

250

IT is written: "Hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." Eze. 20:20. Notice, he does not say, It is a sign that I am the Lord, but "a sign that ye *may know* that I am the Lord your God." There is that in the Sabbath of the Lord which makes it to man the means of finding the true knowledge of the true God. For men know God truly only when they know, not only that *he is*, but that he is *what* he is. "For he that cometh to God must believe *that he is*, and *that he is a rewarder* of them that diligently seek him." Heb. 11:6. In answer to the question, "What is his name?" he said, "I AM THAT I AM." Ex. 3:14. Not only "I am" but "I am *what* I am." Not merely "I am," in point of *existence*, but "I am *what* I am," in point of *character*. For when he proclaimed his name more fully he proclaimed it: "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." Ex. 34:5-7. This is the Lord, the true God; and the Sabbath of the Lord is the sign by which, when it is hallowed, men *may know* that he is such. Therefore the Sabbath of the Lord, which he says is the seventh day, being the sign by which men may know that the Lord is God, it follows as plainly as can be that the churches and Congress of the United States, in putting this, as far as lies in their power, away from men have done all they can to shut away from men the knowledge of the true God.

AGAIN, God is known, as he is, only in Jesus Christ, for "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, *and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.*" Matt. 11:27. "They shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us." Matt. 1:23. He is the Word—the expression of the thought—of God. So that practically and really he is God to us, as well as God with us. Therefore as God is known, as he is, only in and through Jesus Christ; and the Sabbath of the Lord being the sign by which men *may know* that the Lord is God; it is plain that the Sabbath of the Lord is the sign of what Jesus Christ is to men, and by which men *may know* what Jesus Christ is to them. Therefore again, when the churches and Congress of the United States, as far as lies in their power, have put away from men the Sabbath of the Lord and its observance, they have in reality done what they can to put away from men the knowledge of what Jesus Christ is to men. Again we freely admit that they know not what they are doing, any more than did the priests and Pharisees and politicians when they did all they could before to put away Christ from men, but they have done it as certainly as those did before. And in both instances they could not have done it any more certainly if they had known it. And these now will find, as did those eighteen hundred years ago, that their determined effort to put Him away from the knowledge of men only the more powerfully brings him to the knowledge of men.

IT is a sign, says he, "that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." Wherein is it s sign? The first of all things that God is to anything or any person in the universe is Creator. Therefore, of the Sabbath it is written: "It is a sign. . . . for [because] in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed—[took delight]." Ex. 31:17. It is a sign, therefore, by which men may know the Creator of all things, and that the Lord Jehovah is he. And in these days when "science" is taking the place of God, and evolution the place of creation, it is time that men should know God and his creative power for themselves. And now is the time as never before, when the sign—the Sabbath of the Lord—by which men may know him shall be exalted that men may find him and know him for themselves. It is not strange, therefore, that the enemy of all righteousness should take supreme measures to shut away from the world the sign by which men may know the creative power of God in Jesus Christ.

FOR it was through Jesus Christ that the power of God was manifested in the creation of the heavens and the earth and all that in them is. For "God who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us *by his Son*, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, *by whom also he made the worlds*." Heb. 1:1, 2. "God . . . created all things by Jesus Christ." Eph. 3:2. And this is why he challenges all false gods upon the point that they have not made the heavens and earth. Jer. 10:12-15. It was Jesus Christ who spoke, when, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth. . . . For he [Jesus Christ] spake, and it was; he commanded and it stood fast." Ps. 33:6, 9. It was Jesus Christ who rested the seventh day at the close of creation. It was he who blessed the seventh day; it was he who hallowed it and sanctified it. It was he, Jesus Christ, who thus made the Sabbath—the rest—of the Lord on the seventh day. And the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord Jesus Christ thy God. It was he who made the Sabbath for man. It was he who set it to be to man the sign by which he might know what he, Jesus Christ, the Creator, is to man. And this is why it is so emphatically true that they who repudiate and put away the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord, do in effect repudiate and put away Jesus Christ. This is what the Sabbath was to man before he sinned. This is what it would have still been to him if he never had sinned.

BUT man sinned. He did not remain faithfully a part of the Lord's original creation. Through sin, man gave over to the enemy of God, himself and all his dominion. All was wholly lost. But though man and all was lost, yet God in Jesus Christ freely and willingly became his Saviour. The Creator became the Redeemer. He by whom God created all things, is He by whom God would save all. He through whom the power of God was manifested in creation, He is the same one through whom the power of God is manifested in salvation. And the power of God, whenever, or wherever, or unto whatever purpose it may be manifested, is the same power; for he is the same yesterday and to-day and forever, he changeth not, with him is no variableness nor shadow of turning—it is ever the same power, the power of God, creative power. And the power of God manifested through Jesus Christ unto salvation is only the same power that was manifested through Jesus Christ unto creation. Therefore salvation is only creation over again. "For we are his workmanship *created in Christ Jesus* unto good works which God hath before ordained that

we should walk in them." Eph. 2:10. "*Create in me* a clean heart, O God." Ps. 54:10. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creation." 2 Cor. 5:11, R.V. It is yet further evident that salvation is nothing more nor less than creation over again, because the work of salvation, of redemption, when completed is only the accomplishment, in spite of sin, of the original creation as it would have been and remained had there been no sin. Therefore, salvation, redemption, being creation, it follows inevitably that in the nature of things, the sign of creation is the sign of salvation. Redemption being the same power—the power of God manifested through the same one—Jesus Christ, unto the accomplishment of the original purpose, in the nature of things the same sign, the sign of the power of God manifested in the beginning of the original purpose, is still the sign of that same power in the final accomplishment of the original purpose. Therefore it is the everlasting truth that the Sabbath of the Lord which he set to be the sign of his power manifested in creation, is also the sign of his power manifested in redemption. The Sabbath of the Lord, which he set to be the sign by which men may know that he is the Lord, is that indeed; and it is the sign by which men may know him in redemption as in creation; for redemption is creation, the Creator is the Redeemer. See John 1:1-3, 14. Col. 1:12-15. Heb. 1:1-3. Eph. 3:8-12. Isa. 40:25-29.

As salvation is creation, as the Creator is the Saviour, so likewise he challenges all false gods upon the point that *they cannot save*, as well as upon the point that they cannot create. Thus: "They have no knowledge that set up the wood of their graven image, and pray unto a god *that cannot save*. Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together: Who hath declared this from ancient time? Who hath told it from that time? Have not I the Lord? and there is no God else beside me; a just God *and a Saviour*; there is none beside me. Look unto me, and *be ye saved*, all the ends of the earth: *for I am God*, and there is none else." Isa. 45:20-22. Thus it more and more appears from every consideration of Scripture that he who created is he who saves, and that therefore that which is the sign of him who created is also the sign of him who saves; that the sign which he has given that men *may know* that he is the Lord our God, is also the sign by which men may know that he is the Lord our Saviour; for he is Saviour because he is God—"a just God and a Saviour and there is none else." And the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, is this sign. The Lord made is so, and he says so, and it is so. For again, it is written: "I gave them my Sabbaths to be a sign between me and them

that they *might know* that I am the Lord *that sanctify them.*"—Eze. 20:12. And as certainly as there is no other true God, no other true Saviour, no other true Creator, and no other true Sanctifier—as there is no other and can be

251

no other, so certainly there can be no other sign by which men may know as he is, the true God and Saviour, the true Creator and Sanctifier, than the sign which he has named—the seventh day the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.

THEREFORE, this Sabbath question is not a question merely of days *as such*; it is not a question merely as to whether we shall have one day or another as such; it is a question as to whether we shall worship the one true God or another, and whether we shall have him the one true Saviour or another. It is a question as to whether we shall honor the one true Creator, and have him for our Sanctifier, or another. It is a question as to whether we shall wear the sign of the true God and of His power to save, or whether we shall wear the sign of another and of his *powerlessness to save*. *Which sign do you wear?* That other sign and that other proposed saviour we shall examine next week.

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 8, 32 , p. 256.

IT is announced that the Department of Sunday Rest of the World's Fair Congress Auxiliary will hold meetings on September 28-30, at Chicago. The subjects discussed will be included in the following divisions: the Physiological, the Economic and Business, the Governmental and Political, the Social and Moral, and the Religious Relations of the Weekly Rest Day.

AFTER being closed one Sunday, the World's Fair was again open on that day, July 30. The attendance was only 18,637. The game of battledoor and shuttlecock being played between the Sunday openers and the Sunday closers in the matter of the Columbian Exposition is in a sense interesting, though owing to the manner in which it has been conducted—in utter disregard of any correct principle—it cannot be viewed with any degree of satisfaction.

NOT content with stealing the fourth commandment to enforce the claims of Sunday, the *Christian Statesman* has also appropriated the term "Sabbatarian" and now applies to observers of the seventh day, the real Sabbatarians (see Webster), an epithet coined for the

occasion, namely, "Saturdarians." The *Statesman* is welcome to all such methods of warfare. Blackguards and fishwomen should have a monopoly of epithet hurling. It is quite beneath the dignity of any paper which is Christian in anything but in name.

THE *Canadian Baptist* of July 13, has the following to say on the Sunday-car question now being much agitated in Toronto:—

We argue the question upon social and moral, and not upon religious lines, because we hold firmly to the view that the religious side of the question is one with which civic councils and regulations have nothing to do. The sphere of men's spiritual life is above their reach. We take it that whether street-cars run or do not run on Sundays, every Christian will feel that the question of the use he makes of Sabbath opportunities and privileges, and the influences he brings to bear upon others in relation to its high spiritual uses, will still be one between himself and his Master. From the religious point of view no Sabbath observance which can be enforced by civil statutes and penalties can be of any value in the sight of Him who "looketh upon the heart."

It is comforting to see the *Baptist* thus take its stand firmly on the right ground—that religious duties enforced by law count for nothing in the sight of God. If the newspapers which are now clashing over the subject, the ministers, and all the citizens of Toronto would take this invincible position on this question, but little difficulty would be encountered in the settlement of it.

A ROMAN Catholic Church in Long Island City was destroyed by fire recently, and the pastor of a neighboring Baptist Church tendered the priest in charge of the Catholic parish the use of the Baptist house of worship. The kind offer was accepted with thanks, and now the reading public is being regaled with the usual amount of "gush" about "Christian union." Such an occurrence as that in Long Island City is an indication not so much of prospective *union* between Romanism and Protestantism as it is of Protestants truckling to Rome. "Rome never changes." Protestants can unite with "the Church" only by proving recreant to the very principles which gave them the name. The lamb and the lion may unite by the former taking a position inside the latter, and by the process of digestion becoming assimilated with the lion; not otherwise.

We would not lightly criticise a kind act; but when a Baptist pastor says in explanation of such an act, "We are simply performing an act of courtesy by aiding in this way, as much as we can, fellow-Christians who are in misfortune. We are all followers of the same

Master," he simply declares that he has no excuse for separation from the Church of Rome. Rome is either *the Church* just as she claims to be, to the exclusion of "the sects," or she is antichrist, "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." Protestants may unite with Rome, but only as the river unites with the ocean, namely, by flowing into and becoming a part of it. But even if union between Protestantism and Romanism were possible in any other sense, it would not be *Christian* union, for Rome is not Christian. Rome is pagan in everything except in name; and as the ocean gives its saltness to everything flowing into it, so Rome would necessarily give her character to everything "uniting" with her.

WHEN it was given out that the council of administration of the Columbian Exposition had determined to open the Fair on Sunday, July 30, in obedience to Judge Stein's order, the president and secretary of the National Closing Committee, at Pittsburg, sent the council a telegram, saying:—

Any possible penalty for contempt of court in closing in accordance with law will be a trifle to the cost of incurring the everlasting contempt of the country for inefficiency and trickery in recent dealings with the Stein injunction if it results in even one re-opening.

Speaking of this telegram, President Higinbotham said:—

The people who sent that message certainly cannot understand the situation we are in. They seem to think that it would be better for all of us to go to jail for disobedience of that injunction than to incur their displeasure by keeping the Fair open. In other words those good people don't want us to obey the law.

The motto of the Sunday closers, "We ask only obedience to law," always has in it this unwritten clause: "when it is in accordance with our ideas." They have no more respect for law than any other anarchists when it runs counter to their hobbies.

SPEAKING of the small Sunday attendance at the World's Fair, the *Mail and Express* says:—

There are hundreds of thousands of visitors as well as citizens of Chicago and of circumjacent cities and towns who, while not overscrupulous as to their personal conduct on Sunday, do not propose to favor the national sanction of Sabbath desecration. These, with the millions of earnest Christian people who have protested against this stigma upon our institutions, have demonstrated that such a profane and infidel proceeding cannot succeed in this Christian land.

Just so; appearances, must be kept up at all hazards! If there is anything in the universe that is more empty than a barrel with both heads out, it is this hollow pretense which finds expression in governmental "piety" to atone for the lack of personal virtue.

THE Burlington *Hawkeye* having recently taken the ground that Sunday opening at Chicago "undermined the day of rest, and to that extent endangered the liberties of the people and the permanence of the Republic,

the *Evening Post*, of this city, asked it "whether these results had followed in Iowa, where for a number of years the State Fair has been open on Sundays with a large number of visitors." The *Hawkeye* makes no reply to this inquiry, "which," says the *Post*, "is a virtual confession that the experience of its own State lends no support to its argument." Another Iowa paper answers the *Post's* question in these words: "We have never noticed any demoralization from this source."

RELIGION comes to us as a supernatural thing, a revelation from God, regulating our duty toward God; and thus appeals to the consciences of men and binds them under penalties entirely beyond the power of human governments either to enforce or to revoke. This it is that places it beyond the domain of civil government, and removes it from the jurisdiction of human courts.

August 17, 1893

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 8, 33 , pp. 257, 258.

LAMST week, from a number of considerations of Scripture, we found that the Sabbath question is not a question merely of days as such; not a question merely as to whether we shall have one day or another. But it is a question as to whether we shall worship the one true God, or another; and whether we shall have him the one true Saviour, or another. It is a question as to whether we shall honor the one true Creator and have him for our Sanctifier, or another.

AND this, because the Sabbath of the Lord which he made, the seventh day which he appointed—this, the Lord has declared to be a sign between him and men that they *might know* that *he* is the Lord our God; and a sign by which they *might know* that *he* sanctifies us. This being the sign that he is the Lord, the true God, the Creator, and he being also the Saviour, it is also the sign by which men may know him as Saviour. The Sabbath of the Lord being the sign that men may

know that he is God, and as no man can know him except in Jesus Christ, it is, when hallowed, the sign of what Jesus Christ is to man.

IT is by the *power of God* manifested in and through Jesus Christ alone, and by his Holy Spirit, that salvation is wrought. And this to every one that believeth. Therefore, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1:16. "Neither is there salvation in any other." Acts 4:19. "There is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God and there is none else." Isa. 45:21, 22. "And no man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Matt. 11:27. "Hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that you may know that I am the Lord your God." And "I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Eze. 20:20, 12. This is the meaning of the Sabbath of the Lord, as he made it and as he gave it.

