The American Sentinel 12

Alonzo T. Jones

1897

Copyright © 2013
Ellen G. White Estate, Inc.

Information about this Book

Overview

This eBook is provided by the Ellen G. White Estate. It is included in the larger free Online Books collection on the Ellen G. White Estate Web site.

About the Author

Ellen G. White (1827-1915) is considered the most widely translated American author, her works having been published in more than 160 languages. She wrote more than 100,000 pages on a wide variety of spiritual and practical topics. Guided by the Holy Spirit, she exalted Jesus and pointed to the Scriptures as the basis of one's faith.

Further Links

A Brief Biography of Ellen G. White
About the Ellen G. White Estate

End User License Agreement

The viewing, printing or downloading of this book grants you only a limited, nonexclusive and nontransferable license for use solely by you for your own personal use. This license does not permit republication, distribution, assignment, sublicense, sale, preparation of derivative works, or other use. Any unauthorized use of this book terminates the license granted hereby.

Further Information

For more information about the author, publishers, or how you can support this service, please contact the Ellen G. White Estate at mail@whiteestate.org. We are thankful for your interest and feedback and wish you God's blessing as you read.

Contents

Information about this Book i
January 7, 1897 xv
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 1-3. xv
"Which Will It Be?" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 4, 5. . . xxi
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 1, p. 5. xxiii
"The Two New Englands" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 5, 6. xxiv
"A New Sunday Bill in Congress" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 6, 7. xxvi
"Is It Christian?" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 7, 8. xxx
"Notes" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 9, 10. xxxii
"The Source of National Atheism" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 10, 11. xxxiii
January 14, 1897 xxxix
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 2, pp. 17, 18. xxxix
"Who Wants Him?" American Sentinel 12, 2, pp. 18, 19. xliii
"That Sunday Liquor Bill Again" American Sentinel 12, 2, p. 22. xliv
"A Just Criticism" American Sentinel 12, 2, p. 23. xlviii
"That 'Great Discovery'!" American Sentinel 12, 2, p. 24. . . l
January 21, 1897 liii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 3, pp. 33-35. liii
"Christianity and the Common Law" American Sentinel 12, 3, pp. 35, 36. lviii
"The Problem of a Weekly Rest" American Sentinel 12, 3, pp. 43, 44. lx
January 28, 1897 lxv
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 4, pp. 49, 50. lxv
"Study the Constitution" American Sentinel 12, 4, pp. 50, 51. lxvii
"The Monarchical Spirit in America" American Sentinel 12, 4, p. 51. lxix
"Bishop Satterlee on Sunday Laws" American Sentinel 12, 4, pp. 51, 52. lxx

"Christianity and Common Law" American Sentinel 12, 4, pp. 52, 53. lxxiv
"Pure Anarchy" American Sentinel 12, 4, p. 59. lxxvi
"'Desecration' of Christmas" American Sentinel 12, 4, p. 62. lxxvii
February 4, 1897 lxxix
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 5, pp. 65, 66. lxxix
"Christianity and Civilization" American Sentinel 12, 5, pp. 66, 67. lxxxii
"A Menace to Republican Government" American Sentinel 12, 5, pp. 67, 68. lxxxv
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 5, p. 68. lxxxvii
"The Treaty of Arbitration" American Sentinel 12, 5, pp. 68, 69. lxxxviii
"Proposed Law for Christmas Observance" American Sentinel 12, 5, p. 75. lxxxix
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 5, p. 75, 76. xci
February 11, 1897 xciii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 6, pp. 81-88. xciii
"Additional Authorities" American Sentinel 12, 6, pp. 88-90. cxiii
"The Present Practical Bearing of this Discussion" American Sentinel 12, 6, pp. 90, 91. cxix
"No Representatives in Religion" American Sentinel 12, 6, pp. 92, 93. cxxi
"A Long Felt Want" American Sentinel 12, 6, p. 93. . . . cxxii
February 18, 1897 cxxv
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 7, pp. 97, 98. cxxv
"A Sunday Dilemma" American Sentinel 12, 7, pp. 99, 99. cxxix
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 7, p. 101. cxxix
February 25, 1897 cxxxiii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 8, p. 113. cxxxiii
"Liberty Not Lost" American Sentinel 12, 8, p. 114. . cxxxiv
"The Two Ways" American Sentinel 12, 8, pp. 114-116. cxxxvi
"The Clergy Against the Bible" American Sentinel 12, 8, pp. 116, 117. cxl

"An Illustration of Greek 'Learning'" American Sentinel 12, 8, pp. 117, 118. cxlii
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 8, p. 118. cxlvi
"Notes" American Sentinel 12, 8, pp. 122, 123. cxlvi
March 4, 1897 cxlvii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 9, p. 129. cxlvii
"Is It a Christian Mission?" American Sentinel 12, 9, pp. 129, 130. cxlviii
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 9, pp. 138, 139. cl
March 11, 1897 cliii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 10, pp. 145, 146. cliii
"'Sundays Excepted'" American Sentinel 12, 10, p. 146. . clv
March 18, 1897 clvii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 11, pp. 161, 162. clvii
"Freedom for a Million Slaves" American Sentinel 12, 11, p. 162. clix
"'What Is Wrong?'" American Sentinel 12, 11, p. 164. . . clxi
"The 'Religious Significance of the Inauguration'" American Sentinel 12, 11, pp. 165, 166. clxiii
"The Right of Private Judgment" American Sentinel 12, 11, pp. 167, 168. clxvii
"A Week of Prayer for 'Sabbath Observance'" American Sentinel 12, 11, pp. 168, 169. clxxi
March 25, 1897 clxxiii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 12, pp. 177, 178. . . . clxxiii
"Strangely Inconsistent" American Sentinel 12, 12, p. 178. clxxv
"The Hope of the Church" American Sentinel 12, 12, pp. 178, 179. clxxvi
"Enforcing the Laws" American Sentinel 12, 12, p. 180. clxxviii
"Why the Powers Favor Turkey" American Sentinel 12, 12, p. 183. clxxx
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 12, p. 183. clxxxii
"Raising Church Revenue" American Sentinel 12, 12, pp. 185, 186. clxxxii
April 1, 1897 clxxxv
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 13, pp. 193, 194. . . clxxxv

"The Church as a Light" American Sentinel 12, 13, p. 194. clxxxvii
"The Coming State Church" American Sentinel 12, 13, p. 195. clxxxix
April 8, 1897 cxciii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 14, pp. 209, 210. . . . cxciii
"Theological Anarchy" American Sentinel 12, 14, p. 210. cxcv
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 14, p. 211. cxcvi
"Making It Easy To Do Right" American Sentinel 12, 14, pp. 210, 211. cxcvi
"Notes" American Sentinel 12, 14, p. 211. cxcvii
"Noted" American Sentinel 12, 14, p. 211. cxcviii
"Noting" American Sentinel 12, 14, pp. 212, 213. . . . cxcviii
"Notings" American Sentinel 12, 14, p. 213. cc
April 15, 1897 cci
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 15, pp. 225, 226. cci
"A Right of the People, Too" American Sentinel 12, 15, pp. 226, 227. ccv
"A Doleful 'Gospel'" American Sentinel 12, 15, pp. 227, 228. ccvi
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 15, p. 228. ccix
April 22, 1897 ccxi
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 16, pp. 241, 242. ccxi
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 16, p. 251. ccxiv
April 29, 1897 ccxv
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 17, pp. 257-263. ccxv
May 6, 1897 ccxxix
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 18, pp. 273-275. . . . ccxxix
May 13, 1897 ccxxxv
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 19, pp. 289, 290. . . ccxxxv
"The Trouble and the Remedy" American Sentinel 12, 19, p. 292. ccxxxviii
May 20, 1897 ccxli
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 20, pp. 305, 306. ccxli
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 20, p. 307. ccxlvi
"'Christian Citizenship' Defined" American Sentinel 12, 20, p. 307. ccxlvi

"A Government of God on Earth" American Sentinel 12, 20, pp. 307, 308. ccxlvi
"Lawless Lawmakers" American Sentinel 12, 20, pp. 308, 309. ccxlvii
"Longitude vs. the Week" American Sentinel 12, 20, p. 311. ccxlix
"Applied Christianity" American Sentinel 12, 20, p. 313. . ccl
"Christian Principles and Politics" American Sentinel 12, 20, p. 317. ccl
May 27, 1897 ccliii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 21, pp. 321, 322. ccliii
"What We Need to Bring Prosperity" American Sentinel 12, 21, pp. 323, 324. cclvi
"Who Should Run the Government" American Sentinel 12, 21, pp. 325, 326. cclx
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 21, p. 331. cclxiii
June 3, 1897 cclxv
"Separation of Church and State" American Sentinel 12, 22, p. 338. cclxv
"Religion and Democracy" American Sentinel 12, 22, pp. 338, 339. cclxvii
"The 'Trust' Evil Illustrated" American Sentinel 12, 22, p. 339. cclxviii
"'Not by Might Nor by Power'" American Sentinel 12, 22, pp. 339, 340. cclxix
"The Lord's Day and Liberty" American Sentinel 12, 22, p. 340. cclxxi
June 10, 1897 cclxxiii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 23, pp. 353, 354. . . cclxxiii
"The Mission of the American Sentinel" American Sentinel 12, 23, pp. 354, 355. cclxxvi
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 23, p. 355. cclxxviii
"Falling Back Upon Rome" American Sentinel 12, 23, p. 355. cclxxviii
"An Unchristian Petition" American Sentinel 12, 23, pp. 355, 356. cclxxix
"A Menace to Liberty" American Sentinel 12, 23, p. 356. cclxxxi

"Notes" American Sentinel 12, 23, p. 356. cclxxxi
"Noted" American Sentinel 12, 23, pp. 358, 359. . . . cclxxxii
"Noting" American Sentinel 12, 23, pp. 358, 359. . . cclxxxii
"Notings" American Sentinel 12, 23, p. 359. cclxxxiii
June 17, 1897 cclxxxv
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 24, pp. 369, 370. . cclxxxv
"That Elusive Prosperity" American Sentinel 12, 24, pp. 370, 371. cclxxxviii
"'Anarchy' in Monroe County, N. Y." American Sentinel 12, 24, pp. 371, 372. ccxc
"Mob Rule vs. Civil Government" American Sentinel 12, 24, pp. 372, 373. ccxciv
June 24, 1897 ccxcvii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 25, p. 386. ccxcvii
"The Failure of 'Civic Reform'" American Sentinel 12, 25, pp. 386, 387. ccxcix
"The Religious World Adrift" American Sentinel 12, 25, pp. 387, 388. ccc
"The Importance of a Theory" American Sentinel 12, 25, p. 388. cccii
"Saint-making at Rome" American Sentinel 12, 25, p. 388. ccciii
"Foreign Missionary Work" American Sentinel 12, 25, pp. 388, 389. ccciv
"Compulsory, Yet Free!" American Sentinel 12, 25, p. 389. cccv
July 1, 1897 cccvii
"Separation of Religion and the State" American Sentinel 12, 26, pp. 402, 403. cccvii
"The Declaration of Independence" American Sentinel 12, 26, pp. 403, 404. cccx
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 26, p. 405. cccxiii
"God's Service Not Compulsory" American Sentinel 12, 26, p. 405. cccxiii
July 7, 1897 cccxvii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 417. cccxvii
"Christian Profession and Anti-Christian Practice" American Sentinel 12, 28, pp. 417, 418. cccxviii

"Liberty and Law" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 419. . cccxxi
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 419. cccxxiii
"Not Pessimistic" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 420. cccxxiii
"The Right of Private Judgment" American Sentinel 12, 28, pp. 421, 422. cccxxiv
July 15, 1897 cccxxix
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 433. cccxxix
"What Only Can Be the End?" American Sentinel 12, 28, pp. 433-435. cccxxx
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 435. cccxxxiii
"What the Lord Wants" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 435. cccxxxiv
"Politics and Prosperity" American Sentinel 12, 28, pp. 435, 436. cccxxxv
"The Protestant Pilgrimage to Rome" American Sentinel 12, 28, pp. 438, 439. cccxxxvi
"Notes" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 439. cccxxxviii
July 22, 1897 cccxxxix
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 29, p. 448. cccxxxix
"What Only Can Be the End?" American Sentinel 12, 29, pp. 448, 449. cccxl
"'Christian Citizenship' in France a Century Ago" American Sentinel 12, 29, pp. 450, 451. cccxlii
"The Maintenance of a Good Cause" American Sentinel 12, 29, p. 452. cccxliv
"A Mystery" American Sentinel 12, 29, pp. 452, 453. cccxlvi
"Personal to Our Readers" American Sentinel 12, 29, p. 456. cccxlviii
July 29, 1897 cccli
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 30, p. 465. cccli
"Pagan or Christian—Which?" American Sentinel 12, 30, pp. 465-467. ccclii
"The Power of Christianity" American Sentinel 12, 30, p. 467. ccclv
"The Christian Warfare" American Sentinel 12, 30, pp. 467, 468. ccclvii
August 5, 1897 ccclix
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 31, p. 481. ccclix

"The Bible Is Science" American Sentinel 12, 31, pp. 481-483. . . . . cccl x
"The 'Civil Sabbath' 'Corpse'" American Sentinel 12, 31, pp. 483, 484. . . . . cccl xiv
August 12, 1897 . . . . . cccl xvii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 32, p. 497. . . . . cccl xvii
"Salvation Is Science" American Sentinel 12, 32, pp. 497-499. . . . . cccl xviii
"Sin and Crime" American Sentinel 12, 32, pp. 499, 500. . . . . cccl xxi
"Christian Unity" American Sentinel 12, 32, pp. 500, 501. . . . . cccl xxiii
"Not Based on the Law of God" American Sentinel 12, 32, pp. 502, 503. . . . . cccl xxiv
"No Conception of their Own Rights" American Sentinel 12, 32, pp. 503, 504. . . . . cccl xxv
August 19, 1897 . . . . . cccl xxvii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 33, p. 513. . . . . cccl xxvii
"God the Teacher In the Sciences" American Sentinel 12, 33, pp. 513-515. . . . . cccl xxviii
"Human Law Cannot Deal with Sin" American Sentinel 12, 33, p. 515. . . . . cccl xxxii
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 33, p. 515. . . . . cccl xxxiii
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 33, p. 515. . . . . cccl xxxiii
September 2, 1897 . . . . . cccl xxxv
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 34, p. 529. . . . . cccl xxxv
"Science With the Bible, and Without the Bible" American Sentinel 12, 34, pp. 529, 530. . . . . cccl xxxvi
"'Civil Righteousness' and Religious Prejudice" American Sentinel 12, 34, p. 533. . . . . cccl xxxix
"Religious Liberty" American Sentinel 12, 34, p. 541. . . . . cccl xxxix
September 9, 1897 cccxci
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 35, p. 545. cccxci
"The Science of Salvation" American Sentinel 12, 35, pp. 545, 546. cccxcii
"Religious Office Seeking" American Sentinel 12, 35, pp. 546, 547. cccxcv

"Why We Have Rights" American Sentinel 12, 35, p. 557. cccxcv
September 16, 1897 cccxcix
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 36, p. 561. cccxcix
"The Science of Salvation" American Sentinel 12, 36, pp. 561, 562. . . . . cd
"'Faith Cure'" American Sentinel 12, 36, pp. 563, 564. . . cdii
"Truth and Freedom" American Sentinel 12, 36, p. 564. . cdv
"The Object of Civil Government" American Sentinel 12, 36, pp. 571, 572. . . . . cdvi
September 23, 1897 . . . . . cdix
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 37, p. 577. . . . . cdix
"'Who Is He That Condemneth?'" American Sentinel 12, 37, pp. 577, 578. . . . . cdx
"Christianity" American Sentinel 12, 37, pp. 579, 580. . cdxii
"'An Extraordinary Utterance,'" American Sentinel 12, 37, pp. 580, 581. . . . . cdxvi
"The 'Sabbath Logion'" American Sentinel 12, 37, p. 581. . . . . cdxviii
"Politics and Religion" American Sentinel 12, 37, pp. 581, 582. . . . . cdxix
"The 'Continental Sunday'" American Sentinel 12, 37, pp. 582, 583. . . . . cdxx
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 37, p. 586. . . . . cdxxi
September 30, 1897 . . . . . cdxxiii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 38, p. 593. . . . . cdxxiii
"'Follow Thou Me'" American Sentinel 12, 38, pp. 593, 594. . . . . cdxxiv
"A Man of Peace" American Sentinel 12, 38, pp. 594, 595. . . . . cdxxvii
"The Power of the Church" American Sentinel 12, 38, pp. 595, 596. . . . . cdxxvii
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 38, p. 596. . . . . cdxxxi
"Will It Steer Clear?" American Sentinel 12, 38, pp. 596, 597. . . . . cdxxxi
"The 'Powers That Be'" American Sentinel 12, 38, pp. 604, 605. . . . . cdxxxii
October 7, 1897 . . . . . cdxxxv

"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 39, p. 609. . . . . cdxxxv
"Religious Right" American Sentinel 12, 39, pp. 609, 610. . . . . cdxxxvi
"The Two Principles" American Sentinel 12, 39, pp. 620, 621. . . . . cdxxxviii
October 14, 1897 . . . . . cdxliii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 40, p. 625. . . . . cdxliii
"Civil Law and Morality" American Sentinel 12, 40, p. 628. . . . . cdxliv
"A 'Non-sectarian' Myth" American Sentinel 12, 40, pp. 628, 629. . . . . cdxlv
"Note" American Sentinel 12, 40, p. 629. . . . . cdxlvii
October 21, 1897 . . . . . cdxlix
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 41, pp. 641. . . . . cdxlix
"Our Government and God's Sovereignty" American Sentinel 12, 41, pp. 641, 642. . . . . cdl
"Religious Monopoly" American Sentinel 12, 41, pp. 642, 643. . . . . cdli
"What is Righteousness?" American Sentinel 12, 41, p. 643. . . . . cdliii
"Duty not Based upon Rights" American Sentinel 12, 41, p. 644. . . . . cdliv
"Revising History" American Sentinel 12, 41, pp. 644, 645. . . . . cdlv
October 28, 1897 . . . . . cdlix
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 42, p. 657. . . . . cdlix
"The Cross and the Flag" American Sentinel 12, 42, pp. 657, 658. . . . . cdlx
"The 'Question Before the House'" American Sentinel 12, 42, p. 658. . . . . cdlxi
"A Threatened Union of Church and State" American Sentinel 12, 42, pp. 658, 659. . . . . cdlxii
"The Workingman's Palladium" American Sentinel 12, 42, p. 659. . . . . cdlxiii
November 4, 1897 . . . . . cdlxv
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 43, p. 673. . . . . cdlxv
"The Test of Loyalty" American Sentinel 12, 43, pp. 673, 674. . . . . cdlxvi

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 43, p. 674. . . . . cdlxvii
"Tobacco and Christianity" American Sentinel 12, 43, pp. 674, 675. . . . . cdlxviii
"Notes" American Sentinel 12, 43, p. 675. . . . . cdlxix
"Activity in Time of Peace" American Sentinel 12, 43, p. 675. . . . . cdlxx
November 11, 1897 . . . . . cdlxxi
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 44, p. 689. . . . . cdlxxi
"What Army Chaplains Are For" American Sentinel 12, 44, pp. 689, 690. . . . . cdlxxii
"True and False Democracy" American Sentinel 12, 44, pp. 691, 692. . . . . cdlxxvi
November 18, 1897 . . . . . cdlxxix
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 45, p. 705. . . . . cdlxxix
"It Needs Explanation" American Sentinel 12, 45, pp. 705, 706. . . . . cdlxxx
November 25, 1897 . . . . . cdlxxxi
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 46, p. 721. . . . . cdlxxxi
"Some Absolute Certainties" American Sentinel 12, 46, pp. 721, 722. . . . . cdlxxxii
"Teaching the Pagan Conception of the State" American Sentinel 12, 46, pp. 722, 723. . . . . cdlxxxiii
"Reverence and Patriotism" American Sentinel 12, 46, pp. 725, 726. . . . . cdlxxxv
December 2, 1897 . . . . . cdlxxxix
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 47, p. 737. . . . . cdlxxxix
"No Reform Possible by Law" American Sentinel 12, 47, pp. 737, 738. . . . . cdxc
"State Recognition of God and the French Revolution" American Sentinel 12, 47, pp. 738, 739. . . . . cdxcii
"The Right of Freedom of Conscience" American Sentinel 12, 47, pp. 748, 749. . . . . cdxciii
December 9, 1897 . . . . . cdxcvii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 48, p. 753. . . . . cdxcvii
"The Letter Killeth" American Sentinel 12, 48, pp. 753, 754. . . . . cdxcviii
December 16, 1897 . . . . . di

"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 49, p. 769. . . . . di
"The Rest Question" American Sentinel 12, 49, pp. 769, 770. . . . . dii
"'Higher Criticism' of the Calendar" American Sentinel 12, 49, pp. 770, 771. . . . . div
"The Spirit of the Constitution" American Sentinel 12, 49, p. 771. . . . . dv
December 23, 1897 . . . . . dvii
"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 50, p. 785. . . . . dvii
"The New Leaders in 'National Reform'" American Sentinel 12, 50, pp. 785, 786. . . . . dviii
"The American Sentinel for 1898" American Sentinel 12, 50, p. 799. . . . . dx

January 7, 1897

"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 1-3.

ATJ

TO-DAY the AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon its twelfth year's work. Every one who has watched the court of events during these eleven years, knows that the call for this work is more urgent than ever before.

When the first number of the AMERICAN SENTINEL was issued in January, 1886, who, however well informed, would have supposed that in only eleven years the movement to make the United States Government "Christian," and the "Christian religion" a national thing, would have become so all-pervading and so popular as it is?

Then there was but one small sect that was working to this bad end. That movement was weak, and unpopular almost everywhere. All the principles and precepts of the Government were positively against it.

Now the movement is powerful and popular almost everywhere. And in spite of principle and precept, the Government of the United States has been turned bodily in its favor, with notice from the National Executive that "all will have to accept the situation," and "face the music." In more than one way that is a complete revolution.

WHAT IS THE SITUATION

Let us glance at original principles, that we may the better understand what the situation is, that "all will have to accept."

Everybody knows that upon principle, and by express provision of the supreme law, the Government of the United States was es-

tablished not only without any recognition of religion, but with the exclusion of religion, and specifically the Christian religion. This was done, too, because of respect to the Christian religion—"that the infinite Spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom, and purity, and power," and that here there might be no encroachments upon the prerogatives of God.

Thus the Government of the United States was established in truth upon the Christian basis: in that its fundamental principles and supreme law were in exact harmony with the provisions announced by Jesus Christ with respect to the total separation that should be maintained between His religion and the jurisdiction of the State, between the kingdom of God and the governments of this world.

Thus America became to all the world "the classical land" of religious liberty. Therefore no step could ever be taken against this order of things in the Government, without attacking religious liberty: no thing could ever be done toward governmental recognition of the Christian religion, without being against the plain word of Christ, as well as against the fundamental principles and the supreme law of the Government itself.

This was all plain enough to all who cared to consider that the principles of Christ and the good of mankind were of more importance than their own opinions. And this is why the American people have been so slow to believe that there could be any danger to religious liberty, any danger of the establishment of a national religion, in this country; they would not believe that there could ever be enough people in this country who would become antichristian, to change the order of things in which the Government of the United States was founded, and which it represented to all the world.

By the year 1886, however, those who established the AMERICAN SENTINEL considered that there was sufficient indications of this approaching danger to justify the publishing of a paper which should be devoted to the maintenance of the principles of Christianity represented in the fundamental principles and the supreme law of the Government of the United States; while at the same time it should watch closely to detect and expose every motion that might be made toward securing the governmental recognition of religion.

In 1892, the Supreme Court of the nation committed the judicial
[2] department of the Government to the recognition of the "Christian

religion" as a governmental thing by declaring that "organic utterances" and the "meaning" of the Constitution prove that "this is a Christian nation," in accordance with original documents whose "purpose" was "the establishment of the Christian religion" in this country. And by another decision in 1895, the Court has shown that it adheres to this doctrine.

In 1892, also, Congress committed the legislative department of the Government not only to the recognition of the "Christian religion" as a governmental thing, but to the recognition of that particular phase of it that is represented in Sunday observance: and in 1893, by direct action, confirmed that which is had done in 1892.

In 1892, the President of the United States committed the executive department of the Goverment [*sic*.] to the recognition of the "Christian religion" as a governmental thing by approving the action of Congress. In addition to this, in 1896, the President of the United States, in a Thanksgiving proclamation, again committed the executive department of the Government, specifically, to the "Christian religion" as a governmental thing; and shortly afterward followed it up with the ominous declaration that "this *is* a Christian nation, and it is only a question of time when all will have to come to accept the situation."

Now it is undeniable that these three departments—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive—are the Government of the United States. It is also undeniable that these three departments have, by repeated action, committed themselves to the recognition of the "Christian religion" as a governmental thing. It is therefore also undeniable that in spite of the plain words of Jesus Christ; and in spite of the fundamental principles and the supreme law of the nation; the Government of the United States has been dragged into the recognition of the "Christian religion;" and in the antichristian sense in which such a term is always used, has been made a "Christian government."

What more could possibly be necessary to the accomplishment of such a thing? Was it essential that all three branches of the Government should take such step, in order that it might truly be said that the Government had done it? All three have definitely and intentionally taken such step. Was it essential that all three branches of the Government should by repeated action take such step, in order

that it might truly be said that the Government had done it? All three, by repeated action, have done it. And, as though to put a climax to the whole scheme, the President gives notice not only that "this is a Christian nation," but that it is only a question of time when "all will have to accept the situation," and "face the music."

Yet this is not to say that all has been done that will be done. Not by any means: for such evil tide once a-flowing, will not cease until it shall have overflown, reached even to the neck, and filled the breadth of the land. This *is* to say, however, what cannot be disproved, that the particular, the essential, thing of the recognition of a governmental national religion, has been accomplished by the Government of the United States. And when more shall have been done in this direction, it matters not what it may be, it is impossible for it to be the doing of any new thing. All that it can possibly be is but the enlarging and deepening of the thing that has already been done.

PECULIARITIES OF THE SITUATION

In view of all this that has certainly been done, it is remarkable how the great mass of the people of the United States do "accept the situation."

Practically, the whole religious element of the nation accepts the situation, because it is glad to have it so. This element not only accepts the situation, but will do all in its power to emphasize President Cleveland's pronunciamento that all "will have to accept" it.

The vast majority of those who are not confessed, of the religious element, tamely accept the situation because they do not believe that the issue is of sufficient importance to justify them in taking a course that will subject them to the sneers, the scoffs, and the ostracism: both business and social, that are so largely dealt out to all who choose to let it be known that they do *not* accept the situation.

Looking at the situation as it really is to-day, in contrast with the situation that our fathers created when they established the National Government and fixed the supreme law, a person is driven to the supposition that the great mass of the people of the United States to-day must think that our fathers made a great mistake when they

carried on such a long and earnest contest against any governmental recognition of the "Christian religion."

There is certainly a great mistake somewhere in the issue. If our fathers were right in establishing the Government and fixing the supreme law, with the express exclusion of any recognition of the Christian religion, then these men to-day cannot be right in dragging the whole Government into express recognition of the "Christian religion." And if these men are right to-day in giving express governmental recognition to the "Christian religion," then assuredly our fathers were wrong in expressly excluding the Christian religion from governmental recognition.

These two things cannot stand together. One of them must inevitably be wrong. And to "accept the situation" as it is to-day, and as the President of the United States says it "will have to" be accepted, is to say that our fathers were wrong in excluding the Christian religion from governmental recognition. But to say, or tacitly to admit, or "to accept the situation which argues, that our fathers were wrong in this, is to go further back than that point. The leading writer of the history of the United States has well said that the exclusion of religion from governmental recognition was [3]
"the logical consequence of either of the two great distinguishing principles of the Reformation, as well of justification by faith alone as the equality of all believers."

To "accept the situation" then as it is to-day, is to allow that our fathers were wrong in creating the situation which they labored so hard to create. And to allow that they were wrong in this, is to argue that the Reformation, in its two great distinguishing principles, was wrong. And to do that is to occupy distinctly papal ground.

Nor yet is this all. We have shown that the situation which was created by our fathers in the total separation of the Christian religion from governmental recognition, is precisely the situation which the words of Christ declare that governments should occupy. And our fathers caused this Government to occupy that situation because of their respect for the words of Christ which demanded it; and because of deference to "the principles upon which the gospel was first propagated."

