**“Jurisdiction of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have already anticipated this division of the subject, and have shown, by the extent of the gospel commission, that the law of God has been known and transgressed by men in every part of the world; that as the gospel is to be preached in all the world until the coming of Christ, sin will exist just as extensively and just as long; and that, consequently, the law, of which sin is the transgression, will be binding in all the world till the end of time. We wish, however, to carry the subject a little further. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 71.1}

The apostle says that “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself,” and that he has committed the carrying on of this work to his ambassadors-the ministers of the gospel-who, in Christ’s stead, pray the world to be reconciled to God. 2 Corinthians 5:19, 20. Now, reconciliation implies a previous condition of enmity; and if the world needed reconciling to God, it was because the world was at enmity with God. And since the work of reconciling is still being carried on, it follows that the rebellion, or enmity, still exists. Then the question arises, In what does that enmity consist? The same apostle tells us: “Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; *for it is not subject to the law* of God, neither indeed can be.” Romans 8:7. Men are rebels, because they are in opposition to God’s law. And this is the same truth that had been uttered, centuries before, by the inspired prophet: “Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever; that this is *a rebellious people*, lying children, children *that will not hear the law of the Lord*.” Isaiah 30:8, 9. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 71.2}

This brings out again the fact previously stated, that the gospel announces, and carries on its forefront, the law. It was the transgression of the law that made it necessary for Christ to come to reconcile men to God. And as men, by continued sin, lost their sense of its heinousness, and of their obligation to God, it became more and more necessary that the gospel, in announcing to men the way of pardon and reconciliation, should make known their need of such reconciliation and pardon by setting forth, in plain terms, the law which they had transgressed. This is what is plainly stated by Peter, when, after quoting Isaiah’s tribute to the enduring nature of the law, “For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of the Lord endureth forever,” he adds, “And *this* is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.” 1 Peter 1:24, 25. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 71.3}

The quotations made from John Wesley and Bishop Simpson are in harmony with this conclusion. Indeed, the conclusion is so nearly self-evident that it must be reached by all thoughtful, candid minds. The very fact that a pardon is granted, attests the authority of the law; and before a pardon can be granted, the individual must know and acknowledge his guilt. If a man thinks himself righteous, he will indignantly spurn any offer of pardon, even though he may really stand in need of it. Human nature would leave such to the fate which their own blindness and stubbornness deserve; but God loves the world, and desires that all men shall accept his pardon, and thus be reconciled to him; and therefore he takes pains to bring men to a sense of their sinful condition, so that the pardon which he offers may be accepted. The same messenger who is commissioned to announce the pardon, proclaims the law of God, which awakens the self-confident sinner, so that he may appreciate his lost condition. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 71.4}

Let us look still further into the matter of the extent of the law’s jurisdiction. Read Romans 3:19: “Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” The law speaks only to those who are within the bounds of its jurisdiction; it cannot condemn any who may walk contrary to its provisions, if they are outside of its limits. For example, a man in Russia may commit an act which is forbidden by the laws of the United States; yet he cannot on that account be declared guilty, simply because the United States law has no jurisdiction in his case. He is not amenable to it. But as a consequence of what the law of God says, all the world are found guilty before him. This, again, shows conclusively that all the world are in duty bound to keep God’s law. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 72.1}

There are no exceptions to this fact. We have before learned that “sin is the transgression of the law” (1 John 3:4) and that “where no law is, there is no transgression” (Romans 4:15); and therefore we know that wherever we find sin, there must also be the law. To whomsoever sin is imputed, upon him the law has claims; for “sin is not imputed when there is no law.” Romans 5:13. Now we find these statements in the third of Romans: “What then? Are we better than they? No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one;” “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” Verses 9, 10, 23. Here the apostle descends to particulars, and shows that not to the Jews alone, but to Gentiles as well, is sin imputed, thus proving beyond all controversy that the Gentiles as well as the Jews are under the jurisdiction of the law of God, and have violated it. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 72.2}

Our investigation of the law began with the time when it was given on Mount Sinai; and we must therefore now examine to see if that was the first of its existence. And here, as in all our study of the law, we find help from our knowledge of the fact that the law is “the righteousness of God.” Then it must necessarily have been in existence before the exode. Since it is a transcript of God’s character, it necessarily follows that its existence is coeval with the existence of God. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 72.3}

“But,” it may be objected, “the law, as a manifestation of God’s righteousness, might exist, without being transcribed for the government of mankind.” So it might if there were no creatures to whom it could be made known; or if there was any time after creatures had been brought into existence when God did not exercise government over them. But it is not for us to speculate on the state of affairs when God dwelt alone, inhabiting his own eternity, before the existence even of the “sons of God” that shouted for joy at the creation of this earth; and there certainly has never been a time since intelligent creatures were formed, either in Heaven or on earth, when God was not supreme ruler. No created beings have ever been independent of his control. But if God has always been ruler, he must have had some rule of government, and that could be nothing else than his righteousness-his law. The ten commandments are righteousness; they are perfect, holy, just, and good, and therefore exactly fitted to be the rule of a righteous and just government. Then, from the very nature of the law we would conclude that it was binding on men before it was spoken from Mount Sinai. We shall shortly recur to the argument broached in this paragraph; but first we wish to show from positive evidence that the law of ten commandments was known by men, and was binding on them, before the giving of it on Sinai. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 72.4}

In Romans 5:12, we read that “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” Here the apostle shows that death is a consequence of sin; death came into the world because there was sin in the world. If there had been no sin, there would have been no death, and wherever death is found, it is positive evidence that sin exists. With this passage we may well place 1 Corinthians 15:56: “The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law.” Here death is represented as a cruel monster that has brought many people into its power. It has poisonous fangs with which it strikes its victims, and these fangs, this sting, is sin. Let the fangs be drawn,-let sin be obliterated,-and death’s power would be gone. But the “strength of sin is the law.” “Sin is the transgression of the law,” and it is the violated law which provides death with its powerful sting. Were it not for the law, death would have no sting, that is, it would be powerless to destroy. So here, again, we have proof that wherever death is, there is the law also. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 72.5}