BUT in the scriptures of the prophets, it is told that there would arise another power, putting itself above God and in the place of Jesus Christ, as the Commander and Saviour of men. Thus it is written: "That day [the day of the Lord's coming] shall not come except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple [the place of worship] of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not that when I was yet with you I told you these things?" 2 Thess. 2:3-5. This is in the letter addressed to the Thessalonians. When Paul was at Thessalonica, he had told them these same things. Now, of his visit to Thessalonica we read, "When they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews; and Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures. . . . And some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few." Acts 17:1-4.

REAMSONING with them *out of the Scriptures* he told them of the apostasy and of the development and exaltation of this man of sin above God, putting himself in the place of worship of God, showing himself that he is God. Now, the only Scriptures that they then had,

and out of which he taught them, were what are now the Old Testament Scriptures. Where then in these Scriptures did he find this teaching concerning one who would set himself in opposition to God and above God? Read this: "And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many; he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes." "Yea, he magnified himself even to [even *against*—margin] the Prince of the host." Dan. 8:25, 11. By comparing the phrase "stand up" in this verse, with the same phrase in verse 23, and Dan. 11:2, 3, 4, 7, it will be plain to all that in this verse "stand up" signifies "to reign," as a king. It is seen, therefore, that there would appear in the world a power opposed to Christ, reigning in his stead, putting himself in his place, and even above God, showing himself off as God.

NOW, everybody knows that there has appeared, and that there still continues, in the world, just such a power as is here described. It is the Papacy. Everybody knows that the head and the embodiment of this power, calls himself before all the world, "Vicar of Jesus Christ." A vicar is a substitute. He therefore poses as the substitute of Jesus Christ. While Christ is absent from the world he is his substitute to rule it, and to save or destroy it as his "infallible" will shall dictate. And as God is the Saviour and there is none else, and as this power puts itself in the place of God, and even above God, it follows in itself that this power—the Papacy—should, of necessity, put itself in the place of God and Jesus Christ *as the only way of salvation*.

Every one is obliged, under pain of eternal damnation, to become a member of the Catholic Church, to believe her doctrine, to use her means of grace, and to submit to her authority.

Hence the Catholic Church is justly called the *only saving* Church. To despise her is the same as to despise Christ; namely, his doctrine, his means of grace, and his powers; to separate from her is the same as to separate from Christ, and to forfeit eternal salvation. Therefore St. Augustine and the other bishops of Africa, pronounced, A.D. 412, at the Council of Zuria, this decision: "Whosoever is separated from the Catholic Church, however commendable in his own opinion his life may be, he shall, for this very reason, that he is at the same time separated from the unity of Christ, *not see life*, but the wrath of God abideth on him."—*De Harbe's, Full Catechism of the Catholic Religion: Imprimatur, N. Card. Wiseman; Imprimatur, John, Card. McCloskey, Catholic Publication Society Co., 9 Barclay Street, New York, 1883: p. 238.* Italics as in the book.

God in Jesus Christ being the only Saviour; his power being the only power

258

unto salvation; and the Sabbath of the Lord being the sign of this; it follows of necessity that when another puts himself above God and in the place of God and another power is manifested unto a proposed salvation, if that other power is to have a sign by which it would be known and recognized as of authority, this sign would *have* to be a rival Sabbath. It is impossible that it should be otherwise. As he puts himself above God and in the place of God, and of the Saviour—as he is therefore the rival—the substitute indeed—of the true God and Saviour; as certainly as he sets up any sign by which he would be known, this sign, in order to mean anything in the case as it is, would have to be a rival, a substitute indeed, of the true Sabbath, the true sign of the true God and Saviour.

AND the case holds consistently throughout. The "man of sin," "the son of perdition," "the mystery of iniquity," "that wicked," the Papacy, this "vicar," this substitute of Jesus Christ, has also substituted a sign of itself for the sign of Jesus Christ. It has substituted *Sunday for the Sabbath of the Lord*.

During the old law, Saturday was the day sanctified; but the Church, instructed by Jesus Christ, and directed by the Spirit of God, has *substituted* Sunday for Saturday; so now we sanctify the first, not the seventh day. Sunday means, and now is, the day of the Lord.—*Catholic Catechism of the Christian Religion*.

Ques.—How prove you that the Church *has power* to command feasts and holy days?

Ans.—By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

Ques.—How prove you that?

Ans.—Because by keeping Sunday, *they acknowledge the Church's power* to ordain feasts, and *to command them under sin*; and by not keeping the rest by her commanded, they again deny, in fact, the same power.—*Abridgment of Christian Doctrine*.

THUS clearly and easily is it demonstrated from the Scriptures that the Sabbath question, so far from being a question of merely one day or another as such, is a question as to whether we shall worship and serve one God or another, and whether we shall have one Saviour or another. It is a question of whether we shall worship the Lord or the Papacy; whether we shall look to Jesus Christ for salvation or to the

Papacy; whether we shall honor the true God or his supplanter; whether we shall be saved by Christ or by this "substitute" for him. It is a question of whether we shall wear the badge of the Lord of Glory, or that of the man of sin; whether we shall bear the sign, which God has set, or the sign which the Papacy has substituted for it; whether we shall wear the signet of the Most High or the mark of "the mystery of iniquity," "that wicked," "the beast." It is a question as to whether the Sabbath of the Lord shall be observed as he made it, and as he gave it; or whether the substitute, the Sunday, which has been set up by the Papacy shall take precedence of it and crush it out of the world—whether the Lord shall be God indeed, or whether the man of sin—the Papacy—shall indeed be exalted above him.

THIS is what the Sabbath question is, and this is precisely what is involved in it. And what the churches and Congress of the United States have done, in this Sunday legislation, is to fasten upon the Government of the United States this sign of papal authority, and to call upon all the people of the United States to receive and wear this badge of allegiance to the Papacy. In this Sunday legislation, by which the seventh day of the Sabbath of the Lord, was interpreted out of his law, and the first day the Sunday of the Papacy was interpreted into that law instead of God's Sabbath, the churches and Congress of the United States have, so far as lies in their power, shut away from men the knowledge of the true God and Saviour, and have required that men shall receive and worship the Papacy instead. And it is an abominable piece of business. But they have done it.

THAT which now remains is for each person to decide for himself, whether he will do this which the churches and Congress have required. It is for each one to decide for himself whether he will honor the Papacy above God; whether he will worship the Papacy or the Lord, and whether he will wear this signet of the Papacy or the sign of what Jesus Christ is to men. And that this may be seen the more plainly, if need be, we set the two things here side by side:—

Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and doest 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 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.

"The Catholic Church, instructed by Jesus Christ, and directed by the Spirit of God, has substituted Sunday for 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 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.

"Ques.—How prove you that the Church *has power* to command feasts 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.

"Ans.—By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it. Ex. 20:8-11.

contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts Commanded by the same church.

"Ques.—How prove you that?

"Answ.—Because by keeping Sunday, *they acknowledge the Church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them*

Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath. Mark 2:28.

by her commanded, they again deny, in fact, the same power."—*Abridgment of Christian Doctrine.*

Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the LORD that sanctify them.

"It is worth while to remember that this Sabbath—in which, the only Protestant worship Consists—not only has no foundation in the Bible, but it is in flagrant

And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the LORD your God. Eze. 20:12, 20.

contradiction with its letter, which commands rest on the Sabbath, which is Saturday. It was the Catholic Church which, by the authority of Jesus Christ, has transferred this to the Sunday in remembrance of The resurrection of our Lord. Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants *is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the Church.*"—*Plain Talk About The Protestantism of To-day, p. 213.*

Which way do you take? Which do you choose? Which do you serve? Which sign do you bear? To which one of these do you look to be sanctified? To which one do you look for the power of salvation? Think seriously of this, and next week, from the doctrine and the

history, we shall further consider the meaning of this substitution of Sunday for the Sabbath of the Lord.

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 8, 33 , p. 264.

"ALL the great daily newspapers of this city now issue a Sunday edition," says the *Christian at Work*. The statement is quite true; but will the *Mail and Express* take kindly to it? for that paper has no Sunday edition and is not therefore one of the great dailies.

THE *Christian Statesman* still insists that Seventh-day Adventists are parties to the Clingman injunction suit. Well that is not strange since the *Statesman* never misses an opportunity to excite prejudice against Adventists, regardless of the facts. The *Statesman* is as unscrupulous as a Jesuit or a ward politician. Suppose that Mr. Mason–Clingman's attorney–had among his clients a single Adventist stockholder in the Fair, which however he has not, would the *Statesman* be justified in representing that "the Seventh-day Adventists" were parties to that suit? An honest man can give but one answer to the question.

THE *Cleveland News and Herald* is probably no worse than thousands of papers, but it is hard to believe that the following editorial note published by it on the 27th ult., was not inspired by malice:–

The legal warfare over the Sunday question in connection with the World's Fair is not yet ended. The non-religious forces engaged have dropped out, but the Seventh-day Adventists, aided some what, it may be by a few Jews, are keeping up the fight against closing the gates on the first day of the week. Since it has been proved by experience that the financial interests of the Columbian Exposition Company would be best served by Sunday closing, the people who looked only at the money side of the question have been well content to let the latest decision of the directors be final, but the Adventists are not so ready to yield a point. They propose to stick out for their own ideas of the true time to observe the Christian day of rest and religious services, no matter what the result may be to the World's Fair or any other interests, however great. It is such exhibitions of unreasonableness which make multitudes of men and women impatient of denominational and religious controversies.

The Adventists have had absolutely nothing to do with the litigation having for its purpose the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday. Adventists have insisted from the first that the Government had no

right to require the closing of the Fair on Sunday, and they have likewise insisted all along that the directors were the proper persons to decide whether the Fair should be open or closed on that day. They have made no appeal to any court on the subject, nor will they do so. It would be a good thing if the secular press would give the public a little less misinformation. We believe it was one of our great humorists who said he would rather not know so much than to know so many things that were not true. People who rely implicitly on the newspapers for information certainly have a good deal of the latter kind of "knowledge."

SOME one has sent us a paper containing a marked article by the President of the American Sabbath Union in which the position is taken that polygamy is enjoined in the Old Testament, and that, therefore, the Morman [*sic.*] can as plausibly plead that he should be permitted to have several wives as the Sabbath keeper that he ought not to be molested for working on Sunday. For a complete refutation of this sophistry see No. 10 of the Religious Liberty Library, Review and Herald, Battle Creek, Mich. Price 3 cents single copy.

MR. CRAFTS, he of the "new method of petitioning," by which men, women and children are counted again and again many times over as petitioners for his pet schemes, thinks that the reopening of the Fair on Sunday "is not to be feared, especially since Congress has been called for August. "It would," he says, "inflict swift punishment if any second 'contempt' were put upon its authority and the people's will." So he would have Congress not only override the Constitution, by making an appropriation directly in the interests of a religious institution, but he would also have that body violate the charter of American liberty by passing an *ex post facto* law, that is a law imposing a penalty after the commission of the act. Moreover, he would have the legislative branch of the Government usurp the functions of the other two branches of the Government, namely, the judicial and the executive. There is nothing small about this gentleman except his ideas of other people's rights.

WHEN an injunction was sought from Federal Judge Jenkins enjoining the World's Fair Directors from keeping the Fair open on Sunday, on the ground that to do so would impose a financial loss upon the stockholders, because of the religious boycott, the judge held that he had no power to grant the relief prayed for because it was a question of policy to be decided by the directors, and with which the courts had no right to meddle. Some people have

supposed that in granting an injunction forbidding the closing of the gates on Sunday, Judge Stein violated the rule thus stated by Judge Jenkins. This is a mistake. The Stein injunction was granted by a State court solely on the ground that Jackson Park in which the Fair is held, being dedicated to the city for a park "to be open to the people of Illinois for ever," could not be closed to the public on any day of the week by anybody. This is a question over which a United States Court could not possibly have any jurisdiction, and is a very different matter from the question presented to Judge Jenkins.

IT now seems inevitable that the World's Fair will be a financial failure. The latest estimate places its resources at \$6,510,000, and its liabilities at \$6,881,000, including the debenture bonds. The best calculations show a deficit of \$71,200. These calculations take in \$300,000 as an additional resource for certain material on the grounds not counted in the official figures. All calculations leave out the \$11,000,000 of stock subscriptions and city bonds as items of liability. The idea of reimbursing the stockholders or taking up the bonds appears to have been abandoned. This is due in large measure to the general stringency of the times, but it is more than likely that as the Sunday people are claiming everything in sight, and counting it from two to six times, the whole gigantic failure will be charged up to Sunday opening. And in utter disregard of the fact that Sunday is not the Sabbath but is a fraud, the failure of the Fair will be cited as indisputable evidence of the divine displeasure

WE have received from the publishers, 28 Lafayette Place, this city, No. 33 of the "Truth Seeker Library," the same being "Pen Pictures of the World's Fair," by Samuel P. Putnam. Mr. Putnam is a pleasant gentleman, and an excellent writer, and we cannot speak too highly of his "Pen Pictures," except in one particular, namely, the hostility to Christianity which he plainly exhibits several times in this otherwise exceedingly meritorious pamphlet. "Pen Pictures" is well illustrated, is written in Mr. Putnam's happiest descriptive style, and notwithstanding the objectionable feature which we have mentioned, is well worth the price asked for it (25 cents). It would not be a bad hand book for expectant visitors, who have sufficient stamina not to be influenced by what Mr. Putnam does *not* know about Christianity.

August 31, 1893

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 8, 34 , pp. 265-267.

BY the plain considerations of scripture we have found, and all may find, that the Sabbath question, which has been the leading question of the country all summer, instead of one day or another, of the seventh day or the first, of Saturday or Sunday—as such, is a question of rival *institutions* representing rival powers.

THE seventh day which God made the Sabbath, by resting upon it, by blessing it, by making it holy, and by sanctifying it, which he declared from Sinai is the Sabbath, and of which in Judea he declared himself to be the Lord; this—the Sabbath of the Lord—God has set to be the sign by which men may know him the only true God and Saviour. It is the sign which God has set, by which men may know what Jesus Christ is to men. It is the sign of the power of God in Jesus Christ to create men new creatures, to give them rest from all their toil, to make them better, to bless them, to make them holy, to sanctify, to save them.

THE Sunday, which the Catholic Church, "by her own infallible authority," "has substituted" for the Sabbath of the Lord, which she has declared to be "holy," and which she "sanctifies"—this is the sign of the "salvation" provided by the Papacy; "the man of sin," which has opposed and exalted itself above God, in the place of God, showing itself that it is God. This is the sign that the Catholic Church has set, to show what that church is to men. It is the sign of her power to bless, to make holy, to sanctify, and to save.