To "accept the situation" then as it is to-day in the Government of the United States respecting the "Christian religion," and which

President Cleveland says "will have to" be accepted, is not only to allow that our fathers were wrong in excluding the Christian religion from governmental recognition, but it is also to argue that the principles upon which the gospel was first propagated, and even the very words of Christ, are wrong. And to do that, is to take the position of antichrist.

And *that* is the situation as it is to-day.

THE TWO SITUATIONS

There are then, in fact, two situations before the people of America to-day: *First*, the situation which was created by our fathers, when, by the fundamental principles and the supreme law of the Government, and according to the words of Christ and the principles upon which the gospel was first propagated, they excluded the Christian religion from governmental recognition. *Secondly*, the situation upon which the gospel was first propagated; and in spite of the fundamental principles and the supreme law of the Government; has been created to-day by the repeated governmental recognition of the "Christian religion."

These are the two situations that are before the people of the United States to-day. The first is Christian, the second is antichristian. And "it is not a theory, but a condition, which confronts us." For the President has plainly said, and there are multitudes who are ready, by whatever means, to make the saying effective, that "all will have to accept the situation" as it has been created lately—the antichristian situation.

Calmly and deliberately, and in the fear of Christ, we say that *we* will *not* "have to" accept the situation. We will not "have to" do it, simply because we will not do it. Not only this, but we are going to oppose it with all our might—not on the field of carnage nor with weapons of carnal warfare; but as our fathers did, in the field of public opinion, with "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," "with sufferings and the Cross." There are thousands of us now, and there are going to be thousands *upon* thousands of us before the contest is over, who will not "accept the situation," who will not "face the music."

Christ or antichrist—that is the question, Choose ye. As for us and our house, we choose Christ, the principles upon which the gospel was first propagated, the two great distinguishing principles of the Reformation, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States. "Come with us and we will do thee good, for God has spoken good concerning Israel."

IN the *Christian Statesman*, of December 19, 1896, Rev. J. N. Leiper, reporting the visit of the Anti-Saloon League to President Cleveland, a short time before, adds the following; and the italics are his own:—

> "After this ceremony was over, the writer went back to the President, and, in the presence of a few others, said: 'Mr. President, I most earnestly thank you for the recognition of your Saviour and mine in your Thanksgiving proclamation.' I write this incident in order to give the President's reply, which deserves to be remembered by all citizens. After referring to the fact that he had been criticised for it by the Jews and some others, he remarked: '*We are a Christian nation, and we may as well face the music*.'"

That statement of the President's does certainly "deserve to be remembered by all citizens," and by all others in the country. Indeed, there is not much likelihood that they will have much opportunity to forget it. The real question is, Will they "face the music"?

"Which Will It Be?" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 4, 5.

[4]

ATJ

IS this a Protestant Christian nation, or a Roman Catholic Christian nation? An important question is this, one which contains the elements of terrific commotion for the religious forces of the country. And this question is now raised, and the issued joined, which must precipitate the contest for supremacy. President Cleveland's "innocent" little Thanksgiving utterance of recent date, bearing the stamp of a national document, seems to have been all that was lacking to start the avalanche rolling. Note the following from the *Presbyterian Messenger*, quoted in the *Christian Statesman*, of December 12:—

> "The United States Supreme Court has recently declared judicially that this is a Christian nation; and now the executive falls in line. And let us hold up not only the Christian flag, but the Protestant flag. Every historical, constitutional and legal fact and principle that makes this a Christian nation, makes it a Protestant nation. If it be inconsistent with the rights of Romanists to make this assertion, it is inconsistent with the rights of Jews and even of all irreligious men to make the official declarations that the President and the Governor have made. One of our political judges had the temerity to declare in the late Saratoga General Assembly that its not true historically, or in any other way, that this is a Protestant nation. Made in such a place it was a traitorous declaration. Politicians, who are looking for votes may presume on the liberality of Protestants and call for the papal ballots by such declaration; but all Protestants, informed as to the true history of the nation should repudiate them with indignation."

So this is a Protestant Christian nation, is it? Hold on, now; let us see what our Roman Catholic citizens have to say on that point. In the *Catholic Mirror*, of December 12, is found this from the pen of Cardinal Gibbons:—

> "The American nation is a Christian nation. This is manifest from its constitution, from its legislation, and from its observance of certain holidays, such as Thanksgiving and Christmas."

[5] Cardinal Gibbons speaks with authority for the Roman Catholic Church. And when he says that the American nation is a Christian nation, he means that it is a Roman Catholic Christian nation, for the plain reason that the Catholic Church does not recognize anything as Christian outside of her own fold. She denies that there is any salvation outside her pale. She affirms expressly that she is the Christian church, and that all other churches are schismatic and heretical. Only recently the Anglican "High Church," which resembles the Roman

Catholic Church so closely in doctrine and practice as to be almost indistinguishable from it, was refused recognition as a Christian church by the supreme head of the church of Rome.

With Church and State separated, as in the order established by our forefathers, the question as to whether or not this Government is Protestant, or even Christian, could never be raised. But now that every department of the Government has broken through this order, and declared this to be a Christian nation, the question has arisen, and already it has assumed that phase which must precipitate a conflict between Protestantism and Rome for political supremacy. Is the Government to be Roman Catholic or Protestant? As established by the framers of the Constitution, it is Protestant, in that its foundation principles are in antagonism to the papal principle of a union of religion with the State. And every move in the direction of giving it a religious character, has been a move to make it in reality, if not in name, a Roman Catholic Government. In every such move the nation has been playing into Rome's hands. Therefore let Protestants not imagine that victory will lightly turn upon their side when the battle is joined.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 1, p. 5.

[5]

ATJ

THE Paulist Fathers of New York City, whose specialty it is to Catholicize the Protestants of the United States, have extended to Canada their mission enterprise. "Rev." Walter Elliott, with whose work our readers are somewhat acquainted, has lately been on a tour up there. In his report, referring to his question-box, he says:—

> "Among the questions was one affirming justification by faith alone, a novelty in our experience, and showing the primitive type of Protestantism in this part of Canada.... Another question was pertinent and impertinent: 'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' (St. John 3:3.) Are you born again?"

These are interesting statements. Mr. Elliott has been touring thus for several years. He has been west as far as Iowa, and has

had good-sized audiences in all sections. And yet to find a person "affirming justification alone" is "a novelty" in his experience. Now, justification by faith alone, is Christianity. This, then, is equivalent to saying that to find a person affirming Christianity is a novelty in his experience. This in turn shows one of two things—either there is a great dearth of Christianity among the people whom he meets, or else there is a greater dearth of those who are ready to affirm it.

Again: Mr. Elliott says that the question asked him, "Are you born again," was "impertinent." No one needs any better evidence than this, that the Rev. Walter Elliott is not born again. For the man who is really born again will never consider it impertinent to be asked such a question.

"The Two New Englands" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 5, 6.

[5]

ATJ

A WRITER in the *Catholic World* for December, discussing the subject of "New England and the Formation of America," argues that important as may have been the influence of the New England of the past, in the history of the nation, it is to be surpassed by the New England of the future. This is to be, because, while the New England of the past was Puritan and had great influence, the New England of the future is to be Catholic, and therefore will have much greater influence. He argues that as "Puritan New England has made our country to be a Yankee nation," the soon-coming Catholic New England will make our country "to be a Catholic nation."

In the opinion of this writer the future New England from which such notable result is to be expected, has already made such progress that it is almost the *present* New England. He says:—

> "Puritan New England has made our country a Yankee nation. But the New England of yesterday is fast giving place to the New England of the future. What was Puritan New England, has been called, even now, Catholic New England. Surely the Lord Christ has intended to work greater matters by the little handful of Puritans than either they or the world have been aware of. Important as has been the part played by the New

> England of yesterday we may reasonably expect that even greater things will be done by her in the future. These greater things will be done through the transformation of the Puritan. We shall, in the future, esteem the works of the Puritan more for these later fruits of New England, which he did not dream of producing—to have dreamed of them would have been to him a nightmare—than for his share in making this a free nation. The Puritan has made this a religious nation, which is destined to be a Catholic nation."

There is more substance to this view than most of the people will readily believe. The result here so confidently expected, is also nearer than many are ready to believe. Indeed, the Puritan New England system, both theoretical and practical, was so essentially Catholic, that no other result could fairly be expected than that which this writer has defined. It is the logical result. This contemplated "future New England" will be only the legitimate and strictly logical descendant of the Puritan New England.

When this "future New England" shall find itself in power and in working order, it will find also, in large measure throughout the nation, the machinery of the Puritan system existing and in good [6] working order. Many of the same old dreadful laws used by that system, which have never been repealed, will be found serviceable. These laws, having fallen into "innocuous desuetude," are supposed by many to be dead. But they were not dead under the regime of the former New England. And as certainly as "future New England" rises to power, all such laws found unrepealed will be found to be no more dead nor dormant than they were under the former.

Every legislature in the land, whether national or State, should make a specialty of hunting up all such old laws and repealing them at once. If the people of the nation were only half awake to the real situation, they would never rest, and would give the legislatures no rest, until this thing was thoroughly done.

"A New Sunday Bill in Congress" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 6, 7.

[6]

ATJ

54th CONGRESS.
2nd SESSON. H. R. 9679.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

December 16, 1896

Mr. Washington (by request) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

A BILL

To further protect the first day of the week as a day of rest in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall not be lawful for any person to keep open any place of business or maintain a stand for the sale of any article or articles of profit during Sunday, excepting vendors of books or newspapers, and apothecaries for the dispensing of medicines, and undertakers for the purpose of providing for the dead, or others for the purposes of charity or necessity; nor shall any public playing of football or baseball or any other kind of playing, sports, pastimes, or diversions, disturbing the peace and quiet of the day, be practiced by any person or persons with the District of Columbia on Sunday; nor shall any building operations or work upon railroad construction be lawful upon said day; and for any violation of this Act the person offending shall, for each offense, be liable to a fine of not less than five dollars nor more than fifty dollars, and in the case of corporations there shall be a like fine for every person employed in violation of this Act laid upon the corporation offending.

> SEC. 2. That it shall be a sufficient defense to a prosecution for labor on the first day of the week that the defendant uniformly keeps another day of the week as a day of rest, and that the labor complained of was done in such a manner as not to interrupt or disturb other persons in observing the first day of the week as a day of rest. This Act shall not be construed to prevent the sale of refreshments other than malt or spirituous liquors, or to prevent the sale of malt and spirituous liquors as now provided for by law, or tobacco, cigars, railroad and steamboat tickets, or the collection and delivery of baggage.

This bill was originated and framed by the National Sabbath Alliance of Washington, D. C.; and was presented in Congress at the request of this Alliance. After framing it themselves, and themselves having it presented, a convention was held by themselves, presided over by Bishop Satterlee, which gravely proceeded to endorse it. This convention also had a committee appointed to lobby the bill in the Houses of Congress.

Compared with former bills from the same source it will be seen that all use of openly religious words and phrases has been studiously avoided. In this respect it is probably about as taking a bill as it is possible to frame for the purpose for which it is intended: that is, to secure religious legislation under cover of something else. They may be able to make such a showing with this bill that the legislative mind shall be willing to pass it.

Yet, thought all set religious terms and phrases are studiously avoided in this bill, its essential religious meaning and intent is not one whit less than that of any other bill that has been put before Congress by the same parties. In former bills they have so fully exposed their real purpose that there can be no mistaking it, under whatever guise it may now or in future be forced to assume in order to disarm opposition.

The Sunday institution is essentially and only religious, in itself. It never can be made anything else. It is impossible to have legislation of any kind or to any degree in favor of Sunday, without having religious legislation. It is impossible for government or individuals

to recognize Sunday as anywise different from the other working days of the week, without recognizing a religious institution, and conforming just so far to a religious practice. The promoters of this bill know this. They are therefore perfectly willing to tone down their proposition to any extent that will assure their adoption by Congress, knowing that as certainly as the thing is recognized or adopted in any shape, the whole field is opened, and additional steps can be taken at their leisure. We know this because we have heard them say it more than once.

But see how far they have indeed gone to give this bill an acceptable cast: "This Act shall not be construed... to prevent the sale of malt and spirituous liquors as now provided by law," etc. That is to say, We would not have it understood that this bill shall repeal, supersede, or interfere in any way with, any law which sanctions the liquor traffic. In other words, Only give us by specific statute the national recognition of Sunday, and we will say nothing against any law providing for the liquor traffic.

How could there be made a more open bid than this is, for the support,—if not positive at least by consent—of the liquor element? How could there be a more cowardly, not to say a more tricky, compromise with the liquor traffic, than is offered in this bill? Indeed, the title Sunday Liquor Bill would be more accurately descriptive than
[7] simply Sunday bill. We are waiting to see whether the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Christian Endeavorers will support this bill as they have all the others.

The "exemption" which this bill proffers to observers of another day than Sunday, is the worst one that has yet been inserted in any bill presented in Congress. In former bills it was proposed that the provisions of the Act should not *apply* to those who conscientiously observe another day than Sunday. In this bill, its provisions *apply* to all alike, up to the point of defense in a prosecution: only then does the "exemption" clause avail. For "it shall be a sufficient defense to a prosecution for labor on the first day of the week that the defendant," etc. It is only when a man is prosecuted, and when he has thus become a "defendant" that this clause is of any avail. That is to say that under this Act every person who uniformly keeps another day of the week as a day of rest, and who labors on Sunday, shall be subject to arrest and prosecution. But when he shall have been

arrested and is prosecuted, *then* being "the defendant" it shall be "a sufficient defense" to the "prosecution," that he shall prove not only that he "uniformly keeps another day of the week as a day of rest," but "that the labor complained of was done in such a manner as not to interrupt or disturb other persons in observing the first day of the week as a day of rest." And as it is the established rule of the courts that "the burden of proof resets upon him who claims the exemption;" and also that such disturbance may be mental, and may be caused merely by the *knowledge* that the person is laboring on Sunday; it is perfectly plain that under such an act as this, the observer of another day than Sunday would be placed in a position of such difficulty as ought to satisfy the greatest inquisitor-general that ever hunted a heretic.

See also where this bill places honest industry. By the plain words of the bill, "the sale of malt and spirituous liquors," and of course the drinking of them, may be publicly carried on on Sunday wherever "provided for by law," without any danger of interrupting or disturbing other persons, and without any danger of any person being arrested, or prosecuted, or made a defendant in court. Whereas any quiet, sober, inoffensive Christian who engages in honest labor on Sunday is instantly subject to arrest, and prosecution, and to be made defendant in such a network of difficult circumstances as to make it practically impossible to escape.

Thus by this bill drunkenness, carousal and general deviltry are given specific sanction, hoodlumism is encouraged, and idleness is enforced, on Sunday; while honest industry is forbidden, condemned and persecuted. And they expect the national Government to put the seal of its approval upon the iniquitous proposal. It may be that they can persuade the Government to do so. But how long can a Government live that so reverses the true order of things? Honest industry is the life of the State. Idleness, even voluntary, is death to the State. And *enforced* idleness is the suicide of the State.

There is no room for doubt that the National Sabbath Alliance took a great deal of care in the framing of this bill. It bears the marks of this all over. Bishop Satterlee and his associates probably think that in framing and promoting the bill they are pleasing the Lord; but if they had formed a set purpose to please Satan himself, it is difficult to conceive how they could have taken a course better adapted to

such purpose than they have taken in the matter of framing this bill and trying to get it enacted into law.

Probably there will be those who will say that the sponsors of this bill do not mean all that we have pointed out. We are not asking anybody to tell what they do or do not mean. We do not care to know what they mean or do not mean. We do know now what they have *said*, and assuredly that is enough.

"Is It Christian?" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 7, 8.

[7]

ATJ

IS the "Christian Citizenship" movement a Christian undertaking in truth, or is it such only in name? We ask this question with particular reference to some statements made by the president, Mr. Edwin D. Wheelock, in the *Golden Rule*, of December 10. That individual says:—

> "It has taken three years to educate even a comparatively few people up to a clear understanding of the full and true meaning of the Christian Citizenship movement....
>
> "Christian citizenship is more than reform; it is *regeneration*."
>
> "It is more than the ethics of politics, it is the science of righteousness.
>
> "It maintains that the State is as truly sacred as the Church, should be governed by as high principles, and should recognize God as the source of all authority.
>
> "It believes that but two ways lie before our country; one leading to anarchy, the other to the application of gospel principles to public affairs.
>
> "It is the voice of one crying in the wilderness of public sins, 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord;' measure all things by the rule of absolute righteousness rather

> than that of 'policy'; cast out whatever is not in harmony with the teaching of Christ."

The first of these statements distinctly and emphatically affirms that "Christian citizenship" is *regeneration*. This is a scriptural term, and refers the mind to that deep and vital mystery of the gospel of God—the new birth. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" is a cardinal doctrine of the Christian religion. This new birth is "of water and of the spirit." John 3:5. In Titus 3:5 it is spoken of as "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy ghost."

But "Christian Citizenship" is confessedly not "of water and of the Spirit." It does not seek to attain the end it has in view by any such means. Its means are, the ballot and legislation. Through these it seeks "the application of gospel principles to public affairs." As therefore its means are earthly and not spiritual; as regeneration is [8] wholly a spiritual process, wrought only by spiritual agencies; and as "Christian Citizenship" claims to be regeneration and not mere reform; it follows that it is a fraud, and therefore not Christian at all. But not only is it a fraud in not being what it claims to be; it is a substitute for that which has been instituted by God for human salvation. It is a man-made system of regeneration—a substitute for the real generation which is of God by the Holy Spirit. In claiming to be regeneration, it stamps itself as not only a fraudulent, but an anti-Christian, thing.

The acceptance of Christian Citizenship as the means of regeneration, means its acceptance as the Christian religion. The Christian Citizenship worker will engage in politics—for "the application of gospel principles to public affairs" by means of the ballot and legislation can be nothing more than a form of politics—believing that he is thereby showing forth "the science of righteousness." It is the same old error which has done such evil work all through the ages—the confounding of politics with Christianity. And this latest phase of it is no better than any of the others, and no less fraught with evil to mankind.

"Notes" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 9, 10.

[9]

ATJ

> "BY general agreement of scholars the beginning of our Christian era has been set four years wrong. By general agreement the Christmas day, December 25th, has also been set wrong.... So little have feast days and celebrations to do with religion that it never occurred to one of the four evangelists to tell us the day and the month.... All this teaches us the old lesson, that the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, nor birthdays or birthyears, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit."

Such is a very truthful observation made by the New York *Independent*, of December 17; and another equally truthful which it suggests is that no surer evidence of the decadence of Christianity in the life of the people could exist than the general and ever-spreading deference paid to such celebrations by the Christian churches. The *Independent* will bear correction on one point: "feast days and celebrations" do have a great deal to do with religion; but nothing to do with Christianity. They simply put the stamp of paganism upon the religion of which they are made a part.

It was on this very point that the Apostle Paul wrote with the deepest concern to the church he had established in Galatia. "How turn ye again," said he, "to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and
[10] times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." Galatians 4:9-11. What would the apostle say to-day were he to write to the churches, in view of their ostentatious observance of Christmas, Easter, and other festivals which God never instituted, while totally disregarding the one day which he has solemnly ordained as his everlasting memorial—the seventh day of the week?

"The Source of National Atheism" American Sentinel 12, 1, pp. 10, 11.

[10]

ATJ

THE one leading characteristic of the French Revolution was atheism. Not the atheism of men as individuals, but the atheism of men in organized, representative, governmental, capacity. It was strictly national atheism: being the action of the national assembly in its official character as such.

This national atheism was not a sudden wild break of men, in an effort to present to the world a novel spectacle: it was the direct, logical, result of a system that had formerly dominated the country.

There had been fastened upon France, through the governmental authority, a religion professedly Christian. It was not Christian; yet it was adopted and ever held by the national authority, as Christian. All national favors were for this religion: the national authority forced it upon all; the national power rigidly excluded all other forms of worship.

When the Reformation of the sixteenth century came, and therein Christianity was offered to the people of France, it was tabooed, denounced, warred upon, and at last, by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, was excluded. Then the nation was left under the crushing weight of the old false religion; and it was not very long before the people of France found themselves under the necessity of relieving themselves of the incubus that was upon them.

This religion had been adopted and maintained for the supposed good of the State. It was proposed always to the State by "the Church" under the pretense that it was essential to the welfare of the State. It was found at last to be the greatest evil that afflicted the State. Instead of being for the good of the State, it was found to be only a continued and increasing curse. And in order for the State to find relief, it was essential to repudiate this national religion.

Now note: this religion, though not Christianity, was held by the people of France to be Christianity. The nation had been trained for ages in the opinion that it only was Christianity. They knew nothing else as Christianity. And to them, in repudiating it they were repudiating Christianity. In repudiating it, they did not pretend to be doing anything else than repudiating Christianity; for it was all that

they knew as Christianity, and it must be repudiated. And when men intentionally repudiate Christianity, even though it be in something that is mistaken for Christianity, they commit themselves only to atheism. Thus it was that France attained to national atheism.

This, too, was nothing else than carrying to their legitimately logical conclusion the proposition and arguments, by which the country had been held under the power of that national religion. In arriving at national atheism, every step that was taken in the National Assembly was logically derived from propositions that had been laid down by the Church. Every argument offered was but the legitimate extension of the arguments already in print on behalf of the national religion.

For instance, it has always been argued, and was then argued, by the Church, that the exclusive establishment and maintenance of that particular religion as the only Christianity, was essential to the welfare of the State: and that it was the province of the State, of its own motion by an official act, to establish this religion, for its own good. The Church has long declared in behalf of the exclusive establishment of that religion, that "it cannot be doubted that it belongs to the prince to require *of full right* that which is necessary to the State."

Upon this is was argued in the Revolution that, As this religion had been established and maintained for the good of the State, and the event had demonstrated that it was the greatest evil of the State; as it undoubtedly belonged to the State itself to require of full right that which is necessary to the State; as it was not undoubtedly necessary to the State that it be relieved of this great evil; it followed conclusively that the State had full right to repudiate the whole religious establishment. The full right to establish religion, or to do any other thing, for the welfare of the State, remains the full right to repudiate that religion, or to undo whatever may have been done, when it is found to be working evil instead of good to the State. There was no escape from this conclusion.

Holding what had been taught to them by the Church, that "The Church is in the State, and the State is not in the Church," they declared, "We are a National Convention: we have assuredly the right to change religion"—meaning the religion of the State. "The

State used its right to suppress a corporation which had no longer a palce in the new society."

Bear in mind that this national religion was held by all there to be Christianity, and when this was repudiated, it was intended to be the repudiation of Christianity; and when that was repudiated there was nothing left to them but national atheism. The only religion they had then to guide them was the religion of reason; the only god the god of reason. [11]

Thus, "the boldest measures of the French Revolution in regard to the Church, were justified beforehand from the point of view of the purest monarchical tradition." It "was only a rigorous application of the maxims of the ancient monarchy. It was simply Gallicanism to the utmost."

"It is well to remind the detractors of the French Revolution, that the National Assembly in this radical measure only imbibed the principles of the ancient French Monarchy." (*De Pressenseé*, "The Church and the French Revolution.") And these principles of the ancient French Monarchy were derived altogether from the national religion. "The representatives of the ancient society ... imagined that they very foundations had been removed, whereas the maxims of their fathers were being turned against them."

And now, just now, there are national combinations of religionists, determined to fasten upon the United States their religion as the national religion. As we have shown, they have already made much progress. It is proposed by them that the State needs this, and must do it by national acts for its own good. With what they have already gained, they are certain to succeed in their designs. And as certainly as this shall come to pass, so certainly it will soon be found that instead of being for the good of the nation, it is the greatest evil that ever befell the nation, and inevitably threatens only the ruin of the nation. Then a demand will be made that for the good of the nation this religion shall be officially repudiated by the nation as such.

Bear in mind also that this religion is now proposed to the nation for adoption *as Christianity*. It is not Christianity, but it is proposed as essentially and only Christianity. It has been adopted, and it will be further favored, as Christianity; and when found necessary to be repudiated it will be treated still as Christianity. And intentionally to repudiate Christianity, even though this be brought about through

apostate and false Christianity, is to land in atheism. And for the national authority to do this, is to land in national atheism. This is as certain now as it was before. And thus this nation, by encouraging this proposed national religion, will throw itself, as did France, into the terrible strait between the curse of a religious despotism working only certain ruin, and the curse of a national atheism which can work nothing less. Will the people, will Congress, will the nation, take warning in time? And by keeping themselves clear of all semblance of recognition of a national religion, will they do all in their power to enable this nation to escape the ruin which is but the logical result of the establishment of an exclusive national religion?

The French Revolution and the United States Government began in the same year.

In the year 1789, and because of genuine respect to Christianity, the United States rejected all semblance of national religious, holding that no national religion is Christianity. Thus in the Constitution of the United States was embodied the very principle announced by Jesus Christ for earthly government, when he said, "My kingdom is not of this world;" "Render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's;" "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not."

In the year 1789, began the French Revolution—the ievitable [*sic*.] logic of an exclusive national religion—an attempt of the French nation to relieve itself of the unbearable curse which had been put upon it in the exclusive establishment of a national religion. This religion was held to be Christianity, and because of its abominable practices and unbearable oppression, was hated and repudiated, and the nation was plunged into national atheism as the only escape.

Thus in these two nations in the same year God set before the world those two all-important lessons as to the right way and the wrong way. These lessons have been before the nations ever since for their instruction. By the example of the United States the other nations were led gradually but constantly in the right way. But now, against Scripture, against the Constitution and every fundamental principle of the United States, against blessed experience, and in the very face of the terrible warning of the French Revolution, the allied religious forces of the United States are determined to accomplish here the establishment of an exclusive national religion.

Is it possible that the American people will allow themselves and the national power thus to be carried captive to error that cannot possibly mean anything but ruin!

January 14, 1897

"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 2, pp. 17, 18.

[17]

ATJ

THE word from Washington, D. C., is that there are thousands of petitions being sent to Congress from *all over the country*, though far the most of them are from Pennsylvania, calling for the passage of the bill providing a Sunday law for *the District of Columbia*.

We should like to know what business, yea, what right, the people of the States have to meddle in the matter of laws for the District of Columbia. The people of the District of Columbia are the ones whose business and whose right this is.

Why do not those Pennsylvania people send over petitions to the legislatures of California and Idaho, calling upon them to enact Sunday laws for their respective States?—Simply because they have no right to. To do so would be to meddle in matters for the people of California and Idaho themselves to attend to.

It is precisely so with the District of Columbia. The people of Pennsylvania and other States have no more right to send such petitions to Congress—the legislature of the District of Columbia—than they would have to send them to the legislature of California. If they were to send such petitions to the legislature of California, they would, in short order, be given to understand that they had better attend to their own business and let the business of other people alone. And that is what the legislature of the District of Columbia ought to give them to understand.

They need to be told this: for it is the life principle of the Government of the States and of the United States. It is the principle of self-government—government of the people, by the people, and

for the people. Each one is to govern himself and let other people alone. It is the principle of the Declaration of Independence—men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Thus, by the Declaration, all men are equal in the right to the pursuit of happiness. But these people engage in the pursuit of happiness for themselves and for everybody else besides.

THERE is presented before the people of this nation a most singular, a most mysterious, thing. We beg to be allowed to state the case, and then leave it with the reader for him to explain if he can.

Almost all the professed Christian elements in the whole country are combined in a determined effort to have Sunday recognized and made a fixture in national law, as the Sabbath.

They propose that all within the jurisdiction of the national power, shall be compelled by such law to recognize and observe the Sunday as the Sabbath.

Then, from this national example, they intend to carry the like thing into all the States and Territories of the Union, and thus by law require the recognition and observance of Sunday as the Sabbath throughout the whole nation.

The leaders in this movement, and the vast majority of the others engaged in it, cite the fourth commandment of the Decalogue as the source of their authority for requiring thus the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath.

The fourth commandment says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy 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."

This commandment has been officially called for an read from the Bible precisely in the words here printed in the presence of
[18] the United States Senate, as the authority, and as containing the reasons, for requiring by national law, the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath.

This commandment says plainly, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." And it is just as plain that this is the seventh day of the week. The seventh day to be observed is the seventh day in succession from the one which God observed: and that seventh day which God observed was the seventh day of the week; because the week was the only period of time then in existence of which there could possibly be any seventh day.