We read on: “For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.” Romans 5:13, 14. Here we have the statement that until the law, that is, until the time of Moses, when it was spoken from Sinai, sin and death were in the world; therefore we know that the law was in the world. And hereby we know that the expression, “until the law,” does not indicate that the time so specified was the first existence of the law; for both sin and death were in the world before that time, and neither can exist without the law, and the law violated. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 72.6}

Let us go still further into particulars. “Sin is the transgression of the law” (1 John 3:4), and “sin is not imputed when there is no law.” Romans 5:13. But sin was imputed to Cain (Genesis 4:7, 8), and consequently the law was there to condemn. Turn to the commandments, and you will find that the sixth commandment was the one especially transgressed. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 72.7}

Again we read that “the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly.” Genesis 13:13. “Sin is not imputed when there is no law,” and consequently we know that God judged the Sodomites by his law. If he judged them by his law, of course they knew of the existence of that law; otherwise their punishment would not have been just; but we may be sure that the “Judge of all the earth” will do right. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 72.8}

Take the case of the sons of Noah (Genesis 9:22-26). Here we have direct evidence that the fifth commandment was known; that it was violated by Ham, the younger son of Noah, and kept by the other two; and that the one was cursed for his sin, while the others were blessed for their observance of the commandment. These things show the existence of that commandment, a knowledge of its existence, and also a knowledge that it was in full force to condemn the guilty and to acquit the innocent. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 72.9}

We find also the violation of the eighth commandment mentioned in Genesis 31:30. It is not necessary to particularize concerning each of the commandments, but we will notice one more. In Genesis 15:15, 16, we read these words of the Lord to Abraham: “And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.” This shows that in the days of Abraham, the inhabitants of Canaan, the Gentiles, were guilty of iniquity. Iniquity is sin, and “sin is the transgression of the law;” so, therefore, the Amorites had the law of God. Turn now to 1 Kings 21:25, 26, and you will learn of what the Amorites were guilty:- {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 72.10}

“But there was none like unto Ahab, which did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord, whom Jezebel his wife stirred up. And he did very abominably in following idols, according to all things as did the Amorites, whom the Lord cast out before the children of Israel.” {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 72.11}

Here we find that the Amorites were cast out of Canaan because of idolatry,-idolatry, which, in its rites, involved the violation of not only the first and second commandments, but of all the ten. So we find that all the commandments were known and violated hundreds of years before the Jews came to Mount Sinai, and before there ever was a Jew. The point has now been proved, both from the nature of the law and by actual illustrations of the fact. E. J. W. {SITI February 4, 1886, p. 72.12}

(*To be continued.*)

**“Jurisdiction of the Law. (Continued)” The Signs of the Times, 12, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

Thus far we have shown the existence of the law of God from the earliest history of mankind. We wish now to carry the argument a step further, as we have already intimated that we should do. We have found the law to be “the righteousness of God,” the rule of his government. Since God has always been supreme ruler, and his rule has always been just and righteous, he must have judged only by his own righteous character, which is embodied in the decalogue. Now God has created many worlds besides this one (Hebrews 1:2), and since he formed ours that it might be inhabited (Isaiah 45:18), the conclusion is legitimate, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, that he made the others for the same purpose. No thinking person can suppose that this little earth, one of the smallest among the innumerable planets of the universe, is the only one that is inhabited. Now of all these vast worlds, God is the King. “The Lord hath prepared his throne in the Heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all.” Psalm 103:19. And since he can rule by naught except justice and righteousness, and all righteousness, even the righteousness of God himself, is comprised within the ten commandments, it follows that they, and they alone, form the rule of action in all God’s universe. Of the correctness of this conclusion we have direct evidence in Psalm 103:20, where we read that the angels “do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word.” If the commandments are the rule in Heaven, where God himself resides, certainly they are the rule “in all places of his dominion.” {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 87.1}

This view of the law, and we are confident that it is a just view, lifts the law question far, far above the plane on which its opposers would fain confine it. Instead of being imperfect and not calculated to bring man into proper relation to his Maker, it is the righteousness of God; instead of being confined to a small portion of this earth, the bounds of its jurisdiction are as extensive as the universe; instead of being given to one nation of earth, and to that alone, it is that to which all loyal creatures, even the angels of Heaven, bow in humble allegiance; and instead of being limited to a few centuries of existence, it “stands fast forever and ever,” even as long as God exists and his kingdom ruleth over all. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 87.2}

We are aware that at first sight many will think that this is going too far, and will possibly raise objections, and say that when we consider the nature of certain commandments, it is not reasonable to suppose that they could be in Heaven for the restraint of heavenly beings. We will therefore add one or two more points. But first we would remark that when a case is supported by positive evidence, we are not at liberty to reject it because there are points about it which we do not understand. Nothing can be proved so clearly that no one can raise an *objection*, or even frame an argument, against it; and many things that are susceptible of the clearest proof, cannot be fully comprehended even by those who present the proof. Take, for instance, the question of the existence of God. Both nature and revelation plainly teach that there is a God, who has existed from eternity; yet it is impossible to state the case so clearly that no one can cavil or raise objections; and there is no one, no matter how clearly he can demonstrate that there is a God, who can comprehend him, or understand how he could exist from eternity. The argument from ignorance is no argument at all. Truth is truth, however great our ignorance of it may be. The merchant sitting in his office can put a question to his agent a thousand miles distant, and receive a reply the next minute. Tell this well-known fact to a savage, and he will not believe you; he cannot comprehend how such a thing can be done, and will present objections and arguments which, to his mind, show the utter impossibility of such a thing. Yet in spite of his ignorance, the thing is true. So there are many things in connection with God and his government which finite wisdom cannot explain, but which we must accept. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 87.3}

Now to further show the reasonableness, nay, the absolute necessity, of the ten commandments existing as a rule for all creatures of the universe, {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 87.4}

1. “The law of the Lord is perfect.” Psalm 19:7. Since it is perfect, nothing can be added to it or taken from it without making it imperfect. If, then, any creatures should be governed by more or less than this law, they would be governed by an imperfect law. But that, of course, would result in imperfect characters, and would further show the lawgiver to be imperfect; therefore such an idea cannot be entertained. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 87.5}