AND all this is what the Sabbath question means. The question as to whether men shall observe the Sabbath of the Lord, or whether they shall observe Sunday, is the question as to whether men shall honor God, or honor the Papacy above God. It is a question as to whether men shall depend upon Jesus Christ himself, alone, for salvation, or whether they shall depend upon the Catholic Church for salvation. It is a question as to whether men shall bear the signet of the Creator of the heavens and the earth, or that of the Papacy; whether they shall receive the sign of the living God or the sign of the Catholic Church—"the seal of the living God" or "the mark of the beast;" whether we shall serve Christ or antichrist.

THERE is a difference between God and the Papacy; a difference between Jesus Christ and the Catholic Church. The one is "the Sun of righteousness," the other is the "man of sin;" the one is the revelation of "the mystery of godliness," the other the revelation of

"the mystery of iniquity;" the one is "the Prince of life," the other is "the son of perdition." Now, just as there is a difference between God and the Papacy, between Christ and the Catholic Church, so there is a difference between the way of salvation provided by Jesus Christ and the way of salvation provided by the Catholic Church. And the difference between the way of salvation provided by the Lord and that provided by the Catholic Church, is just as great as is the difference between God and the Papacy or between Jesus Christ and any pope that ever lived.

THERE are a number of points upon which this difference might be demonstrated; but for the present occasion we shall dwell on only one, and that is, that whereas *the salvation provided by Jesus Christ is of GRACE ONLY, manifested through FAITH ONLY, and that the gift of God*; the salvation provided by the Catholic Church is of *force only, manifested through penance and "the law and State authority."*

NOW to the evidence: "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." Eph. 2:8, 9. "To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not but believeth on him that justifieth [maketh righteous] the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Rom. 4:4, 5. "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested. . . . even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all that believe: for there is no difference. For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified [made righteous] by faith without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3:20-28. And "if by one man's offense death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." Rom. 5:17. "*Look* unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God and there is none else." Isa. 45:22. "*Hear* and your soul shall live." Isa. 55:3. "*Speak* ye unto the

rock, and it shall give forth his water." Num. 20:8. "And that Rock was Christ." 1 Cor. 10:4. "O *taste* and see that the Lord is good." Ps. 34:8. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." John 3:16, 17. "And 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." John 12:47. This is the way of salvation provided by Jesus Christ.

NOW for the other. Everybody knows that *penance* is the very keystone of the Catholic structure of doctrine as to the

266

way of salvation—that without *penance* the system is even, in the church's own estimation, an empty shell. So closely connected, indeed, in penance with justification, yea, so essential is penance to justification, that Cardinal Gibbons, in his book, "The Faith of Our Fathers," in discussing "The Sacrament of Penance," uses all along "penance" as synonymous with "forgiveness of sins" and "justification."—See pp. 391-394, 414, 415. And, in fact, the Catholic version of the Scriptures reads, "Do penance," where the Protestant version reads, "Repent." It is therefore in order in this place to inquire, What is this doctrine, this "sacrament" of penance? In answer, we quote from a book entitled, "Catholic Belief; or A Short and Simple Exposition of Catholic Doctrine;" by the Very Rev. Joseph Fah Byron, D.D., Author's American Edition, edited by Rev. Louis A. Lambert, author of "'Notes on Ingersoll,' Imprimatur, John Cardinal McCloskey, Archbishop of New York; Imprimatur, Hencions Edwardus, Card. Archbisp. Westmongst; Bensiger Brothers, printers to the Holy Apostolic See." It is stated thus:—

Penance by which the sins that we commit after Baptism, are forgiven

Now, as "baptism" is to be administered to the infant "at the earliest possible moment" ("Faith of Our Fathers," p. 313; it is evident that all the sins that a Catholic can possibly commit are "after baptism." And from this it certainly follows that as "penance" is that "by which the sins that we commit *after baptism* are *forgiven*;" and as without forgiveness of sins *no person can* be justified or saved; then penance is the very nucleus of the way of salvation provided by the Catholic Church. To a person who has grown up without "baptism" he can only obtain "the grace of justification," forgiveness, by, among a

number of other things, "a *resolution* to approach the Sacrament of Penance."—*Catholic Belief*, p. 75.

THAT is what penance is in *definition*, now what is it in *practice*? What are works of penance and what are they really for? Here is the statement, under the heading, "Works of Penance:"—

In the case of those who have fallen into mortal sin *after* baptism, when the guilt of such sin and the everlasting punishment due to it are forgiven, there still very often remains a *debt of temporal punishment*, to be paid by the sinner. This debt remains, not *from any* imperfection in the power of absolution in the Sacrament of Penance, nor from any want of efficacy in the atonement of Jesus Christ, but because by God's will, chastisement for past sins helps us to compensate for the imperfection in our repentance and serves as a correction. The fear of temporal punishment often helps to strengthen the resolution of amendment; it sets as a check to prevent us from again falling into sin, and excites us to make reparation for the scandal given.

From this we see, whilst the God man, Jesus Christ has by atoning for our sins, done what we could not possibly do for ourselves. He has not dispensed us from doing, with the help of his grace, what we can, to punish ourselves for the offenses and outrages we have offered to God. Good sense tells us that this is but right and just.—*Catholic Belief*, pp. 163, 164.

So essential, so indispensable indeed, is penance to salvation in the Catholic system, that even the dying thief, whom the Lord Jesus himself pardoned on the cross—even he is taken up by the Catholic Church and *made to do penance*, when he, "in the spirit of penance, suffered the torment of his crucifixion, and the cruel breaking of his limbs, as penalties justly due to his sins; and it may be that it was the first time that he repented and received pardon of his sin."—*Id.*, p. 195.

WELL, then, when the guilt of sin, and the everlasting punishment due to it, are both forgiven, if there still remains a *debt to be paid by the sinner*, then is not the sinner's justification, his salvation, in the last resort, accomplished by himself? And as this debt is to be paid in punishment, and that punishment inflicted by the sinner himself upon himself, then is it not evident that the justification, the salvation, of the sinner, in the last analysis, is accomplished not only by himself, but *by punishing* himself, and therefore *by force*—force exerted upon himself by himself to save himself. This is not the salvation provided by Jesus Christ. The salvation provided in Jesus Christ is wholly of

the Lord, not of self. The mind that was in Jesus Christ empties self wholly that God may appear wholly.

BUT not only is this self-inflicted punishment to pay up for the sins already committed, it is to "act as a check to prevent us from again falling into sin." And as I am to punish myself, to keep myself from sinning again, it is again myself saving myself from myself; again it is salvation accomplished not only by the sinner himself, but by punishing himself, and therefore *by force*—force exerted upon himself by himself to save himself from himself. Thus completely is it demonstrated that the salvation provided by the Catholic Church is "salvation" not of the Lord but of self; not by grace but by force; not through faith but through penance.

So far however the application of this way of salvation is only to the cases of those who are here and who can be led to apply this self-inflicted punishment. How about those who are not here, and who cannot be led to adopt this way? Oh, she is perfectly logical, and as "*the fear of temporal punishment* often helps to strengthen the resolution of amendment," she has recourse to the temporal power, "to the help of the law and State authority," so that she herself may succeed in inflicting the due amount of punishment—of penance—to "act as a check to prevent men from again falling into sin." This is not only the logic of the case but it is the doctrine of "the church." Pope Leo XIII. only a little more than one year ago, definitely published to all the world for the world's instruction, that—

The church uses His efforts not only to enlighten His mind, but to direct by His precepts the life and conduct of men. . . . and acts on the *decided view* that for these purposes recourse *should be hurt*, in due measure and degree, to the help of the law and State authority.—*Encyclical of May 15, 1803.*

So "the church" sets forth her "precepts" to direct "the life and conduct of men." But as there are many men who will not voluntarily conform to these precepts, she requires the State to make her precepts a part of the "civil" law with the due penalty attached, so that "the fear of temporal punishment" may duly "act as a check to prevent the people from falling into sin." And so she has "recourse to the help of the law and State authority," in directing by her precepts the life and conduct of men into the way of salvation which she has provided. And still it is all of *force* only, and but the logic of her own essential doctrine of *penance* which is in itself only force.

AND such has been her course from the first day that she ever succeeded in gaining the help of the law and State authority. This

was when she and Constantine entered into alliance to bring men by force to the Saviour, and so to render them fit subjects of the kingdom of God, by bringing them to the Catholic Church. A passage or two from the history of that time, and that procedure, will be proper to cite here. Eusebius, the favorite bishop of Constantine, and who took a leading part in all that scheme of securing to the church the help of the law and State authority, has told us not only what the object of it was but how the object was accomplished. In speaking of Constantine and his great goodness and his likeness to the SAVIOUR, he says:—

That preserver of the universe [Christ] orders these heavens and earth, and the celestial kingdom, consistently with his Father's will. *Even so our emperor whom he [Christ] . . . by bringing those whom he rules on earth to the only begotten Word and Saviour, renders them fit subjects of his kingdom.*"

Such was the object. Now as to how it was accomplished: This the same bishop relates by preserving to us the very edict of Constantine himself, A.D. 323, as follows:—

Victor 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. In any case, the delusions of your perverted understandings must entirely cease to mingle with and mar the felicity of our present times; I mean the impious and wretched double-mindedness of heretics and schismatics. For 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 truth, 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 these 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 the very first fruit of her original recourse to the help of the law and State authority only the further, and the more emphatically if need be, illustrates that the way of salvation provided by her, is of *force* only.

AND right there too, was set up her sign of her power and authority "to command men under sin." Right there was set up her own sign of the way of salvation provided by her. Right there she by "the help of the law and State authority" substituted her own Sunday for the Sab-

267

bath of the Lord, set up this sign of her power unto salvation instead of the Sabbath of the Lord which he had set as the sign by which men may know his power to create and to save. Thus says Eusebius again:—

All things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's day.

And again, referring to what "Christ" had accomplished in Constantine's Sunday law; which was enacted to please "the church," the same bishop says:—

Who else has commanded the nations inhabiting the continents and islands of this mighty globe to assemble weekly on the Lord's day, and to observe it as a festival, not indeed for the pampering of the body, *but for the comfort and invigoration of the soul* by instruction in divine truth.

Thus plainly is it apparent how and why and when, the Sunday of the Catholic Church was substituted for the Sabbath of the Lord; and how this sign of the power of the Catholic Church to save, was set in the place of the sign by which men may know the power of Jesus Christ to create and to save. And thus plainly does it appear upon every count that the Sunday institution is the sign of salvation by *force* only, while the Sabbath of the Lord is the sign of salvation by

the grace and gentleness of Jesus Christ only through the benign operations of his Spirit.

NOW, which of these two ways did the churches and Congress of the United States take? Did they leave every man free, as Jesus Christ does, to choose for himself the way of salvation, and the sign of it? Or did they, by "the help of the law and State authority," go into the way of salvation by force, and set up the Sunday institution, the sign of salvation by force, in the place of the Sabbath of the Lord, the sign of salvation by the love and grace of Jesus Christ? Which did they do? Everybody knows which they did. They set up as the sign of salvation to this Nation, the sign of the salvation provided by the Catholic Church; the sign of salvation by force. And then, as though they would proclaim to all the world, and demonstrate before all people, how certainly this is so, the same church leaders who, by the force of threats, had required Congress to set up the sign of salvation by force, followed it up swiftly by loud calls, even by telegram, to the head of the Government of the United States, to furnish armed troops with which to enforce, at the point of the bayonet, the proper observance of, and respect for, the sign of the salvation provided by the Catholic Church—the sign of salvation by force. Right worthily indeed have they vindicated their right to wear the badge of papal salvation, the sign of salvation by force.

LET them wear it as they have chosen it. It becomes them. It belongs to them. But, oh! will the people of the United States wear it, upon whom these men have presumed to force it? Will the people of the United States tamely submit to the wearing of the badge of papal authority and of papal salvation, which, by apostate Protestantism, has been forced upon them? Choose ye this day whom you will serve. Will you honor God, or honor the Papacy in the place of God? Will you receive and wear the signet of the Creator of heaven and earth and the Saviour of men? or will you wear the sign of the man of sin—the mystery of iniquity—the Papacy? Will you keep the Sabbath of the Lord, or the Sunday of the Catholic Church?

A. T. J.

"Note" *American Sentinel* 8, 34 , p. 270.

THE *China Mail*, published in Hong-kong, has this to say about the attitude of the churches in America towards the anti-Chinese law:—

Now that it is too late, the various churches are very indignant and emphatic against the Geary law. The Methodists announce that

they have decided to make a "vigorous fight" against it. If they had fought with only a little vigor a year ago, and brought the great political power of their denomination to bear on Congress and executive, they could have beaten the Exclusion act easily. The General Association of Congregational Churches of Massachusetts adopted a resolution at Boston on Thursday in which they "beg the Chinese to suspend judgment upon Christian ethics until the Christian people of the land have asserted themselves." What were the Christian people of the land doing when the Geary law was pending? They were moving heaven and earth to avert the judgments of the Almighty on a nation that would open a World's Fair on Sunday. They were asserting, as a distinguished Congregational clergyman has said, that it was a great boon to a Christian nation to have a President who began the day with family prayers in the White House, no matter whether he rose from his knees to sign or veto a bill that outraged religion and humanity alike. This was the real display of "Christian ethics" upon which the Chinese are now asked to suspend judgment. Perhaps they will consent to do so, though the Founder of the Christian religion did not feel compelled to in his day, and had some particularly unpleasant things to say of the pious and respectable churchgoers of his time who made long prayers for a pretense, and were especially sound on the Sabbath question, but cared nothing about justice and mercy.

The criticism is just. If one fourth the effort had been put forth in opposition to the Geary law that was expended to secure governmental recognition of Sunday sacredness, the churches would not now be deploring its existence and its probable destructive effects on Christian missions in China. But if the missions in China are devoted to inculcating the superficial Sunday "Christianity" which has of late become so popular in this country, their destruction would be small loss to the cause of vital piety. However, we do not believe that the religion of the cross, so far as it is represented in heathen lands, has degenerated as it has in this country. Not having the civil arm upon which to lean, Christians in China have not yet forsaken their Lord for Baal, nor gone down to Egypt for help. It is only in "Christian" lands that the followers of Christ thus deny him.

September 7, 1893

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 8, 35 , pp. 273, 274.

THE Christian doctrine of justification is, that it is by faith alone, with the faith itself the gift of God, so that it is wholly of the Lord in a free gift to man.

"WHATSOEVER is *not* of faith *is sin*." Rom. 14:23. Conversely, whatsoever *is* of faith is *righteousness*. Consequently righteousness is of faith only. And the faith being the gift of God the righteousness of faith is inevitably the righteousness of God. See Rom. 3:22; Phil. 3:9.

IT is not by faith *and* works; it is by faith *which* works. The faith, being the gift of God, is a divine thing, bearing in it the divine virtue which conveys to every sinner who will receive it, the righteousness of God for remission of sins that are past; and in it also the divine power to keep the justified one in the way of righteousness.