Therefore, as this commandment definitely cites the rest of God on the seventh day at the close of the six days' creative process; and as there was no period of time but the week, of which it could possibly be the seventh day; it is absolutely impossible that this commandment to men to observe the seventh day can refer to any other than the seventh day *of the week*.

But Sunday is the *first* day of the week. Those who are urging it upon all people as the Sabbath know that it is the first day of the week. The bill now before Congress to enforce its observance in the District of Columbia, as well as the laws of the States, calls it the first day of the week.

Now the singular and mysterious thing to which we call attention is, that those who are calling for national law enforcing the observance of this first day of the week, cite the fourth commandment as the source of their authority for requiring its observance as the Sabbath, while that commandment plainly enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week, and cannot possibly refer to any other day.

Another phase of this singular and mysterious thing, is that those people hold that the fourth commandment is the word of God. Yet they have so little regard for that word, that they hesitate not at all to substitute a day of their own choice for the day which, even upon their own claim, *God* has named. They totally ignore the day which the word of God has plainly designated, and boldly endeavor to make this same word of God enjoin the observance of a day to which it cannot possibly apply.

How much regard, then, have those people for the authority of that word *as the word of God?* How much regard have they for the authority *of God*, which they themselves say is the substance and life of that word as the word of God? Do they really believe that when the Lord spoke His law He had sufficient clearness of mind to know

what He wanted to say; and sufficient ability of expression to say what He meant? If they do really believe this, then will they say that He intentionally spoke so ambiguously when He said the seventh day is the Sabbath, that nobody ever caught the correct idea until two hundred years ago when the Puritans discovered that when the Lord *said* the seventh day is the Sabbath He *meant* that the first day is the Sabbath? "To whom, then, will ye liken me, saith the Lord."

If the people of the District of Columbia, or of the States, should treat the laws which these people frame enjoining the observance of the first day of the week, as they themselves treat the law which God has spoken enjoining the observance of the seventh day of the week, what would those people themselves say to that? Everybody knows that such a thing would not be accepted for one moment. It would be denounced as an assertion of self-opinion, and disrespectful to the authority of the Government that is the life of the law.

Is it not then a singular and mysterious thing, that people will claim that a certain word is the word of God, and at the same time treat it as they would not allow for a moment that the word of men should be treated? Shall the words of men be considered as of more force and value than the word of God? "Shall mortal man be more just than God?"

God is the God of judgment. Just and right is He. He will bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil: and it will "be judged by the law." And when He does rise up to judgment, will He regard lightly this light regard for His law? In that day that law will be interpreted by the Judge: not by self-opinionated men.

Now in view of the fact that the people who are endeavoring to force upon all the nation the observance of the first day of the week as the Sabbath, cite as the authority for it the law which enjoins the observance only of the seventh day of the week, while at the same time they hold that law to be the law of God, and that there is to be a judgment of God at which every man shall give account of himself to God and "be judged by the law," is it not a most singular and most mysterious thing that they will act as they do in the matter of the word and the authority of God?

"Who Wants Him?" American Sentinel 12, 2, pp. 18, 19.

[18]

ATJ

MR. MOODY, the evangelist, has said something calculated to shock the church congregations of New York City out of their moral complacency. What he says of the spiritual condition of this city is of course just as applicable to any other section of the country.

Mr. Moody said before a audience in Carnegie Hall, that Christ would be no more welcome should he return to the earth to-day than he was when he came to the Jews in Palestine nineteen centuries ago. "Nineteen hundred years," said the evangelist, "have rolled away since Christ found no place on earth to lay his head. His gospel is now preached in all parts of the world, but is it not a fact that even now there is not room on earth for the Son of God, and no nation wants him?

> "Does America want Him? It is a Christian nation. England claims to be the most Christian nation, but if a man stood up in Parliament to-morrow to advocate—could it be possible—that Christ should come in person to rule England, he would be hooted down. France, Germany, Italy and Spain are Christian nations. Is there room for Him in either?
>
> "Has not Christianity settled down to be a mere

[19]

> lifeless form? Suppose it were possible to petition Christ to return to earth to rule us. How many of the people of New York would sign the petition? Would business men sign it? They would have to change their methods first. Would stock-brokers sign it? It would smash up their business pretty quick. Would saloon-keepers sign it? They would find their occupation gone should they do so.
>
> "I'll bring the question closer home to you. How about the churches? Do they want Him? Pride and form and dignity in the church would have to step down.

> "But we can bring the question even closer to us. How many ladies here would vote to have Him come? I think but few hands would be raised should the vote be taken this afternoon.
>
> "There is hardly a name to unpopular in the world to-day as that of Jesus Christ. Thank God there are a few who have stepped out of the world who would welome [*sic*.] Him!"

Mr. Moody knows, and knows so well that he does not hesitate to state it to his congregations, that the "Christian nations" of to-day do not want Christ any more than did the Jewish nation of old. Even the church-going people, he says, do not constitute an exception in this matter. And what Mr. Moody knows, thousands of others in the Church know as well.

What meaning, then, is there in the movement, in which the churches and religious societies are now all engaged, to make this a "Christian nation" by the exercise of their political power. If the churches themselves are not Christian enough to want Christ with them as Mr. Moody described, how can they make anything else Christian? And if they cannot make the nation Christian by the religious stamp which they propose to put upon it, what else can they do, but to make it antichristian? What else was ever done to a nation by giving it a religious stamp?

This is the plain meaning of the movement to make the United States Government profess religion.

"That Sunday Liquor Bill Again" American Sentinel 12, 2, p. 22.

[22]

ATJ

IN our discussion of the Sunday bill now before Congress, and which we reprinted in our issue of last week, we called attention to the evident fact that it did not in any sense express the real purposes of its framers. We pointed out that it had been toned down to the lowest point, expressly to secure its passage if possible, and then, having the Government committed to the principle, afterward bring

forward their real purposes and secure their embodiment in law. It will be of interest to our readers to have the statements of the framers of the bill themselves to this effect.

December 18, there was held in Washington, D. C., the National Convention of the "Woman's Sabbath Alliance," in which the discussion and endorsement of this bill was the principal business. But two resolutions were passed. The first was to ask "pastors of churches to give at least one service during the year to the subject of Sabbath observance." The other one was the following:

> "(2) *Resolved*, That we endorse the bill proposed by the Churchman's League and approved by the District Commissioners for the observance of the Sabbath in the District, and pray that it, or some other, adapted to the needs of the city, may become a law."

The first speaker was Bishop Satterlee, who spoke of the bill as follows:—

> "I want to say a few words about this bill that has just been introduced into Congress. Of course this country is made up of many men of many minds; and I think that all civilization tells us that it is very unwise for a government to pass a law that the people will not, or cannot fulfill—that will become inoperative. Lord Salisbury said a very profound truth in one very small sentence some years ago when he said, 'One of the first points for a ruler to consider, or a Prime minister to consider, is not what is ideally best, but what is best under the present circumstances.' You will probably find that the bill will not satisfy the ladies, and it does not satisfy its promoters; but it is the best we can get. This bill, it seems to me, is very good. It does not satisfy me, or you; but if we all unite upon it, let us use all our influence in its favor. It will be a great gain if this bill is passed, at least I think so. Perhaps those who are behind me will speak in a different way regarding it."

Bishop Satterlee was followed by Bishop Hurst, who, however, avoided saying anything about the bill. In this he was wise. Bishop Hurst was followed by Professor Whitman, who, of the bill and what is expected of it, said:—

> "There is no more important thing for us to bear in mind than that the things we are doing in Washington are known and read of all men. Most cities can do things for themselves—by themselves. The doings of Washington are National doings. It is therefore a matter of great satisfaction to all of us who are interested in the well being, who are interested practically in the well being, the enterprise, the best good of this country, to feel that all Christian people, all well disposed people, are joining hands in the interest of the bill that has been spoken of this morning.
>
> "I endorse very heartily the words that have been spoken. The bill is not an ideal bill considered from the Christian point of view; but it is a very much better bill than it seemed likely we could get. We can get no farther in this matter than we can carry the common sense of the community. Far better to have no law at all on the question of the Sabbath, than that we should have a law on the Sabbath that is continually violated.
>
> "A law generally marks the highest point that sentiment has reached. The utmost that a law can serve ordinarily is as a sort of bulwark. Every statute must serve as a sort of safeguard and give us a point to which we can continually refer, that we can keep the public sentiment up to that point. I rejoice therefore that it has been possible to enlist Christian men and women of all beliefs in our city in defence of the bill to which reference has been made—for the names that are behind this bill area simply representative names.
>
> "This is important. It is a significant thing. Public attention has been called to the fact that the President's

> proclamation this year at Thanksgiving is the first pronounced Christian recognition of Thanksgiving which our Government has ever made. And I know no other way to account for this advance over previous years than as an appeal to the general sentiment which has been growing in favor of the recognition of God as the central fact of our national life. I think the proclamation is at once a repetition of that sentiment, and a concession to it.
>
> "It is of the utmost importance for all these reasons, that we push on in the lines indicated."

So, then, "A bill to further protect the first day of the week as a day of rest" and which distinctly declares that "This Act shall not be construed ... to prevent the sale of malt and spiritous liquors as now provided by law"—*that* " is a very good bill." Yes, it undoubtedly is a very good bill for the liquor traffic. And "it will be a great gain, if this bill is passed." Yes, it will certainly be a great gain to the liquor business. For when everybody is forbidden, under penalty of from five to fifty dollars, to engage in any kind of honest labor, play, sport, pastime, or diversion, on Sunday while the bill makes this express provision for the liquor traffic, there can be no room for doubt that it will be an immense gain to the liquor business, if this bill is passed.

No, certainly, "This bill is not an ideal bill considered from a Christian point of view;" but it can be hardly anything less than an ideal bill from the whiskey point of view; from the point of view of idleness, carousal and deviltry.

And Dr. Whitman rejoices "that it has been possible to enlist Christian men and women of all beliefs in our city [of Washington] in defense of the bill." He and everybody else ought to be ashamed of it.

Yes, it is an important and a significant thing that "the names that are behind this bill are simply representative names." It is a pity and a disgrace that these representative names of professed Christians should represent so much favor to the liquor traffic and its baleful accompaniments, that they would deliberately frame a bill prohibiting honest labor while at the same time exempting and

sanctioning the sale of malt and spirituous liquors, on Sunday, if it is only "provided for by law."

"A Just Criticism" American Sentinel 12, 2, p. 23.

[23]

ATJ

THE Rev. D. M. Talmage, pastor of the Reformed Church of Westwood, N. J., recently drew upon himself severe denunciation from Christian Endeavor workers connected with his congregation, by a criticism of the Society pledge. He compared it with the Saviour's last commission to his disciples, with the ten commandments, and with the Lord's prayer, and said that the pledge was too weak.

The particular points of his criticism were, that the Christian Endeavor pledge puts striving in the place of doing, sets up the human conscience instead of God's holy law as the standard of duty, and rests upon human promises. "God's promises to us are important," he said, "not our promises to Him. God does not ask me to promise Him anything."

In this Mr. Talmage touches the vital weakness of the whole Christian Endeavor movement. His criticism is true. The pledge is weak—as weak as are all merely human promises. There are many places in which a human promise is proper and necessary; but as a means of righteousness it is weak indeed. It is true that God does not ask man to promise Him anything. He knows that man's promises are altogether too weak to serve His purposes. What God does ask is that men shall have implicit faith in His promises to them.

The Christian Endeavor hosts must face this truth, disagreeable though it be. Their whole movement is vitally, fatally weak—not weak as regards politics, or the changing of the structure of government or of society—but weak as regards the righteousness of God. Like some of the Jews of old, who went about "to establish their own righteousness," those embraced in this movement "have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." If they have done so before, they cease to do so when they adopt the Christian Endeavor methods, for such methods cannot work out that righteousness. The only Book which tells us anything about that righteousness declares plainly that it "is revealed through faith." It cannot be revealed by

any amount of electioneering, balloting, legislation, or other manner of political procedure.

FREEDOM OR BONDAGE—WHICH?

Faith is belief of God's word. The Scriptures cite us to the faith of Abraham. "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness." His belief was not a mere intellectual assent to the truth of God's word; it was an "Amen!" to that word. Abraham believed that God would perform what He had promised. God had promised that his seed should be as the sand of the seashore. As Abraham waited for the fulfillment of this promise, and continued childless, he finally engaged in what doubtless seemed to him a truly Christian endeavor to fulfill the promise. The result was Ishmael, the child born "after the flesh." But Isaac, not Ishmael, was the child contemplated in the purpose of God. Ishmael was the child of works; Isaac the child of faith. Through faith, and not through the works of man, the divine purposes are to be fulfilled.

Abraham did all that any man can do to carry out the purposes of God. But he accomplished absolutely nothing toward the realization of that which he so earnestly desired. His execution of God's promise did nothing at all to advance the cause of righteousness in the earth. His attempt was the most flat and dismal failure that could be imagined. It only placed an obstacle in the way which had to be set aside in the real fulfillment of the promise. "Cast out the bond woman and her son; for the son of the bond woman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman." Just so must it be with every attempt to fulfill God's purposes through the works and the wisdom of man.

It is the purpose of God that righteousness shall fill the earth. He has promised that it shall be so. His prophets have prophesied of the establishment of His kingdom, and the subduing of the forces of evil that dominate the earth to-day. But how will all this be done? Will man now work out the purposes of God, by the power and methods which he has learned to use? or will those purposes be wrought out now, as of old, through faith? Shall we account that God is able to do and will do what He has promised, or shall we set our own puny, fallible hands to fulfill His promises? These are

questions the Christian Endeavor forces would do well to consider before proceeding further in the work of gaining control of political power to "enthrone Christ on Capitol Hill."

The commission of Christ to his followers is, to go into all the earth and preach the gospel to every creature. These are the marching orders for all who would engage in true Christian work. Not to do this, is to proceed contrary to Christ's word; and this is to proceed without faith. The Christian Endeavor forces, in their schemes to take possession of civil governments and wield political power, are proceeding without faith, and therefore without divine power. The Word of God authorizes no such endeavors.

All such efforts can only work against the righteousness which is of faith, which is God's righteousness, and the righteousness that will be manifested in His kingdom.

"That 'Great Discovery'!" American Sentinel 12, 2, p. 24.

[24]

ATJ

THE one leading object of the "Christian Endeavor" work for 1897, is to make universal the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, and *instead* of the Sabbath. And this is to be accomplished by whatever means can be employed.

In performing its part in the business, the *Christian Endeavorer* begins its campaign for the year, by booming a fraud. The *Endeavorer* declares this fraud to be the greatest discovery since Columbus discovered this Continent—"As important in theology as the discovery of America was in geography."

This "great discovery," this fraud in fact, is that the Sabbath of the Lord, the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, was *not* the seventh day, but "occurred on fixed dates like one's birth-day or the fourth of July." And yet they call it the "*weekly* Sabbath"! Henceforth then all the people may expect Independence Day to occur, and may prepare to celebrate it, *weekly* on the fourth of July throughout the year; their birth-days likewise may be celebrated weekly throughout the year. That *is* a great discovery. And it is as plain as A B C that it is as great a fraud as it is a great discovery.

Yet the *Christian Endeavorer* actually booms this thing as so great a truth that among other great things to be accomplished by it

the *Endeavorer* "trusts" that "The Jews throughout the world ... will be led to observe Sunday."

This is a great thing of course, and so are some of the other things "trusted" for by the *Endeavorer;* but the greatest of all, the thing that brings most satisfaction to the soul of the *Endeavorer*, the thing that makes it fairly leap for joy, is the halorious fact that by this dismal fiction "The Seventh-day Adventists are left without any standing whatever;" and "The Seventh-day Adventists will simply have no reason for existence." How great indeed must be the Seventh-day Adventists in the view of the Christian Endeavorer, when a thing that is hoped to leave them "without any standing whatever," and without any reason for existence, deserves to be boomed as the greatest discovery of ages! If the Seventh-day Adventists are really so important an element as this, we hardly expect them to be put out of existence by this fraud, gigantic as it may be.

January 21, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 3, pp. 33-35.

[33]

ATJ

WE have set permanently at the head of our columns that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is published in the interests of religious liberty—Christian and Constitutional.

It is published in the interests of *Christian* religious religious [*sic*.] liberty first of all, over all, in all, and through all, because that in the realm of the spirit of man, Jesus Christ is the Author of religious liberty and of nothing else.

Jesus Christ created man. He created him with such a nature that his only happiness and his only good can be found in serving his Creator with all his heart, all his soul, all his might, all his mind, and all his strength. For such is “the first of all the commandments.”

Yet for all this, the Creator made man so perfectly free that it rests altogether in the man’s own choice as to whether he will serve his Lord at all. It was so in the beginning, in the garden; it is so yet, and for evermore; because men in his creation is an element in “the eternal purpose which is purposed in Christ.”

Therefore the word in which are revealed the counsels of the Creator in this eternal purpose, that word which liveth and abideth forever, rings out to all, through all the ages, “Choose ye this day, whom ye will serve.” “Whosoever will, let him come, and take of the water of life freely.” “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.”

His word is “the word of life.” It is the word of eternal life—the word of life of the eternal One. To whomsoever that word comes, in

this there comes to him eternal life. To reject that word is to reject eternal life. And to *reject* eternal life is to *choose* eternal death.

He who rejects eternal life, in that very thing judges himself worthy of eternal death. He who chooses eternal death, thus passes sentence of death upon himself. Therefore it was spoken to them of old, and is written to all, "It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and *judge yourselves* unworthy of everlasting life," etc. "See I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; ... therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."

Thus it is that the Lord can say truly, "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not." That is the truth: and when in that Great Day, the unbelieving meet eternal death, they receive only that which they have freely chosen. And though the Lord created man in the beginning for the highest of all possible destinies, and, when the man by wrong choice lost the way to it, gave Himself that the man might after all attain to it; yet He still leaves him absolutely free to accept or reject this destiny at his own choice.

CHRISTIANITY AND ANTICHRISTIANITY

This is Christianity. This is the divinely-ordained freedom of mankind in religious things. We ask then, Why will not all professed Christians recognize it and act accordingly? They cannot deny that it is the principle of the word of God: why do they not stand unswervingly upon it? They cannot deny that it is the word and the example of the Lord Jesus: why then do they not in strictest integrity "walk as He walked"?

It is perfectly plain that to swerve a hair's breadth from this principle is to forsake Christianity. For Christians to act in any point or in any degree contrary to this word of Christ, is to act the part of antichrist. This is as plain as that two and two make four.

And yet the professed Christians of almost all sorts are working in almost all ways, to get governmental power in their hands by which they propose to compel men to observe the Christian Sabbath; to compel men to submit to the will of the Church; to compel men by human laws to accept "the reign of Christ on Capitol Hill." Who does not know that this is so?

And because all such work is antichristian, this is first of all why [34] the AMERICAN SENTINEL is uncompromisingly opposed to it. It is first of all in the interests of true Christianity, or genuine allegiance to the word of God, that we oppose the Christian Endeavorers, the miscalled Christian Citizenship League, the National Reformers, and the whole Church combination of the country, in their efforts to control the civil power. In this matter their endeavor is antichristian. Its only influence is to misrepresent Christianity; its only result will be to envelope men more and more in antichristianity.

CONSTITUTIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IS CHRISTIAN [34]

The AMERICAN SENTINEL is published also in the interests of constitutional religious liberty. And this because constitutional religious liberty *is Christian*. The provision respecting religious liberty in all the Constitutions of this country, is the correct statement of the principle announced by Jesus Christ as to total separation of His religion from all governmental recognition.

Nor was it an accident that this is so. The original provision on this subject, which has been followed in all the Constitutions in this country, is distinctly declared to be so enacted *because of this principle* of Christianity. Here it is with the leading reasons for it, as written by Thomas Jefferson, in 1779:—

> "Well aware that ALMIGHTY GOD HATH CREATED THE MIND FREE: that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, *and are a departure from the plan of* THE HOLY AUTHOR OF OUR RELIGION, who being Lord of both body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in His almighty power to do; that 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 greatest part of the world, and through all time: that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, *is sinful* and tyrannical....
>
> "*Be it* THEREFORE *enacted by the General Assembly*, That no person shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief: but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall *in nowise* diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities."

We repeat: This is the original statement upon which the provisions respecting religious liberty, of all the constitutions of the country have been modeled. This original statement was so framed, in order NOT TO BE "a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion."

Let it be borne in mind too, that this original statement of the Christian principle as a constitutional provision was in an earnest campaign *against* an attempt of a religious combination to secure governmental recognition of "the Christian religion." Thus in the origin and establishment of the form of government that is distinctively American, an attempt to secure governmental recognition of "the Christian religion" was uncompromisingly opposed expressly in the interests of the Christian religion and in order not to depart from "the plan of the holy Author of our religion."

SOME UNDENIABLE TRUTHS

It is therefore undeniable that this provision in the Constitutions is the expression of the principle announced by Jesus Christ on this subject, and was intended by those who made it, to be in harmony with "the plan of the holy Author of our religion."

It is also undeniable that in upholding and defending this provision of the constitutions of the States and the Nation, we are maintaining the vital principle of Christianity for States and nations.

And it is further undeniable that all these churches, leagues, societies, and combinations, that are insisting on the governmental recognition of the "Christians" religion in legislation, jurisdiction, and otherwise, although they call themselves Christians, are violating vital Christian principle: are departing from "the way of the holy Author of our religion:" and are taking a course that is positively antichristian.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not *say* that the people of these churches, leagues, and societies, are knowingly and intentionally taking an antichristian course. We simply say, what is plain enough, that they are doing it—without any question or impeachment of their motives. We willingly do them the justice really to think that if they knew it, they would not do it.

The priests, the Scribes, and Pharisees, of Judea did not knowingly and intentionally take the antichristian course that they did in crucifying the Lord of glory. If they had known it, they would not have done it. Nevertheless *they did it*. And they could not have done it any more completely had they known it. Their ignorance as to what they were really doing, did not alter the nature of what they really did. It only lessened the measure of their guilt in the doing of it. And it was proper for the Christians in that day, to tell those church leaders and religious combinations that they had taken an antichristian course and had crucified the Lord of glory.

So it is now: It is an antichristian course that these professed Christian Endeavor Societies and Christian Citizenship Leagues and Christian churches are taking in their efforts to have the "Christian" religion recognized by the governments, State and national, in the jurisdiction and legislation.

It is antichristian, in that in so doing they override constitutional provisions that are expressive of the principle announced by Jesus Christ for governments, and that were established expressly to place and to keep these governments in harmony with "the plan of the holy Author of our religion." [35]

It is antichristian also, in that it is in violation of the vital principle of the government of the Creator and the essential happiness of the worshiping creature.

And it is perfectly proper for the Christians of to-day to point out to them and to all, that such a course is antichristian both doctrinally and constitutionally, even though it be unintentionally.

Therefore as the vital principle of the government of God and the happiness of worshiping creatures is the perfect liberty of the individual, exercised freely upon his own choice; in order to publish a paper in the interests of true religious liberty, it *must be* published in the interests of religious liberty—CHRISTIAN.

And as the provisions of the American constitutions separating religion and government, are expressive of the principle announced by Jesus Christ for governments, and are thus in harmony with "the plan of the holy Author of our religion," the AMERICAN SENTINEL in being published in the interests of religious liberty—Christian, is published also in the interests of religious liberty—CONSTITUTIONAL, because constitutional religious liberty is Christian.

"Christianity and the Common Law" American Sentinel 12, 3, pp. 35, 36.

[35]

ATJ

IN his recent decision denying a certificate of incorporation to a Jewish society because it was to hold some of its meetings on Sunday, Justice Pryor, of the Supreme Court of New York, affirms that "In the State of New York the Sabbath exists as a day of rest by the common law." His authority to make this statement is borrowed from the idea which has acquired a show of legal authority in this country, that Christianity is a part of the common law under the State government. That this idea is itself without any real authority, or the slightest foundation in truth, is evident when considered from the Christian standpoint.

What is Christianity? Can it be a part of a human code? Can it be anything of human manufacture? Can it be comprised in statutes, or in customs and observances which have acquired the force of

law? If Christianity be a part of the common law, these questions must be answered in the affirmative.

But no truthful affirmative can be given them. Christianity is not a form or set of forms; it is a power, and it is nothing less than the power of God. It is life; for according to the word of its divine Author, he who believes on Jesus Christ has been raised to life from a state of death in trespasses and sins. His life as a Christian is wholly different from his life as an unbeliever. The things which he once loved, he now hates, and what before he hated, he now loves. If his conversion has been genuine, this difference is plainly manifest. He has been "born again." He has received a new creation.

There is no power, no life in law. A statute has no power to execute itself, or to compel obedience from any. Obedience to any human law is secured either by the strength of right principles in the individual's heart, or by fear of the consequences of transgression. There is nothing in the statute which can affect the heart, or supply any power toward the performance of that which it requires.

It will be said, however, that by the statement that Christianity is part of the common law, it is meant only that Christian customs and observances are established in the common law, being recognized and supported by it, as in the case of the "Christian Sabbath." Customs and observances, however, even be they such as the Scriptures enjoins, can at most be but the letter of Christianity, which without the Spirit is a lifeless form. To enforce the letter of Christianity without the Spirit can benefit no one. On the contrary, it is the worst injury, spiritually, that could be inflicted. "The letter killeth: but the Spirit giveth life." 2 Corinthians 3:6. As there is no life in it without the Spirit, to enforce the letter is but to enforce spiritual death. And this is what it means to enforce Christianity as a part of the common law.

Nothing more utterly anti-Christian could be conceived. As no condition could be worse, spiritually, than that of the one who holds Christianity itself as a lifeless thing, and in whom the very light is darkness, so nothing more opposite to Christianity could be devised than the scheme of forcing an individual to accept the forms of Christianity, without the power.

The very worst state of things, spiritually, that is to exist in the world, is that foretold by the Apostle Paul in his letter to Timothy,

where he says that "in the last days" "men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers," etc., "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." The mere "form of godliness" goes hand in hand with all the sins that God's Word denounces. And this *form* of godliness can be enforced by law, but the *power* of godliness cannot be enforced. Hypocrisy can be enforced, but piety cannot be enforced. And where the power of godliness is lacking, there must be hypocrisy, and sin of every kind.

A form of godliness without the power of godliness is not Christianity. But when the State forces the forms of godliness upon its citizens, it enforces them as Christianity, and those who receive
[36] them through the agency of the State receive them as Christianity. They might not accept them as such upon the word of the secular authorities, but they are not prepared to dispute the assertions of the preachers who are behind the civil authorities in all such work. And thus Christianity itself is made death to them, and erelong they loathe it as they would a corpse. And if they are rigidly bound to it by the law, all the manhood that is in them will resolve to be freed from it at any cost. No man will tamely submit to be bound to a thing that is dead.

Such are some of the indisputable facts that pertain to the blasphemous doctrine that Christianity is part of the common law.

"The Problem of a Weekly Rest" American Sentinel 12, 3, pp. 43, 44.

[43]

ATJ

THE religious and labor federations, the statesmen and theologians, who are laboring over the problem of securing a weekly rest for the toiling masses, are making much ado about nothing. There is no problem involved in the matter at all.

There is not a man on the face of the earth but is now, and has been all his life, supplied with a weekly day of rest. It is given him by none other than the Creator, and by the latter enjoined upon his observance. The only problem that can be connected with it is the problem of doing what the Lord commands.

It is true that some people—very many in fact—make a great problem of obedience to God. But this is because they do not want to obey Him, and do not obey Him in fact. Obedience itself is a very simple thing. Obedience to God, in just the way that God points out, is one of the simplest things in the world. But when men try to obey God in their own way, at once a problem arises; and so great is that problem that it is altogether beyond solution by any wisdom or power on earth. God cannot be obeyed by any man in man's way.

THE LORD'S REST

What God says concerning a weekly rest is that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work." God is the author of the Sabbath; and by resting on the seventh day after six days of work and setting apart that day as a day of rest, He made the week. The Sabbath and the week stand in inseparable relation to each other. The very process of making the one, established the other.

The seventh day Sabbath is the seventh day of the week. God fixed it there at creation, and no human power can move it from its place. God commanded—and still commands—every person to keep it holy; and all that any one has to do in the matter is to do as the Lord directs.