2. “The law of the Lord is perfect,” because it is a transcript of his will,-his righteousness. Therefore all intelligent creatures must be governed by it. This has already been stated, but it will bear repetition. Too much stress cannot be laid upon it. Wherever God rules, his will must of necessity be law. That the ten commandment law, the law out of which the Jews were instructed, is the will of God, Paul shows in Romans 2:17, 18: “Behold, thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, And *knowest his will*, and approvest the things that are more excellent [margin, triest the things that differ], *being instructed out of the law*.” That the ten commandments are here referred to, may be seen from verses 21-23. Paul, therefore, speaking to a Jew, said, You know the will of God, because you are instructed out of the law. No further evidence is needed to show that the ten commandments are the will of God. Now, since all intelligent creatures must be governed by the will of God, it is evident that they are governed by the ten commandments, unless it could be shown that God changes, having one will at one time and toward one people, and another will at another time and for another people. But this cannot be; for “with him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.” James 1:17. There is, then, one law for all. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 87.6}

3. There are none who can have a greater interest than the righteous whether of the redeemed or of those who never sinned, in having the ten commandments maintained as the standard of right. And this for the very reason that it is the standard of right. It is the badge of their loyalty. If there were a place where the ten commandments were not held as the law, the righteous ones would not want to go there; for there would be nothing to show that they were righteous. But enough has been said to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the universality of God’s holy law. In all places of God’s dominion, rational beings are by this law either justified or condemned. E. J. W. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 87.7}

(*To be continued*.)

**“Faith Healing” The Signs of the Times, 12, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

The question as to the propriety of the praying for the recovery of the sick, and of depending on the prayer of faith for the healing of disease, has of late been discussed very much, by both the secular and religious press. On the one hand, the infidel and the worldling scoff at the idea of expecting the recovery of those whose diseases will not respond to the action of the medicinal agents known to science. To them such a thing seems an impossibility, an absurdity. The cause of this incredulity is found in 1 Corinthians 2:14. On the other hand there are those who read James 5:13-15, and declaim that all the remedial agents known to the medical profession should be thrown aside, and that in every disease the patient should rely on prayer alone for his recovery. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 87.8}

These are the two extremes; the first was well represented by Mr. Tyndall, who several years ago proposed to test the efficacy of prayer by an experiment. He proposed to set apart two wards in a hospital; the patients in one to be treated by the ordinary remedies, and those in the other to be prayed for. This impious and foolish proposal was, for obvious reasons, declined by the Christian world. As an instance of the other extreme, we may cite the case of the young man belonging to the missionary company that Bishop Wm. Taylor recently conducted to Africa. Being taken with one of the fevers incident to that climate, he utterly refused to make use of any means for his recovery, but, as he said, trusted himself entirely in the hands of the Lord, believing that his faith would insure his restoration to health. In vain the Bishop urged him to adopt the simple remedies which proved successful in other cases similarly afflicted, and the young man died. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 87.9}

We most heartily believe in the power of God to heal the sick, that he has often done so in answer to the professor of faith, and that he does so still; but at the same time we believe that those who discard all remedial agents, and establish what they term “faith cures,” *i.e.*, places where all the sick who have faith may come to be healed by prayer alone, bring the cause of religion into disrepute. The position of the modern “faith cures’ advocates may be summed up to about as follows: 1. Disease of the body corresponds to disease of the soul, and if cured at all, must be cured in the same manner that sins are forgiven, *viz*., by faith alone; 2. All disease may be cured if we have faith; 3. We must trust the Lord for the healing of all our ailments, without using any material remedies. And therefore, (1) The use of any remedial agency is a manifestation of a lack of faith; and (2) If we call on the Lord in faith, without having first employed remedies, we have a right in every instance to expect, and even to demand a cure. The folly of such a position may be readily seen by a consideration of the Scriptural position, to which we will now proceed. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 87.10}

We will first cite as a parallel the instruction found in the Bible concerning the provision for the nourishment of our bodies when in health. In the sermon on the mount, Christ said: “Take no thought for your life, of what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink; nor yet the for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more then meat, and the body than raiment?” “Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall be eaten? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be closed? for heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.” Matthew 6:25, 31, 32. Now an extremest might say, “It is wrong for me to work for my living; God knows what I need, and he will see that I am provided for, if I only exercise faith, and do not try to do anything for myself.” So he folds his hands in idleness, and perhaps starves to death. What is this? What is there wrong in this interpretation of Scripture? Simply this: He has been too hasty in his conclusion, and has not taken into the account that other inspired declaration that, “if any would not work, neither should eat.” 2 Thessalonians 3:10. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 87.11}

A proper interpretation of Scripture takes into the account the various texts bearing on a given point, and then draws a legitimate conclusion from the whole. As bearing on the question of living, we quote the following: “Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labor, *working with his hands* the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth.” Ephesians 4:28. “We beseech you, brethren, ... that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands, as we commanded you: that ye may walk honestly toward then that are without, and that ye may have lack of nothing.” 1 Thessalonians 4:10-12. A very plain intimation that if they do not work they will lack the necessaries of life. Again Paul says: “But if any provide not for his own, and, specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.” 1 Timothy 5:8. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.1}

Now is there any lack of harmony between these texts and Matthew 6:25? Not a particle. Read now Deuteronomy 8:18: “But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God; for is he that giveth thee power to get wealth.” Read the context, from the 10th verse onward, and you will see that all the texts which we have quoted are bound together. Men are to work with their hands for their support; but they are still to give the credit to God, because he gives them the power and the opportunity to labor. If God gives a man the ability to work, and then orders circumstances so that he has an opportunity to work, the honor belongs to God. Thus it is that God supports us. And knowing that “the Lord will provide,” we are not to worry and fret over the future, as though the Lord had no interest in us. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.2}

There are cases, however, in which is beyond the power of man to secure provision by his own labor. In such cases the Lord has worked a direct miracle, as in the case of the Israelites in the wilderness, and Elijah by the brook Chereth and in the desert. What God has done for the support of his people, we may be sure he will do again under similar circumstances, for his promise cannot fail; but from a careful examination of Scripture it certainly appears that we are not warranted in expecting the Lord to work a direct miracle for support, so long as it is possible for us to provide for ourselves by using the means which is ordained. Such an expectation is not in accordance with God’s word, and hence is not faith. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.3}