FOR in the gospel of Christ "is the righteousness of God revealed from faith *to faith*; as it is written, The *just* shall *live* by *faith*." Rom. 1:17. And "in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith *which* worketh by love." Gal. 5:6. "Abraham believed God and *it* [the faith] was *counted* unto *him* for *righteousness*. Now to him that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that *worketh not*, but *believeth* on him that *justifieth* the ungodly, his *faith* is *counted for righteousness*." Rom. 4:3-5.

THE true Protestant doctrine of justification is just this Christian doctrine of justification, neither more nor less; while the Catholic doctrine of justification is directly the opposite of this.

THAT it may be seen how certainly this is so, we give here the Catholic statement of the case. In telling what was done in this respect, at the time of the "so-called" Reformation, the statement is as follows:—

To make up for this rejection [of the Catholic sacraments], and enable each individual to prescribe for himself, and procure for himself the pardon of sins, and divine grace, independently of the priests and of the sacraments, they invented an *exclusive means*, never known in the Church of God, and still rejected by all the Eastern churches and by the Roman Catholics throughout the world, by which the followers of Luther ventured to declare that each individual can secure pardon and justification for himself, independently of priests and sacraments.

They have framed a new dogma, not to be found in any of the creeds, or in the canons of any general council; I means the new dogma of *justification by faith alone, or by faith only*. . . .

By adding the word *alone*, Protestants profess to exclude all exterior, ceremonial, pious, or charitable works, works of obedience

or of penance, and good moral acts whatever, as *means* of *apprehending* justification, or as conditions to obtain it.—*Catholic Belief*, p. 366.

He [Luther] invented a thing which he called justifying faith, to be a sufficient substitute for all the above painful religious works; an invention which took off every responsibility from our shoulders, and laid all on the shoulders of Jesus Christ. ¹⁰ 1—*Doctrinal Catechism*, p. 37.

To do these acts with a view of being justified, is, they [Protestants] say, like giving a penny to the Queen to obtain from her a royal gift. Come as you are, they add; you cannot be too bad for Jesus. Through *faith alone* in his promise, they assert, you can and should accept Christ's merits, seize Christ's redemption and his justice [righteousness]; appropriate Christ to yourself, believe that Jesus it [*sic.*] with you, is yours, that he pardons your sins—and all this without any preparation and without any doing on your part; in fact that however deficient you may be in all other dispositions which Catholics require, and however loaded with sins, if you only trust in Jesus that he will forgive your sins and save you, you are by that *trust alone* forgiven, personally redeemed, justified, and placed in a state of salvation.—*Catholic Belief*, p. 367. And the Italics are all in the book.

Bear in mind that this is the Catholic Church's statement of the Protestant doctrine of justification. And bear in mind that the Catholic Church thus plainly declares that this doctrine was "never known to the Church of God," is "not to be found in any of the creeds, or in the canons of any general council," and that it "is still so regarded by Roman Catholics throughout the world."

VERY good. That is correct. No true Protestant could ask for any better statement of the case. And this Protestant doctrine of justification, which is here so emphatically repudiated and opposed by Catholicism—this doctrine is the *Christian* doctrine of justification, as every one knows who has ever read the Bible for himself. Consequently no better evidence is needed to show that the Catholic doctrine of justification is certainly *antichristian*.

IT is true that that church holds what it calls faith; but instead of its being the gift of God and therefore divine, it is only the invention of men and is therefore wholly human. And being human it has neither virtue nor power of any kind or degree whatever in it for good. Here is the evidence: After citing some passages of scripture which speak of believing in Jesus, it is said:—

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

Thus "the church's" idea of faith is only "the faith of the creed," and *man made the creed.* Therefore as the "faith" held by the Catholic Church is only "the faith of the creed," and as only man made the creed, it follows conclusively that what she calls faith and holds as faith, is only an invention of men, and is therefore wholly human. And being only human it is utterly impotent to bring to men any shadow of virtue or power for good, and so men are left to supply the lack by penances inflicted in punishments upon themselves, by themselves to save themselves from themselves. The "faith" which the Catholic Church holds, having in it neither virtue nor power, it is impossible for her to depend upon faith alone for justification. She must depend upon "faith" *and something else.* And this something else, is works and penances paid in punishments which not only pay for past sins but serve "as a check to prevent us from again falling into sin." This, for those who voluntarily go or are caused to go, in that way of salvation. And for the rest she has recourse to the help of the law and State authority to secure conformity to her way and furnish the due measure of punishment to

274

pay for their past sins and to prevent their again falling into sin.

NOW, in the matter of Sunday legislation, and other too, have the professed Protestant churches of the United States remained loyal to the true Protestant, and Christian, doctrine of justification? or have they gone over bodily to the way and doctrine of the Catholic Church? Have they remained loyal to the true Protestant and Christian doctrine of justification *by the faith of Christ alone?* or have they gone in the way, and to the doctrine, of the Catholic Church of justification by "the faith of the creed," with "recourse to the help of the law and State authority" to provide the necessary "fear of temporal punishment to act as a check to prevent" the American people from "falling again into sin"? Which of these have they done? Everybody knows, from these evidences, that they have forsaken the true Protestant and Christian way, and have gone in the Catholic and antichristian way.

AND that all may more fully see how complete is this their apostasy, we insert here Mr. Bryce's scathing arraignment of false Protestantism everywhere, and which is as applicable to this as to all before it:—

The principles which had led the Protestants to sever themselves from the Roman Church, should have taught them to bear with the opinions of others, and warned them from the attempt to connect agreement in doctrine or manner of worship with the necessary forms of civil government. Still less ought they to have enforced that agreement by civil penalties; for faith, upon their own showing, had no value save when it was freely given. A church which does not claim to be infallible, is bound to allow that some part of the truth may possibly be with its adversaries; a church which permits or encourages human reason to apply itself to revelation, has no right first to argue with people and then to punish them if they are not convinced.

But whether it was that men only half saw what they had done, or that finding it hard enough to unrivet priestly fetters, they welcomed all the aid a temporal prince could give. The result was that religion, or rather, religious creed, began to be involved with politics more closely than had ever been the case before. Through the greater part of Christendom, wars of religion raged for a century or more, and down to our own days feelings of theological antipathy continue to affect the relations of the powers of Europe. In almost every country the form of doctrine which triumphed, associated itself with the State, and maintained the despotic system of the Middle Ages, while it forsook the grounds on which that system had been based.

It was thus that there arose national churches, which were to be to the several Protestant countries of Europe that which the Church Catholic had been to the world at large; churches, that is to say, each of which was to be co-extensive with its respective State, was to enjoy landed wealth and exclusive political privilege, and was to be armed with coercive powers against recusants. It was not altogether easy to find a set of theoretical principles on which such churches might be made to rest. For they could not, like the old church, point to the historical transmission of their doctrines; they could not claim to have in any one man or body of them an infallible organ of divine truth; they could not even fall back upon general councils, or the argument, whatever it may be worth. "*Securus indicat orbis terrarium.*"

But in practice these difficulties were soon got over, for the dominant party in each State, if it was not infallible, was at any rate quite sure that it was right, and could attribute the resistance of other sects to nothing but moral obliquity. The will of the sovereign, as in England, or the will of the majority, as in Holland, Scandinavia, and Scotland, imposed upon each country a peculiar form of worship, and kept up the practices of medieval intolerance without their justification.

Persecution, which might at least be excused in an infallible Catholic and Apostolic Church, was peculiarly odious when practised by those who were not Catholic, who were no more apostolic than their neighbors, and who had just revolted from the most ancient and venerable authority, in the name of rights which they now denied to others. If union with the visible church by participation in a material sacrament be necessary to eternal life, persecution may be held a duty, a kindness to perishing souls. But if the kingdom of heaven be in every sense a kingdom of the spirit, if saving faith be possible out of one visible body and under a diversity of external forms, persecution becomes at once a crime and a folly.

Therefore the intolerance of Protestants, if the forms it took were less cruel than those practiced by the Roman catholic, was also far less defensible; for it had seldom anything better to allege on its behalf than motives of political expediency, or more often the mere headstrong passion of a ruler or a faction, to silence the expression of any opinions but their own. . . . And hence it is not too much to say that the ideas . . . regarding the duty of the magistrate to compel uniformity in doctrine and worship by the civil arm, may all be traced to the relation which that theory established between the Roman Church and the Roman Empire; to the conception, in fact, of an Empire Church itself.—*Holy Roman Empire, Chap. XVIII., par. 3.*

THUS certain and thus complete by every count and in every sense, is the apostasy of the professed Protestant denominations of the United States, as such. By the persistent action of their ecclesiastical leaders, these denominations, as such, have been carried clear over into the antichristian way. They have thus become the harlot daughters of "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." And now the voice from heaven calls, "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.

A. T. J.

"Note" *American Sentinel* 8, 35 , p. 280.

THE Philadelphia authorities recently arrested several persons for manufacturing clothing on Sunday. The accused were all found guilty, and fined under the law of 1794.

THE *Christian Statesman* complains that "the Government examiner continues his examination of the Commercial Bank of New

York through the Sabbath, keeping half a dozen persons at Sunday work."

THE *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* of the 29th ult. states that several Seventh-day Adventists have been banished to Siberia, by the Russian authorities, for their faith. In this country they are only imprisoned and worked in the chain-gang, but the principle is the same.

THE Stein injunction still lives to trouble both the Sunday closers and the Sunday openers. The Sunday Fair does not pay, lent open gates are none the less offensive to the friends of the so-called "American Sabbath." Mr. Crafts says that "this farce has ceased to be funny, and has become tiresome."

THE *Christian Statesman* accounts for the increased attendance at the World's Fair by saying: "It is evident that most of the Christian people who refused to attend during authorized Sunday opening do not consider the nominal re-opening under the Stein injunction anything more than a technicality, closing having been practically achieved."

MARKED papers have been sent to us containing statements very damaging to the reputation of the author of one of the Sunday bills recently before Congress. The facts are that the gentleman is charged with seduction and breach of promise by a young lady, who says that he agreed to marry her in the event of his wife's death. His wife did die, and he subsequently married another lady; hence the suit. The case has not yet been tried, and we are not warranted in assuming the guilt of the defendant and defaming him before the world. But even if guilty that fact could in no way affect the merits of the Sunday bill which he introduced, If a worthy measure, it could be none the less so because of the bad character of its author; while on the other hand, improper legislation does not become proper because of the good character of those who advocate it. The SENTINEL deals with principles not with men.

THAT clerical mountebank, "Father" McGlynn, has at last been permitted to "say" low mass, at which his Protestant (?) admirers are highly elated, forgetting that the sacrifice of the mass is abominable idolatry. McGlynn is and always has been a Romanist, and some of his utterances show him to be a very silly one at that.

THE *Union Signal* says of the meeting of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to take place in Chicago in October, "May we come up to this city of seven thousand saloons on the 16th

of October, trusting as of old in the God of Jacob!" All good people will certainly wish that it might be even so, but the events of the past five years have not been such as to inspire confidence that such will be the case. The trust of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has for some years been not in the God of Jacob, but in human governments.

THOSE Protestants who have been indulging a hope that Roman Catholics in the United States were about to become hopelessly divided over the school question, and the Corrigan-Satolli imbroglio would better learn to depend on correct principles rather than on factional disputes among their enemies. The monsignor and archbishop have settled their differences, and the worm that was to have eaten the Romish gourd in the United States is dead. Rome is fast sapping the bulwarks of American liberty, and thousands of so-called Protestants, "degenerate sons of noble fathers," are giving her active aid and sympathy.

THE Ministerial Alliance of Denver recently prepared a memorial to be sent to the President asking that he fix a day for national prayer and fasting. The address refers to the existing financial distress and the great legalized sins of the Nation, and petitions the President to set aside a day when the people shall gather in their accustomed places of worship and pray that the Nation may be rightly guided in its present sore distress. Commenting upon this fact the *Catholic Review* says:—

That is always the way with the ministers—looking to the State to do the work of the Church. Let them appoint a day themselves for ecclesiastical observance and request all other congregations to do the same. The President has enough to do to fulfill the duties of his secular office without meddling in the religious matters of prayer and fasting by the people.

What the *Review* says is true enough, but it comes with poor grace from such a source.

FELIX R. BRUNOT, President of the National Reform Association, has issued a call for "a national gathering of the friends of the Christian Sabbath and all other Christian features of our national life, with a view to secure for them abiding and authoritative expression in fundamental law," to be held in the First United Presbyterian Church, Union Ave., in the City of Allegheny, Pa., November 14, 15 and 16, 1893. The first meeting will be at 7:30 o'clock, P.M., November 14. Mr. Brunot says:—

The whole country has been stirred by the struggle for the Sabbath. And now that the victory has been won, let the fruits be secured. Let the Christian Sabbath sentiment of the United States be crystallized in some appropriate and permanent national and legal form.

It is thus evident that the success of the National Reformers in securing congressional recognition of Sunday only encourages them to demand still greater things. The conflict has only begun.

SPEAKING of the World's Congress of Religions to be held in Chicago, September 11-27, the *New York Observer* says: "The discussions will be friendly, not controversial." But to the Catholics has been assigned the first place. The address of welcome will be delivered by Most Rev. P. A. Feehan, D. D., Archbishop of Chicago, and to this there will be its response by Right Rev. Mgr. Gadd, Vicar General, Manchester, England, and His Eminence Cardinal Moran, Archbishop of Sydney, Australia. These men will laud "the church" to the skies, and as there is to be no controversy, the speakers who come after them must either give silent consent or else lay themselves open to the charge of making an unseemly attack on "brethren." Rome is certain to get more out of this monstrous humbug parliament than all other denominations combined.

September 14, 1893

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 8, 36 , pp. 281-283.

BY proofs abundant it has been shown in these columns, and demonstrated in their own actions, that the professed Protestant churches of the United States are completely apostate, and are joined in principles and in practice to Rome.

THIS is the literal truth in regard to these churches. It is true of them *as churches* as they stand, in organizations, in influence, in leadership and in management. There are however noble instances of individuals in those churches who have refused to go to Rome, and have protested and still continue to protect against this apostasy.

THUS there are in those churches individuals who still remain Protestant and Christian, for which we sincerely thank the Lord. And as these churches, in their leadership and management, have not only gone over to Rome, but have actually carried the United States Government with them and propose now to use the power of the Government to compel all others to pay honor and allegiance to

Rome too, it is evident that as these individuals remain Protestant and Christian their protest will become more decided and more emphatic and consequently their numbers will certainly grow. And for this too we sincerely thank the Lord.

IF these church misleaders and mismanagers had carried only the churches with them in their apostasy, this in itself would have been bad enough; but when this was made the means of subverting the Government of the United States and carrying it also over to Rome, the evil of their apostasy was infinitely increased. Because they are not the only ones who will now use the power of the Government for the purposes of religious oppression and despotism. If they *were* the only ones who would use the governmental power for such apostate purposes, this would be bad enough, in all conscience; but having delivered the Government over to Romish principles, Rome herself, too, will use the governmental power for purposes of oppression. She will not only use these professed but apostate Protestants as puppets to accomplish her ulterior purposes, but as occasion demands, she will act directly and with her old-time energy.