But, it is said by many, "I cannot keep the weekly rest day, on my own responsibility, without a great sacrifice." Possibly that is so. Possibly you would lose your job, and be brought into financial straits. But what of that? If you are willing to make a sacrifice to obey God, you can obey Him. You can take the rest day that He gives you, and get all the good from it that can be realized by any person in the world. If you are a Christian, you will not deny that it does not hurt any individual to lose his job or be brought into a strait place on account of obedience to God. From a Christian point of view, a strait place is not half as bad as a broad place where everything goes smoothly. And if you are not a Christian, you can derive no benefit from the Sabbath, anyway. The Sabbath benefits only those who obey God.

It is said that man needs one rest day in each week; and that is true. If man did not need the Sabbath, the Creator would not have

made it. Unremitting toil is not good for the race. No one claims that it is. But the Lord, who made man, knew what kind of a rest man would need, and made the Sabbath to supply that need. The one who takes the Sabbath and keeps it as God has commanded, gets the rest, and the one who does not obey God in this respect, does not get it.

Seven days' work in the week, it is loudly asserted, is contrary to God's order. True: and disobedience to one of God's commands is also contrary to God's order. And the one is no more contrary, and no more hurtful, than the other.

GOD'S LAW IS ENOUGH

Laws may be passed to enforce the observance of Sunday; the trades unions may adopt regulations to secure the workingmen a weekly day of rest; but all such work amounts to nothing, so far as securing benefit to men is concerned. It is wholly unnecessary. Why?—Because God himself has legislated on that very point, and his legislation covers the whole ground. No human legislation covers the whole ground. No human legislation can add anything to the command of God; and any legislation that is not in harmony with God's command, would much better never have been enacted.

No matter what may be the needs of the human race; no matter how eloquently or convincingly the modern "reform" orator may be able to discourse on the evils of unremitting toil, the fact remains that the Creator has taken out of the hands of man all legislation touching a weekly rest, by legislating on the subject himself for every individual on the earth; and that legislation remains in full force to-day. If individuals do not heed it,—if they work seven days in the week themselves, or try to force their employees to work, the only remedy still lies in obedience to God's command. Man cannot legislate on the subject of a *weekly* rest without invading the prerogatives of God.

All men are bound by God's Sabbath law; and when man pre-
[44] sumes to make a different law covering the same point, or to re-enact God's law, he is guilty of nothing less than blasphemy.

These considerations make it clear why human Sabbath laws never benefited the human race in the past, and why no possible benefit can be derived from them to-day.

January 28, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 4, pp. 49, 50.

[49]

ATJ

A MAN may believe in, and advocate, Constitutional religious liberty, without being confessedly a Christian; and without desiring to be a Christian. But he cannot do so without recognizing and indorsing, and indeed advocating, a Christian principle.

This, because the very principle of Constitutional religious liberty, the principle of separation of religion and the State, the principle of excluding religion from governmental recognition and jurisdiction, is essentially and only a Christian principle.

Though it be possible now for a man to believe in and advocate the truth that religion should be totally separated from government, without being confessedly a Christian, there was a time when such a thing was impossible.

It was Christianity that first announced in the world the idea of separation of religion and the State. This too, at a time when it was death to do so. “The Empire of the Romans filled the world.” By law, under penalty of death, that Empire forbade the exercise of any religion that was not recognized by the Roman State. Yet in the very heart of the Empire, in the most prominent cities—Antioch, Ephesus, Athens, Corinth, Rome itself—without State recognition, without asking any such thing, indeed declaring that the State had nothing to do with the subject, Christianity was exercised in all the privileges that it gave.

At that time, for any one to advocate the truth that religion should be separated from governmental jurisdiction, was in itself to confess Christianity. None but Christians would think of doing it. So essen-

tially Christian was the idea, that had an emperor himself adopted it he would have been looked on as having espoused Christianity.

It took two hundred and fifty years of suffering, and sacrifice of everything, to bring the Roman world to the acknowledgment of the principle. It was finally done though. And then when an ambitious clergy took the antichristian step of securing the imperial, governmental recognition of the "Christian" religion—then it was, and not till then, that pagans and enemies of Christianity advocated the principle. Yet it was still the Christian principle it was before, even though it was adopted and maintained by the enemies of Christianity, as well as by genuine Christians, against the outrages of a professedly Christian, though really antichristian, power.

And so the principle yet, and ever, remains a Christian principle only. It matters not who may advocate it, it is still the same Christian principle it was when Christianity first announced it in the world.

If professed Christians had never taken an antichristian course, it is plain that none but the friends of Christianity could ever have accepted and advocated the principle. It is therefore perfectly plain that the apostate antichristian "Christians" are responsible for the enemies of Christianity using the principles of Christianity in opposition to Christianity.

Bear in mind that we do not object to the enemies of Christianity advocating the principle. We have only called attention to the truth, that had there never been any antichristian "Christians," there had likewise never been any enemies of Christianity using Christian principles in opposition to what they suppose is Christianity. What we say is, Let Christian principles be espoused and advocated by whomsoever will do it. It is better that it be done by professed enemies of Christianity than not to be done at all by the professed friends of Christianity. When the principle is so outraged in the house of its professed friends, it is well that it should be so befriended in the house of its professed enemies.

It can never be denied that in the Roman world there was never any thought of any such thing as separation of religion and the
[50] State. It cannot be denied that Christianity was introduced into the Roman world in the first century and that it was there in the first and second centuries as really as it ever was at any other time. Pliny,

Tacitus, Suetonius, Tragan, Hadrian, and Marcus Aurelius, all give unexceptionable testimony that it was there then.

And just as certainly as Christianity was there then, so certainly did it proclaim the divine right of men to worship according to the dictates of their own consciences; and that the State has of right nothing whatever to do with religion. Thus this Christian principle was announced and maintained there then. It has been maintained in the world ever since, and it will always be maintained in the world.

It will always be a Christian principle and nothing else, it matters not who may advocate it. And it is only antichristianity that will ever under any pretext impugn it or deny it.

"Study the Constitution" American Sentinel 12, 4, pp. 50, 51.

[50]

ATJ

IN pointing out the dangers that threaten the people of the United States, a writer of clear discernment speaks of the time when "our country shall repudiate every principle of its Constitution as a Protestant and Republican Government."

The AMERICAN SENTINEL has shown quite fully the repudiation of every Protestant principle that has been accomplished for the country. We have also called attention to some things that have been against republican principle. And now we are compelled to notice an immense stride that has been made toward the *repudiation* of republican principle. This is the statement lately made by the Secretary of State, expressing the view of the President of the United States, that the President would not be bound by the action of Congress if that body were to pass a joint resolution, and he veto it, and then Congress pass it over his veto. This is a clear repudiation of the principle of republican government.

It is true this was said with direct reference to a joint resolution recognizing the independence of Cuba. But that matters nothing. If he can so act upon this point in one matter he can do so in all. The Constitution makes but one exception. Here are the words:—

> "Every order, resolution or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and the House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment)

> shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or, being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill."

And the statement of the Constitution in the case of a bill, is that when repassed by the requisite two-thirds majority over the President's veto, "*it shall become a law*." Secretary Olney's statement then is formal notice to Congress and the country that President Cleveland does consider himself under any obligation to administer "law" that does not please him.

We know that there is much discussion and difference of opinion as to the "meaning" of the Constitution, this question that has thus been raised. But we are asking any of the parties to this discussion, what Constitution means. We know what it *says*. And know that those who made it intended it to mean as it says. We know also that the men who framed the Constitution were just as able to say what they meant as any now are to show what they meant by interpreting their language differently from what it says. Although the Supreme Court were to interpret it different from what is *says*, such interpretation should be separated by the people. For what Abraham Lincoln said is the truth. "The people of these United States are the rightful masters of both Congresses and Courts; nor overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow those who pervert the Constitution." And there is not way to pervert the Constitution but by "interpreting" it differently from what it says.

Of this statement by the Secretary of State *The Houston* (Texas) *Post*, of January 7, well says:—

> "When we come right down to the significance of the declaration by Secretary Olney, it is one of the most revolutionary ever emanating from the executive branch of the Government, short of the assertion of the right to secession which some of Mr. Buchanan's secretaries ... and carried into open warfare....

> "*We have almost a constitutional monarch in our Presidency. Few constitutional rulers possess such real power. The assertion of one or two prerogatives more and we would become dangerously near a dictatorship.*
>
> "Many people will declare that such fears are idle and baseless, but history is full of executive encroachments upon legislative power. With the Republican centralized Government idea uppermost in our politics, the old Hiltonian theory of a strong central government, was reduced to its legitimate conclusions, means a strong executive, will have been greatly fortified if the Presidency or a cabinet officer is permitted to successfully assert the right to disregard an act of Congress, passed by the constitutional two-thirds majority over the Presidential veto."

If Republican Government is to be maintained in this country, the people of these United States need to study the Constitution of the United States, and think carefully on what it *says*.

"The Monarchical Spirit in America" American Sentinel 12, 4, p. 51.

[51]

ATJ

IT is interesting to note the monarchical tendencies among the would-be "higher classes" in the United States.

The manifestations of this monarchical spirit and ambition are not by any means few. It is most marked, of course, among the idle rich; but it is by no means confined to that circle.

The ambition of American girls and women, to give themselves and vast fortunes for European titles and misery, is so notorious as to call for nothing more than mere mention in this connection.

Besides these there are thousands who, having no chance to secure titles, spend fortunes to secure the recognition of the titled ones of Europe. People will spend years and thousands of dollars to gain *entré* to "the Prince of Wales's set," or to a "drawing room" of the Queen of England; this "dignity" to be used in America in holding themselves as far as possible above other people.

And thousands of the people who stay at home, or who, if they go abroad, have not the fortune to attain to such "dignity," are themselves so imbued with the same spirit that they look upon those who have attained to it, as being thereby so far superior to what they ever were before as to be entitled to some sort of worshipful reverence, and they proceed to pay it like any other toadies....

"Bishop Satterlee on Sunday Laws" American Sentinel 12, 4, pp. 51, 52.

[51]

ATJ

A "MAMSS MEETING" in the interests of "national reform" was held in the Metropolitan Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., January 17. Dr. Lyman, president of the "Reform Bureau" at Washington, presided.

The principal speaker was Bishop Satterlee, of the Episcopal Church, who addressed the meeting on the subject of "Sunday laws." Some introductory remarks were made by the chairman, in which he said: "What we desire for the capital of this nation, a Christian nation, is that it shall be a Christian city." This was to say that at present Washington is not a Christian city, and this opinion found ample support in the speeches following. How it is that the nation can be Christian, with its capital and seat of government unchristian, he did not explain.

Bishop Satterlee began by saying that he was a Christian, and
[52] believed that "no man can call himself a Christian unless he is in all times and places a true witness for the Lord Jesus Christ."

Judged by this rule, what must be thought of the propriety of calling the United States a Christian nation? Is it "a true witness for the Lord Jesus Christ" "in all times and places"? No sane person would affirm such a thing. Yet Bishop Satterlee is fully assured that this nation is indeed Christian. Have the advocates of "national Christianity" two standards of Christianity, one for the individual, and another for the nation? It would seem that they have. Nevertheless there is but one true standard, and by that standard no such thing as national or governmental Christianity can be possible. Christianity will fit the individual, and nothing else.

It must be said that Bishop Satterlee's speech did not speak well for his own knowledge of Christianity. As proof that this is a Christian country, he affirmed that it "is a country of universal suffrage," and said that by this the nation manifests its confidence in humanity, and imitates the example of Jesus Christ, for "He trusted human nature"! What an assertion! If there was one thing Jesus Christ did not do, it was to trust human nature; and if there is one thing the follower of Christ must not do, it is this same thing. Human nature is fallen nature, and fallen nature is sinful nature so sinful that it can descend to the lowest depths of wickedness. The whole mission of Jesus Christ to this earth was to replace human nature by the divine nature, in which alone any being can safely trust.

To such lengths of error are men of intelligence and high church standing led in the search for some justification for Sunday laws.

"The highest law court in the land," the bishop continued, "has decided that this is a Christian country. And the highest law in dictionary that I know anything about says that Christianity is the common law in America in every State but Louisiana." This being so, we may fairly expect, if Christianity amounts to anything, to find a wonderful difference between Louisiana and other States with respect to the moral condition of society; since in these States all persons would be Christians except such as are lawless. It does not appear, however, by comparison with her sister States, that Louisiana suffers in the least from the failure of the common law in her domain to include Christianity. Nor does it appear that the people of those States which claim Christianity as part of their common law, however faultlessly they may observe the latter, are raised thereby one degree in spirituality above the plane of ordinary human nature.

Coming to the subject of the pending Sunday law for the District of Columbia, the bishop said:—

> "Now I wish this law first of all, ladies and gentlemen, because first of all there is a great advantage in this Sunday law that it is proposed to enact, it seems to me, simply because there is not a single word—Christian, religious word—in the law itself. We believe in the eternal separation of Church and State in this country. It must carefully guard that, and we must not force

> our opinions upon others who have different opinions, and yet who are under the dominion of the same law. I have heard this Sunday law described within the last week of a very prominent legislator as the most moderate on the subject of Sunday he had ever seen in his life. Therefore it offends no prejudices; therefore all men can unite as far as that is concerned, and become at one with it. There is no place where one can insert an entering-wedge. There is not a single knife edge where this objection can be made. Throughout the law, from beginning to end, it speaks only of Sunday and the Sunday rest."

It certainly would not be clear why a bishop in the church, rejoicing in the belief that this nation is Christian in character, and addressing an audience gathered for the express purpose of making the capital of the nation Christian by means of a Sunday law, should consider it a "great advantage" in that law that it contains not a Christian or religious word—were it not for his explanation that "we must not force our opinions upon others who have different opinions, and yet who are under the dominion of the same law." In this country, "We believe in the eternal separation of Church and State. Therefore, "we" must say "Sunday" in our Sunday bill, instead of "Christian sabbath." That makes a big difference in the character of the bill!

In other words, if "we" should force people to rest on the "Christian sabbath," that would be forcing our opinions upon others of different belief. Hence we must enforce them to rest on Sunday!

The bishop would prevent any union of Church and State, and any forcing of one person's opinions upon another, by *disguising* the means that would be used in their accomplishment! But a thing is disguised only that it may the more surely accomplish the purpose for which it is used. And that is the case with this Sunday law. It is a religious law, disguised as completely as possible in order that it may, if possible, deceive Congress and commit that body to Sunday legislation. That is the "great advantage" which the bill contains.

If any further proof of this were needed, it is furnished by Bishop Satterlee's own words, uttered in the same connection; for it is with this evil scheme of Church and State as it is with murder; it "will

out." And so having called attention to the bill as one not at all religious and that could not offend the prejudices of anyone, the bishop in the very next breath stripped the disguise completely off, by saying:—

> "We are following the sample of the first law, following after the line of the first law—Sunday law, which Dr. Elliott, who is present here this afternoon, told me to-day was ever enacted in the world—that is the law of Constantine. When the Roman Empire became Christianized many of its people were still heathen; and therefore instead of saying upon the Lord's day, or upon the Sabbath day, in that law of his, it was enacted that upon the great day of the Sun no work shall be done."

This is as true a statement of the purpose of the movement for [53]
Sunday legislation by Congress, and as strong a condemnation of it, as was ever uttered. Nothing worse would be said of it than that it is a repetition of the movement inaugurated by Constantine in the fourth century. That first "sample" Sunday law, which was a very mild one, was speedily followed by others more rigid, until the "venerable day of the sun" was forced upon the observance of all classes by a law as complete and undisguisedly religious as the most ardent sun worshiper could desire. Out of that movement of Constantine's, begun by his Sunday edict, grew the union of Church and State, the Papacy, the Inquisition, and the persecution and death of millions of Christian martyrs. How much worse could anything be than a movement which starts out in the United States Government upon this same line?

Therefore, upon the representation made by the friends and advocates of this proposed law, as well as from what appears in the law itself, we are totally and unalterably opposed to its enactment. Nor can we see how any lover of liberty who is familiar with the history of Constantine and of the ear which he inaugurated in Church and State, can fail to be as fully opposed to it as ourselves. That the religious character of this bill if disguised, only makes it the worse, and the more worthy of opposition.

"Christianity and Common Law" American Sentinel 12, 4, pp. 52, 53.

[52]

ATJ

AFTER reading Jefferson's exposure of the fraud by which "Christianity" was made a part of the common law, which we reprinted last week, the reader may query, how, in the face of such an exposure, it could still be maintained by American judges that Christianity is a part of the common law.

As stated last week, Jefferson's expose—written in 1824, published in 1829—was a complete answer to the New York and Pennsylvania cases. It destroyed the basis upon which those cases was made to rest. Before a religious despotism could be further perpetuated in this country by the fraud that "Christianity is part of the common law," this argument of Jefferson's had to be overridden. This was done by Chief Justice Clayton, of Delaware, in 1837.

In sustaining a conviction for "blasphemy," Chief Justice Clayton proffered an answer to Jefferson's argument. Logically this proffered answer is a confirmation of Jefferson's argument rather than an answer to it; but as it was officially given as an answer, it has been allowed the weight of an answer by those who wanted an established religion, though in fact no such weight justly belongs to it.

Justice Clayton speaks of Jefferson as "this letter-writer": and says that the "letter is phrased in terms more becoming to the newspaper paragraphs [paragraph*ers?*] of the day than the opinion of a grave jurist who feels respect for the memory of the eminent lawyers of England, because he knows and can appreciate their worth." It is thus plain at the start that Justice Clayton had more regard for *authority* than he had for sound argument; and this character he sustains even at the expense of logically confirming Jefferson's argument while he authoritatively overrides it.

Jefferson had said that "Sir Matthew Hale lays it down in these words: 'Christianity is parcel of the laws of England.' *But he quotes no authority*." And that "Lord Mansfield qualified a little by saying ... that 'The essential principles of revealed religion are part of the common law.' *But he cites no authority* and leaves us at our peril to find out what in the opinion of the judge, and according to the

measure of his foot or his faith, are those *essential* principles of revealed religion obligatory upon us as a part of common law."

To this Justice Clayton says that "they had *no occasion to cite any authority*"; and that "Sir Matthew Hale was *an authority of himself*, and is considered as a sufficient authority for a common law principle in every case when there is no contrary authority. What sources of legal knowledge his great erudition may have consulted on this subject, we have no means of certainly knowing *nor is it necessary to inquire*."

This is the sum and the substance of his "answer" to Jefferson's argument. And thus in spite of logic, in spite of sound argument, in spite of the plainly written Constitution which he had taken an oath to uphold, and solely on the dictum of an English judge, he carries over and establishes in Delaware the English and papal principle of established religion.

After all this it is interesting to see what argument he made on his own part, to land himself comfortably in his arbitrary position. He made a distinction "between a religion preferred by law, and a religion preferred by the people without the coercion of law;" and says that "every court in a civilized country is bound to notice what is the prevailing religion of the people" and by common law to protect it "to the full length of punishing any man who outraged the feelings of the people, by wantonly and maliciously reviling or ridiculing the religion which they had freely preferred."

He then says that if the people should change from the Christian religion and prefer Mahommedanism, then the courts would change their ruling also and punish as blasphemy the reviling or ridiculing of Mahommedanism, while taking no notice of such conduct toward Christianity. Then if the people should drop Mahommedanism and prefer the religion of Judaism or "Joe Smith," the courts would punish as blasphemy the "malicious reviling of Moses" or of Mr. Smith. And all this change and counter-change because "no human power can restrain them from compelling every man, who lives among them, to respect their feelings."

It is perfectly plain, therefore, that Chief Justice Clayton would not have been as just as Pilate was; but would have sent the Lord Jesus to the cross upon the high priest's charge of blasphemy. If any would be inclined to doubt this, then let him read the following:— [54]

> "No man could justify himself under the *present* civil institutions of the State in endangering the public peace [by speaking against the prevailing religion]. He might feel himself impelled by a stern sense of religious duty to brave public opinion and become a martyr for his zeal. All this he might do and justify himself in his own opinion for it before God.... He who forcibly resists a bad religion is thus far like him who resists a bad government: if successful in his resistance he may become a reformer of men or a hero; if unsuccessful, a martyr or a traitor."

And by this doctrine it would be a settled thing that the courts would be fully enlisted in the "laudable" work of making martyrs and traitors of all such men. A blasphemer, a traitor, and a martyr, are precisely what were made of the Lord Jesus; and it was done by this identical doctrine.

Such is the doctrine, and such the authority for the doctrine, that is couched in the phrase "Christianity is part of the common law." And such is the means by which that doctrine has been perpetuated in the States of the American Union. For in spite of the splendid efforts of Jefferson and his fellow-workers for religious freedom, and in spite of the constitutional provisions in all the States, Chief Justice Clayton's decision has ever since been accepted as the standard on that subject.

How appropriate it is that such an enormous fraud should be supported by such a horrible doctrine. Yet what a pity and how astonishing it is that either the fraud or the doctrine should ever have found any countenance by men who ever made any pretentions to enlightenment or justice, or who ever heard of Christianity!

"Pure Anarchy" American Sentinel 12, 4, p. 59.

[59]

ATJ

"EXCEPT the State be born again, it cannot see the kingdom of God." This statement is conspicuously inscribed upon the official organ of the "Christian Citizenship League," and is credited to a "professor" of "applied Christianity" in a western college. It

is the doctrine that Christianity can be applied to the State—that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of the State as well as of the individual. There is but one way of salvation, and that is by being "born again," as the Saviour explained to Nicodemus. Supposing then that the State could be "born again," what would result? It would have to manifest the spirit of Christ, which would necessitate that it forgive its enemies; and forgive them not once merely, nor "until seven times," but "until seventy times seven." Matthew 18:21, 22. So as often as the trespasser against the State might say, when brought into court, "I repent," the State would be obliged to forgive him, and discharge the debt! Could any arrangement better suit the desires of the criminal classes? or more quickly and thoroughly destroy the whole structure of civil government? Could any doctrine be more thoroughly anarchistic? These questions answer themselves.

And yet it is actually a fact that this doctrine is, in this very land of enlightened government, now held and advocated by nearly all the leading religious societies! And those who would warn the people against it are denounced as anarchists!

"'Desecration' of Christmas" American Sentinel 12, 4, p. 62.

[62]

ATJ

A WRITER in the *Catholic Mirror*, of January 2, 1897, says: "The saddest thing connected with the Christmas season is the terrible and widespread profanation of the holy day." If Protestant ministers have a right to protest against the profanation of Thanksgiving Day, Roman Catholics certainly have a right to protest against the profanation of Christmas, which is a "holy day" in the calendar of their church. It is certain, too, that Christmas Day and Thanksgiving Day stand upon exactly equal footing in respect to their alleged sanctity.

That the "profanation" of Christmas Day and other legal holidays is very bad, is true enough; not, however, because any such day is in any sense holy, but because they are given over by the masses to reveling and drunkenness. As the writer above quoted says: "In every section of our country the papers record melancholy and appalling evidence of drunkenness, debauchery, murder, and crimes of all

kinds. A great many people think that Christmas is the period for reviving the Roman Saturnalia, or else they so conduct themselves."

And what is there strange about this? The Roman Saturnalia just suited the carnal mind back in the days of the Cesars, and why should it not just suit the same mind now? There is as much of that mind in the world to-day as there ever was, and as much of it can be found in professedly Christian communities, as anywhere else.

The trouble is that these legal "holy days" furnish the carnal mind with just the opportunity that it seeks. Let an individual have plenty of good, honest labor to perform, and the carnal propensities will remain comparatively dormant. But shut off this salutary employment of mind and hand, by legal provisions designed to "protect" some "holy" day or holiday, and the carnal mind will at once assert itself wherever it has not been dispossessed by the Spirit of God, and the old saying which connects the devil with "idle hands" will be qualified. The *man* is exposed to all evil in order to "protect" the *day!* Better would it be to protect the man than all the days in the calendar.

The more "holy" days and holidays increase, and the more their observance is made compulsory upon the people, the more drunkenness, debauchery, murder, and general lawlessness there will be. And the more honest employment can be provided for the multitudes whose hands are idle, and the more the people are made free to engage in honest work when they want to work, the fewer occasions there will be calling to mind the Roman Saturnalia. The truth of this is so evident that it can be be [*sic*.] seen by any one who does not feel bound to uphold Sunday laws at whatever cost.

February 4, 1897

"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 5, pp. 65, 66.

[65]

ATJ

DID the Lord Jesus make a mistake in regard to the way in which true reform should be conducted and accomplished in the world?

It is certain that all people look upon the mission and work of Christ in the world as having been at least *intended to be* reformatory.

Was His mission and work then truly reformatory or not? Did He proceed upon correct principles? did He employ right methods to accomplish real reform? or were His principles and methods altogether wrong?

These are not captious questions. They are not asked lightly. We are asking the questions seriously; and we ask that they be considered seriously. These are questions that need to be carefully and seriously considered, especially by all who profess to believe in Christ—by all who profess to have any respect for Him as a Reformer.

We are asking these questions just now, for the especial benefit of the Christian Endeavor Societies, the Christian Citizenship Leagues, the Christian Temperance Unions, and the combined Christian churches of the whole country. And this with especial reference to the principles which they have adopted and the methods which they employ. The principles entertained and the methods employed by these people as would-be reformers, are not at all those of Christ when He was on earth.

The conditions existing when Jesus Christ was on earth were just such conditions as are now upon the earth—only somewhat worse. The evils which then prevailed—private and public, individual and governmental—were precisely such as are now prevalent in

the United States. There was corruption in government everywhere, whether municipal or national. Yet He did not, nor did He direct His disciples to, enter into an agitation for either municipal or national reform. He did not engage Himself, nor did He direct His disciples to engage, in the formation of any societies, leagues, unions, or federations, "to enthrone Christ in every town and city in the" Empire, nor to cause Him "to reign supreme on the Capitoline Hill."

When a multitude of people were unanimous in the opinion that He should be King of His own city and His own country, which by the way were at the time governed by outrageously immoral men, He would not for a moment countenance their movement, but left the whole company and went away to the mountain alone.

When at another time the personage whose "seat" was at the Capital of the Empire, who really reigned on the Capitoline Hill, and who at the same time reigned in fearful unrighteousness, voluntarily offered to bestow upon Christ the power over all the kingdoms, and indeed over his whole Empire, according to much the same arrangement as these now propose to have Him reign on Capitol Hill, He unhesitatingly refused the offer.

There was tyranny of capital: and when one who was thus oppressed came to Jesus asking Him to direct an equable division of the capital, He refused to interfere, saying: "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you? Take heed and beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth."

The social evil was sadly prevalent. Some Pharisees employing Pharisaic—now the Parkhurstian—method to suppress it, captured and brought to him a guilty one, "taken in the very act," and demanded what He had to say as to stoning her to death. He answered, "He that is without sin among you, let him cast the first stone at her." "Being convicted by their own conscience, they went out one by one" till all were gone and the criminal was left alone with Jesus. Then Jesus said to her, "Woman, hath no man condemned thee? She said, 'No man, Lord.' And Jesus said unto her, '*Neither* do I
[66] condemn thee; go, and sin no more.'"

Now in none of this did Jesus for a moment convey the impression to the guilty one, nor to her accusers, nor to anybody else, that He either justified or excused what she had done. What she had done

was wrong. It was a serious criminal offense. None knew this to its depths better than He. And knowing this, at the same time He showed to the Pharisaical accusers then and now and for all time, that *their way* of dealing with such people is not the Christian way.

Again, when his disciples decided that *because* they were his disciples, they were just so much better qualified than all others to hold the officers and exercise authority in the kingdom which they desired to have Him establish then upon the earth, He said to them: "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles, exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. BUT SO SHALL IT NOT BE AMONG YOU: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister; and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. *Even as* the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, *and to give His life* a ransom for many." "I am among you as He that serveth."

So it was in all the life of Christ on earth. At a time when there were greater evils in government and in society than had ever been survived, he never did himself, not ever hinted that his disciples should, attempt to reform government or society, by any kind of political working, nor by any kind of governmental means. He ever in word and act kept himself far aloof from any suggestion of anything of the kind: and so did his disciples in the infancy and purity of the gospel as He left it upon the earth to be preached by them.

Yet on the other hand he freely employed and poured out to employ his disciples, "All power in heaven and in earth" to the *individual* to cleanse the heart from all sin and purify the life from all evil, in "every one that believeth," from the leper in the fields to the king in his royal robes, from the slave in his stable and the prisoner in the dungeon to the emperor at the pinnacle of human greatness.