Now it seems to us that the same principle that governs the support of the body when in health must be acted upon in seeking a restoration of it to health, when it is diseased. This can best be proved by citing typical instances of healing, as recorded in the Bible. By so doing we shall find that the cases where God has directly interposed to heal people by a miracle, were cases that were beyond the reach of human skill. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.4}

In the first place we have a record of many who were raised from the dead. Here, of course, human agency was of no avail. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.5}

Entering into particulars, we not the case of the young man who was born blind. John 9. In his case it was not thought worth while even to seek for a cure; for, as the young man said, “Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind if this man [Christ] were not of God, he could do nothing.” John 9:32, 33. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.6}

Again, we read of a woman with the issue of blood, who was healed by touching the hem of Christ’s garment. She had been afflicted for twelve years, “and had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing better, but rather grew worse.” Mark 5:26. The “beloved physician” says that she “had spent all her living upon physicians, neither could be healed of any.” Luke 8:43. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.7}

Take the case of the nobleman’s son he was “at the point of death.” The case was very urgent; for when Jesus was testing the man’s faith, the father cried out, “Sir, come down ere my child die.” John 4:49. He felt that Jesus alone had power to check the fever. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.8}

The man at the pool of Bethesda had been unable to walk for thirty-eight years. John 5:2-9. He was unable even to make the attempt to make use of the remedy that was supposed to be able to reach his case. He was healed by the word of the Lord. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.9}

Indeed the third of Acts we have the account of the man whom Peter healed at the gate of the temple. He had never walked, and no means known to man could enable him to walk. The healing of this man was admitted, even by the scoffing Jews, to be “a notable miracle.” {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.10}

Take the case of the stilling of the tempest, recorded in Matthew 8:24-26 and Luke 8:22-25. Here, when the men were unable to manage the boat on account of the violence of the sea, and were about to perish, Christ stilled the winds and waves with a word. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.11}

When Jesus miraculously fed the 4,000 men, besides the women and children, it was because they had eaten nothing for three days, and were in the wilderness, where it was impossible to find food for such a vast multitude. More than this, they had not sufficient strength to go to the villages to buy food, and doubtless but few of them had money, had they been able to go. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.12}

To all these cases might be added the numerous instances of the cleansing of lepers who had been cast out as incurable, the healing of the deaf and dumb, and the casting out of devils. In every case the direct power of Heaven was interposed after the means known to mortals had failed. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.13}

The case of Peter’s mother-in-law might be cited by some as a case where Jesus healed a curable disease. But no one knows that this fever could be cured. Indeed. The probabilities are, rather, that, as in the case of the nobleman’s son, they had been unable to check the fever by ordinary means. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.14}

There is another class of cases that may be thought to contradict the position above taken. These are the cases where persons whom God has employed in a special manner in his service, have been healed in answer to prayer when there was urgent need of their immediate attendance upon certain duties connected with the Lord’s work. Persons have been healed of ailments that *possibly* might in time have been removed by medical skill, if it had been employed. But these cases are in reality the same as the others; for there was certainly no human skill that could heal them in the brief space of time that the circumstances demanded. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.15}

Again we notice that in many cases where miracles of healing were performed, the sufferers were required to do something before their cure was effected. Namaan the Syrian was required to wash seven times in the Jordan. 2 Kings 5:1-14. The blind man of whom John writes, after having his eyes anointed with clay and spittle, was told to go and wash in the pool of Siloam, and then he received his sight. Now whatever effect these washings had, it is safe to say that if those individuals had not employed the means provided they would not have been healed. Thus we see that God has provided remedies that will with his blessing accomplish the restoration of the sick to health, and he has made it possible for men to obtain a limited knowledge of these remedies. Now when those heaven-ordained remedies are within our reach, for us to expect to get well when we refuse to make use of them, is a manifestation not of faith, but of presumption. The case is exactly parallel to one who, having health and strength, should fold his hands and expect the Lord to feed him. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.16}

But the worst presumption comes in when men establish what they call “faith cures,” where, as they advertise, all people may come to be prayed for and healed. This is a reversing the true order of things, instead of being content to be instruments in the hands of God, such ones presume to make God an instrument in their hands, and to manipulate him to suit their own interests. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.17}

It is entirely a mistake to try to make a strict parallel between sickness, disease of the body, and sin, disease of the soul. Men can do nothing whatever to secure the forgiveness of sin, except to believe in the merits of Christ. There are no means provided, no works, by which a man may cleanse himself from sin. But there are means provided by which he can remove certain forms of disease. Again, God has not promised to instantly heal all cases of disease; but he will at once forgive the sins of any who come to him in faith. But in every case of healing, whether of the body or of the soul, the praise rightfully belongs to God. “It is of the Lord’s mercies that we are not consumed.” Lamentations 3:22. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.18}

Once more: Everything must tend to the glory of God. All things are for his pleasure, and he is worthy to receive all honor, and glory, and blessing. Revelation 4:11. Now it is not always for his glory that even his most devoted servants should be freed from disease. Paul’s “thorn in the flesh” was not removed, although he thrice besought the Lord that it might depart from him. Therefore he gloried in infirmities, that the power of Christ might rest upon him. Sometimes Christ is glorified by the patient’s suffering, or even by the death, of his faithful followers, and therefore the Christian should pray that he may recover if it will be for the glory of God. “Not has I will, but as thou wilt.” We do not always know what will be for the best. We are zealous to work for the Lord; and when we are afflicted we feel like a prisoner of war, who, in his anxiety to be in the battle, beats against his prison bars. We are in danger of imagining that the Lord needs us in the field, forgetting that he knows best, and may require us to serve him in affliction, and that he can get along without any of our service. Milton solved the problem, when, having been smitten with blindness in the midst of his career, he wrote:- {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.19}

*“When I consider how my light is spent
Ere half my days, in this dark world and wide;
And that one talent which is death to hide,
Lodged with me useless, though my soul more bent
To serve therewith my Maker, and present
My true account, lest he returning chide;
Doth God exact day-labor, light denied?
I fondly ask. But Patience, to prevent
That murmur, soon replies, God doth not need
Either man’s work or his own gifts; who best
Bear his mild yoke, they serve him best; his state
Is kingly; thousand at his bidding speed,
And post o’er land and ocean without rest;
They also serve who only stand and wait.” {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.20}*