THAT it may be further seen how directly opposed are the principles of Rome and those of the Government of the United States *as the Government was made and as it was intended* by our fathers *to remain*, we cite here three "errors" which are condemned under "anathema" by the "infallible" decree of Rome speaking, *ex cathedra*, through Pope Pius IX. One of these "errors" is that—

Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason.—*Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion, by Gladstone and Schaff, p. 113.*

Now, although this is a condemned error by Rome, yet everybody knows that this very thing is one of the very fundamental principles of the Government of the United States.

ANOTHER of these "errors" is that—

The Church has not the power of availing herself of force, or of any direct or indirect temporal power.—*Id., p. 115.*

Everybody, even Rome herself, knows that this, too, is one of the very foundation principles of the Government of the United States *as our fathers established it.*

Yet another of these condemned "errors" is that—

The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church.—*Id., p. 123.*

It is hardly proper to say that this is a fundamental principle, it is THE fundamental principle, the very foundation of the foundation of

the Government of the United States as it was originally established. And it was made so with the direct purpose of keeping away from Rome. For the makers of this Government said that—

To judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercises of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, is an inalienable right, which upon the principles on which the gospel was first propagated, *and the reformation from popery carried on*, can never be transferred to another.

And they further said:—

It is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith without creating a claim to infallibility *which would lead us back to the Church of Rome?*

NOW, although the principles of Rome and the principles of the Government of the United States are directly opposite to each other; although the fundamental principles of the Government of the United States are condemned as "errors" under "anathema" by Rome; and although the Government was established upon these principles for the direct and expressed purpose of escaping and keeping away from Rome; yet, in spite of all this, the professed Protestant churches of the United States have subverted the principles of the Government of the United States, and have adopted and forced upon the Government and people of the United States the principles of Rome. These churches have adopted Rome's view that the Church *has* the power of availing herself of force and of direct temporal power, and they have asserted this power and have availed themselves of this force. Instead of maintaining the American and Protestant and Christian principle that "the Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church," these professed Protestants have adopted Rome's principle and have joined the State to the churches to do their bidding and to enforce their decrees even by armed force. They have also required the Congress of the United States to adjudge the right of preference between different sects that profess the Christian faith, and this, too, in spite of the warning given by our governmental fathers that it "is impossible" to do such a thing without leading "back to the Church of Rome." They have set up and accepted the Congress of the United States as authoritative interpreter of the Scriptures, in spite of the faithful warning bequeathed by the sufferings of ages that "the establishment of a tribunal charged with the interpretation of the Bible had ended only in the subjection of man to man in that which should be most unfettered—conscience and faith." They have abandoned every

Protestant and Christian principle and have adopted the principles of Rome instead. Their apostasy is complete, and there remains only the appearance of the bitter but inevitable fruits of it.

AND not only the appearing but the *gathering* of the bitter and destructive fruit of this apostasy is at the threshold. That this may be plainly seen by all, let us glance at the situation as it is to-day. This step was taken, this act was done, and this interpretation of the scripture, was made by Congress, at the dictation and under the threats of the professed Protestant churches of the United States, *aided by the Catholic Church*, in this controversy between Protestant sects, as to which day is the true Sabbath. Those who keep Sunday demanded that Congress should decide in their favor and fix in the law of the land their interpretation of the Sabbath commandment. Congress yielded to their demand. And now they have declared that this "settles the Sabbath question." They were able to make their influence felt in Congress in a sufficient degree to accomplish their will in this matter; and having accomplished their purpose, they now declare that that question is "settled."

BUT *all* the questions between Catholics and Protestants are not settled yet. Now suppose some question arises between the Catholics and these same Protestants, and suppose the Catholic Church is able to exert sufficient influence to secure the decision of Congress in *her* favor. What, then, can these Protestants say? If they propose to deny the right of Congress to decide any such question, the Catholics can simply tell them: "You did not deny the right of Congress to decide a controversy between you and other Protestants. So far from denying the right of Congress to do this, you demanded it. If Congress was then competent to decide a controversy between Protestant sects, it is now competent to decide between Protestants and Catholics. When Congress decided in your favor there, you gladly claimed the decision and declared that that settled that question. Now Congress has decided this question in our favor, why does not this settle this question? If a decision of Congress in *your* favor settles a question, why is it that a decision of Congress in *our* favor does not settle a question? *Then* Congress adopted your view and fixed it in the law; you said that was right, and we say so too. *Now* Congress has adopted our view and has fixed it in the law; and we say this is right. You did that with our help. You said it was right, and we say so too. We did this without your help, and we say it is right. And you cannot deny it."

WHAT can these Protestants answer?—Not a word. Their mouths will be completely stopped. And just then they will find out how completely they have sold themselves into the hands of Rome, in the doing of this which they have already done.

NOR is such a controversy a far-off thing. It is at hand in more shapes than one. One point is already raised. It came about in this way: In 1885, by a scheme of the Catholic Church, the Catholic Church and about fourteen professed Protestant churches secured donations of money from the treasury of the United States to aid them in carrying on their missionary work among the Indians. And at the very first move the Catholic Church obtained more money than all the Protestants put together—the Catholics \$118,343, and all the others together only \$109,916. The second year the Catholics got \$194,635, while all the others got but \$168,579; the third year the Catholic Church got \$221,169, while all the others got only \$155,095; the fourth year the Catholic Church got \$347,672, while all the others together got but \$183,000; the fifth year the Catholic Church got \$356,967, while all the others got only \$204,993; and the sixth year the Catholic Church got \$400,000, while all the Protestants together got but the same, \$204,993. Thus starting almost even, in only six years the Catholic Church succeeded in increasing her portion of the public money to almost double that of all the others together—and this while the others were increasing theirs all the time too.

IN 1889 an effort was made by the Harrison administration to stop all such appropriations of public money; but it was obliged to confess openly on the floor of the United States Senate, by Senator Dawes, that it "*found it impossible to do that.*" When it was found impossible to stop it, it was next proposed to stop as much as possible, and allow no increase to any, over that which they had received the year before. With this the Protestants were content. Not so the Catholic Church, however. She wanted more, and more she would have, and more she got. But how could she get more when the administration was opposed to it? Oh! that was no particular hinderance [*sic.*] to her. She simply ignored the administration altogether and went into the House of Representatives in Congress and got \$32,000 added to her share of the year before; and when the bill went to the Senate she went there too, and got \$12,000 more added, making \$44,000, which she secured that year in addition to her share for the year before, *and this in spite of the administration*, and in spite of the "protests" of all the Protestant churches engaged in the matter. For, as soon as these

churches learned that the Catholic Church was getting all this increase while they were getting no increase, they all began to "protest" against it. But their protest amounted to nothing, because they were taking money from the public treasury at the same time, and they protested only because she was getting *more* than they were. But they kept up their "protest" and succeeded in reducing the appropriations to themselves to the amount of \$48,647, and to the Catholic Church to the amount of only \$31,432, so that for the year, 1892, the Catholic Church got \$369,535, while all the others together got only \$156,346—the Catholic Church is now getting *more* than two dollars, to one dollar paid to the Protestants.

WELL, the Protestants seeing that the Catholic Church was beating them at every turn, even when they had the whole Harrison administration on their side, have now taken another tack and propose to take no more public money at all. The Methodist, the Episcopalian, the Congregationalist, and the Baptist churches have all refused to take any more; and leading men in the Presbyterian Church are trying to get that church to refuse likewise. The object of this is to have all the Protestant churches refuse to receive any more public money, and then together raise one united cry against any appropriation to the Catholic Church. But here again they will find themselves defeated and sold into the power of Rome by the selfish blunders which they themselves have already made.

First, when they declare it wrong to make appropriations of public money to churches, the Catholic Church can reply: "You yourselves took public money in direct appropriations for from six to eight years straight ahead. If it is wrong, why did you do it? We all began it at the same time. If you have since found out that it is wrong, it does not follow that I should acknowledge it to be wrong. Even if you do think it wrong, I am not obliged to accept your view. I do not think it wrong. The Catholic Church says that it is right that the State should support the Church." And what answer can the Protestants make?—Just none at all.

Again, the Catholic Church can argue thus: "The Supreme Court of the United States has unanimously declared that 'this is a Christian Nation.' As the starting point and leading proof of this, the court has cited 'the commission to Christopher Columbus,' prior to his sail westward, from 'Ferdinand and Isabella, by the grace of God, King and Queen of Castelle,' etc., which recites that 'it is hoped by God's assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be

discovered.' Now the religion intended to be propagated by Ferdinand and Isabella was the Catholic religion. The religion which Columbus revered and which he hoped to be the instrument of spreading abroad, was the Catholic religion, and that alone. Therefore, as this royal document is adduced as evidence that this is a 'religious people' and 'a Christian Nation;' as the only religion contemplated or considered in connection with the document or its purposes was the Catholic religion; as all but Catholics are heretics and not Christians; it follows that the religion of this Nation is the Catholic religion, and that this is a *Catholic* Christian Nation. It is therefore perfectly proper and right that the Catholic Church should be supported, and the Catholic religion propagated, *under national authority and from the national funds.*"

And, again, what can the Protestants answer?—Just nothing at all.

The fathers of this Republic told them long ago that "the same authority that could establish Christianity in exclusion of all other religions, could establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians in exclusion of all other sects." For this reason the Government was forever forbidden to recognize any religion. This wisdom these Protestants disregarded. They asked for years that the Christian religion should be recognized as the national religion. They rejoiced when this Supreme Court decision did establish the Christian religion as the national religion in exclusion of all other religions. And now when it results in establishing the Catholic sect of the "Christian religion" in exclusion of all other sects, they can have but themselves to blame for it.

They cannot deny that such an argument by the Catholics upon the Supreme Court decision would be strictly logical. Neither can they call in question the rightfulness of the decision itself, for the reason that they themselves have already used that decision to their own advantage [*sic.*] in influencing Congress to recognize Sunday

284

as the Christian Sabbath, and to fix in the law their interpretation of the word of God. Having used this decision, and claimed it as certainly right, to their own advantage, and to sustain and fix in the law their own views in matters of religion, they have forever cut themselves off from calling in question either the decision or the use of it, when it is employed to their disadvantage, and to fix in the law Rome's views in matters of religion.

Thus completely, and by professed Protestants, has this Nation been sold into the hands of Rome. Thus completely has the new order of things been reversed and the old order of things restored, and *Rome knows it*. Rome's knowledge of this and the use which she is even now making of this knowledge, will be related next week.

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 8, 36 , p. 288.

THE Consolidated Street Railway Company of Worcester, Mass., recently did some Sunday work on their tracks, upon which an indignation meeting was called by the ministers of that city to protest against a recurrence of the "desecration."

IT is a little surprising to read that "Mgr. Satolli's recent visit to Cincinnati was not made without danger of attack at the hands of sectarian cranks." He was constantly attended by a body guard. But where one "sectarian crank" may have been ready to attack him, ten thousand milk-and-water Protestants(?) were ready to fawn upon him.

GOVERNOR ALTGELD, of Illinois, has gone on record as saying that in all America there are not more than fifty anarchists. The Governor evidently forgot to count the American Sabbath Unionists, who, by threats and intimidation, compelled Congress to violate the fundamental law of the land in the passage of the Sunday-closing proviso.

AN effort was made to induce Judge Ewing, of Chicago, to set aside Judge Goggin's order continuing for sixty days the proceedings in the Clingman injunction, but on the 6th instant His Honor denied the motion, on the ground that it would be a breach of judicial courtesy for him to take jurisdiction of the hearing. It now seems certain that the Fair will remain open on Sunday until the gates are finally closed the last of October.

THE *Christian Statesman* says that Sunday closing of the World's Fair has been "practically achieved," nevertheless the number of paid admissions on Sunday, September 3, was 25,439, of which 24,284 were adults who paid full price, while only 1,155 were children at twenty-five cents per head. The receipts for the day were, therefore, \$12,307.75, beside the percentages received from concessionaires. If this sort of Sunday closing satisfies the Sunday people, it must be because they are so accustomed to frauds and fakes that they would

not know a genuine article if they were to see it. But no wonder, a counterfeit Sabbath naturally blinds them to every thing else. Moreover, they all want to go to the Fair, but they pledged themselves not to go unless the gates were closed on Sunday; but now that the dates are not closed, nor are they likely to be, the Sunday close their eyes instead to the open gates and visit the Fair just as everybody knew they would, notwithstanding all their bluster and pledges.

THE *Christian Advocate* of the 24th ult., referring to mob violence in the South and West, says: "The cords that bind society together are being snapped at a fearful rate." It is too true; but what can we expect when the churches of the land set the example of mob law by overriding the fundamental law of the Nation in compelling Congress by threats of political boycott to enact unconstitutional laws?

THE *Catholic Review* complains of Protestant missionaries, that "in India, China and other parts of Asia, in Central Africa, with the help of British officers, they are exterminating the native Catholics and banishing priests and native rulers." The *Independent* takes this as an evidence that the missionaries are meeting with success in their work. They certainly are, but if the *Review* states the case correctly, it is certainly not Christian work.

A SUNDAY law paper remarks that "the decision rendered by Chief Justice Fuller, of the Supreme Court of the United States, has served to encourage and embolden the lawless, godless element of this country and their abettors, the Seventh-day Adventists, in opposing the Sabbath." It has done nothing of the kind. Chief Justice Fuller's decision had nothing to do with either Sunday or the Sabbath. The only question before Judge Fuller was the right of the United States to assume jurisdiction over the Fair grounds and usurp the powers both of the State of Illinois and of a corporation created under the laws of that State. So far as the fling at Seventh-day Adventists is concerned, it is true only in this, that they from the first consistently opposed any governmental interference in the matter, because it was a purely religious question, and legislation upon religious matters is forbidden by the Federal Constitution. Seventh-day Adventists respect that instrument as it reads.

THE Nebraska *City Evangelist* says:—

Chief Justice Fuller, in his famous decision in regard to Sunday opening of the Columbian Exposition, has published to the world that a contract has no moral binding force. He does not say this in just these words, but it is evidently implied in what he does say.

The *Evangelist* ought to remember that whatever may be true of contracts, the ninth commandment is still of binding force. Even religious papers have no right to bear false witness. Chief Justice Fuller's decision was simply to the effect that the United States had no jurisdiction over Jackson Park, in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois. The suit was not brought to enforce a contract, but was brought on the assumption that the United States had control of the Fair. There is no excuse for lying about this matter.