This was Christ and His Christianity then; and this alone is Christ and His Christianity forevermore. Such were the principles maintained, the methods and the power employed, by the Lord Jesus when he the true Christian and the true Reformer was at work on earth for the world; and such alone are the principles that can be

maintained, the methods and the power employed, by true Christians and true reformers unto the world's end.

Now if the Christian Endeavor Societies, the Christian Citizenship Leagues, the Christian Temperance Unions, and all kindred "Christian" organizations who have set themselves by political methods and governmental power so to reform the world that "Christ shall be enthroned in every town and city and State," and "shall reign supreme on Capitol Hill"—if, we say, all these professed Christian bodies really believe that the principles and methods of Christ were the correct ones to effect the reform, why do not they adopt these and hold strictly to them?

If on the other hand they think that His principles and methods are now antiquated, that they are not adapted to present conditions, how then can they believe in Him as a living present Person in all affairs, any more than any other reformer of antiquity?

There are very few people who will not allow that Christ was a reformer *for His day*, and that His way was adapted to the conditions then existing, just as to allow so far the claims of other men who have sought to benefit their people. They will allow, too, that He ... His work just as that of others may be looked upon as a good example; but that he is a present living Person and power for all time, and without whom all effort at true reform must fail, they will not allow.... a belief about Jesus, however, is far from being Christianity.

To believe that Jesus Christ is *the* Reformer for our time; that the principles held, the methods and power employed by Him, are adapted to all conditions of the human race; and that in the application of the identical principles, and the employment of these methods and this power, He is an ever-present living Person—this is to believe in Him as the true Reformer. Such belief in Jesus is Christianity.

"Christianity and Civilization" American Sentinel 12, 5, pp. 66, 67.

[66]

ATJ

THE Christian Endeavorers, the Christian Citizens League, the National Reformers—the combined churches generally—distinctly announce it to be their great purpose to "regenerate the city," to

"redeem the States" to "save the nation." This in order to preserve to the world the benefits of the highest state of civilization, which in turn shall redound to the glory of the Church.

To accomplish these great things they declare that the Church must direct the primaries, control the candidates and have general supervision of all the interests of State and nation; because Christians are best of all qualified to know what is for the true interests of the State, of the nation, and of civilization. Therefore they count the primary as important to the Christian as is the prayer meeting; to go to the polls as much an act of worship as to go to the Lord's supper; the ballot as much a symbol of Christian standing as baptism.

They argue that the Church is certainly in the world for good; she is to influence people, States and nations for good. But if she is to keep herself separate from the State, and her work apart from the work and workings of the State, then how shall she fulfill her mission for good in the world? Then at the rate at which corruption is pervading the government of cities, States, and the nation, what will become of our civilization? And then what shall become of the [67] Church?—what indeed will become of Christianity?

The answer to all this is that keeping herself totally separate from the State, and her work entirely separate from the work and workings of the State and the world, is *the only way* in which the Church can ever influence the State for good. It is only by being not of the world even as *He* is not of the world, that Christians can ever influence the world for good.

The Church, the Christian, though *in* the world, is to be not of the world. The Lord says, "I have chosen you out of the world." "Ye are not of the world *even as I* am not of the world." As certainly as the Church is in the world, she will influence the world and all that is in it. But the vital question is, shall she influence it for good, or for evil? She will exert a powerful influence one way or the other: which shall it be?

The Church will influence the world, the kingdoms, nations, and peoples thereof, *when* and *only* when she is faithfully the Church of Christ, walking only as He walked, and when she is not of the world even as He is not of the world. When it is not so with her, she will influence them, that is true; but it will be only to their undoing.

The truth is, that the Church has nothing to do with civilization as such. Christians have no commission to civilize the world, nor to preserve civilization in the world. Christianity does not aim to civilize anybody. Christianity aims alone at *Christianizing* men.

If civilization were the object and aim of Christianity, then there was no place for Christianity in the place, and at the time, when it was started in the world in the days of Christ on earth.

Were not the Jews civilized? Then what had Christianity to do for the Jews, if civilization is its object?

But if it be said that the Jews were not up to the proper standard of civilization, then let us turn to the Greeks and Romans. What of them at that time?—They had such a standing in architecture, art, literature, law, and the science of government—all that pertains to civilization—that the very goal of the most advanced nations of to-day is to copy successfully the achievements of those peoples. Therefore we say that if civilization were the object of Christianity there was no place for it at that time within a thousand miles of where it was started in the world.

But what were those people morally, who were so highly civilized? They were heathen. They were civilized heathen. Their "art" was idolatry. Their wisdom was foolishness. Their philosophy was a lie. Their morals were immorality. Amidst all the splendor of their outward civilization, at heart they were savages.

And to those civilized heathen, those civilized savages, in fact, the gospel of Jesus Christ is sent, because they needed it just as much as did the savage heathen—the uncivilized savages. But the gospel was not sent to them to civilize them. It was sent *to save* them. And those who were saved, those who were changed in heart, were civilized. However savage they may have been before.

Thus as a matter of fact, the gospel will have much to do in civilizing people, *provided* that no effort shall be made *by means of the gospel* to civilize people. That is to say: If the gospel, which is sent to the world solely to Christianize men, shall be used only to civilize men, then it will not even civilize men. Whereas if the gospel shall be used solely to Christianize men, it will indeed Christianize men, and, *as a consequence*, will civilize them.

Therefore Christians are not to aim at civilizing men, solely at Christianizing them. Christians are not to seek to civilize men in

order to Christianize them. Christians are not to seek to Christianize men in order to civilize them. Christians are to seek to Christianize men solely in order *to save them:* and when that is done the civilizing will take care of itself.

Let all the power, all the zeal, and all the effort of all these professed Christians organizations, be turned with all the mind and all the soul only to Christianizing people. Then they and the world too will find that they are influencing the city, the State, the nation, and the world only for good. While to continue as they are going, will be only to influence all for unmitigated evil.

"A Menace to Republican Government" American Sentinel 12, 5, pp. 67, 68.

[67]

ATJ

THERE is nothing unusual in the fact that some of the leading representatives of wealth and fashion in the nation's metropolis are about to amuse themselves and at the same time accent their standing in "society" by means of a fancy-dress ball, at a cost of a quarter of a million of dollars. Ostentatious wealth has long been wont to manifest itself in this way. The noteworthy feature in the present instance is not the event itself, but its materialization in the face of an all too necessary display of direful and widespread poverty.

The gaunt spectre of desperate human want stalks through the land, and extravagant luxury dares to display herself almost at its side. If the former should turn upon the latter, there would be no occasion for surprise.

It is said in defense of this extravagant affair that it has furnished a large amount of extra employment to costume makers, which is no doubt true. And it is better, of course, that the money should be spent in some way than hoarded in vaults. But there is little or nothing in this to offset the effect of such a flaunting of superfluous wealth in the face of destitution. Probably no worse method could be taken of letting the army of poverty know that they stand in close proximity to almost limitless wealth, which its holders prefer to spend in the most useless manner rather than apply it to their relief.

The situation has attracted attention even in Europe and the [68] comments which come from that quarter, while not of a nature to

foster American pride, are worthy of notice. The London *Daily News*, of January 26, has the following:—

> "In America society is very old, reckoning its age by its ideas, and there is nothing more characteristic in society of that kind than the defiant animation with which the people dance when anybody ventures to whisper that they are on the edge of a volcano. Mr. Bradley-Martin and his guests have no belief in a volcano, and they are making every preparation for a good time.
>
> "Our own younger and altogether more modern community would be disturbed by such discussion, and would probably tone down the frolic and redouble its attentions to the East End."
>
> The same paper notes further that—
>
> "There is a certain suggestiveness in some of the costumes for which arrangements have already been made. There is to be an abundance of Louis XVI. And Marie Antoinette. Louis the well-beloved will not be forgotten, and it is quite conceivable that some cynic may choose to represent the monarch whose private party for the encouragement of trade was so rudely disturbed by the handwriting on the wall."

Europe has had centuries of experience in dealing with the problems which arise from abnormal social conditions, and her thinking men are qualified to speak understandingly upon such subjects. It is quite possible that a clearer view of the dangers which threaten this Republic from class antagonism is to be found on the other side of the Atlantic than is commanded by the vast majority of those directly concerned.

It is a fact that fancied security often hovers on the brink of the precipice; and finite humanity, when blinded by selfish indulgences and selfish hopes, has often danced above a volcano. We do not allude to these things to excite alarm, but because it is better to know the truth, even though it cause alarm, than to borrow ease from

ignorance. It is best to be alarmed, if need be, while there is time to profit by the experience. It is truth that we want, first and always.

When such things happen in a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," it is much worse than would be the case under a monarchy. The revolution which they breed will be against republican government, and only despotism in some form can be the result.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 5, p. 68.

[68]

ATJ

THE trouble with all such methods of reform as that adopted by the "Christian Citizenship" and kindred organizations for the regeneration of society, is that they do not go deep enough. They stop when they reach the Church; but alas! the Church herself needs to be reformed as much as anything else. Reform must start with the individual; it must proceed with individuals. Reform "en masse" or by organization, is a delusion. The Church is an organization; but her purity and righteousness are those of individuals in her communion. There are some in every church, and a large number in most churches, whose piety is but a pretense. They are a part of the organization, but are not made righteous by that fact. The Church herself cannot be pure while any of her members are unrighteous.

A moral reform which is to prove effectual must pierce through every organization and get at the individuals. It must reach the individuals in the Church as well as those outside of it. The Christian Citizenship kind of reform does not purpose to go within the portals of the Church. Hence as a moral reform it must prove a failure. It can only drive people to seek refuge with the Church, where as long as they can keep up a pretense of piety, they will be safe. Thus this "reform" will not only fail to benefit the State, but will fill the Church with the unconverted; and that must work the ruin of the Church. There is no safety in stopping short of individual reform, which is heart reform, and to be accomplished only by the power of divine grace.

This is the kind of reform that is most sadly needed to-day. But the professed ministers of that grace seem to be fast going into the business of trying to reform men by civil law. They are thus doing

more than any other class of persons to lower the moral tone of society.

"The Treaty of Arbitration" American Sentinel 12, 5, pp. 68, 69.

[68]

ATJ

THE treaty of arbitration between this nation and Great Britain, which is now awaiting the ratification of the United States Senate, is hailed by multitudes as a sure omen of an approaching era of widespread if not universal peace. The Rev. Heber Newton, in a recent sermon, went so far as to say that it was a fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah which points, as it is said, to a time when men's swords shall be beaten into plowshares, and the nations learn war no more. Isaiah 2:2-5.

We make mention of this to call attention to the fact that there is only one sure guarantee of peace, whether between nations or individuals; and that is the absence of those propensities of the heart from which contentment arises. When peace reigns in the hearts of individuals, there will be peace without; and when peace does not reign in the heart, there cannot long be peace in the outward life.

A treaty of peace is very good; but nations have a habit of disregarding treaties when their interests seem to demand it, so that not the treaty, but the selfish interests of the parties concerned, really control the situation. The Behring Sea award did little or nothing to settle the question of the seal fisheries which it concerns. Treaties are susceptible of being interpreted; and when the interests of two nations come into conflict touching some point of the treaty, it is never difficult for them to come to a misunderstanding upon that point.

About one year ago there was a remarkable outburst of "patriotism" in all parts of this country in view of the prospect of war with
[69] this same nation of Great Britain. A little later there was an even greater outburst of patriotic feeling in the latter country, in view of what seemed a menacing attitude towards her on the part of Emperor William and some of the nations of Europe. Such manifestations show as clearly as anything could what is the real mind of both countries, as regards the prospects for peace.

There will be peace in the world just in proportion to the desire of the people in the world to live peaceably. And this desire and disposition to live peaceably will prevail in the world just in proportion to the extent to which men yield themselves to the control of the God of peace. Selfishness, envy, pride, the love of power, do not breed peace. They breed war.

Note the language of the Apostle James on this point: "From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?" James 4:1. The lusts of the flesh can be overcome only by divine grace. The one great antidote for war in the world is the gospel of peace.

There is nothing to be gained by taking a sentimental, rather than sensible, view of this subject. We must not shut our eyes to facts for the sake of seeing pleasing visions in the realm of fancy. The Scriptures of truth do not speak of this age as an age of peace. They warn men of a time when the cry, "Peace and safety" will be the precursor of "sudden destruction." 1 Thessalonians 5:3. The inspired utterances, above all others, demand our attention now.

If peace is to be promoted in the earth, it will be by means of the gospel of Jesus Christ. There will come a time when "the meek shall inherit the earth, and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace." Psalm 37:11. But that time will be when the judgments of the final day shall have swept the wicked out of existence and a new creation shall have come in the place of that so long cursed by sin.

"Proposed Law for Christmas Observance" American Sentinel 12, 5, p. 75.

[75]

ATJ

IN Atlanta, Ga., the 25th day of December last was made an occasion of revelry and crime, by the baser element of the population, to an extraordinary degree. The result was a proposition by the chairman of the police committee of the city council to obtain legislation which would secure a "proper observance" of the day. The following information relative to the project is furnished by the *Atlanta Journal* of January 7:—

> "Alderman Joseph Hirsch, the new chairman of the police committee of the city council, proposes to secure legislation that will bring about a proper observance of Christmas as a religious holiday. The alderman thinks that rowdyism and riotous conduct should not be permitted on Christmas and is determined to at least make an effort to put a stop to the practice prevalent here of celebrating Christ's birthday as if it were the Fourth of July.
>
> "'I propose, if possible, to secure legislation that will prevent a repetition of the disgraceful conduct on the part of rowdies which has characterized Christmas in Atlanta in the past,' said Alderman Hirsch, this morning. 'Christmas is a holiday in celebration of the beginning of the Christian era, and by the Christians is regarded as a holy day. Therefore, it should be observed as such. In the north, east, west and, in fact, everywhere but here, the people observe Christmas as a holy day and attend divine worship. But here the day is turned into a regular Fourth of July. The streets are given over to rowdies, their riotous conduct disturbs the peace as well as the devotions of good citizens. This, I think, is all wrong, and I propose to start a movement that will result in the day being properly observed.'
>
> "Captain Connolly, chief of police, heard the remarks of the chairman of the police committee and stated that his views coincided exactly with those of Mr. Hirsch. He said the police did their best to keep order, but were unable to do so."

Anyone familiar with the history of Sunday legislation can easily see the exact parallel which will be furnished by the development of Christmas into a legal "holy day," with the development of the legal "sabbath." First appears the fact that the holiday is made an occasion of unusual lawlessness. This has long been the case with Sunday. For reasons which require no great study to understand, Sunday has

long contributed more cases for the police court dockets than any other day of the week. To this fact the champions of Sunday have long been calling public attention; and that this Sunday lawlessness was exceedingly bad and demanded a remedy, could not be denied. And the "remedy" proposed and in many instances secured, was a stricter law for Sunday observance.

Upon the same ground precisely it is now proposed to secure such an observance of Thanksgiving as will not conflict with the religious exercises of the day. By the same logic these "holy days" stand or fall together.

No one denies the evil of the rioting and criminal excess which our holidays so frequently bring forth. But the proposed remedy can only make the matter worse. Idleness can never become a remedy for crime.

There is no reason why people should not be required to behave themselves as well on Sunday, Christmas, or any legal holiday, as on any other day of the year; and there is no reason why they should not be required to conduct themselves as decently on every day as on these days. There can be no reason whatever for making Christmas, Sunday, or Thanksgiving legally different from other days in this respect.

The only remedy for holiday lawlessness is to cut off the opportunity from those to whose natures such conduct is congenial. In other words, they should be kept at work. If they were not so frequently cut off from honest work by these holidays, the civil authorities would not so often be called upon to furnish them with work in the penal institutions of the State.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 5, p. 75, 76.

ATJ

THE *Pittsburg Catholic*, of January 14, notes that "Governor Hastings, in his message, deplores the fact that official statistics show that crime is increasing at a more rapid ratio than our population," [76] and adds: "Building additional prisons will not prove a preventive. When the growing generation is trained in morality, as it is in secular knowledge, the State may look for a decrease. The education from which God is banished is the root of the evil."

The "root of the evil" is the depravity of human nature; and only that which will change that nature can prove a remedy. Will training the growing generation "in morality" avert the evil? The Roman Catholic Church trains the growing generation of her adherents in "morality," but criminal statistics do not speak more favorably for that class of our citizens than for any other. The morality which will restrain people from crime is that which is taught to individuals by the Holy Spirit, through the Word of God; and that morality does not come through any secular channel.

February 11, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 6, pp. 81-88.

[81]

ATJ

FEBRUARY 12 is the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.

Throughout the country on that day there will be held meetings, dinners, etc., at which many speeches will be made in honor of that man in whom were mingled so many of the elements of true greatness.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL heartily joins in the tribute of honor to the memory of Abraham Lincoln. We propose to honor him by honoring the principles to which he was so thoroughly devoted. And that this may be done in the best way, we give to him space in our columns to speak again in behalf of the great principles which called forth the highest efforts of his great powers.

Nor is this done merely as a tribute to his memory. It needs to be done again: because again the principle is attacked, to the advocacy of which he gave the best years of his life, and which he caused to triumph.

In principle, the situation to-day is precisely what it was in 1857-1860. And the position which Abraham Lincoln occupied with [82] reference to the situation as it was in his day needs to be recalled for the instruction of all the people respecting the situation as it is to-day.

The one great governmental principle to which Abraham Lincoln devoted his mighty energies from 1857 to 1861, is THE INALIENABLE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO THE UNITED STATES TO APPEAL FROM, AND TO REVERSE, DECISIONS OF THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES UPON CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.

This principle was denounced at that time as *revolutionary*. For advocating this principle, Abraham Lincoln was denounced as preaching "monstrous revolutionary doctrine"; as being an enemy of the Constitution and the supremacy of the laws; as giving over the country to violence, to anarchy, to the rule of the mob.

In 1896, this identical principle, with all who advocated it, was denounced in the same way and in the same words. And it was done by men who profess to be not only admirers of Abraham Lincoln, but the very conservators of the principles maintained by him.

Perhaps these same men, on this Lincoln birthday occasion, will again contradict themselves and falsify history, by attempting to honor Lincoln in speech, while both in speech and action they repudiate his principles. We want the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to be prepared to put into the hands of those men, and all to whom those men may speak, Lincoln's own discussion of the principle which he so devotedly maintained.

In the month of March, 1857, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision on the slavery question, in which the court gave to the Constitution a certain interpretation. The occasion of the decision is of no particular interest to-day; but the governmental principle developed upon the rendering of the decision is of vital interest always to the whole people of the United States.

No sooner had the decision been published than throughout the whole country there was a taking of sides for and against it. From whatever cause, it was but a little while before it was found that United States Senator Stephen A. Douglas and Abraham Lincoln stood distinctly in the place of leaders of the respective sides to the controversy—Douglas for the decision, Lincoln against it.

DOUGLAMS AND LINCOLN AT SPRINGFIELD, ILL

The position and argument of those who accepted the decision of the court were stated by Senator Douglas at Springfield, Ill., about the second week of June, 1857, as follows:—

> "The courts are the tribunals prescribed by the Constitution and created by the authority of the people to

> determine, expound, and enforce the law. Hence, whoever resists the final decision of the highest judicial tribunal, aims a deadly blow at our whole republican system of government—a blow which, if successful, would place all our rights and liberties at the mercy of passion, anarchy and violence. I repeat, therefore, that if resistance to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of the matter like the points decided in the Dred Scott case, clearly within their jurisdiction as defined by the Constitution, shall be forced upon the country as a pointed issue, it will become a distinct and naked issue between the friends and enemies of the Constitution—the friends and the enemies of the supremacy of the laws."

In a speech at Springfield, "two weeks" later, June 26, 1857, Lincoln replied to this, as follows:—

> "And now as to the Dred Scott decision.... Judge Douglas ... denounces all who question the correctness of that decision, as offering violent resistance to it. But who resists it? Who has, in spite of the decision, declared Dred Scott free, and resisted the authority of his master over him?
>
> "Judicial decisions have two uses—first, to absolve and determine the case decided; and, secondly, to indicate to the public how other similar cases will be decided as they arise. For the latter use they are called 'proceedings' and 'authorities.'
>
> "We believe as much as Judge Douglas (perhaps more) in obedience to, and respect for, the judicial department of the Government.... But we think the Dred Scott decision is erroneous. We know the court that made it, has often overruled its own decisions, and we shall do what we can to have it overrule this, and offer no resistance to it.

Judicial decisions are of greater or less authority and precedents, according to circumstances. That this shall be so, accords both with common sense, and the customary understanding of the legal profession.

"If this important decision had been made by the unanimous concurrence of the judges; and without any apparent partisan bias; and in accordance with the public expectation; and with the steady practice of the departments throughout our history; and had been in no part, based on assumed historical facts which are not really true; or, if wanting in some of these, it had been before the court more than once, and had there been affirmed and re-affirmed through a course of years; if then might be, perhaps would be, factious, nay, even revolutionary, not to acquiesce in it as a precedent.

"But when, as it is true, we find it wanting in all these claims to the public confidence, *it is not resistance, it is not factious, it is not even disrespectful, to treat it as not having yet quite established a settled doctrine in the country*. But Judge Douglas considers this view unlawful."

AT CHICAGO

In 1858 Lincoln and Douglas were rival candidates for the United States senatorship; and this supreme court decision was the leading issue. Friday evening, July 9, Senator Douglas made a speech in Chicago, which, noticing Lincoln's speech upon his nomination as senator, he said:—

"The other proposition discussed by Mr. Lincoln in his speech, consists in a crusade against the Supreme Court of the United States on account of the Dred Scott decision. On this question also I desire to say to you, unequivocally, that I take direct and distinct issue with him. I have no warfare to make on the Supreme Court of the United States, either on account of that or any

other decision which they have pronounced from the bench.

[83]

"The Constitution of the United States has provided that the powers of government (and the constitution of each State has the same provision) shall be divided into three departments—Executive, Legislative, and Judicial. The right and the province of expounding the Constitution and construing the law are vested in the judiciary established by the Constitution.

"As a lawyer, I feel at liberty to appear before the court and controvert any principle of law while the question is pending before the tribunal; but when the decision is made, my private opinion, your opinion, all other opinions, must yield to the majesty of that authoritative adjudication.

"I wish you to bear in mind that this involves a great principle, upon which our rights, our liberty, and our property all depend. What security have you for your property, for your reputation, and for your personal rights, if the courts are not upheld, and their decisions respected when once fairly rendered by the highest tribunal known to the Constitution?

"I do not choose, therefore, to go into any argument with Mr. Lincoln in reviewing the various decisions which the Supreme Court has made, either upon the Dred Scott case or any other. I have no idea of appealing from the decision of the Supreme Court upon a constitutional question of the Supreme Court upon a constitutional question to the decisions of a tumultuous town meeting.

"I am aware that once an eminent lawyer of this city, now no more, said that the State of Illinois had the most perfect judicial system in the world, subject to but one

exception, which could be cured by a slight amendment, and that amendment was to so change the law as to allow an appeal from the decisions of the Supreme Court of Illinois, on all constitutional questions, to justices of the pace.

"My friend, Mr. Lincoln, who sits behind me, reminds me that that proposition was made when I was judge of the Supreme Court. Be that as it may, I do not think that fact adds any greater weight or authority to the suggestion. It matters not with me who was on the bench, whether Mr. Lincoln or myself, whether a Lockwood or a Smith, a Taney or a Marshall; the decision of the highest tribunal known to the Constitution of the country must be final till it is reversed by an equally high authority.

"Hence, I am opposed to this doctrine of Mr. Lincoln by which he proposes to take an appeal from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, upon this high constitutional question, to a Republican caucus sitting in the country. Yes, or any other caucus or town meeting, whether it be Republican, American, or Democratic, I respect the decisions of that august tribunal. I shall always bow in deference to them. I am a law-abiding man."

The next night, July 10, 1858, Lincoln spoke in reply, and upon this point said:—

"Another of the issues he says that is to be made with me is upon his devotion to the Dred Scott decision, and my opposition to it.

"I have expressed heretofore, and I now repeat my opposition to the Dred Scott decision; but I should be allowed to state the nature of that opposition, and I ask your indulgence while I do so.

"What is fairly implied by the term Judge Douglas has used, 'resistance to the decision'? I do not resist it. If I wanted to take Dred Scott from his master, I would be interfering with property, and that terrible difficulty that Judge Douglas speaks of, of interfering with property, would arise. But I am doing no such thing as that; but all that I am doing is refusing to obey it as a political rule. If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up on a question whether slavery should be prohibited in a new territory, in spite of the Dred Scott decision I would vote that it should.

"That is what I should do. Judge Douglas said last night that before the decision he might advance his opinion, and it might be contrary to the decision when it was made, but after it was made, he would abide by it until it was reversed. Just so! We let this property abide by the decision, but WE WILL TRY TO REVERSE THAT DECISION. We will try to put it where Judge Douglas would not object, for he says he will obey it until it is reversed. SOMEBODY HAMS TO REVERSE THAT DECISION, since it was made, and WE MEAN TO REVERSE IT, and we mean to do it peaceably.

"What are the uses of decisions of courts?—They have two uses. As rules of property they have two uses. First, they decide upon the question before the court. They decide in this case that Dred Scott is a slave; nobody resists that. Not only that, but they say to everybody else that persons standing just as Dred Scott stands, are as he is. That is, they say that when a question comes up upon another person, it will be so decided again, unless the court decides in another way, unless the court overrules its decision. Well, *we mean to do what we can to have the court decide the other way*. This is one thing we mean to try to do.

"The sacredness that Judge Douglas throws around this decision is a degree of sacredness that has never

been before thrown around any other decision. I have never heard of such a thing. Why, decisions apparently contrary to that decision, or that good lawyers thought were contrary to that decision, have been made by that very court before. It is the first of its kind: it is an astonisher in legal history; it is a new wonder of the world.

"It is based upon falsehood in the main as to facts; allegations of facts upon which it stands are not facts at all in many instances, and no decision made on any question—the first instance of a decision made under so many unfavorable circumstances—thus placed, has ever been held by the profession as law, and it has always needed confirmation before the lawyers regarded it as settled law.

"But Judge Douglas will have it that all hands must take this extraordinary decision, made under these extraordinary circumstances, and give their vote in Congress in accordance with it, yield to it, and obey it in very possible sense."

DOUGLAMS AT BLOOMINGTON

Again: In a speech at Bloomington, Illinois, July 16, 1858, Senator Douglas said:—

"I therefore take issue with Mr. Lincoln directly in regard to this warfare upon the Supreme Court of the United States. I accept the decision of that court as it was pronounced. Whatever my individual opinions may

[84]

be, I, as a good citizen, am bound by the laws of the land as the legislature makes them, as the court expounds them, and as the executive officer administers them. I am bound by our Constitution as our fathers made it, and as it is our duty to support it. I am bound as a

good citizen to sustain the constituted authorities, and to resist, discourage, and beat down, by all lawful and peaceful means, all attempts at exciting mobs, or violence, or any other revolutionary proceedings, against the Constitution and the constituted authorities of the country."

LINCOLN SUSTAINED BY AUTHORITY [84]

The next night, July 17, at Springfield, Lincoln replied and said:—

"Now as to the Dred Scott decision, for upon that he makes his last point at me. He boldly takes ground in favor of that decision.

"This is one-half the onslaught, and one-third of the plan, of the entire campaign. I am opposed to that decision in a certain sense, but not in the sense which he puts on it. I say that in so far as it decided in favor of Dred Scott's master, and against Dred Scott and his family, I do not propose to disturb or resist the decision.

"I never have proposed to do any such thing. I think that in respect for judicial authority my humble history would not suffer in comparison with that of Judge Douglas.

"He would have the citizen conform his vote to that decision; the member of Congress, his: the President, his use of the veto power. He would make it a rule of political action for the people and all the departments of the Government. I would not. By resisting it as a political rule, I disturb no right of property, create no disorder, excite no mobs.

"When he spoke at Chicago, on Friday evening of last week, he made this same point upon me. On Saturday evening I replied, and reminded him of a Supreme

Court decision which he opposed for at least several years. Last night, at Bloomington, he took some notice of that reply, but entirely forgot to remember that part of it.