If the position of many so-called “holiness” people and the modern “faith cure’ advocates were true, that we may at once be healed of all disease if we will but exercise faith, then Christians would not all be practically immortal. There would be no death. But immortality is not promised to any one until the coming of the Lord and the resurrection. See Luke 20:35, 36; 1 Corinthians 15:51-54, etc. At that time “the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing.” Isaiah 35:5, 6. Of the new earth it is said, “And the inhabitant shall not say, I am sick; the people that dwelt therein shall be forgiven their iniquity.” Isaiah 33:24. And then, when all things shall have been made new, and the people of God have been redeemed from destruction, we will find the complete fulfillment of Psalm 103:2-4: “Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits; who forgiveth all thine the iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; who redeemeth thy life from destruction; who crowneth thee with loving-kindness and tender mercies.” Compare this with Isaiah 33:24. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 88.21}

It is a favorite saying with a man that “God helps them who help themselves.” This is true; but there is something else that is equally true, and that is that God helps those who are not able to help themselves. And while his protecting care is continually over us, blessing the means which we employ for the preservation or the recovery of our strength, it is not till we are brought where the resources which we have at hand utterly fail that God miraculously exhibits his power; and then only when he will be glorified in so doing. As is often said, “Man’s extremity is God’s opportunity.” “He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might he increaseth strength.” Isaiah 40:29. E. J. W. {SITI February 11, 1886, p. 89.1}

**“Jurisdiction of the Law. (Continued).” The Signs of the Times, 12, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

(*Continued*).

While we have been making the claim and proving it, that the law of God covers every possible act or thought, and that no responsible being is outside of its jurisdiction, some one has been looking for the verse which says that the Gentiles do not have the law, but are a law unto themselves. Perhaps this is as good a time as any to consider that text. An answer to it will also involve the consideration of the question why the ten commandments, since they have such universal jurisdiction, were spoken from Mount Sinai only to the Jews. Let us now read the passage above referred to. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 103.1}

“For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; (for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.)” Romans 2:12-15. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 103.2}

A brief examination of Paul’s argument in this chapter will be necessary in order to get a proper understanding of this text. It will be noticed that the 13th, 14th, and 15th verses are parenthetical, and are therefore secondary to the main argument. Therefore in stating the argument, we shall omit those three verses. In the first chapter of Romans, Paul has shown the terribly immoral condition of the heathen world; and in the second chapter he proceeds to show that whoever condemns the heathen, condemns himself; for all are guilty. God, he says, “will render *to every man* according to his deeds.” To those who patiently persevere in well-doing, he will render eternal life; but to those who are contentious, and do not obey the truth (see Psalm 119:142), he will render indignation and wrath. And these rewards of good or ill will be rendered to every man, whether he be Jew or Gentile. “For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.” {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 103.3}

In the first two chapters of Romans, the apostle brings out the fact which is plainly stated in the third, that “both Jews and Gentiles” are “under sin,” and that “there is none righteous, no, not one.” In the passage under consideration, he states that, as a consequence, all who do not repent shall suffer “the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds.” This will be done without regard to nationality; “for there is no respect of persons with God;” that is, it is not a man’s birth, but his character, that gives him favor with God. It is the *doers of the law* whom he justifies, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, and not those who, as did many of the Jews, hear the law, but do not obey. All who sin, whether with the law or without it, shall perish. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 103.4}

In the 12th and 14th verses, we have the two classes brought to view-those who have the law, and those who have it not. There is no question but that the Jews had the law; they rested in it (Romans 2:17), and by breaking it dishonored God. Verses 23, 24. And the 14th verse tells us plainly that those not having the law are the Gentiles. Before considering their case, we must not fail to note the fact that both the Jews who had the law, and the Gentiles who had it not, had sinned. They were alike guilty before God. Romans 3:9, 10. Now “sin is the transgression of the law” (1 John 3:4), and “where no law is, there is no transgression.” Romans 4:15. Therefore it is beyond controversy that both classes here mentioned had transgressed law, and more than that, had been conscious of the fact; for “sin is not imputed when there is no law.” So it is certain that the Gentiles had transgressed the law; yet the text says they had not the law, and that they “sinned without law.” How shall we explain this seeming contradiction? Let us see. Read again verses 14, 15:- {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 103.5}

“For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.” {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 103.6}

When God made man in his own image, he made him upright. Ecclesiastes 7:29. Not alone in his physical form, but also in his moral nature, he was in the image of God. While Adam continued in this upright, sinless condition, the law of God was in his heart. We know this from Psalm 40:8, where David, speaking for the Messiah, says, “I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart.” The existence of the law of God in the heart is manifested by the willingness to obey that law; and he who, as was the case with Christ, has the law perfectly formed within his heart, will render perfect obedience to the law. This was the case with our first parents in the garden of Eden. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 103.7}

But man fell from his high estate; he sinned against God, and thus marred the perfect copy of the law which had existed in his heart. The tendency of sin is to multiply itself; like the tares sown among the good grain, it will grow without any attention. So the first sin prepared the way for many more, till at last nearly all the world became wholly given up to sin. In Hebrews 3:13, the apostle says that men become “hardened through the deceitfulness of sin;” that is, the more men sin, the less heinous does sin appear to them, until at last evil appears to be only good, and good evil, and they sin without the slightest compunction of conscience. This principle is something with which everybody is familiar. Now this progressive love of sin, and the indifference to it, is nothing else than the obliterating of the copy of the law which exists in a more or less perfect state in every heart. This work is not done instantaneously; it takes time for men to so completely obliterate the law from their hearts that they will feel no restraint. But when it is entirely gone, then man is in the condition in which he was just prior to the flood, when “every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” Genesis 6:5. So long, however, as any portion remains in the heart, the Spirit is enabled to strive with man, and, by means of that law, to convict of sin; and this whether the individual knows anything of the written revelation or not. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 103.8}

Now the Gentiles did not have the law written on stone and in books, as did the Jews; they only had that portion which still remained unobliterated from their hearts. Of course the Jews, having much more light than the Gentiles had, were far more responsible. The former would necessarily be judged by the fullness of the law; for they could not plead ignorance of any portion of it. If they sinned, justice required that the condemnation of the law should be visited upon them in full measure. But the Gentiles could be judged only by the light that they had. Since they had not the written revelation, that, of course, would not be brought up against them. They knew, however, the difference, in many things, between right and wrong; and by this they are judged. Had they lived fully up to the light which they had by nature, they would have been counted as doers of the law; but since they did not, since their own conscience condemned them, they must suffer the consequences. The Jews, having the written law, are judged by the law; and the Gentiles, not having the written law, perish without being brought into Judgment by it. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 103.9}