"THE Turkish authorities," remarks the *Mail and Express*, "have promised to protect American missionaries in that country. It is hoped that the State Department officials at Washington will insist on this promise being kept. If any thing happens in this country to the subject of an inferior nation, the diplomats get to work immediately, and we are called on for explanations or reparation. Let us give other countries some of their own medicine and show to the world our disposition, and if necessary our ability to protect the God-fearing men and women who have abandoned the comforts of home to spread the light of the gospel among the ignorant."

This is a strange mixture of religious cant and of irreligious bullying. It is the duty of the Government to protect its citizens everywhere, whether missionaries or not, but it is not Christian to "give other countries some of their own medicine." The Christian rule is, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." But governments are not Christian; they are simply civil, and hence properly use force in perpetuating themselves and in defending their subjects, but they have no more duty in this respect toward missionaries than toward any other persons entitled to their protection.

"ANOTHER instance of courtesy from Protestant pastors to the Roman Catholics," says the *Independent*, "has occurred at Harrison, N. J., where the pastor of the Knox Presbyterian Church offered that church to Father Kernan for the use of his newly organized congregation until they could arrange for their own building." What would sturdy old John Knox say to this were he still in the flesh?

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore
uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending
toward a union of Church and State,
either in name or in fact

.C4m.nZo ni^{aa}j_ mam moonm ñ ñ ñ .oie 14111 .

THE *Evangel and ab bath Outlook* very pertinently remarks that the " growth of Roman Catholicism in New England is well known to those who study current events. Neither is it surprising when one remembers that 'Church authority' forms so large a part of the basis of Protestant faith. The end is not yet and Protestants must open their eyes to these facts or suffer the defeat which always accompanies blindness, whether induced by indifference or disobedience."

September 21, 1893

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 8, 37 , pp. 289-291.

THE principles upon which the Government of the United States was founded, and the principles of Rome, are directly at opposites. *And Rome knows it, and has known it all the time.*

THE principles of the Government of the United States have now been completely subverted, and the principles of Rome fully adopted, by an apostate Protestantism, in the United States. *And Rome knows it.*

THE effect of the principles of the Government of the United States upon other nations has ever been to weaken Rome's influence over them, and to draw them away from her. So certainly is this true, that although Rome long ago denounced religious toleration as one of the eighty heresies of the age, yet even Spain has "granted" "toleration."

HERE is a statement that is worthy of consideration in this connection:—

We must briefly survey the influence of the American system upon foreign countries and churches.

Within the present generation the principle of religious liberty and equality, with a corresponding relaxation of the bond of union of Church and State, has made steady and irresistible progress among the leading nations of Europe, and has been embodied more or less clearly in written constitutions. . . .

The successful working of the principle of religious freedom in the United States has stimulated this progress without any official interference. All advocates of the voluntary principle [in support of churches and religion] and of a separation of Church and State in Europe, point to the example of this country as their strongest practical argument.—*Schaff, Church and State in the United States, p. 83.*

ROME did not want the nations of Europe, or anywhere else, drawn away from her. Yet here was this very work "steadily and irresistibly" going on. This was not by any means a pleasing thing to her. Yet what could she do? The work was not being done by any official action of the United States Government, in diplomacy or otherwise, and, of course, she could not meet it by any such means. It was by the silent, steady and "irresistible" influence of the divine principle upon which the Government was founded, and which was spread before all the world in constitutional guaranties. Plainly, as long as this was suffered to go on she could do nothing; and still the longer it went on the more her influence over the nations was being weakened and her power with them was vanishing. And this to her was heartrending sorrow, and affliction unbearable.

YET what could she do? What *should* she do? Well, as it was the silent, steady, irresistible power of the divine principles of this Government that was sapping her life away, it is evident that the only thing that she could logically or possibly do to save herself was *to subvert the principles of religious liberty, of the separation of Church and State, upon which this Government was founded*, and thus turn back the Government of the United States into the way of her evil principles, and so regain her influence and power over the nations and thus once more draw all the nations in her train. For with this Government holding such a high place in the estimation of the nations, it is manifest that if the principles of the Government could be subverted and this Nation so turned into her evil course, then the influence of this Nation would be just as powerful to draw the nations back to Rome as it had formerly been to draw them away from her.

EVIDENTLY this was the logic of the situation. And as Rome is always logical in the application of her own premises, this is the scheme which she set on foot, and which she has been working ever since she awoke to the real situation. As a church, and for this purpose, she entered American politics, she secured political possession of all the great cities, so that now, by this means, she holds the balance of power even in a national election. She worked her agents also into the field of journalism, so that to-day, generally speaking, she absolutely controls the publications of the country, by which she is steadily warping public opinion in her favor, and if not that, then into fear of her power. She sends her secret agents into the Protestant religious schools and theological seminaries, and even into Protestant pulpits, by which means, she steadily and stealthily

tones down the principles of the Protestantism and molds religious opinion upon the view that there are at least certain things upon which Protestants and Catholics "can unite to shape legislation for the public weal," etc., etc. She sends her agents into the trades-unions, the labor-unions, etc., and takes control of these and molds them upon her principles; strikes, with their accompanying violence, are multiplied upon, in which she deftly insinuates herself as the "arbitrator," whose justice alone can settle the differences and whose word alone can calm the troubled waters. Note the Pope's encyclicals on the labor question.

ALL these have, for a long time, been her means of loosening the foundations of integrity to the principles of the Government of the United States. And all the while, too, she has beheld with secret but unbounded satisfaction, the work of professed Protestants in their endeavors to secure the recognition of religion in national legislation and national affairs. And when, February 29, 1892, she heard the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that "This is a Christian Nation," with Catholic documents quoted to prove it, she could contain herself no longer. She knew that her advantage was so certain, and her time was so fully come, that she need no longer work in secret, but could announce her purposes openly to the American people and to the world, which she did shortly in a letter from the Vatican to the New York *Sun*, and which was printed in that paper July 11, 1892, under the heading of "The Papacy and Nationality; Pope Leo and the United States."

IN that letter are found the following startlingly significant sentences, in which she announces her programme and her purpose concerning the United States, and *through this*, all humanity:—

In his [Pope Leo's] view, the United States has reached the period when it becomes necessary to

290

bring about the fusion of all the heterogeneous elements in one homogeneous and indissoluble Nation. . . . It is for this reason that the Pope wants the Catholics to prove themselves the most enlightened and most devoted workers for national unity and political assimilation. . . . America feels the need of this work of internal fusion. . . . *What the Church has done in the past for others, she will do for the United States.* . . . That is the reason the Holy See encourages the American clergy to guard jealously the solidarity, and to labor for the fusion of all the foreign and heterogeneous elements into one vast national family. . . .

Finally, Leo XIII. desires to see strength in that unity. Like all intuitive souls, he hails in the united American States and in their young and flourishing Church, *the source of new life for Europeans*. He wants America to be powerful, *in order that Europe may regain strength from borrowing a rejuvenated type*. Europe is closely watching the United States. . . . Henceforth we [Europeans] will need authors who will place themselves on this ground: "What can we borrow and what ought we to borrow from the United States for our social, political, *and ecclesiastical reorganization*? The answer depends in a great measure upon the development of American destinies. If the United States succeed in solving the many problems that puzzle us, Europe will follow their example, and *this outpouring of light will mark a date in the history not only of the United States, BUT OF ALL HUMANITY*. . . .

That is why the holy father, anxious for peace and strength, collaborates with passion in the work of consolidation and development in American affairs. According to him, the Church ought to be the chosen crucible for the moulding and absorption of races into one united family. And that, especially, is the reason why he labors at the codification of ecclesiastical affairs, *in order that this distant member of Christianity may infuse new blood into the old organism*.

NOW, until the year 1892, what could any nation have possibly borrowed from the United States for "*ecclesiastical reorganization*"? Nothing. Until that year the Constitution was avowedly against the United States Government even in any way having anything to do with any ecclesiastical matter. That year, however, February 29, the Supreme Judicial branch of the Government unanimously decided and declared that "This is a Christian Nation," and that *this is the meaning of THE CONSTITUTION*. This was at one stroke to subvert the Constitution and the principles of the Government as established by those who made the Government and the Constitution. Then this was followed at once by the professed Protestant churches of the country in demanding national legislation declaring Sunday to be the Christian Sabbath, and requiring its observance, because this is a Christian Nation. The success of this committed the legislative branch of the Government to the subversion of the principles upon which the Government was founded. And when President Harrison approved and signed this legislation, this committed the Executive branch of the Government to the subversion of the principles of the Government as established. And thus in the year 1892, in the whole Government of the United States—in its legislative, judicial and executive branches—were the principles of the Government, as established by the makers

of the Government, subverted, and the principles of Rome adopted instead. And then it was, and not till then, that Rome could propound for Europeans the important inquiry, "What can we borrow and what ought we to borrow from the United States for our . . . ecclesiastical reorganization?" And just *then*, it was too—July 11—that this important inquiry was openly propounded in the United States. Was this merely a coincidence?—nay, was it not rather an intentional and definite action, taken at that time, upon these proceedings of the Government and churches of the United States which so entirely accomplished her long desired purpose—the subversion of the principles of the United States Government as established by our fathers?

AGAIN we say that, with sorrow Rome has seen all the nations steadily drawn away from her by the bright example of the separation of Church and State and complete religious liberty in the United States Government, assured in the national Constitution, the supreme law, and the fundamental principles of the Nation. Seeing this, she knew that if she would recover her loss, and regain her influence over the nations, she must draw this Nation into her toils. If she could succeed in this, and get the divine principle of this Nation subverted and its influence reversed, she knew that the influence of this Nation would be as strong to draw the nations back to her as it had been to draw them away from her. And so it has been with the most greedy satisfaction that she has seen the professed Protestant churches in the United States, steadily playing into her hands by their amazing blindness in calling for the legal recognition of religion and the legal enforcement of religious observances. And when at last she saw "the Christian religion" legally recognized, and this Nation plainly declared to be "a Christian Nation" by the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, and supported in argument by that court, by the citation of Catholic documents; and when she saw the professed Protestant churches joining hands with herself, and by threats requiring Congress to recognize and fix in the national legislation her own chief, sacred day, the very sign of her authority—when she saw all this, and knew that it gave her her longed-for opportunity and advantage, she instantly grasped it with all her might; at once publicly announced to the people of the United States and the world her scheme and her purpose for the United States and for the world; and followed this up immediately by sending over Archbishop Satolli and establishing him here as "permanent apostolic delegate"—the Pope's

personal representative,—to carry out by his immediate and active presence, the scheme and purpose of Leo XIII. as announced.

AND *this is exactly what Satolli is here for.* It has been so announced in print, more than once, since he came over. And there is not the least doubt that what the church has done for other nations in the past she will now do for the United States. She has been the continual curse and the final ruin of nations in the past. And she will do that now to the United States, and to the other nations, by the restoration of her power which she gains through the subversion of the divine principle of the Government of the United States. *And the chief hand in it all will have been that of the apostate Protestants of the United States,* who have sold this Nation into Rome's ruinous hands.

Leo's scheme so far as the United States is concerned has succeeded. And that scheme as it relates to Europe and "all humanity" will certainly succeed. All the nations will now be drawn back under the influence, and to the support, of the Papacy. This we know, not only from the history and the nature of things, but also from the sure Word of God. For it is written: "All that dwell on the earth shall worship him [the beast, the Papacy] whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb." Rev. 13:8. And again it is written: "The same horn [power, the Papacy] made war with the saints and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of Days came and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." Dan. 7:21, 22. For a long time Rome has not had power to persecute, to make war against, the people of the Lord. The Scripture plainly declares that she will have and will use such power against them until the day that they enter into the kingdom of the Lord. This in itself shows that power is regained by her. And as the only thing that she ever wants with power is to compel all to worship at her bidding, or to persecute to the death all who will not, these two texts together show that her power will yet be universal over all, and all will obey her, whose names are not in the book of life of the Lamb.

AGAIN it is written of her: "She saith in her heart, I sit a queen and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." Rev. 18:7. There was a time when she could say this; there was a time when so far from being a widow every kingdom and nation of Europe was united to her and living in adulterous connection with her. She had as many husbands as there were kingdoms and nations. The Reformation came and

separated some from her. Political vicissitudes of one kind and another separated one after another, all the rest from her, until 1870 when Victor Emanuel completely widowed her by taking Rome and her temporalities, and separating the last kingdom from her. Since that time she has been a widow and has seen sorrow. She has mourned most dismally, and has lost no opportunity to spread her plaint before all the world. She does not sit as a queen; she is a widow, she has no husband at all; and she is exceedingly sorry that she is not living in constant adultery with the kingdoms and nations of the earth.

BUT the time does come again when she "glorifies herself and lives deliciously," and joyously exclaims, "I sit a queen and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." And at that very time the kingdoms of the earth are committing fornication and living deliciously *with her*. Rev. 18:7, 9. This shows conclusively that her scheme of drawing back the nations to her will succeed. Once more she will have all the kingdoms and nations for her husbands and will truly as a queen and be no widow, and will exultantly congratulate herself upon it. *And then what?* It is written: "Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death and mourning and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." Rev. 18:8. "That wicked, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming." 2 Thess. 2:8. And this is the end of the course of events which have been begun by this action of the churches and Government of the United States in subverting the principles upon which the Government was founded and going back to the principles of the Papacy. Henceforth God hath a

291

controversy with the nations. God standeth up to judge, and the judgment is ruin because their works are evil and defiant. Jer. 25:15-38; Rev. 16 and 18.

IT may be that this will not be believed. We have nothing to do with that, however. It is the truth, and we know it. It is the truth whether men believe it or not. And whether they will believe it or not is for them to decide, each one for himself alone. For seven years straight ahead in these columns we told the people that this would be made "a Christian Nation," and that Congress, at the dictate of the churches, would set up Sunday as the Sabbath. The people would not believe it. Now all this has been done and everybody knows it.

And this which we have mapped out now will as certainly come as this other has come. For your soul's sake believe it, and get ready, get ready, get ready, for it is near and hasteth greatly.

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 8, 37 , p. 296.

IT is now denied that the Vatican will ask the Government at Washington to receive a papal nuncio.

IT is said that the Pope will shortly publish an important document relative to the Catholic University at Washington.

AN Illinois paper of August 31, says: "Sunday's paid attendance at the World's Fair numbered 20,709, the receipts amounting to about \$10,000. The expenses were about \$3,000." September 10, the attendance was over 34,000. But the *Christian Statesman* says that "Sunday-closing has been practically achieved"!

THERE is to be held in Chicago the last three days of this month, a "Sunday Rest Congress." The committee in charge of the arrangements, of which Rev. Dr. Atterbury, Secretary of the New York "Sabbath" Committee, is chairman, includes members of the Presbyterian, Lutheran, Baptist, Congregational, Episcopal, Methodist, Universalist and Roman Catholic communions, and a representative of the labor organizations of the country.

THE programme of the Sunday Rest Congress, it is stated, provides for addresses by Protestants of various shades of religious opinion, Roman Catholics, Jews and men who will appear simply as specialists, without reference to their religious affiliations. The question will be discussed in its physiological, economic, social and moral, political religious, and miscellaneous relations.