"He renews his onslaught upon me, forgetting to remember that I have turned the tables against himself on that very point. I renew the effort to draw his attention to it. I wish to stand erect before the country, as well as Judge Douglas, *on this question of judicial authority;* and therefore I add something to the authority in favor of my own position. *I wish to show that I am sustained by authority*, in addition to that heretofore presented....

"In public speaking it is tedious reading from documents; but I must beg to indulge the practice to a limited extent. *I shall read from a letter written by Mr. Jefferson in 1820*, and now to be found in the seventh volume of his correspondence, at page 177. It seems he had been presented by a gentleman of the name of Jarvis with a book, or essay, or periodical, called the 'Republican,' and he was writing in acknowledgment of the present, and noting some of its contents. After expressing the hope that the work will produce a favorable effect upon the minds of the young, he proceeds to say:—

"'That it will have this tendency may be expected, and for that reason I feel an urgency to note what I deem an error in it, the more requiring notice as your opinion is strengthened by that of many others. *You* pages 84 and 148, *to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions,—a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us upon the despotism of an oligarchy. Our judges are as human as other men, and not more so. They have, with others, the same passions for party, for power, and the privilege of their corps*. Their maxim is, "*Boni judicis est ... are jurisdictionem:" and their power is the more dangerous*

as they are in office for life, and not responsible to the other functionaries are, to the elective control. The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal, knowing that, to whatever hands confided, with the corruption of time and party, its members would become deeper. It has more wisely made all the departments co-equaled, co-sovereign within themselves.'

"*Thus we see the power claimed for the Supreme Court by Judge Douglas, Mr. Jefferson holds, would reduce us to the despotism of an oligarchy*.

"Now, I have said no more than this,—in fact, not quite so much as this: at least I am sustained by Mr. Jefferson.

"Let us go a little further. You remember we ... had a National Bank. Some one owed the bank a dollar, he was sued, and sought to avoid payment on the grounds that the bank was unconstitutional. The case went to the Supreme Court, and therein it was decided that the bank was constitutional. *The whole Democratic party revolted against that decision. General Jackson himself, asserted that he, as President, would not be bound to hold a National Bank to be constitutional, even though the court had decided it to be so. He fell in precisely with the view of Mr. Jefferson, and acted upon it under his official oath, in vetoing a charter for a National Bank*."

The declaration that Congress does not possess the constitutional power to charter a bank has gone into the Democratic platform, at their national conventions, and was brought forward and reaffirmed in their last conventions at Cincinnati. They have contended for that declaration, in the very teeth of the Supreme Court, for more than a quarter of a century. *In fact, they have reduced the decision to an absolute nullity*.

"*That decision, I repeat, is repudiated in the Cincinnati platform; and still, as if to show that effrontery can go no farther, Judge Douglas vaunts in the very speech in which he denounces me for opposing the Dred Scott decision that he stands on the Cincinnati platform.*

"Now, I wish to know what the judge can charge upon me, with respect to the decisions of the Supreme Court, which does not lie in all its length, breadth, and proportions at his own door....

"*Free men of Sangamon, free men of Illinois, free men everywhere, judge ye between him and me upon this issue*."

THE FAMOUS DEBATE

Shortly after the foregoing speech at Springfield, arrangements were made, and the famous debate between Lincoln and Douglas, was entered into. The first discussion was at Ottawa, August 21, 1858. Upon this question, Mr. Douglas said nothing: but Lincoln
[85] spoke as follows:—

"Let us see what influence he [Judge Douglas] is exerting on public sentiment. In this and like communities, *public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail; without it nothing can succeed. Consequently, he who moulds public sentiment, goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions. He makes statutes and decisions possible or impossible to be executed.*

"This must be borne in mind, as also the additional fact that Judge Douglas is a man of vast influence, so great that it is enough for many men to profess to believe anything, when they once find out that Judge Douglas professes to believe it. Consider also the attitude he occupies at the head of a large party,—a party which he claims has a majority of all the voters in the country.

> "This man sticks to a decision ... not because he says it is right in itself,—he does not give any opinion on that,—but because it has been decided by the court; and being decided by the court, he is, and you are, bound to take it in your political action as law, not that he judges at all of its merits, but because a decision of the court is to him a 'Thus saith the Lord.'
>
> "He places it on that ground alone; and you will bear in mind that thus committing himself unreservedly to this decision commits him to the next one just as firmly as to this. He did not commit himself on account of the merit or demerit of the decision, but it is a 'Thus saith the Lord.' The next decision, as much as this, will be a 'Thus saith the Lord.'

There is nothing that can divert or turn him away from this decision. It is nothing that I point out to him that his great prototype, General Jackson, did not believe in the binding force of decisions. It is nothing to him that Jefferson did not so believe.

> "I have said that I have often heard him approve of Jackson's course in disregarding the decision of the Supreme Court pronouncing a National Bank constitutional. He says, I did not hear him say so. He denies the accuracy of my recollection. I say he ought to know better than I, but I will make no question about this thing, though it still seems to me that I heard him say it twenty times.
>
> "I will tell him, though, that he now claims to stand on the Cincinnati platform, which affirms that Congress *cannot* charter a National Bank, in the teeth of that old standing decision that Congress *can* charter *a* bank."

LINCOLN AT GALESBURG, ILL

The next place at which the subject of the nature of Supreme Court decisions was discussed was Galesburg, October 7, 1858. There, on this point, Lincoln spoke as follows:—

"I have turned his [Judge Douglas's] attention to the fact that General Jackson differed with him in regard to the political obligation of a Supreme Court decision. I have asked his attention to the fact that Jefferson differed with him in regard to the political obligation of a Supreme Court decision.

"Jefferson said that 'Judges are as honest as other men, and not more so.' And he said, substantially, that 'whenever a free people should give up in absolute submission to any department of government, retaining for themselves no appeal from it, their liberties were gone.'

"I have asked his attention to the fact that the

[86]

Cincinnati platform upon which he says he stands, disregards a time-honored decision of the Supreme Court, in denying the power of Congress to establish a National Bank....

"So far in this controversy I can get no answer at all from Judge Douglas upon these subjects. Not one can I get from him, except that he swells himself up and says, 'All of us who stand by the decision of the Supreme Court are the friends of the Constitution: all you fellows that dare question it in any way, are the enemies of the Constitution.' Now, in this very devoted adherence to this decision, in opposition to all the great political leaders whom he has recognized as leaders, in opposition to his former self and history, there is something very marked.

"And the manner in which he adheres to it,—not as being right upon the merits, as he conceives (because he did not discuss that at all), but as being absolutely obligatory upon every one, simply because of the source from whence it comes,—as that which no man can gainsay, whatever it may be; this is another marked feature of his adherence to that decision.

"It marks it in this respect that it commits him to the next decision whenever it comes, as being as obligatory as this one, since he does not investigate it, and won't inquire whether this opinion is right or wrong. So he takes the next one without inquiring whether it is right or wrong. He teaches men this doctrine, and in so doing prepares the public mind to take the next decision when it comes, without any inquiry."

AT QUINCY

At Quincy, Ill., October 13, 1858, Mr. Lincoln said:—

"We oppose the Dred Scott decision in a certain way, upon which I ought perhaps to address you a few words. We do not propose that when Dred Scott has been decided to be a slave by that court, we, as a mob, will decide him to be free.

"We do not propose that, when any other one, or one thousand, shall be decided by the court to be slaves, we will in any violent way disturb the rights of property thus settled: but we nevertheless do oppose that decision as a political rule which shall be binding on the voter to vote for nobody who thinks it wrong; which shall be binding on the members of Congress or the President to favor no measure that does not actually concur with the principles of that decision.

"We do not propose to be bound by it as a political rule in that way because we think it lays the foundation, not merely of enlarging and spreading out what we consider an evil, but it lays the foundation for spreading that evil into the States themselves.

"We propose so resisting it *as to have it reversed if we can*, and A NEW JUDICIAL RULE ESTABLISHED UPON THIS SUBJECT."

To this and Lincoln's position altogether, on this subject, Judge Douglas on the same occasion replied as follows:—

> "He tells you that he does not like the Dred Scott decision. Suppose he does not: how is he going to help himself? He says he will reverse it. How will he reverse it? I know of but one mode of reversing judicial decisions, and that is by appealing from the inferior to the superior court. But I have never yet learned how or where an appeal could be taken from the Supreme Court of the United States! The Dred Scott decision was pronounced by the highest tribunal on earth. From this decision there is no appeal this side of heaven."

And to this Lincoln responded:—

> "But he is desirous of knowing how we are going to reverse the Dred Scott decision. Judge Douglas ought to know how.
>
> "Did not he and his political friends find a way to reverse the decision of that same court in favor of the constitutionality of the National Bank? Didn't they find a way to do it so effectually that they have reversed it as completely as any decision ever was reversed, so far as its practical operation is concerned?
>
> "And let me ask you didn't Judge Douglas find a way to reverse the decision of our Supreme Court when it decided that Carlin's father—old Governor Carlin—had the constitutional power to remove a Secretary of State. Did he not appeal to the 'MOBS,' as he calls them? Did he not make speeches in the lobby to show how villainous that decision was, and how it ought to be overthrown? Did he not succeed, too, in getting an act passed by the legislature to have it overthrown? And didn't he himself sit down on that bench as one of the five judges, who were to overslaugh the four old ones,—setting his name of 'Judge' in that way, and no

other? If there is a villainy in using disrespect or making opposition to Supreme Court decisions, I commend it to Judge Douglas's earnest consideration."

AT COLUMBUS

At Columbus, Ohio, September 16, 1859. Lincoln spoke the following suggestive words:—

"I wish to say something now in regard to the Dred Scott decision.... I undertake to give the opinion, at least, that if the Territories attempt by any direct legislation to drive the man with his slave out of the Territory, or to decide that his slave is free because of his being taken in there, or to tax him to such an extent that he cannot keep him there, the Supreme Court was unhesitatingly decide all such legislation unconstitutional, *as long as that Supreme Court is constructed* the Dred Scott Supreme Court is....

"In my judgment there is no avoiding the result save that the American people shall see that constitutions are better construed than our Constitution is construed in that decision. They must take care that it, more faithfully and truly carried out, than it is there expounded."

AT CINCINNATI

The very next day—September 17, 1859—at Cincinnati, he also proclaimed the following all-important truth:—

"THE PEOPLE OF THESE UNITED STATES ARE THE RIGHTFUL MAMSTERS OF BOTH CONGRESSES AND COURTS: NOT TO OVERTHROW THE CONSTITUTION; BUT TO OVERTHROW THE MEN WHO PERVERT THE CONSTITUTION."

AT THE NATION'S CAPITOL

At the Capitol of the nation, March 4, 1861, when about to take the oath of office as President of the United States, in his inaugural

address, and as the final word in a discussion which brought him to the headship of the nation, Lincoln again stated the principle, as
[87] follows:—

> "I do not forget the position assumed by some that Constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court, nor do I deny that *such decisions must be binding in any case upon the parties to a suit, as to the object of that suit*, while they are also entitled to a very high respect and consideration in all parallel cases by all other departments of the Government. And while it is obviously possible that such decision may be erroneous in any given case, still the evil effect following it, *being limited to that particular case*, with the chance that it may be overruled and never become a precedent for other cases, can better be borne than could the evils of a different practice.
>
> "At the same time, *the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government, upon vital questions affecting the whole people, is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made, as in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers*, having to that extent practically resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal.
>
> "*Nor is there in this view any assault upon the court or the judges*."

LINCOLN'S PRINCIPLE AGAIN REPUDIATED

Thus from the beginning to end of a discussion and campaign continuing for four years, Abraham Lincoln steadfastly and courageously proclaimed the governmental principle of the right of the people of the United States to call in question, to sit in judgment upon, and to reverse, a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States touching the meaning of the Constitution.

To his position as to the principle he was able to bring the weighty authority of Thomas Jefferson—"the author of the Declaration of Independence, and otherwise a chief factor in the Revolution; then a delegate in Congress; afterward, twice President; who was, is, and perhaps will continue to be, the most distinguished politician in our history."

In addition to this he was able to bring to his support the national precedent of President Jackson and the great party of which he was the leader; and even the precedent of Senator Douglas himself, his own chief opponent.

And beyond this, he was sustained in his position by the overwhelming voice of the whole nation, in making him President, as the result of a campaign in which this was the chief issue.

Yet in the face of all this, in 1896 such prominent men as Benjamin Harrison, Chauncey M. Depew, and Bourke Cochran, denounced as revolutionary a resolution embodying the identical principle for which Abraham Lincoln contended and which he sustained by national authority and national precedent.

A SERIES OF STULTIFICATIONS

And as though to illustrate how completely a man of national prominence can stultify himself, the plainest history, and even his hero Mr. Depew, in delivering an oration in "honor" of Abraham Lincoln, at Galesburg, Ill., October 7, 1896, on the very spot where Lincoln spoke twenty-eight years before, attempted to divorce Abraham Lincoln from the principle which he unswervingly maintained, and to commit him to a view that he never even referred to but once in the whole four years' record, and then only to show that it did not apply. Mr. Depew said:—

> "If the court interpreted the Constitution against his judgment and conscience, he would bow to its opinion, but agitate to so amend the charter as to clearly establish liberty in that instrument."

All that any one needs to do to see how entirely Lincoln is misrepresented in this statement by Mr. Depew, is simply to glance again at the words of Lincoln as printed in the foregoing columns.

We have printed all that has been preserved of what he said on that subject from beginning to end. And in it all, there is not a single sentence to justify Mr. Depew's statement.

The interpretation of the Constitution by the Court, was against his judgment and conscience. But he *did not* "bow to its opinion." He distinctly said that he did not, and that he would not. He distinctly said that if he were in Congress and a vote should come up on a question whether Congress could do what the Court said it could not do, "in spite of the Dred Scott decision" he would vote that it could. He distinctly said "refuse to obey it as a political rule." "We oppose that decision as a political rule which shall be binding on the voter, on the members of Congress, or the President;" "We do not propose to be bound by it as a political rule."

If that indicates the attitude of one who bows to the opinion of the court in interpreting the Constitution, then we should like very much to have Mr. Depew's definition of the attitude of a man who refused to bow to such an opinion.

Nor is Mr. Depew any more fortunate in his statement that Lincoln would "agitate to amend the Constitution," etc. The plain truth is that in the whole four years' discussion and agitation on this subject by Abraham Lincoln there is not to be found a single sentence that can be construed into an agitation to amend the Constitution as a remedy for the decision which he opposed.

From beginning to end his agitation was solely, his call was only, "Reverse that decision." "Somebody has to reverse that decision, since it was made, and we mean to reverse it." "We propose so resisting it as to have it reversed if we can, and [not an amendment to the Constitution, but] A NEW JUDICIAL RULE *established on this subject*." "The American people shall see that constitutions are [not amended, but] *better construed* than our Constitution is construed in that decision."

These are not the words of a man who was agitating for an amendment to the Constitution as a remedy for an interpretation of it that was against his judgment and conscience. Abraham Lincoln was too well acquainted with the fundamental principles of the
[88] Constitution of the Government of the United States, and had too much respect for the liberties of the people, to pursue a course that would "establish the despotism of an oligarchy."

As certainly therefore as Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson, were right, so certainly Benjamin Harrison, Chauncey M. Depew, and Bourke Cochran, are wrong. If, however, it shall be insisted by anybody that Harrison, Depew, and Cochran, are right, then it will have to be claimed the Lincoln, Jefferson, and Jackson, were wrong: and in that case a new set of principles will have to be recognized, which will develop shortly a different order of government from that established by the fathers and maintained by Lincoln—an order of government that will not be "of the people, by the people, and for the people." Were Lincoln alive he might well exclaim again: "Free men everywhere: judge ye between *them* and me upon this issue."

"Additional Authorities" American Sentinel 12, 6, pp. 88-90.

[88]

ATJ

THERE are yet other important authorities that are worth recalling in this connection, in order that the reader may have as nearly as possible a complete presentation of this important subject—especially in view of the fact that some of the most prominent men in the country seem to have forgotten it all.

First, there is the authority of one of the makers of the Constitution—John Dickinson—in a pamphlet of 1788, on "The Federal Constitution." He said:—

> "It must be granted that a bad administration may take place. What is then to be done?—The answer is instantly found: Let the Fasces be lowered before—*the supreme sovereignty of the people*. It is their duty to watch, and their right to take care, that the Constitution be preserved, or, in the Roman phrase on perilous occasions—to provide that the Republic receive no damage."
>
> "When one part [of the Government], without being sufficiently checked by the rest, abuses its power to the manifest danger of public happiness; or when the several parts abuse their respective powers so as to involve the commonwealth in the like peril: *the people* must restore things to that order from which their functionaries

> have departed. It *the people* suffer this living principle of watchfulness and control to be extinguished among them, they will assuredly not long afterwards, experience that of *their* 'temple' 'there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.'"

Further, we have the authority of George Bancroft, the historian of the Constitution. In his work, "The History of the Formation of the Constitution," discussing the "Federal Judiciary," he makes the following statement concerning the Supreme Court, which is also but an extension of the principles laid down by Alexander Hamilton in his discussion of the Judiciary in the *Federalist*, *No. LXXVIII:*—

> "The Supreme Court was to be the 'bulwark of a limited constitution against legislative encroachments. ["Federalist," LXXVIII.] A bench of a few, selected with care by the President and Senate of the nation, securing a safer tribunal than a multitudinous assembly elected for a short period under the sway of passing current thought, or the intrepid fixedness of an uncompromising party. There always remains danger of erroneous arguments, arising from mistakes, imperfect investigation on the bias of previous connections, the seductions of action, or the instigations of surrounding opinions, *on a court from which there is no appeal* is apt to forge circumspection in its sense of security.
>
> "The passage of a judge from the bar to the bench, does not necessarily divest him of prejudices, nor close relations to the particular political party to which he may owe his advancement, nor blot out of his mind the great interests which he may have professionally allotted through doubtful straits, nor quiet the ... which he is not required to renounce, even though his appointment is for life, nor cure predelictions which at times have their seat in his inmost nature.
>
> "But the Constitution retains the means of protecting itself against the errors of partial or interested comments.

In the first place, the force of a judicial opinion of the Supreme Court, in so far as it is irreversible, remains only the particular case in dispute; and to this society submits, in order to escape from anarchy in the daily routine of business.

"To the decison [*sic*.] on an underlying question of constitutional law no such finality attaches. To endure must be right. If it is right, it will approve itself to the universal sense of the impartial. A judge who can just lay claim to integrity will never lay claim to infallibility, but with indefatigable research will add, retract, and direct, whenever more mature consideration shows the need of it. The court is itself inferior and subordinate to the Constitution: it has only a delegated authority, and an opinion contrary to the tenor of its commission is ... except as settling the case on trial.

"The prior act of a superior must be preferred to the subsequent act of an inferior, otherwise it might transform the limited into an unlimited constitution. When laws clash, the latest law is rightly held to express the corrected will of the Legislature; but the Constitution is the fundamental code, the law of laws; and when there is a conflict between the Constitution and a decision of the court, the original permanent act of the superior, outweighs the later act of the inferior, and retains its own supreme energy unaltered and unalterable except in the manner prescribed by the Constitution itself.

"To say that a court, having once discovered the error, should yet cling to it because it has once been delivered as its opinion, is to invest caprice with inviolability and make a wrong judgment of a servant outweigh the Constitution to which he has sworn obedience. The act of the Legislature at variance with the Constitution is pronounced void; an opinion of the Supreme Court at variance with the Constitution is equally so."

This passage is worthy of more extended notice.

(*a*) "The Supreme Court was to be the bulwark against legislative encroachments" upon the rights of the people. This was the purpose of the founders of that tribunal. But did the people erect no bulwark
[89] against judicial encroachments? Or did they suppose that supreme judges were so decidedly infallible that there was no possibility of their encroaching even unconsciously? Did they think it impossible for that Court to make a mistake?—Nothing of the kind. They knew that even supreme judges, being only men, are just like other men, having the same weaknesses and the same liability to mistakes as other men, and therefore being as liable as legislators to mistake the meaning of the constitution and to encroach upon the rights of the people. And knowing that "a court from which there is no appeal is apt to forget circumspection in its sense of security," and is thereby only the more apt to make mistakes and encroachments, the people, while setting the Supreme Court as the bulwark against legislative encroachments, retained to themselves the right of final appeal, judgment and decision upon the decisions of the court touching all questions of the Constitution.

(*b*) "Where there is a conflict between the Constitution and a decision of the court," etc. But if every decision of the Supreme Court is final in all respects; and if said decisions are to be accepted as final as to the meaning of the Constitution; then it would be impossible that there ever could be any such thing as a conflict between the Constitution and a decision of the Court.

Yet, as it is expressly declared in the Constitution that the people have reserved certain rights and powers exclusively to themselves, and so have forbidden the Supreme Court any jurisdiction in these, it is clearly possible for a conflict to be made between the Constitution and a decision of the court. And where there is a conflict there must of necessity be some authority to decide. And as the people made both the Constitution and the Court; and as the people stand outside of and above both the Constitution and the Court; it is perfectly plain that in all cases of conflict between the Constitution and the Supreme Court, the right of final judgment and decision lies with the people as an inalienable right.

(*c*) The court "has only a delegated authority, and every opinion contrary to the tenor of its commission is void." But if every decision

of the court is to be accepted as final in all respects, how would it be possible for any opinion ever to be void? And even though it were possible, how could the fact of its being void ever be discovered? It is true that the court has only a delegated authority, and that every opinion contrary to the tenor of its commission, that is, every opinion contrary to the tenor of the Constitution, is void. And it is equally true that it lies with the people, who delegated this authority, to discover and to disregard and set aside as void every such opinion. And this prerogative lies with the people as their inalienable right.

(*d*) "An act of the Legislature at variance with the Constitution is pronounced void. An opinion of the Supreme Court at variance with the Constitution is equally so." An act of the Legislature at variance with the Constitution is pronounce [*sic*.] void by the Supreme Court. But when an opinion of the Supreme Court is at variance with the Constitution, whose prerogative is it to pronounce this void and to treat it so?—Clearly this is the prerogative and right of the people.

It is here said, and repeated, that every such opinion of the court [90] "is void." This is true; and if such decisions were completely ignored by everybody, and so left meaningless and void as they are, they could never do any harm. But it is hardly possible that there could ever be a decision in which nobody would have sufficient personal interest to seek to make it of force as far as possible; and every decision, void or otherwise, always stands as a matter of record to be taken up by interested parties and used as a precedent upon which to carry any principle involved, to its fullest extent in real factitive law. For this reason it is incumbent upon the people to see that every such decision is so positively pronounced void, and so regarded by themselves—the supreme and ultimate authority—that it shall not be cited even as a precedent.

There is another excellent statement of this principle, which, though not bearing exactly the force of national authority, is well worthy to be set down here. It is in every respect true, and shows how this subject presents itself to a disinterested mind. Mr. Bryce, in his great work, "The American Commonwealth," speaks thus:—

> "How and by whom, in case of dispute, is the validity or invalidity of a statute to be determined?—Such determination is to be effected by setting the statute side

by side with the Constitution, and considering whether there is a discrepancy between them. Is the purpose of the statute one of the purposes mentioned or implied in the Constitution? Does it in pursuing that purpose contain anything which violates any clause of the Constitution? Sometimes this is a simple question which an intelligent layman may answer; more frequently it is a difficult one, which needs not only the subtlety of a trained lawyer, but a knowledge of former cases which have thrown light on the same or a similar point. In any event it is an important question, whose solution ought to proceed from a weighty authority. It is a question of interpretation, that is, of determining the true meaning both of the superior law [the Constitution] and of the inferior law [the statute], so as to discoves [*sic*.] whether they are inconsistent. Now the interpretation of laws belongs to courts of justice."

"How is the interpreting authority restrained? If the American Constitution is capable of being so developed buy this expansive interpretation, what security do its written terms offer to the people and to the States? ... There stands above and behind the Legislature, the executive, *and the judiciary*, ANOTHER POWER, that of public opinion. The President, Congress, and the courts are all, the two former directly, the latter practically, amenable to the people.... If the people approve the way in which these authorities are interpreting and using the Constitution, they go on; if the people disapprove, they pause, or at least slacken their pace.... The people have, of course, much less exact notions of the Constitution than the legal profession or the courts. But ... they are sufficiently attached to its general doctrines, they sufficiently prize the protection it affords them against their own impulses, to censure any interpretation which palpably departs from the old lines."

And upon all this it is well to bear in mind, and forever to say, that "there is not in this view any assault upon the court or the judges." It is simply maintaining the fundamental principle of the Government of the United States, and the vital principle of the right of the people.

Nor is this to say, nor in any sense to imply that every man is at liberty to disregard, or disrespect, whatever decision of the court he may not personally agree with. It is to say that it is absolutely incumbent on every citizen to be so well read in the Constitution that he shall know for himself the limitations upon the Government, and shall know how to act accordingly. The citizen must hold himself, as well as the court, and the Government, altogether, strictly to the Constitution.

"The Present Practical Bearing of this Discussion" American Sentinel 12, 6, pp. 90, 91.

[90]

ATJ

THIS discussion would be well worth all the space that is given to it in these columns, even though there is nothing more to it than the calling of the minds of the people anew to a vital principle of their government that is almost wholly forgotten.

But this is not all there is to this matter. The nation has a present practical bearing, that is of the highest importance to all the people of the nation. In 1892 the Supreme Court of the United States expressed the opinion that the first amendment to the Constitution had one language and one meaning with organic acts whose object was "the establishment of the Christian religion and that therefore the meaning of the Constitution was that "this is a Christian nation."

This decision has been seized upon, and has been pushed ever since, by the combined religious elements in the country as authority for demanding that religious customs, rites, and dogmas shall be recognized and enforced in the legislation and the actions generally of the Government.

In this crowding religious practices upon the Government, and upon the people by governmental power, the ecclesiastical managers find it "a very wholesome doctrine, and one very full of comfort," that from a decision of the Supreme Court there is no appeal,—that a Supreme Court decision is a 'Thus saith the Lord.'"

As stated by a Catholic priest, as illustrating the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope, it stands thus:—

> "It is strange that a rule which requires a Supreme Court to give final decisions on disputed points in our Constitution, should be abused and slandered when employed by the Catholic Church. Citizens and others must read the Constitution, but they are not allowed to interpret it for themselves, but must submit to the interpretation given by the Superior [Supreme(?)] Court. The Bible is the constitution of the Catholic Church, and while all are exhorted to read this divine constitution, the interpretation of its true meaning must be left to the superior court of the church founded by Christ. The decision of our Federal Supreme Court is final; the decisions of

[91]

> the superior court of the church is final also, and, in virtue of the divine prerogative of inerrancy granted the church, infallible. The church has not, does not, and cannot, permit the violation of God's commandments in any case whatever."—*Reported in Catholic Mirror, March 1895*.

The professed Protestantism of the country, is, if anything, more zealous than is Catholicism in the advocacy of this doctrine. And both alike are greatly pleased and find eminent "statesmen" insisting with all their power and influence upon the same doctrine.

All these vast influences are steadily and rapidly holding public sentiment into the fixed doctrine that Supreme Court decisions on constitutional questions are to be accepted *because* they are such decisions, without any question as to whether they are right or wrong—as soon as a decision has been made and because it has been made, it is a governmental and national Thus saith the Lord.

Public sentiment is thus being prepared so to accept any decision that may come from that source. And thus the way is surely being paved for the establishment of a national religious despotism. By

repudiating that doctrine, Abraham Lincoln succeeded in averting the establishment of a national civil despotism. And nothing but the repudiation of that doctrine again, by the whole people, can avert the establishment of a national religious despotism. Yet for this, it must be confessed the evil has already spread too far; and it is too late to avert it.

"No Representatives in Religion" American Sentinel 12, 6, pp. 92, 93.

[92]

ATJ

THE members of the State and National legislatures are, as legislators, the representatives of the people. Representatives in what? In religion? No; certainly not. Then what can Congress or a State legislature properly have to do with religious affairs?

As individuals, legislators are like other men accountable to their Creator in all things: but they are not and cannot be accountable to God for other persons, for each individual must render his own account to God. He who expects to render his account or to settle it with God through a State legislature, or even through the Congress of the nation—if there be anyone so foolish—will find himself terribly mistaken in the day of reckoning.

Who is willing to be represented by another in religious faith and practice? Who is willing to make a member of his State legislature or of Congress his representative in religion? Who is willing to be bound in religion by an act of any legislative body? Who will in the [93] day of Judgment fall back with confidence upon such an act as valid authority for his own religious conduct?