Perhaps this can be made plainer by illustration. The Jews had every one of the ten commandments in such shape that they could constantly be reminded of them, and know the extent of their claims. Now when they came into Judgment, it is no more than justice that the whole law should be held up before them, that the enormity of their guilt may be manifest. But here is a poor, ignorant barbarian, who, we will suppose, knew by the light of nature, only two precepts of the law,-that it is wrong to kill and to commit adultery. His knowledge of the sinfulness of those acts is shown by his trying to conceal the fact when he has done one or the other of them. His own conscience accuses him. Now it is not necessary, in order to convict him of sin, that the whole ten commandments be held up beside the record of his life. In the Judgment let the two precepts with which he was familiar be recalled to his mind. By these alone he stands condemned as a sinner; and since “the wages of sin is death,” he justly perishes, without ever having seen the written law. Thus we see that all men, whatever their condition, are amenable to, and are to be judged by, the law of God. When Paul says that the Gentiles have not the law, he means that they had not the written revelation, but not that they did not have some knowledge of right and wrong, as defined by the moral law. E. J. W. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 104.1}

(*To be continued*.)

**“What Is Faith?” The Signs of the Times, 12, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

This question presented itself very forcibly to our mind a few days ago, when we read in a religious paper the following quotation from an eminent minister: “Faith is the true anesthesis of the soul.” We do not propose to enter into a fine-spun theological discussion as to the exact definition of faith, but simply to cite a few instances of true faith, that we may see how the possession of it affects people. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 104.2}

Let us first get the meaning of the quotation. An anesthetic is something which is administered to produce insensibility, so that surgical operations may be performed without pain to the patient. Anesthesis is the state of insensibility which is produced by the administration of an anesthetic. The meaning of the quotation, then, is that faith is that condition in which the soul has no sensibility, no consciousness. That is, it is a state in which the individual feels perfectly secure, having no care for surrounding circumstances. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 104.3}

“Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.” Hebrews 11:1. Faith is active; it is keenly alive to all the dangers that surround, yet is confident, because it has a clear perception of certain evidence. Take the case of Caleb and Joshua. When the ten spies brought back an evil report, and said, “We be not able to go up against the people; for they are stronger than we,” these two men said, “Let us go up at once, and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it.” Numbers 13:26-33. Was it because Caleb and Joshua did not understand the danger, that they were so confident? No; they had seen the walled cities, and the giants, before whom they were as grasshoppers. But they had faith in God. They said; “If the Lord delight in us, then he will bring us into this land, and give it us; ... and the Lord is with us; fear them not.” Numbers 14:8, 9. This was true faith. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 104.4}

When David went forth to answer the challenge of Goliath, he knew that the giant had for forty days defied the army of Israel. He did not in the least underestimate the giant’s strength and skill. But he believed that the One who had delivered him in his encounters with the wild beasts of the forest, would help him now. So the stripling went boldly toward the giant, saying, “Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield; but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied. This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand; and I will smite thee, and take thine head from thee; and I will give the carcases of the host of the Philistines this day unto the fowls of the air, and to the wild beasts of the earth; that all the earth may know that there is a God in Israel.” 1 Samuel 17:45, 46. David knew the power of the giant; but he believed the evidence which he had received, that the Lord is stronger than all, and willing to help those who trust him. This was true faith. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 104.5}

But it is worthy of note, that although David said to Goliath, “This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand,” he did not sit down and wait for the Lord to deliver the giant into his hands. He made use of the means which the Lord had provided, believing that the Lord would bless them. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 104.6}

Take the case of Paul on his sea-voyage to Rome. Among the two hundred and seventy-six souls on board the vessel, Paul alone was calm and unmoved amid the terrible tempest. Could it be that he was insensible to the danger? By no means. He had many times been on the sea, and he realized the danger of the situation better than any one else did. When the sailors thought the prospect was favorable, Paul had told them that the voyage would end disastrously. Acts 27:9-11. What was the source of his courage? Hear his words to the passengers and crew: “There shall be no loss of any man’s life among you, but of the ship. For there stood by me this night the angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve, Saying, Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Cæsar: and, lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee. Wherefore, sirs, be of good cheer; for I believe God, that it shall be even as it was told me.” Acts 27:22-25. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 104.7}

Paul’s belief in the promise of God, however, did not keep him from putting forth every possible effort for the safety of himself and his fellow passengers. He exhorted them to eat, that they might retain their strength, and he hindered the sailors from leaving the ship, declaring that if they should leave, the rest could not be saved. The sailors were needed on board the ship, to do all that they could towards managing it. It is worthy of note, also, that because these people were saved in answer to his prayers, Paul did not set up in the life-saving business, and advertise that he would deliver from shipwreck all sailors who would take him along to pray for them. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 104.8}

The definition which we quoted is incorrect, because anesthesis, indifference to danger, leads one to make no effort for self-preservation; and faith which is unaccompanied by works is no faith at all, for “faith without works is dead.” That which is dead has no existence. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 104.9}

Sometimes that which is called faith is only blindness or negligence. For instance, there are many professors who, no doubt, pray for their children, and who therefore have, as they think, faith that they will be saved. Yet they do nothing more than pray occasionally for the children, and leave them practically without restraint. Now is it a manifestation of faith for the parents to believe that their children will be saved? Not at all; for the “evidence” is all against such a result. “A child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame,” says the Bible. Self-deception and careless security are altogether different from faith. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 104.10}

Thousands have no thought but that they will enter Heaven at last. Under certain circumstances it is proper to have faith that we shall be saved; but if the conditions are not met, there is no ground even for hope. What are the conditions? “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments,” says the Saviour. Again: “Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.” Revelation 22:14. We may believe in Christ after a manner, that is, we may believe that he is the Son of God; but unless our belief leads to obedience, it is not true faith in Christ, because Christ suffered for us in order “that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.” {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 104.11}

“Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works; show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works.” James 2:18. E. J. W. {SITI February 18, 1886, p. 104.12}

**“Jurisdiction of the Law. Why the Law Was Spoken Only to the Jews (Concluded)” The Signs of the Times, 12, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

Now why was it that only the Jews had the written law? Did the giving of the law to them indicate partiality on the part of God? Not by any means: “For there is no respect of persons with God.” Before the exode, all the world was on a level, so far as written revelation was concerned. When sin separated man from God so that he could no longer talk with him face to face, then God supplemented the light which men had in their own hearts, by communicating with them in visions and dreams given to his prophets (Numbers 12:6), and by sending angels to them. Genesis 22:15. Had all men hearkened to the voice of conscience, the communication thus opened between God and man would have been sufficient to bring them at last to the state where the law would be perfectly restored in their hearts. This is that which God is still striving to accomplish. Hebrews 8:10. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.1}

But men did not care to follow even that portion of the law which they retained in their hearts, and consequently God could not send them more light through his prophets. Thus “as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a mind void of judgment.” Romans 1:28. In process of time, only one family retained the knowledge of God, and all the rest of the world were destroyed for their abominable wickedness. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.2}

Within four hundred years after the flood, men had again corrupted their way on the earth, and only Abraham remained loyal to God. He kept God’s commandments (Genesis 26:5), and had the determination to command his children and his household after him, that they should keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment. Genesis 18:19. In order that the descendants of Abraham might retain the knowledge of God, God called Abraham away from his corrupt associates, and gave him the rite of circumcision, in order that the separation might be complete. This rite was not designed to be a mark of birth or nationality, but simply as a means of keeping the observers of God’s law from the contaminating influence of those who did not regard it; for whenever one of any other nation became willing to separate from his people and keep the law, he also became circumcised. Genesis 17:12. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.3}

This precaution served to keep the descendants of Abraham a distinct people through all their wanderings, and to preserve among them the knowledge of the true God. some from other tribes, getting the light from them, would occasionally turn to the Lord, to keep his commandments, and, becoming circumcised, would be counted as the descendants of righteous Abraham; but the great mass of the world chose to remain in the darkness of heathenism. Thus it happened that when the Lord brought his people from Egyptian bondage, they alone of all the people in the world had a knowledge of God. All the rest could say with Pharaoh, “I know not the Lord.” At that time the Lord chose to give mankind his law in a manner so plain that it could not possibly be mistaken, and so that they could always meditate in it, in its perfection, even though no prophet were at hand. By this means, the Spirit could make greater progress, so to speak, in writing the law in their hearts. But to whom could he speak the law? Only to those who knew him, and would accept the law as coming from him. Therefore he was compelled to give the written law to the Jews, and make them light-bearers to the world. The law, when it entered, came to the Jews, not because it was designed for them alone, but because they alone would receive it. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.4}

As a further evidence that God was not moved by race considerations, and did not give the law exclusively to the Jews as a nation, we may notice the fact that when the Jews left Egypt, “a mixed multitude went up also with them.” Exodus 12:38; Numbers 11:4. This “mixed multitude” was composed of Egyptians, and, no doubt, of people of other nationalities. These went along with the Jews, and with them received the law from God at Mount Sinai. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.5}

We cannot close this portion of our subject without giving, from the pen of another, the following graphic portrayal of the condition of a people who should have no regard for the law of God:- {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.6}

“No error accepted by the Christian world strikes more boldly against the authority of Heaven, none is more directly opposed to the dictates of reason, none is more pernicious in its results, than the modern doctrine, so rapidly gaining ground, that God’s law is no longer binding upon men. Every nation has its laws, which command respect and obedience; no government could exist without them; and can it be conceived that the Creator of the heavens and the earth has no law to govern the beings He has made? Suppose that prominent ministers were publicly to teach that the statutes which govern their land and protect the rights of its citizens were not obligatory-that they restricted the liberties of the people, and therefore ought not to be obeyed; how long would such men be tolerated in the pulpit? But is it a graver offense to disregard the laws of states and nations than to trample upon those divine precepts which are the foundation of all government? It would be far more consistent for nations to abolish their statutes, and permit the people to do as they please, than for the Ruler of the universe to annul His law, and leave the world without a standard to condemn the guilty or justify the obedient. Would we know the result of making void the law of God? The experiment has been tried. Terrible were the scenes enacted in France when atheism became the controlling power. It was then demonstrated to the world that to throw off the restraints which God has imposed is to accept the rule of the cruelest of tyrants. When the standard of righteousness is set aside, the way is open for the prince of evil to establish his power in the earth. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.7}

“Wherever the divine precepts are rejected, sin ceases to appear sinful or righteousness desirable. Those who refuse to submit to the government of God are wholly unfitted to govern themselves. Through their pernicious teachings the spirit of insubordination is implanted in the hearts of children and youth, who are naturally impatient of control; and a lawless, licentious state of society results. While scoffing at the credulity of those who obey the requirements of God, the multitudes eagerly accept the delusions of Satan. They give the rein to lust and practice the sins which have called down judgments upon the heathen. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.8}

“Let the restraint imposed by the divine law be wholly removed, and human laws would soon be disregarded. Because God forbids dishonest practices,-coveting, lying, and defrauding,-men are ready to trample upon His statutes as a hindrance to their worldly prosperity; but the results of banishing these precepts would be such as they do not anticipate. If the law were not binding, why should any fear to transgress? Property would no longer be safe. Men would obtain their neighbors’ possessions by violence, and the strongest would become richest. Life itself would not be respected. Those who disregard the commandments of God sow disobedience to reap disobedience. The marriage vow would no longer stand as a sacred bulwark to protect the family. He who had the power, would, if he desired, take his neighbor’s wife by violence. The fifth commandment would be set aside with the fourth. Children would not shrink from taking the life of their parents, if by so doing they could obtain the desire of their corrupt hearts. The civilized world would become a horde of robbers and assassins; and peace, rest and happiness would be banished from the earth.”-*Mrs. E. G. White, in “Great Controversy,” vol. 4, chap. 51.* {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.9}

This is just the state of things that would exist, not only in this world, but in all the universe, if the ten commandments were not the universal rule of action. If there be any portion of the universe where the decalogue is not the recognized law, the above paragraphs accurately describe the condition of its society. E. J. W. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.10}