NO definite action will be taken by the Sunday Congress, and it is understood that each speaker will be solely responsible for the views he may advance, and thus be free to say what he pleases. The *Bulletin*, of the French Popular League, for Sunday rest, among whose leading spirits are Jules Simon and Leon Say, says that while it might have been expected that a Sunday Congress held on the borders of Lake Michigan would be exclusively Protestant, the programme provides for Roman Catholic and Jewish representation, thus showing that there is no greater liberality displayed on the banks of the Seine than on the shores of the American lake.

BUT there need be no surprise either felt or expressed at the "great liberality" displayed in the matter of this Sunday Congress. It matters not how or by what means Sunday is exalted, if only it be exalted. Viewed only from a human standpoint one might well wonder that Jews would join in exalting the day which has ever been the rival of the time-honored Sabbath of the God of Abraham; but it is only natural that Roman Catholics should have a prominent place in doing homage to an institution which is preeminently the badge of papal authority.

THE article on another page, which we reprint from the *Catholic Mirror* is apropos to this subject. Its appearance in the leading Catholic paper at this time is significant. Just as the leaders of so-called Protestantism are about to assemble to do homage to Sunday, the taunt is by the Catholics thrown in their faces that *the claims of Protestants to any part in Sunday are "groundless, self-contradictory, and suicidal."* And what can such Protestants answer? Nothing at all, for Sunday as a "Christian" institution is wholly of papal origin; and back of that its only religious significance was as "the wild solar holiday of all pagan times." Sunday-keeping Protestants stand abashed before the well-grounded claims of the Papists to proprietorship in the so-called Christian Sabbath.

THE *Catholic Mirror* publishes the statement, and apparently sees nothing wrong in the fact, that "the reason that President Cleveland appointed Colonel Jesse Sparks, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., to a Mexican consulship, was because the gallant old confederate officer, during Cleveland's former term, sent him a present of a couple of fat, juicy, Tennessee opossums, which Grover seemed to heartily relish. To show his gratitude for this unique present, Colonel Jesse was tendered a consulate." If this is not a slander on the President, it certainly is on the Nation. A consulate for two opossums! And yet some people think our liberties secure because we are living in such an enlightened age!

THE *Examiner* (Baptist) of this city, has this to say about the Congress of Religions:—

There have been intimations—somewhat hazy, it is true—that an attempt is to be made to use the preposterous "Congress of Religions" to convene at Chicago as a sort of catapult for slinging a new religion into the world. The basic proposition is that all religions are true and all are false, and the new cult is to be made up of the best in all of them. Who is to decide what is "best" does not yet appear. A gentleman who professes to have some knowledge of the

movement expresses the opinion that it is rather premature; and with that view of the subject we heartily concur.

The congress may not be the occasion of giving a new composite religion to the world, but it will certainly have a tendency to create the impression that one religion is about as good as another, after all; indeed it has done something in this direction already. And as merely moral systems the difference may not be so very great; but while other religions have no power in them or back of them but the power of the human will, there is in Christianity the power of God to transform the soul. This fact has, however, been very largely lost sight of by the promoters of the Congress of Religions. They propose to make an exhibit of Christianity, but they cannot thus exhibit its hidden power, without which it is not Christianity. The Congress of Religions is simply an exhibition of human vanity.

AT its recent meeting at Saratoga, the New York "Sabbath" Association adopted the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That we rejoice in and indorse the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, on February 29, 1892, that "this is a Christian Nation."

Resolved, That we see in such contrary decisions as that of Judge Stein, of an inferior court, the necessity for putting the decision of the Supreme Court into our national Constitution that all our Christian institutions may have an undeniable legal basis in our fundamental law.

Resolved, That we rejoice in the World's Fair Sabbath-closing law and in the equally impressive failure of Sunday opening, and we urge that these great victories be vigorously followed up with State and local victories over Sunday papers, Sunday trains and Sunday mails.

Resolved, That we recognize the Church of Christ as the chief reform organization and religion as the very heart of all reforms.

Thus, on every hand, the evidence multiplies that it is the settled purpose of the so-called Protestant churches to control the politics of the country in the interest of their dogmas.

THE much talked of "Faribault plan" of settling the public and parochial school question has proved a failure and is about to be abandoned. The matter is thus explained: The Catholics of Faribault, Minn., whose children attend the parochial school, which was placed under the jurisdiction of the city Board of Education, now insist that only Catholic teachers be engaged there. The Board of Education is willing to have two Catholic teachers only. Otherwise, it says, the

purpose of the plan would be lost. As usual the Catholics are modest—they are willing to take everything.

THE 19th of March, the Feast of St. Joseph, will henceforth be officially recognized as a holiday in Portugal. So says the *Catholic Review*. But what of it? St. Patrick's day is officially recognized in New York; and Sunday, another popish day, is recognized nearly the world over.

November 23, 1893

"The Power Unto Salvation" *American Sentinel* 8, 46 , p. 364.

IT is true there never was a time when there were more efforts being put forth, professedly, in the interests of salvation for man and the Nation. All seem to acknowledge that power is necessary to the accomplishment of this work, but it is also evident that there is a lack of harmony as to the source of the power, and the means of obtaining it.

When we look over the various societies, unions, etc., on this line, and see the course pursued, we incline to the conclusion that *the mind of power* is seen, by many at least, in *organizations*. But when we see that organizations are made up of men and women, we again conclude that they see the power in themselves. We listen to the voice of organization, however, before passing judgment, and from almost every direction, whether from the Church as such, or from its professed auxiliary organizations, the trumpet is blowing with no uncertain sound. Listen!

Here is a blast from a ministerial convention. "What we want is *law* in this matter [for the establishment of their ideas of salvation], and we are going to have it too; and when we get it we will show . . . that their time is short." Where is the power here? "What we want is law," in this they acknowledge that they do not have the power, but when they get the *law* they will have the power. Then the power must be in the law. But what is law? It is but the voice of man; it is a product of man. Therefore the *cry* from individuals or organizations for "law" is but the voice of man, for more power of man to save man.

But some will say at this point, "It is not man's law we want, it is God's law." Very well. Do you mean to say that you do not have God's law; and if not, what have you done with it? It has been on record, in God's statute book, for over three thousand years, and has

been sealed by the finger of the eternal God himself on tables of stone at Mount Sinai, and all down the ages since then in the hearts of his true people. Please read Ex. 20:1-17; Heb. 8:10. If it is *God's law* that men want they are without excuse if they do not have it, and in their hearts too. But that is just the trouble here. It is not in the heart that it is wanted, but in the Constitution and statute books of our Nation. Listen again!

"We propose to incorporate in our national Constitution the moral and religious command, etc." Again, "Have the Government set up the *moral law*. . . . Inscribe this character on our Constitution." No man desires to see any such law, or any law for that matter, on our statute books, unless he desires to see it enforced either upon himself or some one else (usually some one else); therefore, every man or woman who is working to connect the moral and religious law with the Government, is laying plans for the enforcement of morality and religion. Not a few have admitted this in language like the following:—"Have the Government simply set up the moral law . . . and lay its hands on any religion that does not conform to it." This testimony shows not only that morality is to be enforced, but it is that kind of morality that is called religion. Again, "By eternal force of sheriffs we propose to arrest and punish all violators of this [moral] law." "Let those who *will*, remember the Sabbath to keep it holy, from motives of love and obedience; the remnant must be made to do so through fear of law."

Call it the law of God all we may, but if it is ever put into our national Constitution or statutes, man will put it there; then man must put with it the penalty for its violation; then man must execute the penalty, and this makes it a man's affair, and it never can be anything else. Since Christ came into this world, God has never made men the ministers of his law. Again, we ask, what is the object in all this? The only answer that can be given is, to make men "holy," or make them act as though they were holy, by law. "Those who will not keep it [the moral commandment] holy, from motives of love, must be made to do so through fear of law." All the holiness man can get from forced obedience will be the holiness there is in the compelling power; but as has been often shown, the only compelling power (for religious acts) is man, and he only while he is separated from the gospel of God. God says that all of man's righteousness or holiness "is as filthy rags." Isa. 64:6. Therefore, is it not true that the best thing organizations, for the enforcement of religious dogmas, can give to

poor sinners is man-made righteousness? This is the power unto salvation that is being aggressively sought after! This is the power of *man* unto salvation, but it is not the power of *God* unto salvation!

The law of God is "love" and that is just what his service is, therefore it must be from the heart, and from the heart only, to be at all acceptable to God; and that love and service can only come through faith in Jesus Christ. "Therefore," says Paul, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." This is the power men ought to seek after to-day.

There is no holiness or goodness for a single sinner in this world that has, as ever can, come to man only through the gospel of God. "For there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:11.

Law cannot accomplish holiness in a single sinner, no, not even the "holy" and "perfect" law of God. Why? for, "By the deeds of the law [by doing the law] there shall no flesh be justified [made righteous or holy] in his sight. . . . for all have sinned and come short." Rom. 3:20, 23. "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness [holiness] should have come by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given." Gal. 3:21, 22. Thus it is seen again that since sin came into this world there has been no law given that can possibly give life; hence there is no law, however thoroughly enforced upon a sinner, that can ever grow him, or develop in him, one particle of holiness.

December 21, 1893

"Editorial" *American Sentinel* 8, 50 , pp. 393-395.

JESUS CHRIST was persecuted because he did not keep the Sabbath to suit the Pharisees, the scribes, and the priests, in his days on earth.

CHRIST was not only persecuted, but he was rejected, and a robber and murderer was chosen in his stead, and he was crucified, because he would not keep the Sabbath to suit the Pharisees, the scribes, and the priests.

ALTHOUGH Lord of the Sabbath, himself, yet he was denounced as a Sabbath-breaker, was spied upon, was persecuted, was rejected, and a robber and murderer chosen in his stead, and was crucified, because he would not conform to the narrow, bigoted ideas of the Sabbath held by the Pharisees, scribes, and doctors of the law.

ALL this is worthy of peculiar attention in every way, just now when the Pharisees, the scribes, the chief priests, the hypocrites, and the doctors of the law, are making such a great stir over the Sabbath question, and are spying upon, and persecuting, and imprisoning, people for "Sabbath-breaking," who are actually Sabbath-keeping, according to the plainest word of the Son, and according to the whole life's example of Jesus Christ himself.

THE first year and a half of the Saviour's ministry did not arouse much antagonistic attention from the church leaders and authorities. During this time their attention was that of curiosity to know what his work was to amount to. As he had not come in the worldly pomp and kingly power which their selfish designs had pictured, and as he did not show any signs of developing into it, they counted him as nothing, and expected to see his influence fade away and come to naught.

BUT, although Jesus indulged in no empty show, and made no attempt to draw attention to himself, and always spoke in the quietest, simplest way, there was a power that attended his words which held the minds and hearts of the people, and which they readily contrasted with the words of the scribes; for "his word was with power," and "he taught as one having authority and not as the scribes." And, instead of the Pharisees and other church leaders seeing his influence and work fade away, they saw it steadily increase and grow so that it even began to threaten their own influence with the people. Then they began their open criticism.

IT was at the end of the first eighteen months of his public ministry, when the man who was sick of the palsy, was let down through the tiling and was forgiven his sins and instantly restored by Christ's word, and was bidden to take up his bed and walk. "There were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every town of Galilee, and Judea and Jerusalem," and they murmured against him as speaking blasphemies. Matt. 9:1-7; Mark 2:1-12; and Luke 5:17-26. Very shortly after this, however, at Jerusalem, he restored the man at the pool of Bethesda, who had been impotent thirty-eight years, and bade him also to take up his bed and walk. But *it was the Sabbath day when this was done*, and

"the Jews therefore said unto him that was cured: It is the Sabbath day: it is not lawful for thee to carry thy bed. He answered them, He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed and walk." They asked who this was, and the man could not tell. Afterward, however, the man met Jesus in the temple and recognized him, and went and told the inquirers that it was Jesus who had made him whole, and therefore the one who had told him to carry his bed, and both on the Sabbath day. *"And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the Sabbath day. But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God."* John 5:1-18.

NOW Jesus is Lord of the Sabbath. He made it. He is the one whose power it commemorates. He is the one whom it brings to the mind of the faithful observer. It was literally impossible for Jesus to break the Sabbath; the Sabbath being the sign of what he is, and that men may know that he is what he is. Whatsoever he did therefore on the Sabbath was in itself Sabbath-keeping, and could not possibly be anything else. His Sabbath-keeping was precisely and in its fullness God's idea of Sabbath-keeping, and was in itself perfect righteousness. The Pharisees condemned it as utterly wrong because it did not comport with their ideas of the Sabbath, and demanded that the Lord should give up his own and adopt their ideas of the Sabbath. The contest, therefore, in that day was, whether the Lord's or man's idea of the Sabbath should prevail. To reject the Lord's idea of the Sabbath was to reject the Sabbath itself, and this was to reject the Lord himself. And when they clung to their own views against his, this was to put themselves above him, and to substitute themselves for him; and this was to put themselves above God.

SOON after the healing of the man at the pool, Jesus, his disciples, and some Pharisees, were going through a field of wheat on the Sabbath day, and the disciples pulled off some of the heads of wheat, rubbed out the wheat in their hands and ate it, for they were hungry. Then the Pharisees said at once to him, "Why do thy disciples that which is not lawful to do on the Sabbath day?" Jesus answered, "The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath day." "If ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye

would not have condemned the guiltless." "Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days."

THEN, if not on the same day, the next Sabbath Jesus went into the synagogue and taught, and there was a man there who had a withered hand. And the Pharisees narrowly watched Jesus to see whether he would heal this man on the Sabbath that they might accuse him.

394

Jesus knew their thoughts and their purpose, and as though to make the thing as open as possible, he said to the man with the withered hand, "Stand forth in the midst." The man stepped out, and thus every eye in the synagogue was fixed on him and Jesus. Then said Jesus to the Pharisees: "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life or to kill?" They could make no answer. Then said Jesus to the man, "Stretch forth thine hand." "And he stretched it forth whole, as the other. Then the Pharisees went forth and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against him, how they might destroy him." Matt. 12:1-14; Mark 2:23-26; and Luke 6:1-11.

THIS counselling with the Herodians is worthy of notice. The Herodians, as the name clearly indicates, were the partisans of the family of Herod. They were a political rather than strictly a religious sect. And they were also the supporters of Rome as well as of the Herods, because the Herods were dependent on Rome for their power. The original Herod received his place as governor of Judea from the Roman Senate led by Mark Antony. And Rome was the support of the house of Herod throughout. The Pharisees were ever resentful of the Roman power and constantly galled under the Roman yoke; and were therefore, both on religious and political grounds, the sectarian enemies of the Herodians. But their hatred of Jesus, and their determination to suppress his heretical views and practices on the Sabbath question were so great as to lead them to forego all differences and distinctions of either a sectarian or a political nature, and to enter into intimate counsel with their sectarian enemies to further their purposes against the Lord. This alliance with the Herodians also explains the readiness with which the Pharisees finally secured the cooperation of Herod and Pilate in corruptly carrying out their more corrupt purposes against Jesus.