The advocates of religious legislation say that legislators are like all other men, bound by the law of God; and so they are. But they are not so bound for other men, but only for themselves. Here is the vital point in the whole subject,—the point which the would-be reformers who are besieging our legislatures overlook or ignore. There can be no representative capacity in religion; and hence while each legislator is bound individually by the divine law, as representative of the people he has nothing to do with religious questions. He must confine himself to civil matters only.

This is not to say that he is to act against religion or against morality. The domain of things secular is not in any sense opposed to that of Christianity, any more than truth and justice in the one sphere are opposed to truth and justice in the other.

Legislators, like all other persons, may properly be urged to be obedient as individuals to the law of God. But to urge them to act thus for their constituents, as their representatives, is a different thing altogether. However righteous it may sound, or however necessary it may seem to be for the good of the country, in reality it is neither necessary nor righteous.

The Almighty will not recognize any arrangement by which one person is made to act for another in religion. Any such arrangement is in reality a heaven-daring piece of iniquity.

Legislators must simply refuse to deal as legislators with religious questions. Such matters must be settled in another way than by legislation. They must be left to the individual conscience and the Word of God.

"A Long Felt Want" American Sentinel 12, 6, p. 93.

[93]

ATJ

THE February *Christian Endevorer* contains the following:—

> "Intense interest was caused by the publication, in the January *Christian Endeavorer*, of Rev. S. W. Gamble's discovery that 'the Jewish Sabbath was not Saturday, but was a movable one.' Letters have been pouring in to him and into this office from all over the land, expressing the thanks of the writers that this new theory has been made known. Lack of space prevents our publishing a tithe of the letters that have been received from leading men of every denomination."

Well, we have always thought there was a good deal of uneasiness and uncertainty in the camp of the Sunday forces regarding the genuineness of their sabbath, and now we know it. Their action in this case confesses it. The greeting accorded Mr. Gamble's "great discovery" by "leading men of every denomination," is that of something which supplies a long felt want. A dubious testimonial this, for

all the argument which was supposed to furnish an abundant support to the Sunday sabbath heretofore.

And by this very fact, the Rev. Mr. Gamble's "discovery" has done more already to weaken the Sunday institution that it can ever do to sustain it. For erelong it will be found that this "discovery" is not what it seemed at first, and the long felt want will make itself more keenly felt by the adherents of tradition than ever before. These "great discoveries" which overthrow the Sabbath of the fourth commandment have been coming regularly for a long time, and they will continue to come with their accustomed frequency. But meanwhile the Sabbath, like Moses before the infidels, manages to keep right side up.

February 18, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 7, pp. 97, 98.

[97]

ATJ

THE Sabbath is a sign which the Lord has established: and “the seventh day is the Sabbath.”

God has established this sign between Himself and the believer in Him, that the believer may know that He is the Lord the true God.

Therefore 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.” Ezekiel 20:20.

The first of all things that God is to any other person or thing, is Creator. Unless He creates, there can be no existence of any person or thing but Himself.

As the Sabbath is the sign by which the believer may know that the Lord is God, it must first of all be a sign by which He may be known as the Creator of all things.

Therefore it is written: “It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever: *for* in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed.” Exodus 31:17.

Thus the “seventh day,” by being made the Sabbath, has been established by the Lord of heaven and earth as the sign by which it may be known that He is the Lord, the true God.

As the seventh day has been established by the Lord, as the sign by which it may be known that He is the Lord; it follows, in the nature of the case, that the Lord has connected with the seventh day that which is suggestive of what He is to the man who believes Him.

Yet all that God is to men, He is in Christ. All that men can know of God is through Christ. For it is written, “No man knoweth

the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him."

Then as the seventh day is the sign by which it may be known that the Lord is God: and as God can be known only through the revelation of Christ, it follows that the seventh day is the sign by which it may be known what Christ is, and what God in Christ is, to men.

And as the seventh day is the sign which God has established by which men may know what Christ is, what God in Christ is, to men, it certainly follows that the Lord has connected with the seventh day, that which is suggestive of what Christ is to all who believe in Him.

We have seen already that it is a sign of the creative power and acts of the Lord—"It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day He rested and was refreshed." And now since men have sinned, the believer is "His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

Thus the seventh day being the sign, the memorial, of the creative power and act of the Lord, is as truly the sign, the memorial, of that creative power and act in making the individual Christian as it is in the making of the worlds. Creative power being the same wherever manifested, the sign of that power is also the same in all places and at all times that that power is manifested. In other words, the sign of the power is, it must be, as continuous as is the manifestation of the power of which it is the sign.

Therefore as creative power is continually manifested in the individual Christian, and as the seventh day is the sign of the manifestation of that power, it is certain that this sign must be worn by every one who would show true respect and allegiance to the power that has created him. This is why it is that the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, is given by Him as the sign to be worn by every one who recognizes and receives in his own life the working of that power which creates him new in Christ Jesus, that power that makes him a new creature, or rather, a new creation.

[98] But the significance and appropriateness of this sign does not stop here. The Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, is a sign, it

bears about itself that which is suggestive, of all that Christ is to those who believe in Him.

When He had created the worlds, then "He rested the seventh day seventh day." "The seventh day is the rest of the Lord thy God." And to every person in the world He says, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest." "He is thy rest." Thus the seventh day is the sign of the rest that the believer finds in Christ, as the consequence of the creative act, just as certainly as it is the creative act itself. The two things are inseparable, therefore the sign of the two things is the same thing. "It is a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God," thy Creator and thy rest.

Yet not only did He rest the seventh day as the consequence of the creative act, but "He blessed the seventh day." The blessing of the Lord is upon the seventh day. The word says so. In this also it is a sign of what Christ is to the person who believes in Him: For it is written: "God having raised up His Son, Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." And "He hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ."

He hallowed the seventh day also: He made it holy. And so He calls it "my holy day," and calls upon all people to remember it "to keep it holy." In this also the seventh day is a sign of what Christ the Lord is to the believer in Him. For He says, "Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God." And it is His presence with the believer that alone can make him holy. It was His presence at the burning bush that made that place holy. So it is alone His presence with the believer that makes him holy. It was His presence that made the seventh day holy; it is His presence that makes the believer holy: and the seventh day is the sign of His presence which makes holy the place where it dwells, whether it be the heart of the believer now, or the Sabbath day at the close of creation week.

And He sanctified the seventh day. In this also the seventh day is a sign of what He is to the believer. For the believer is "sanctified by faith that is in Jesus." And "I am the Lord that doth santify you." And these two things He himself puts together in such a way that there is no escaping it. "I gave them my Sabbaths to be a sign between me

and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify them."

Thus the Lord has connected with the seventh day the suggestion of all that He is to those who believe in Him. He has done this, in order that the believer, by the observance of the Sabbath, may ever be growing in the knowledge of the Creator, the Lord and Saviour. To understand these suggestions, to see in the Sabbath the reflection of Jesus Christ, to receive these spiritual impressions—this, and this alone, is Sabbath observance.

The seventh day, then, having been established by the Lord, and plainly declared over and over in His written word, to be the sign of Himself, the sign of what He is in all things to mankind, the sign by which men may know that He is the Lord God—and that He is what He is, bearing always the suggestion of what He is to the one that believeth—what an enormous fraud has been committed in setting it aside and exalting Sunday in its place!

Sunday is not, and cannot be, in any sense a rest of the Lord, nor or anything in connection with Him. He did not rest on the first day; He did not bless the first day; He did not make holy the first day; He did not sanctify the first day.—There is therefore absolutely nothing about the Sunday that is suggestive of what the Lord is to the believer in Him nor to anybody else who lacks everything that could possibly make it such. It is therefore the most gigantic fraud and imposture that has ever appeared in the world.

And when the churches that have committed and fostered this fraud and imposture, dragged the Congress of the United States into the support of it, and of ... it, there was committed the greatest piece of governmental sacrilege since the night of Belshazzar's feast, as far as it would be possible to do such a thing, that which God himself established—the day on which He rested, which He blessed, hallowed, and sanctified, and deliberately set aside, and an absolute fraud and imposture was erected in its place. And now the same gymnastics that dragged Congress into the doing of that sacrilege, are working with might and main to get Congress to enact a law compelling people to wear this fraudulent thing, instead of leaving them free with the Lord to keep His own established sign, upon their own free choice. How could impiety go further?

"A Sunday Dilemma" American Sentinel 12, 7, pp. 99, 99.

[99]

ATJ

JUDGE RITCHIE, of Ohio, in opening the Court of Common Pleas, of Putnam County, in that State, recently charged the grand jury that they "should disabuse their minds of the idea that Sunday has any connection with the Christian Sabbath." He proceeded to shoe how "Sunday was first adopted by Constantine, A. D. 321, who "took it from paganism rather than from Christianity;" and declared that Sunday observance is but a police regulation, and not a matter of moral obligation at all.

This moved a believer in Sunday sacredness, who heard the judge's charge, to reply at length to the judge in the local paper, endeavoring to refute the idea that Sunday is not a sacred day.

The judge doubtless delivered his charge with a view to the enforcement of the Sunday law, believing that the law could not be enforced if construed as applying to a sacred institution. To put it on an enforceable basis in the minds of the grand jury and of the people, he was obliged to divest it in their minds of all claim to any [99] higher nature than that of a police regulation. It can well be imagined what the preachers and church people of the country would think of having the judges in general make such statements about Sunday as a regular part of the proceedings of opening court.

The only logical way out of the dilemma in which Sunday is thus placed, lies in an open confession that Sunday laws are to enforce a religious institution. That is the real ground on which they are demanded by the preachers; and to this basis they will have to come in the public view. On that basis, and not as a matter of police regulation, the public must accept or reject them.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 7, p. 101.

[101]

ATJ

A WRITER in a late number of the *Missionary Review of the World* deems it necessary to defend the cause of missions against the charge that "converts are only from the low-caste people in countries like India."

It is certain that *Christianity* needs no defense against such a charge as that. If "the cause of missions" needs it, it can be only because "the cause of missions" is lacking in some of the elements of Christianity.

It if should prove true that not a single high-caste person in such countries as India or any other country, and ever accepted Christianity, this would weigh absolutely nothing against the truth, the power, or the merit, of Christianity. It would simply show that all such people had made the greatest mistake that it is possible for any human being to make.

Yet there are thousands of people who propose to measure the merit of Christianity by just such a test as is here suggested. They support that if Christianity were to make many "converts" among the "high classes," this would be evidence that it was a pretty good religion. And if only it were to make *all* its "converts" among the "high classes," this would be evidence that it was a perfect religion—completely adapted to all the needs of mankind. Whereas if it made only a few converts from the "high classes," this would be evidence that it is rather an inferior religion. And if it should make no converts at all form such "class," this would be sufficient evidence that it is a religion worthy of no consideration at all by such altogether wise and proper people as "we" are.

Such views as this, however, are altogether vanity. Such people as these would have rejected Christ when He was on earth, just as did the other Pharisees. Such is precisely the argument made then by the "higher classes;" "Art thou also His disciple? Have nay of the rulers or the Pharisees believed on Him? But this people that knoweth not the law"—these unlearned, low class, common folks, who believe on Him—"are cursed." "He goeth in with publicans and sinners, and eateth with them." In fact, not a single one of the "higher classes" there was known to be a believer in Him till after He was dead; *then* two of them, who had been disciples, "but secretly," stepped out publicly and let be known that they were such.

If Christianity in Christ's day on earth had been dependent on the "high classes" for a place in the world, it would have had no place at all in the world. In fact, in that case it could not have even entered the world; for the only ones in all that land to whom the angels could announce the glad tidings were the lowly shepherds

who were watching their flocks and longing for the coming of the promised One.

Christianity knows no higher classes nor lower classes, nor classes of any other kind. It knows only that all men are so low as to be overwhelming lost in sin, and need to be saved. It knows that men of low degree are nothing, and that men of high degree are worse than nothing. It knows that all are lost alike, and all must be saved alike. And there is no respect of persons with God. Christianity therefore goes to all alike, offering everlasting life and eternal glory. And wherever it is true that there are any classes so "high" that they cannot be converted by it, that is only the more shame to them, and shows that they are really so low as not to be able to discern the value of the highest gift the universe can afford.

Caiaphas was so "high" that he could despise the Lord Jesus and persecute Him to death, and because of it he will sink to eternal perdition. But when the Lord was crucified with the two thieves, one of them was so "low" that he could believe on Him, and because of it he will rise to the heaven height of eternal glory.

Oh! in the presence of Christianity as it really is, for men to talk of "higher classes" and "lower classes," "high caste" and "low-caste," betrays such a lack of comprehension of it as to be painful to every Christian. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Why will any man in the wide world hold himself so high as to despise such a gift?

February 25, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 8, p. 113.

[113]

ATJ

THE Sabbath is God’s, not man’s.

The Lord says that it is “the Sabbath of the Lord thy God:” “My holy day.”

It was made for man, that is true: but it itself is the Lord’s, designed for the good of man.

It is the Lord’s institution, established for the good of man: and it is the man’s, and is only for the good of men, when it is held ever to be the Lord’s and is devoted sacredly to the object for which the Lord established it.

What is that object?—That man may know only the Lord. Therefore 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.” “It is a sign between me and you, throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.”

THERE are many people who do not know that Jehovah is God. There are many who say that they do not know whether there is any God at all. Yet all can know that Jehovah is God.

All that any one needs to do to know that Jehovah is God, is merely to employ the means which He has established that He may be known. “Hallow my Sabbaths and the shall be a sign between me and you that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.”

Surely that is simply enough. Surely that proposition if fair enough. Wherever there is one who does not know God, let him hallow the Sabbath of the Lord and he will know that Jehovah is

God. And if any one will not take enough interest in the matter to do so simple a thing as that, he is certainly without excuse.

And think of it: It is eternal life to know God; for it is written, "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

Eternal life is in knowing God; and by hallowing His Sabbaths God may be known; and yet men will despise His Sabbath, will trample it under foot, will ostracise, cast-out and persecute those who hold it, will set up a fraud in its place, and will make laws to compel the acceptance of the fraud instead of the genuine!

God established the Sabbath: man established the Sunday. The word of God says that "the seventh day is the Sabbath:" the word of man says that Sunday is the Sabbath. The word of God is the truth; therefore the seventh day is the Sabbath, by which is the knowledge of God, by which is eternal life; and Sunday is the fraud.

Is it wise then, is it safe, for Congress, State legislatures, or judges, to allow themselves to be made instruments in a grand scheme to shut away from men the God-given means of attaining to the knowledge of God and eternal life?

Who is the one most interested in keeping from men the knowledge of God? Who is the one most determined to keep men from the way of eternal life? Who? Every one can tell. Then into whose hands are they playing who by legislation, by law, or by any other means, keep men from the observance of the Sabbath of the Lord? In whose interests is it that Sunday—the false Sabbath, the false sign—is exalted, and supported, and forced upon men by all the power of earth?

We know that this is not the way that the Sabbath question is usually looked at; but this is the way it *should* be looked at, for this is the way the Bible puts it—and the Bible is right.

"Liberty Not Lost" American Sentinel 12, 8, p. 114.

[114]

ATJ

LIBERTY—in the highest and truest sense of the term—cannot be lost except by voluntary surrender. No combination of Church and State power, no Sunday "laws," no restrictions that can be put

upon an individual by religious legislation, can of themselves take away that individual liberty that is from God.

God is infinitely superior to all these forces, and it is His will that every one of His creatures should be free. This is so because freedom is indispensable to the rendering of that worship which is due from the individual to his Creator. God can accept no worship and no service that is not freely given.

It is not therefore in any spirit of hopelessness that we point out the dangers which now threaten the liberties of the American people. It may be, indeed, that the Constitution, and those principles of justice which it embodies, and upon which both the national and State governments are founded, will no longer serve as a protection to individual rights. It would seem that this is all but true of the situation even now. But even though the Constitution be entirely subverted, and though the very pillars of free government fall, soul liberty must still remain at the disposal of its divine Author. Its source is higher than any earthly constitution or government. All of liberty that ever found its way into such embodiments, was placed there by Him who presides over the destinies of all men; and when any people reject it as a principle of government, there still remains that avenue through which the gifts of God descend in their most perfect form, and which no governmental power can control.

This avenue the individual himself controls, and its use depends upon his own volition. It is the avenue of faith in the Word of God, necessitated by the relation of every individual to God. That relation is an individual relation, and is independent of earthly governments or power.

What we would do, in view of the encroachments upon the guaranties of liberty set in the principles and institutions of the Government, is to point out to all the one sure means by which liberty may be retained in the individual life. We are not prophesying the loss of all liberty. We know that liberty will not be lost; that after Sunday "laws" shall have been made as oppressive as enthroned despotism can make them, and enforced as rigorously as the churches are demanding they should be, even after the decree shall have been enforced that none may buy or sell save such as do homage to the papacy through that day she has set up,—there will be those who in the very midst of persecution will enjoy liberty in its fullness,

because they have been set free by the Son of God. "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

It was the Son of God who, in the midst of the "burning fiery furnace" kindled by Nebuchadnezzar of old, brought to the three faithful one such freedom that had never been their before. And that was a freedom for all time of the futility of any effort of earthly government to take away liberty from the soul.

And the time is coming—such is the unmistakable indication of events—when every individual must decide it with himself whether in his own case liberty shall be lost, or retained as these ancient worthies retained it. But this need cause no person fear or despair. Never were the three Hebrews better off, or in the government of greater happiness, than when in the midst of the fiery furnace.

The prospect before every individual who will serve and obey God is bright indeed. We would not ... point to this as well as to the gathering storm of religious persecution.

"The Two Ways" American Sentinel 12, 8, pp. 114-116.

[114]

ATJ

IN one of the cities of the West, lately, it was arranged to celebrate by a ball, the opening of a mission depot. The celebration happened to be appointed by Wednesday night.

"The ministers of sixteen churches of the city established "an emphatic protest," among other things, "against the presumption of arranging for such celebrating on the night generally conceded to the prayer-meeting, without any consultation with those who nearly concerned."

This is another of those general pointers that show how determined are the preachers to rule everybody in everything. They insist that people who are too religious shall conform in an altogether outward and formal way, to the ways and institutions of those who are religious. That is, they insist that people who are not religious, shall act as though they were religious, when the have no heart in it.

People who are not religious have just as much right to find entertainment in the way that they choose as do people who are religious have to find entertainments the way that they choose. In other words, people who are not religious have just as much right

to go to them as people who are religious have to go to a prayer-meeting. And there is no sort of presumption in those who are not religious, going to such entertainment on the same night that the religious ones go to prayer-meeting. Indeed, the only presumption in the case is in anyone calling such a thing presumption.

Now we are not admitting for one moment that a ball is as good as a prayer-meeting. There is no ... comparison between them. A ball is not a good ... at all; while a prayer-meeting is only good. But there is also a great difference between the two sorts of people. The people who go to balls, *ought* to go to prayer-meeting instead. They ought never to go to balls at all, and they ought to go to prayer-meeting every time. And this must be of their own free choice. [115] And to show a disposition that would compel them to go to prayer-meeting if we could; or that censures them for going somewhere else on prayer-meeting night; is not the best way to cause them to choose, or incline them, to go to the prayer-meeting.

THE REALITIES OF CHRISTIANITY [115]

Of course no Christian ever goes to a ball. The Christian has substantial pleasures and entertainments of an order so much higher than balls or anything else that this world can furnish, that such things can find no place in his thought at all. To him the prayer-meeting so far surpasses the ball or any other worldly entertainment, that there can never be any shadow of rivalry or divided purpose when the two things fall on the same night. He is a Christian. He is not of this world, even as Christ is not of this world. His mind, his affection, his heart, is set on things above, not on things on the earth. And his pleasures and entertainment are from a source as much purer, and are of an order as much higher, than this world or anything that is of this world, as is the difference and the distance between heaven and earth.

Now the person who goes to balls and finds his pleasures and entertainment in such things as this world affords, does not know that Christianity presents these higher pleasures and richer entertainments. And while he does not know this, shall he be deprived of what little fleeting pleasure he may be able to find in the world where he is? And above all, shall he be deprived of it by professed

Christians? And more than this, when "the ministers of sixteen churches" show so much jealousy of his little joy, is such action calculated to convince him that there is a reality about the superior pleasures which they say belong with the religion that they profess?

SEPARATION FROM THE WORLD

These ministers said of themselves: "We, as ministers of the gospel and followers of a religion that demands of us separation from the world, take this opportunity to offer our emphatic protest," etc. It is true enough and it is supremely proper that they should be followers of a religion that demands of them separation from the world. Why, then, being separated from the world, do they still try to run the world as though they yet belonged to it? The proper thing for us to do, who are separated from this world, is so to present the transcendent glories of the world to which we belong that people will leave this old sinful, troublesome, fleeting world, and come over to the happy, holy, eternal bliss of the world to come, but which to the Christian begins already in this.

Those who are of this world know that the best that they can get from it is unsatisfactory. They know that even the best pleasures that it can afford do not satisfy—that they are not pleasures at all for more than the moment. On the other hand those who have hold on the heavenly world know that every item is very satisfaction itself—their joy is full, their peace passeth all understanding, their meditation is sweet, their study is a delight, their very labor is restful. Those who know this good of the other world even in this, are to let its love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness and goodness, so shine in their lives, they are to be so glad, so rejoicing in the Lord always—and all this is simply to say that they are to be Christians—that those who know only the apples-of-Sodom-pleasures and good of this world shall see that there is a source of pleasure and of all goodness and truth—that there is indeed a world that is so much better than this one that they will freely, gladly, leave the fleeting shadows of this one, and enter into the enjoyment of the eternally-enduring substance of the other world.

LET US NOT BE HARD-HEARTED

Then even though they will not take the good and the joy of the world to which we belong, oh let us not be so hard-hearted as to want to deny to them the little pleasures that they try so hard to find in this world. There is but little of it at the very best, and even though there were much of it there is but a very short time at the most in which they can possibly have it. Then when the pleasure is so little, so fleeting, so unsatisfying, and the time so very short in which they can have it, even though they take all the time they will ever have, it is cruel to want to deprive them of it; and to brand it as presumption if the times of their uncommon pleasures happen to fall at the times of our common ones.

No, no. The Christian, while exceedingly sorry that people who for the taking can have the best that the universe affords will seek to be pleased and satisfied with the very worst, will not attempt to take from them against their will or their wish the little empty pleasures that they may be able by such hard endeavor to gain.

DON'T AMSK PEOPLE TO BE DISHONEST

It is proper also to say to these "ministers of sixteen churches" and to all others, that the Lord Jesus does not want any person to make pretensions to being religious from any sort of outward considerations whatever. He does not want any person to act as though he were religious when his whole heart is not in it. Here is His word: "Either make the tree good and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt; for a tree is known by his fruit." The Author of Christianity would rather have a man to be openly and honestly worldly than to have him make a profession and an outward show of Christianity when he is not a Christian. Either make the tree good and his fruit good, or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt, and be done with it.

The Lord wants no criss-cross work. He wants it straight and honest from the heart, or not at all. And every man who has any respect for himself wants it so too. And it is in every way better to have it so. It is better for a man to be honestly wicked than to be hypocritically good. An honest infidel is better—he is a better man and it is better to have him in the world—than a dishonest Christian. [116]

Of course, rightly speaking, there is no such thing as a dishonest Christian; for if he is dishonest in anything he simply is not a Christian. But yet every Christian is obliged with sorrow to confess that there are those who bear the name, and make the profession, of being Christians, who are not honestly such. They are such only from policy of some phase—perhaps indeed that they may not be counted presumptuous by the ministers of sixteen churches, when the night of their worldly pleasures happens to be the same as the prayer-meeting night. But may the Lord save the people from all such religion as that!

Let all who bear the name of Christian be Christians indeed; then there will not be nearly so many people going to balls on prayer-meeting nights; and then those who do go to balls on prayer-meeting nights will not be denounced as presumptuous by those who do not go.

"The Clergy Against the Bible" American Sentinel 12, 8, pp. 116, 117.

[116]

ATJ

NOW that the political campaign is ended, the preachers are finding time between the filling of their ... pulpits and laying plans to get control of the government, to discuss the question of the infallibility of the Bible. As the Bible says nothing about political campaigning or getting control of the civil power pertaining to the work of the Christian ministry, but speaks distinctly to the contrary, it is perhaps not stranger to find the question of its infallibility should have become a ... point.

Foremost in the ranks of dissenters from this cardinal principle of orthodoxy, is the Rev. Lyman Abbott, of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. Dr. Abbott discourses seem to be in the main a statement of his beliefs in regard to the Scriptures. He does not believe Genesis—that has been known ever since he became successor of Henry Ward Beecher. Not long ago he had a laugh in his congregation over the idea of the fish in the Book of Jonah; and a little later he announced his disbelief in another portion of the sacred volume as to what parts of the Bible—if any—he places out in the realm of fiction, it would be difficult to judge from his discourses. One thing

he does believe in, however, and that is a strict Sunday law. In the February *Christian Endeavorer*, we find him saying:—

> "I think that experience demonstrates that a day of rest must be secured not merely by private agreement, but by legislative enactments vigorously enforced."

Some of the papers have been drawing comparisons between Dr. Abbott's words concerning the Book of Jonah and the words of Thomas Paine on the same subject, and discover such a similarity of language as to come to the conclusion that it is a case of teacher and pupil. The only difference is that in Paine's day infidelity did not presume to speak from the "Christian" pulpit.

What has made the question of the Bible's inferiority especially prominent just now, however, is a discussion which took place at a meeting of about three hundred prominent Methodist ministers at the Methodist Book Concern, New York City, February 15. There an editor of the leading Methodist journal in America, Mr. Buckley, stated that he did not believe in the infallibility of the Bible in the English version. This announcement created considerable disorder, in the midst of which Mr. Buckley maintained his position and demanded that the question be put to vote. This was finally done, with the result that only one vote was obtained for the view that the Bible, in English, is infallible. [117]

Of course, the practical effect of this attitude of this representative Methodist body will be to lessen confidence in the Bible, as read by the masses in English-speaking countries. And since the latter can read no other, they are from this latest Methodist standpoint left without any Bible at all; for a Bible that is fallible is not the Word upon which we can depend for salvation. Faith being the indispensable requisite to salvation, and demanding unquestioning belief of the Word of God, we must have that Word itself, or derive no benefit from the plan of salvation.

And the same is of course true of the German, French, and any other Bible, since all these are but translations of the original text, and therefore as fallible as the English Bible. The work of the British and Foreign Bible Society and similar bodies in giving the Bible to the nations and places of the world, must be discounted, since

they have only furnished translations, which are therefore fallible and even if we would go back to the original text for an infallible authority, we are met by the fact that there are nothing but copies of the original writings now in existence; and of course a copyist is just as fallible as a translator.

Hence the doctrine that the Bible, in the English or other tongues, is not infallible, is equivalent to a denial of the infallibility of any Bible known to the world to-day. The real nature of this objection may be understood from the fact that this is one of the leading points sought to be made against the Bible by the author of the "Age to Reason."

As the AMERICAN SENTINEL stands for liberty, for justice, for equal rights to all men, so it stands for the Christian's Bible, against the traditions, customs, and popery which have sought to take the place of the Word, and which have ever been a menace to the liberties and rights of the people. The less reverence men have for the Bible, the more reverence they have for tradition and the opinions of men in higher station than themselves; and the more this reverence finds expression, the nearer do men come to the full realization of popery.

We believe it would be well for the clergy to settle the question of their belief in the Bible's infallibility before proceeding further with the scheme to take control of the Government and make the "revealed will of Christ" the supreme authority in our civil affairs. Are they sure that we have the "revealed will of Christ" in the "fallible" English Bible? This is a question which ought, with them, to take precedence of all others.

"An Illustration of Greek 'Learning'" American Sentinel 12, 8, pp. 117, 118.

[117]

ATJ

IN a recent number of the *Christian Advocate*, of this city, there was printed—and from a Doctor of Philosophy too—one of the most thoughtless articles we ever saw in a journal of any standing. We do not mention it here to criticise it, but to call the sober attention of thoughtful people, and of that kind of thoughtless people too, to an important consideration that is involved in it.

This Doctor of Philosophy was in Greece and sent to the *Christian Advocate* an account of his journey from Patras—which is the principal port of the Gulf of Corinth to Pireus, which is the port of Athens, with descriptions of the Acropolis of Corinth and the Acropolis of Athens.