**“The Chinese Question” The Signs of the Times, 12, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is well known by all the readers of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES that this paper is purely a religious family journal. On political questions we have ever been strictly non-partisan, not because we have not private opinions on political matters, but because there are thousands of papers in which people can find the news of the day, and because we believe that we have a work to do that is of far greater importance. The matter of high or low tariff is of trifling importance compared with the things which pertain to our eternal destiny. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.11}

But the anti-Chinese agitation has assumed such proportions on this coast, that we feel it duty to define our position upon it; and this because it is becoming a question of morals fully as much as one of politics. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.12}

In the first place, we will say that there are features of the Chinese question which people in the East, where Chinamen are very scarce, cannot possibly appreciate. One who passes through “Chinatown” in San Francisco will learn more of Chinese character and habits in a single hour than he could by reading books for a month. They are not the most desirable neighbors, by any means. They are of a race that is so entirely different from ours that it is probably impossible that there should be any assimilation between the two, even in a civil capacity. And we do not think that it would be wise to attempt to make American citizens of them. While we believe that God made of one blood all the nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth, we also believe that he has “determined the bounds of their habitation.” For this reason we think that unlimited Chinese immigration would be an injury to this country, and possibly to the Chinese themselves. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.13}

But some of the Chinese are here, and it should be remembered that they came by invitation. They came for the purpose of bettering their condition; and it must also be remembered that if they have bettered their own condition, they have added immensely to the resources of this country. Hundreds of miles of railroad have been built by them, over places where few but Chinamen would be willing to work; and thousands of acres of land on this coast have been cleared by the Chinese, and are now teeming with the fruits of the earth as a result of their labor. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.14}

Furthermore, the Chinese evil is not one-hundredth part as bad as it is represented to be. It is said that they degrade labor; but labor and mechanics receive higher wages in California than they do in the East. It is said that they won’t become Christianized. Perhaps they will not; we confess we don’t see much inducement for them to; but there are many, many thousands of the Caucasian race who show, not indifference to Christianity, as to the Chinese, but open contempt. It is said that they are vicious; but a drunken Chinaman would be a novelty; and the number of brothels and gambling dens that are run by Chinamen can be quadrupled in San Francisco by the same class of places in which no Chinaman ever set his foot. Therefore we say that the cry that “the heathen Chinese” is corrupting the youth of our land is a point poorly taken. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.15}

The question now is, What shall be done with those that are here? The answer comes back, “The Chinese must go!” There is no doubt but that the country could get along without them; so far as we are concerned, it would make no difference; for we do not employ them. But we will say frankly that we have no sympathy with a method that is to be adopted to drive them out. It is proposed to boycott, not only the Chinese, but every man who refuses to boycott them, and also to boycott those who do not boycott those who do not boycott the Chinese. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.16}

We cannot think that all who have committed themselves to such a course have fully considered what they are doing. For ourselves, we believe is is condemned by every principle of right. We are American citizens, and we have always had unbounded respect for those brave men who, at the risk of their lives, made the following declaration: “We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” That principle is just as true to-day as it was a hundred and ten years ago; and it is just as applicable to the Chinese as it is to the Americans or Europeans. And that statement of the Declaration of Independence derives its truth from the Golden Rule spoken by our Saviour. We must not infringe upon anybody’s rights, but must allow them the same freedom that we would exact for ourselves. Those who are unwilling to grant liberty to others, are not worthy of it themselves. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 119.17}

It is true the Chinese are heathen, and they have some terribly debasing vices. But the fact that the American and European even in this country out number the Chinese ten to one; that for every Chinese gambler, there are doubtless a score of white gamblers; and that among the white population whisky has doubtless a hundred victims where opium has one among the Chinese; is ample evidence that it is not on moral grounds that Chinese expulsion is called for. The Chinese smoke opium in their dens, and stay there till they recover from its effects; but the whites drink whiskey everywhere, and the effects never cease. We are finally convinced that if the Chinese were patrons of the saloons, the outcry against them would be very much more feeble than it now is. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 120.1}

But suppose that the Chinaman is not covered by the Declaration of Independence, it cannot be denied that all native-born Americans have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Then to boycott our fellow-citizens is contrary both to the genius of our Government and the law of God. For example, here is my neighbor; he is a good, law-abiding citizen; possibly he is a brother in the church. He does not see fit to resort to mob violence to rid the country of the Chinese, and so I am required to pledge myself to boycott him, to have no dealings with him, to keep others from dealing with him, and to injure his business all I can. is this right? Every honest person must say No. then I will not do it; for though I may not be what many are pleased to call a sentimentalist, I profess to be a Christian. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 120.2}

Whenever evil is done that good may come, the devil gains a victory, and the good never comes. It is as true now as it was three thousand years ago, that the violent dealing of any man is sure to come back upon his own pate. Even though the Chinese were more of a curse than it is claimed that they are, this boycotting business would be a thing to be unqualifiedly condemned. It is a cowardly act, and will fail of the desired result. It is the design of the anti-Chinese League to secure uniformity of action against the Chinese, so that they can say to Congress that the people of California are a unit upon this matter. But do they not see that when their petition goes to Congress the very fact that boycotting has been resorted to will kill it? The men at Washington are wise enough to perceive that there is not unity of sentiment when it is necessary to ruin people’s business in order to “convert” them to any course of action. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 120.3}

The best men of the Pacific Coast, the Christian men, the men of steady habits and stability of character, are not in favor of boycotting, which is simply mob rule. While there is a general sentiment against further Chinese immigration, the men just referred to are in favor of letting the matter be settled in a peaceable manner by the legislature. Many have been led against their better judgment to engage in this boycotting for fear of the results to their business. But we believe that “the spirit of ’76,” to say nothing of the spirit of Christianity, will lead a man to do what is right, and to be just to all men, regardless of the consequences to himself. And the color of a man, the shape of his eyes, the length of his hair, his private opinions, or his personal tastes and habits, have nothing to do with determine whether or not he is to be treated justly. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 120.4}

We have written thus at length because we know that many conscientious persons are troubled as to their duty in this crisis, and we desire to help them to a decision that will not put them to shame in the day of Judgment. E. J. W. {SITI February 25, 1886, p. 120.5}