AGAIN, at the feast of tabernacles, Jesus was teaching in the temple and said: "Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of

you keepeth the law? Why go ye about to kill me? The people answered and said, Thou hast a devil: who goeth about to kill thee? Jesus answered and said unto them, I have done one work, and ye all marvel. Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision; . . . and ye on the Sabbath day circumcise a man. If a man on the Sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken; are ye angry at me because I have made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath day?" "Then they sought to take him, but no man laid hands on him, because his hour was not yet come. And many of the people believed on him, and said, When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done? The Pharisees heard that the people murmured such things concerning him; and the Pharisees and the chief priests sent officers to take him." But the officers returned without him, and were met with the inquiry, "Why have ye not brought him?" They answered, "Never man spake like this man." The Pharisees replied, "Are ye also deceived? Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him? But this people who knoweth not the law are cursed." And in their angry zeal they were about to judge and condemn him right there, without any hearing, but Nicodemus put a check upon the proceedings by the inquiry, "Doth our law judge any man before it hear him, and know what he doeth?" The assembly broke up and every man went unto his own house. But Jesus went unto the "Mount of Olives." John 7:19-53; 8:1. While they went on with their wicked plotting against him, he himself went to the Mount of Olives to pray, and to pray for them. Ps. 31:13-15; 69:11-13. While they were allying themselves to political power, he was holding fast to God. While they were putting their trust in earthly power, he was showing his trust in God.

SHORTLY afterward he met the man who had been born blind, and anointed his eyes with clay, and sent him to the pool of Siloam, and the man went and washed and came seeing. His neighbors and others brought to the Pharisees him whose sight had been thus given him. "*And it was the Sabbath day* when Jesus made the clay, and opened his eyes. . . . therefore said some of the Pharisees, This man is not of God because he keepeth not the Sabbath day." John 9:14-16.

AGAIN, "He was teaching in one of the synagogues on the Sabbath. And, behold, there was a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up herself. And when Jesus saw her, he called her to him,

and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. And he laid his hands on her: and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the Sabbath day, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the Sabbath day. The Lord then answered him, and said, Thou hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day? And when he had said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed: and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him." Luke 13:11-17.

AGAIN, "And it came to pass, as he went into the house of one of the chief Pharisees to eat bread on the Sabbath day, that they watched him. And, behold, there was a certain man before him which had the dropsy. And Jesus answering spake unto the lawyers and Pharisees, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day? And they held their peace. And he took him, and healed him, and let him go; and answered them, saying, Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the Sabbath day? And they could not answer him again to these things." Luke 14:1-6.

Every time they watched to see whether he would do so and so on the Sabbath day, they saw just what they were looking for. And they saw it so plainly, too, that there was no mistaking it. Nor did he ever make any apology for it; nor did he ever attempt to prove that what he did could not have "disturbed" anybody.

JESUS went on in his blessed work, and the Pharisees followed with their accursed plotting. At last he raised Lazarus from the dead, and "many of the Jews believed on Jesus." And immediately the news was carried to the Pharisees. "Then many of the Jews which came to Mary, and had seen the things which Jesus did, believed on him. But some of them went their ways to the Pharisees, and told them what things Jesus had done. Then gathered the chief priests and the Pharisees a council, and said, What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation. And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that

same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. . . . Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death." John 11:45-53.

THEIR self-convincing and self-justifying argument was this: "This Christ perpetually disregards the Sabbath. He is a confirmed Sabbath-breaker. All who believe on him will follow his example, of course. And he is gaining such an influence that all the people will certainly believe on him if things are suffered to go on. And as surely as they do this they will all become, from his teaching and example, habitual Sabbath-breakers like himself. This will make a whole nation of Sabbath-breakers. Then the judgment of God will fall upon the land, and he will bring in the Romans like a flood as he did the Chaldeans before and sweep all away and leave the land desolate. The salvation of the nation depends upon the maintenance of the Sabbath. But this Christ continually disregards the Sabbath and will not yield. Therefore, as the salvation of the nation depends upon our maintaining the Sabbath, and as this fellow's teaching and influence is carrying the whole nation into Sabbath-breaking, it is plain enough that if we would save the nation we must get rid of him." Thus their blind zeal and bigoted prejudice led them to attempt to save the nation by rejecting and destroying the Saviour. This was then only to put themselves in the place of Christ, and even above him, as the saviours of the nation. So that, in the Sabbath question in that day, as well as in this, there was involved the question: Who is the Saviour? Is it Christ or man? Is it Christ, by the power and faith of God alone; or is it the self-appointed church-leaders, by the power and force of earthly government?

THEY tried one more tack, however, before proceeding to open violence: They set a trap by which to get him to say some word or give some sign which they could twist into a charge of treason or disrespect of authority so as to get him into the clutch of the law. "Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. And they watched him. And they sent out unto him their disciples, with the Herodians, as spies, who should feign themselves to be just men, that they might take hold of his words, that so they might deliver him unto the power and authority of the governor." And they asked him that question concerning the tribute, when he answered, "Render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and unto God the things which are God's." "And when they heard it, they

were not able to take hold of that saying before the people: and they marvelled greatly at his answer, and held

395

their peace; and left him and went their way." Matt. 22:15-22; Luke 20:20-30. Then the very next day, "were gathered together the chief priests and the scribes and the elders of the people unto the court of the high priest who was called Caiaphas; and they took counsel together that they might take Jesus by subtlety, and kill him. But they said, Not during the feast, lest haply a tumult arise among the people, for they feared the people." Then came Judas to the chief priests and captains and offered to betray him secretly unto them. They gave him the thirty pieces of silver, "and he consented, and from that time he sought opportunity how he might conveniently deliver him unto them in the absence of the multitude." And the night of the very next day they captured him in Gethsemane, after midnight, and led him to Annas, and then to Caiaphas, then to Pilate, then to Herod, and back to Pilate. And when Pilate had insisted, even to the sixth time, that he found in him no fault, and spoke three times of releasing him and really sought a way to release him, then it was, that in their desperation, they cried: "If thou let this man go thou art not Cesar's friend. Whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cesar." Pilate then took the judgment seat, and they demanded that Jesus should be crucified. Pilate said, "Shall I crucify your King?" And in utter renunciation of God and all that he had ever done for them, they replied: "We have no king but Cesar." *Then therefore* he delivered him unto them to be crucified." And they led him away to crucify him." "And they crucified him."

AND they did it all to save themselves and the nation. But this was to make themselves the saviours of themselves and others; for in doing it they rejected the Saviour both of themselves and of all men. Thus the Sabbath question in that day, as in all days, involved the question of, Who is the Saviour? Their efforts then, to save themselves and the nation, resulted in the utter ruin of themselves and of the nation. They said, "If we let him alone, the Romans will come and take away both our place and nation." They did not let him alone, they persecuted him to death, and the Romans did come and take away both their place and nation. Their effort to save their place and nation only destroyed their place and nation.

THIS whole account was written for the warning and instruction of men in the ages to follow. And to no age or time could it possibly be

more applicable, or more pertinent, than to just this day and time in the United States. Here the Pharisees, the scribes, and the doctors of the law have rejected God's idea of the Sabbath and have set up a man's. God's idea on this subject is clearly stated, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Man's idea is and is declared, "Sunday is and shall be the Sabbath," and this plainly *instead* of the Sabbath of the Lord, as the Lord himself has stated the matter. To-day also the most widely separated sects, in profession, the Protestants, and the Catholics, have joined themselves together, as did the Pharisees and Herodians, to get control of governmental power to make effective their purpose to put down the Lord's idea of the Sabbath and exalt a man's—even that of the man of sin. These too, to-day, like those of old, accomplished their purpose upon the governmental authorities by threats of political ruin, like those of old did upon Pilate. And to-day, in many parts of the land, these Pharisees are persecuting those who maintain the Lord's idea of the Sabbath, as expressed in his own words, just as those Pharisees back there did Jesus for doing the same thing. To-day these Pharisees are watching, and spying upon those who are loyal to God's idea of the Sabbath, just as were those back yonder watching Jesus and spying upon him for the same thing. To-day these Pharisees are doing all this to get these to compromise or give up the Lord's idea of the Sabbath and adopt man's idea, which is but the idea of the man of sin, as did those Pharisees back yonder to get Jesus to do the same thing.

AND we are most happy to know, and to have these Pharisees find out, that there are some people so much like Jesus, that when they are persecuted to get them to yield the Lord's Sabbath and adopt man's, they will not do it. We are glad to know that there are to-day some people who are so much like Jesus, that when they are conforming strictly to God's idea of the Sabbath and are therefore faithful Sabbath-keepers, they are yet persecuted and imprisoned as Sabbath-breakers. And we are especially glad to know that these people are so much like Jesus that when the Pharisees of to-day go sneaking and spying around them as the others did around Jesus, these see just what they are watching for, as the other Pharisees saw when they watched Jesus. And we sincerely hope that these people shall still be so much like Jesus that they will suffer persecution to the death as did he, rather than to compromise or yield one hair's-breadth of their allegiance to God's idea of the Sabbath, or to adopt

to that extent man's idea of the Sabbath in the place of God's, or *even along with* the Lord's. For to put man's idea on an equality with the Lord's is at once to put it in the place of the Lord's. Of the Sabbath keeping Waldenses it is written, that "many of the true people of God became so bewildered that while they observed the Sabbath they refrained from labor also on the Sunday.—*Great Controversy, Vol. IV., p. 65.* God forbid that any of the true people of God in our day should become so bewildered as this! No. Far better be like Jesus and die for allegiance to God's truth, than to live by compromise with the lies and abominations of the Pharisees and Herodians, backed up by both Herod and Pilate.

A. T. J.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 8, 50 , p. 400.

DOCTOR MACARTHUR writes as a Baptist, and claims much for his denomination; but to that people much is certainly due. For centuries Baptists were, under God, almost the sole defenders of religious liberty, and to them the people of the United States are largely indebted for the freedom hitherto enjoyed in this land in the profession and practice of religion.

BUT while it is true that Baptists have in the past stood stiffly for religious liberty, it is equally true that within a few years the mass of Baptists have, in some respects, proved recreant to their principles, and have, with other Protestants, clamored for governmental support of religious institutions. Doctor MacArthur is himself prominent in the American Sabbath Union, an organization which has done more than any other to secure national recognition of Sunday as "the Christian Sabbath."

SUNDAY is not only a religious institution, but it is an ecclesiastical institution; and the demand made in its behalf by the united churches under the lead of the American Sabbath Union was not one whit better in principle than is the proposed crusade of the Papists on State funds, in behalf of their denominational schools. The Papists do not ask aid for their schools alone, but only that there shall be an equitable distribution of school funds among all schools giving secular instruction coming up to the requirements of the State, whether Protestant or papal. This is simply inviting Protestants to a concerted action in the matter of school funds similar to the united demand made on the general Government in behalf of the Sunday institution.

Consistency demands of the Baptists opposition to Sunday legislation as well as to all other State interference in religious matters.

BUT whether consistent or not, Doctor MacArthur says some excellent things. One paragraph alone fully justifies the position of those who have gone to prison rather than deny their faith by observing a false and counterfeit Sabbath. "The early Christians," says the doctor, "obeyed civil law in secular matters, but they dared to disobey when their Christian faith was in peril. Then they refused and received punishment with Christian submission and with heroic endurance. Their persecutions arose chiefly from the ancient laws which forbade the worship of deities which the State did not recognize. The Roman Government was tolerant of various religions, when their representatives were quiescent, but when Christians became active in propagating their faith they encountered fierce civil opposition."

THE principle which the doctor states and applies to the early Christians, is equally true of the Seventh-day Adventists of our own day, and his language needs but little change to express the exact truth concerning the Adventists and the persecution which they are called upon to endure. We paraphrase his words thus: The Adventists obey civil law in secular matters, but they dare to disobey when their Christian faith is in peril. Then they refuse and receive punishment with Christian submission and heroic endurance. Their persecutions arise chiefly from old laws still upon our statute books which require the observance of a pagan festival as the Christian Sabbath. Our civil authorities are tolerant of Adventists when they are quiescent, but when they become active in propagating their faith, and are consistent in living it out, they encounter fierce civil opposition.

THIS is the situation in a nutshell. Human nature has not changed at all, and times have changed but little since the days of the Cesars. The spirit of persecution is not essentially different now from what it was then, while the pretexts for it are almost identical with those of thirteen hundred years ago.

IN the Senate, on Dec. 11, Mr. Cullom, of Illinois, in offering petitions from his constituents said:—

I also present a petition signed by the pastors of a pretty large number of churches in Chicago, praying Congress to make an appropriation (I understand from outside sources that the sum required will not be over \$10,000) for a small chapel in connection with the marine hospital located in Chicago, and on the ground which belongs to the Government, and is in part occupied by the

marine hospital. The proposed chapel is to be for the accommodation so sick persons who are in the hospital, so that they may have an opportunity to attend church. I move that the petition be referred to the committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Is this not a logical conclusion from the appointment of chaplains by the Government? If it is the duty of the United States to provide teachers of religion in Government institutions, why does it not follow that it is the duty of the United States to furnish churches and chapels in which the teaching may be given? This being so, why is it not the right and duty of the Government, then, to decide what form of religion shall be taught by its paid chaplains, and in the building which it has provided? This acknowledged, as how can it be denied if the premises are granted, how does the Government differ from a great ecclesiastical organization, and what is it but an image to the Papacy?

¹ We would not be understood as denying the divinity of Christ nor the inspiration of the Scriptures. Both are Bible doctrines and worthy of all acceptance. But this Government has no more right to take cognizance of these questions than has the Porte to declare that "there is but one God and Mahomet is his prophet." All such questions are beyond the proper sphere of civil government.

² Church petition to Congress to secure Sunday closing of the Fair.—*Congressional Record*, May 29, 1893, p. 5144.

³ From telegram to President Cleveland, May 27, 1893, sent from Boston, by Wilbur F. Crafts, Joseph Cook, and A. H. Plumb.

⁴ Telegram to President Cleveland, May 19, 1893.

⁵ *Mail and Express*, (N. Y.) May 31, 1893. Report on first Sunday opening of the Fair.

⁶ Address of "Rev." W. F. Crafts, in Boston, May 21.—*Christian Statesman*, June 3, 1893.

⁷ Letter printed in *Christian Statesman*, June 3, 1893.

⁸ Iowa State Prohibition Convention, June 1, 1893.

⁹ Wilbur F. Crafts' speech in Boston, reported in *Christian Statesman*, June 5, 1893, by "Rev." J. M. Foster.

¹⁰ "The Lord hath laid upon Him the iniquity of us all." Isa. 53:6.