In his description of the temples of the Acropolis of Athens he speaks of them repeatedly as "sacred"—"the sacred cella of her sacred house," etc. He does not say that by the Greeks and other heathen anciently they were *considered* sacred. Nowhere in the article does it appear that he used the word with any such idea as that it is merely in accommodation to ancient notions. Every sentiment in the article bears irresistibly to the conviction that the writer himself considers those places sacred and uses the word in the same sense that the ancient Greeks did. In other words, the writer is evidently so imbued with Greek ideas, Greek conceptions, and Greek modes of thinking, that what to them was "sacred" is to him sacred.

But everybody knows that those Greeks were sheer heathen. And all who have read much know that they were heathen of such a sort that their very idea of sacredness was profanity, and their most sacred emblem an obscene symbol. That a man in this age, in the presence of Christian ideas and in a Christian journal should speak of the [118] places that to those heathen were "sacred," and himself use the word in the same sense as did they, certainly shows a thoughtlessness that is remarkable.

But this is not all. Please read the following:—

> "Thirdly comes the crown and pride of all temples made with hands, the Parthenon, the temple of the Athenian Virgin. To attempt any description of this superb shrine would be a work of supererogation alike distasteful to gods and men."

"Distasteful to gods." Is it true, then, that there are really such things as gods to whom things can be distasteful? Does this writer think that the Greek gods still have their habitat on the Acropalis of Athens and round about, so that if he should take the liberty of writing up their shrines for the consideration of the barbarian

Americans, they would be displeased—does he? If not, what does he mean? And if he *does*, what does he mean?

Does he not know that such of the Greek gods as had any real identity, were devils? While Athens and Corinth were in their glory, and their gods were worshiped in all the corrupt and corrupting rites that became them, it was written to people who dwelt there: "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils." But they sacrificed unto their gods. Are these devils the gods for whom this writer has so much respect that he would not do so slight a thing as to write a detailed account of their "sacred" shrines lest he should do that which was "distasteful" to them?

If not this, then does he believe that the mythical things of the vain imagination of the Greeks, were really gods, and of such enduring substance that they still continue in the ancient haunts; so that if a person should not there walk softly and with reverent mien or should attempt to write about them and their "sacred" places, they would be offended—at least in taste? Does he not know that they were "nothing?"

If he believes neither of these things, then why does he write so? For, as before suggested, there is no hint that he writes otherwise than with sobriety and from conviction. And if he believes either of them, then his article betrays a remarkable thoughtlessness.

It is not to be supposed that he takes devils to be these gods, and would hesitate to do anything distasteful to them. It is possible, however, that his mind may have become so thoroughly saturated with Greek ideas, his imagination so pervaded with Greek conceptions, and his admiration so engrossed with the "perfections" of Greek sentiment, that all these things appear to him just as they did to the Greeks themselves, that they are all as real to him and in the same way as they were to the Greeks themselves. And that this is indeed most probable, is strongly suggested in his statement that the Parthenon was "the crown and pride of all temples made with hands." But this again betrays sheer thoughtlessness or worse. Did he never read the description of the Temple of God at Jerusalem that was built by Solomon. It far surpassed the Parthenon.

Surely every person who will think at all on the subject can see at once that the Greek gods were in conception nothing but the reflection of the imagination of the Greeks themselves. And every

person who has reason knows that in disposition and character the Greek gods were perfectly devilish. And if then he will think for a moment he will see clearly that in disposition and character the Greek gods were but the reflection of the disposition and character of the Greeks themselves. He will see therefore that these gods were, so far as themselves were concerned, literally nothing; but were in *fact* only the Greeks themselves—and every one of them has been dead from a thousand to two or three thousand years.

Then as for the gods themselves, why should this writer think that he could do anything that would be distasteful to *nothing?* And as for the Greeks who were in fact their own gods, but who have been dead so long, why should he think he could do anything distasteful to them? And as the dispositions and characters of those Greeks when they were alive were so essentially devilish, why should he hesitate to do what might be distasteful to them even though they were all alive to-day. That the thing were distasteful or even offensive to them would be one of the best possible evidences of the essential virtue of it, and that it was the very thing to do.

An important question upon all this is, Where is the merit in Greek philosophy, religion, or art—for their art was but idolatry? What possible good can come to anybody from contemplating and absorbing such a mass of falsehood, corruption and vanity? The Latin field is the same. Yet these are the chief field, and the pride, and "learning," in almost all the colleges in the world. It is so even in professed Christian colleges. But how is it possible for young men, or young women, or anybody in fact, to study such stuff as all that really is, without becoming essentially paganized? It is not possible.

But what was this paganism to Greece and Rome? What did it do for them? What did this philosophy, religion, and art, *in its perfection*, do for the Greeks and Romans? Was the result of all this with them, so altogether good and profitable, that it needs to be reproduced in the world? Every man who thinks, knows that the height of Greek and Roman development, when all this "shone" in its "brightest lustre," was the deepest state of moral degradation that had ever been seen in the world since the day that Sodom and Gomorrah perished. Does it need to be reproduced in the world? Every decent man is compelled to say, No. Then why should that

which produced it before be reproduced and glorified in the world? Can you indulge the cause and escape the effect? It is time that the people began to think.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 8, p. 118.

[118]

ATJ

WE have reached a time when individualism finds its sole refuge in the gospel of Jesus Christ.

"Notes" American Sentinel 12, 8, pp. 122, 123.

[122]

ATJ

> AN exchange says that "The ministers of Salt Lake City, Utah, have passed resolutions recommending capital punishment, based on these grounds, to wit: 'That the Bible favors the infliction of the death penalty for the crime of murder; that the Lord has never ordered it repealed; that it has never been repealed, and is, consequently, still in force; that such being the undisputed

[123]

> facts in the case, it follows that it is right; and therefore the Utah legislature should so recognize it and make laws in conformity."

This is the doctrine that the United States Government is asked to accept in the proposed "Christian Amendment" to the Constitution. By that amendment, the Government would be bound to enforce by civil penalties all that is commanded in the Word of God and not repealed. And as the Bible leaves no side of human life and duty untouched, but covers all by its precepts, the Government, having passed the amendment, would merely have to consider theological questions as to what the Bible enjoins. And of course it would devolve on the theologians to say what a command of Scripture means, and whether it has been repealed, or is still in force. This would make of Congress an assembly of contending theologians? It is our impression that there is enough of such controversy in the country as it is.

March 4, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 9, p. 129.

[129]

ATJ

“SELF-PRESERVATION is the first law of nature.”

But self-sacrifice is the first law of grace.

In order to self-preservation, self-defense is essential.

In order to self-sacrifice, self-surrender is essential.

In self-defense, the only thing that can be employed is force.

In self-surrender, the only thing that can be employed is love.

In self-preservation, by self-defense, through the employment of force, force meets force, and this means only war.

In self-sacrifice, by self-surrender, through love, force is met by love, and this means only peace.

Self-preservation, then, means only war: while self-sacrifice means only peace.

But war means only death: Self-preservation, then, meaning only war, means only death. While self-sacrifice, meaning only peace, means only life.

Self-preservation being the first law of nature, nature then means only death. While self-sacrifice being the first law of grace, grace means only life.

But death is only the wages of sin: nature, then meaning only death, it is so only because nature means sin. While life being only the reward of righteousness: grace meaning only life, it is so only because grace means righteousness.

Sin and righteousness, nature and grace, are directly opposite and antagonistic elements. They occupy realms absolutely distinct. Nature, self-preservation, self-defense, force, war, and death, occupy

only the realm of sin. Grace, self-sacrifice, self-surrender, love, peace, and life, occupy only the realm of righteousness.

The realm of sin is the realm of Satan. The realm of grace is the realm of God. All the power of the domain of grace is devoted to saving men from the dominion of sin. This in order, that "as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign, through righteousness, unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

On which side do you stand in this great controversy?

"Is It a Christian Mission?" American Sentinel 12, 9, pp. 129, 130.

[129]

ATJ

THE *Christian Observer* observes that "the work of the Rev. Gilbert Reid, in China, is distinctly to the higher classes. In that country Mr. Reid believes that the educated and official classes must be reached before much can be accomplished for those beneath them."

This work of Mr. Reid is professedly Christian work. It is a mission distinctly to the higher classes. It is proposed to bring these higher classes to Christianity; then by these bright examples of Christian grace and virtue accomplish much for "those beneath them."

But we wonder what means is to be employed by Mr. Reid to do this. As his mission is professedly Christian, the Bible is the only thing that can rightly be used for the work to be done. But for the mission and the method of work here proposed he has not Bible; for the Bible is directly against it.

The root idea of this mission is distinction of classes—respect of persons: while the Bible holds to the eternal truth, that "There is no respect of persons with God." How then can he use the Bible in the work of a mission whose root idea is against Bible principle?

As this is professedly a Christian mission, it is fairly to be presumed that the faith of Christ is to be the all-important theme; but the faith of Christ plainly forbids that which is the fundamental proposition of the scheme. It is written, "My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons.... For if ye have respect of persons ye commit sin; and are

convinced of the law as transgressors. How then can men be brought to Christ, by methods whose fundamental principle is contrary to [130] the expressed word and faith of Christ? And if they are not brought to Christ, then what will the mission accomplish?

But this is not all: As Mr. Reid's is professedly a Christian mission, it is to be supposed that he will follow the method, and present the word, of Christ. There came to Jesus once, one of "the higher classes"—one of "the educated and official class"—a ruler of the Jews, a member of the Sanhedrim. The first words that Jesus said to him were these: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

This high-class man didn't understand that, and asked, "How can a man be born when he is old?" "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again."

It Mr. Reid does not preach this to the higher classes to whom he has gone, then he will not preach to them Christianity at all. And as certainly as he does preach it, and as certainly as any of them accept it and are born again, so certainly they will no longer be of "the higher classes." On their own part they will not count themselves of "the higher classes," but of the lowest, the chiefs of sinners; and on the part of "the higher classes" those who are born again will no longer be recognized or counted as belonging in their "class" at all.

Yet more than this: Even though Mr. Reid's scheme should succeed exactly according to his plan as described, no man would be justified in concluding that it was the work of Christianity throughout. Even though he should succeed in getting "the higher classes" to accept his religion and still remain "the higher classes," so that "those beneath them" could be attracted by their example, the mission would yet lack the essential element of Christianity.

Everybody knows the readiness of the lower classes to court the attention and favor of the higher classes by imitating their ways, whether it be in the cut of their hair, the cut of their beard, the cut of their coats, or the cut of their religion. Whatever becomes fashionable among the higher classes will be readily copied by those beneath them. And only let Mr. Reid's religion become fashionable

among the higher classes of China or anywhere else, and just then he will find "much accomplished for those beneath them" in the way of their imitating the ways of the new fashion in religion.

But it would not by any means be Christianity. Whole nations have been thus "Christianized;" but they were further from Christianity when it was done, than when they made no pretensions to being anything but heathen. At first they were only heathen. But after being so "Christianized," they were heathen and hypocrites besides. When they were only heathen, there was room, and a possibility, for them to become genuine Christians by accepting the faith of Christ upon principle. But when they became heathen, who, by only outward form, gave themselves credit for being Christians, they thus shut themselves off from becoming Christian indeed, by having made it only a cloak for their heathenism.

Christianity is not a fashion: it is a principle. It is not a thing that can be imitated: it is a new life put in the heart. It cannot be derived from any example of "the higher classes," but from God alone, by a positive faith in Jesus Christ.

And just because it is *a principle* and not a mere profession; because it is a *new life* and not a new fashion, in its very nature Christianity can never recognize classes, nor class distinctions, nor have any ... of persons whatever. The cross of Jesus Christ abolishes and obliterates all middle walls of partition, obliterating "the enmity" from which arise all things.

In the light of the plain words of Scripture, and what Christianity really is, it is plain enough then that Mr. Reid's mission is, is to carry to China a view of philosophy and civilization that is different from that which they have. But neither philosophy nor civilization, nor even a compound of both, is Christianity.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 9, pp. 138, 139.

[138]

ATJ

ONE of the assumptions upon which Sunday laws are sought to be upheld, is that Sunday as a rest day is an "American institution." It seems incredible that an intelligent person could regard this plea as anything more than an assumption, and an exceedingly poor one at that. An American institution is something the origin of which

can be traced back to some event or series of events in the history of the American nation. But every person knows, the Sunday rest can be traced to, or ages before the American nation came into being, [139] and if it were, as claimed, an American institution, that fact would entirely destroy its claim to rest upon an authority higher than that of man. But in the matter of commanding and enforcing religious observances, man has no authority whatever.

By way of making this claim more plausible, however, it is asserted that the Sabbath is "an American institution on the civil side of it." This was said by a prominent speaker at the recent Sabbath Observance convention at Pittsburg, Pa. But was the Sabbath instituted by the Creator with one side of it lacking, which it was to be left for man to supply? Was not the Sabbath a perfect institution when it came from the hand of the Creator? Did the Creator ever make anything that was imperfect?

These question answer themselves, and entirely sweep away the idea of a "civil side" to the Sabbath. The Sabbath came to man in Eden, before there was any civil government on earth; it was a complete institution then, and it was the same then that it is to-day.

March 11, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 10, pp. 145, 146.

[145]

ATJ

THE religious world in general has not entered upon that period of extra-biblical observances which culminates in the festival of Easter.

This festival has acquired an importance in the religious world which is in inverse proportion to the distinction accorded it in the Scriptures of divine truth. By Catholics and Protestants alike, it will be observed in a manner calculated to give the impression that it is a thing of the greatest importance to all Christians, instead of a mere innovation, as it is, without any standing whatever in the Word of God.

Why is this day observed? By Protestants, it is observed in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ. The underlying idea of the observance is that on Easter morning Christ arise from the dead. Easter day is not a weekly or monthly day, but a yearly day; and in its celebration Protestants recognize the fact that the day of Christ’s resurrection from the dead is a yearly day. Like any other event,—as for example the birth of the infant Christ,—the day of its happening would recur not once a week or once a month, but once a year. As well might it be claimed that Christmas or Independence day comes every week, as that this is true of the day of Christ’s resurrection.

The festival of Eastern we repeat, is on the part of Protestants at least, a recognition of this fact; for if the day of the resurrection comes once a week, it does not come once a year, but fifty-two times

a year; and any yearly celebration of the day would be without any reason whatever.

But these same Protestants observe the first day of every week in commemoration of this same event. In this they contradict themselves with reference to Easter; and in the observance of Easter they contradict themselves with reference to Sunday.

Of course, being a yearly day, it could not come every year on Sunday; yet lo, by theological sleight-of-hand it is made to coincide every year with that day of the week! Equally marvelous with this is the fact that it does not have to occur each year in the same month. Sometimes is happens in March, sometimes in April, according as the moon may have fulled before or after the sun "crossed the line." But whether in one month or the other, it is celebrated as the day of the resurrection of Christ.

Had this celebration been fixed on a certain date, as Christmas is, the religious world would have found itself celebrating, very often, some other day of the week than Sunday in commemoration of the resurrection. And this is the way it should be, if any attempt is to be made to celebrate the day at all. But this would be a contradiction of Sunday observance which even the most accomplished theologian would not be able to explain. Consequently it was decreed that the date must coincide with Sunday, and the month and day of the month were left to adjust themselves to a day of the week.

Of course, nobody knows the date of Christ's resurrection from the dead, any more than the date of his birth. Doubtless it was not designed by the Almighty that these dates should be known. If God had wished either of them to be observed, he would have preserved them for that purpose; but their observance serves no purpose in His economy, and He would not give any people an excuse for observances which He has not commanded.

Would it not be better—infinitely so—to observe a day which God has plainly commanded, and which He Himself has fixed in the week? By resting on the seventh day after His six days' labor, and blessing and sanctifying that day as a day of rest and blessing for mankind, the Creator established the weekly division of time, and fixed the seventh day of that period as the Sabbath. Why will the religious world turn aside from the one day which God has so
[146] plainly commanded, to do honor to other days which he has never

approved? Have they reasons for this which it is certain the Creator will accept?

"'Sundays Excepted'" American Sentinel 12, 10, p. 146.

[146]

ATJ

A SPEAKER at the "Christian Citizenship" meeting in Washington, February 28, contended that the words "Sundays excepted" in that clause of the Constitution which relates to the signing of bills by the President, were sufficient to demonstrate that Sunday observance is Constitutional and therefore not un-American.

These words of the Constitution, however, afford no basis whatever for an enforced observance of Sunday. The most that can be deduced from them is an acknowledgment of the President's right to rest on Sunday from his official work. He is granted a certain length of time in which to consider bills passed by Congress before affixing his signature thereto, and in order to avail himself of the full limit, he would be obliged to do such work on Sunday were that day not designated as an exception. Were the words "Sunday excepted" left out, the provision would simply amount to the statement that the President has nine days in which to consider the said bills, unless he should be a man devoid of religious scruples, which would be rarely if ever the case. But the framers of the Constitution designed that the President should have ten days—not nine days—in any case, and accordingly made this allowance for conscientious scruples against Sunday work.

No one claims that mere Sunday observance, in obedience to the dictates of conscience, is unconstitutional or un-American. Neither also is it Constitutional; for what is Constitutional is established in the supreme law of the land. It is simply outside the sphere of the Constitution; and that instrument does not undertake to regulate it in any way. If the President wishes to examine bills on Sunday, there is nothing in the Constitution to prevent him; and he is equally free to observe that day as the Sabbath if he believes that he ought to do so.

But compulsory Sunday observance is another thing altogether. That is not sanctioned by the Constitution in any way. That can be secured only by religious legislation, which is forbidden so far as

the provisions of the Constitution extend, and it totally un-American and un-Christian.

March 18, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 11, pp. 161, 162.

[161]

ATJ

ABOUT as near as anyone can come to divining the purpose of “Lent,” as related to Protestants, in the absence of any authority on the subject, is to say that it institutes a sort of “indulgence” for a life of doubtful duty during the rest of the year.

It would be possible for Lent to be only this, even if it were a season instituted by the Lord; for God’s institutions often become perverted. And as it was not instituted by the Lord, it is not possible that it should be anything but this.

The real purpose of penance, in the heathen system of which it forms a part, is that of an indulgence, either to satisfy a past transgression, or to provide for a future one. It is a principle of human nature—and human nature is strictly heathen—that an individual can in some way and to some extent, atone for his own transgressions. This principle crops out everywhere in an individual’s way, before he becomes a Christian, of dealing with himself and with others. His own bad deeds, or those of others, are offset in his view by the later “good” deeds of the respective parties. He thinks that he must do something good in order to become good; and that he must just make himself good in this way to a certain extent, before he can come into touch with God.

Having done what he considers a very good deed, by way of penance, his conscience will be eased until he again does something that he knows to be of a decidedly different character, or until he has continued for some time in the pathway of “small” transgressions. Then he feels that he must again do something to set himself straight.

So it happens that the Lenten period of penance supplies a want of human nature, coming as it does in intervals convenient for that purpose.

Upon this question of the real nature and purpose of Lent, we may cite the testimony of the papal church. That church is the author of the observance, and being in no sense a divine ordinance, it has never been perverted from its original purpose. In a late issue of Cardinal Gibbons' organ, the *Catholic Mirror*, the following observations are made by way of preparing the minds of "the faithful" for the occasion:—

> "With this week begins the holy season of Lent, when according to the precept and immemorial custom of the church, we should, as far as possible, lay aside worldly thoughts, and especially worldly pleasures, and occupy ourselves with considerations which relate to our eternal salvation. This, indeed, we should do at all times; but more especially in Lent, when everything in the divine offices of our religion reminds us that the passion and death of our Lord are to be soon commemorated.
>
> "There is no person who cannot give up something for the sake of Almighty God, in Lent—all that is necessary is the will to do so. There are pleasures, of doubtful benefit to us spiritually at all times, which should now peremptorily be abandoned. There are the very questionable amusements in which many indulge—the play-going, the reading of light literature, and the various diversions of society. During the penitential season, at least, these recreations should be utterly relinquished, and the discipline of the church should be complied with as rigorously as possible. Then it will not follow at the end that one, looking back with regret and self-reproach, will realize that the holy season for him or her has come and gone in vain."

In brief, the idea here expressed is that during this season of penance, "worldly pleasures" "of doubtful benefit to us spiritually

at all times," "very questionable amusements," etc., should be laid aside, and the individual should conduct himself in a strictly Christian manner. And what makes it a season of penance is the very fact that he feels obliged to conduct himself in this way. For forty days a heathen must try to act like a Christian. And truly, if that be not a penance, we cannot think of anything that would be. Every individual who has tried the experiment knows how hard it is to try to act like a Christian before being one. [162]

It will be said, of course, that Lent is for Christians—"the faithful"—and not for the heathen at all. But we do not care anything about the theory of Lent. We are considering only the reality of it, and the reality is that Christians can have no possible use for Lent, because (1) it has no sanction in the Word of God, and (2) a Christian acts like a Christian at all times of the year, and not merely during some period of penance. And he finds no penance at all, but only pleasure, in so doing.

To seek to gain an indulgence for a life of "questionable amusements" and "worldly pleasures" during the rest of the year, by means of the Lenten penance, is no more Protestant or Christian than to purchase an indulgence from the pope direct.

"Freedom for a Million Slaves" American Sentinel 12, 11, p. 162.

[162]

ATJ

THE *Christian Endeavorer* is much exercised over the matter of "Sunday slavery" which is alleged to be very prevalent in this country. In its March issue it calls for the abolition of this Sunday slavery as the thing of first importance in work for the "rescue of the Sabbath." "There are," it says, "over a million people in the United States who are obliged to work on Sunday against their will."

If the SENTINEL could but reach this million and more of people, it would say to them in the name and by the authority of Him who rules over all, You are not slaves at all, but free men, if you but will to have it so. We have better tidings for you than those who remind you of your slavery. You need not wait for the success of some movement on their part to set you free by law; you are free already. It only remains that you should assert your freedom.

This, of course, you may not be willing to do; but you can do it if you will; and if you do not, your slavery will be voluntary.

You are not compelled to work on Sunday against your will. No one is compelled to do this. You are, at most, only compelled to choose between Sunday work and the prospective suffering of pecuniary loss. But pecuniary loss is not the loss of liberty. The freest individual in the world is liable to pecuniary loss.

If you are in slavery, it is only because you do not know that you are free. That, indeed, is the common condition of mankind. Freedom, full and complete, has been purchased for all. The great emancipation proclamation for the race has been issued, over a name and seal that stand for all power and authority. The only thing necessary for any man is that he shall accept his freedom.

If the slaves of the South had refused to accept the freedom offered them in the proclamation of President Lincoln,—if they had chosen to remain just as they were, refusing to believe that they had been set free, or waiting for some law to be enacted compelling them to be free, they might have remained slaves until this day. In some instances they did, through ignorance, remaining until long after the edict of emancipation went out. But the vast majority were willing to take the freedom it brought them. They immediately took their liberty. But people are very much aloof to the soul liberty which is just as truly theirs.

By the sacrifice on the cross, the Lord has purchased this liberty for every individual so that it becomes to each a free gift. But a ... not unless it is accepted. By accepting this it becomes the high prerogative of every person ... always the dictates of his will and conscience.

This, of course demands faith in the person. It is faith that sustains the individual in personal freedom. His will being always to do that when he simply obeys the dictates of conscience as unto the Word, and leaves the results with God.

There is no reason whatever why any one should complain of "Sunday slavery." The ... such complaint should be conclusive evidence of the Christian character of the complainant.

The Christian simply trusts his God and ... freedom. Whatever he believes God has ... that he does, without reference to any arrangement established by man. Hence he is never without the

enjoyment of Sabbath rest. Human customs and actions must, with him, adapt themselves to the word of God, and not the precepts of God to the rule.

And this is the liberty that every individual may assert. He must *assert* it, on the basis on which it is offered, if he is to *realize* it. If he waits for a law to compel him to realize it, he will not realize liberty. Soul liberty cannot be obtained that way.

We say again, there is full and complete liberty for this multitude in "Sunday slavery," for the immediate realization, upon the basis God himself has established for it. God is the Author of liberty, and also the Creator of man. He is the God both of the Christian and the gentile. All men should be possessed of that means by which they may know the freedom which God gives, and become forever emancipated from their slavery. And why should the *Christian Endeavorers* hold them to anything else?

"'What Is Wrong?'" American Sentinel 12, 11, p. 164.

[164]

ATJ

WHAT is wrong? inquires the Rev. C. S. Bullock, in the March *Christian Endeavorer*, and proceeds to justify and answer the query as follows:—

> "Every pulpit in the land guarded by law—nearly one hundred thousand men of learning and ability set for the bringing to the attention of other men the life and death message of God—and yet—
>
> "Multiply the twelve apostles by eight thousand and how soon they would turn the word up-side-down! What is wrong?
>
> "Think of England—the brightest part of Europe. Eighty thousand criminals; one hundred and sixty thousand drunkards; one hundred thousand prostitutes; nearly ten hundred thousand paupers, and a drink bill of one hundred and thirty-six million pounds sterling! Is that the best the gospel of Jesus Christ can do for England?

> "Look upon our own land—over seventy-three million population and about twenty million enrolled members in all branches of the church! Seven million young men, of whom but five per cent. are enrolled as members of the church, these, as a fraction of one of the million, attend church somewhat regularly, another million attended occasionally, but five million never attend. Think of arresting over one and a half million of men and women annually—fifty millions in a generation! Crime increases four and a half times faster than the population. What is wrong?
>
> "Here we stand upon the threshold of the twentieth century with the record of forty million people habitually absenting themselves from the house of God! We have perfect machinery and a seemingly large amount of zeal—we are doing everything that we can think of to reach the ungodly—we have tried spinning-wheels and grabbags, theatricals and tableaux, broom drills and donkey socials. We have fiddled to them and fed them with ice cream and cake, and tickled them with funny stories, yet 'Ichabod' seems to be written upon everything we do. What is wrong?
>
> "Is there a power that can change these things? What is needed? Paul cries, 'The gospel is the power of God.' O, that is what is needed—power! POWER! Power in the Church and through the Church in politics to regenerate society. The only thing that can correct the things that need correction is the 'gospel.' Let us apply the gospel in liberal doses!"

Yes; it is *power* that is needed, and that power is needed in the church. But the needed power is not political power, but "the power of God." The gospel is not political power. The gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Romans 1:16. The power comes only to those who believe, and this totally separates it from politics, for politics have nothing to do with faith.

If the Church does not have the power she needs, it is because there is a lack in believing—believing the Word of God. Jesus Christ said to his followers, as he was about to ascend after his resurrection, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.... And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Then why has the Church not power? Is it not because she has forsaken Christ and joined with Cesar, and is seeking for divine power to be exercised through politics, for the "regeneration of society"? God cannot lend himself to any such scheme. The Church will have to get out of politics before she will realize the power for which some in her communion long.

"The 'Religious Significance of the Inauguration'" American Sentinel 12, 11, pp. 165, 166.

[165]

ATJ

THE Sunday evening following the inauguration at Washington, D.C., the pastor of the Metropolitan M. E. Church, of that city, delivered a sermon on the "religious significance" of the event. This church is one of the largest in the city, and was attended by the President at the morning service of the same day. For his text the speaker read from 2 Kings 11:12, "And they clapped their hands and said, God save the king;" also from Romans 13:11, "The powers that be are ordained of God." Among other things he said:—

> "We are a Christian nation. There is a secular theory of civil government. We have a little band of vociferous secularists and infidels, who have succeeded in giving the public an aburdly [*sic*.] exaggerated sense of their numbers and importance, who would de-Christianize the State, who would have judicial oaths, prayers in our legislative assemblies, and Sunday laws abolished; in short, all the Christian elements of our national life. They would destroy our national inheritance and are no more patriots than they are Christians. They deal their deadly blows not merely at revealed religion, but at human liberty and progress.

> "The Christian religion is the foundation of all law and all literature, and to be hostile to the Christian religion is to be hostile to the Government in which we dwell.
>
> "The Constitution provides that Congress shall make no law regulating the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office of public trust. These simply secure religious freedom and separation of the Church from the State. They are as a bill of rights, guaranteeing to all the churches full liberty, and forbidding Congress ever to abridge that liberty. It is not a union of Church and State, but the union of Christianity and the State. A free church in a free country; each independent of the other; each fulfilling different functions, yet coöperating together to increase the reverence for law and increase the stability of the Government. The recognized religion of this land is not the Episcopalian Christianity, the Presbyterian, Roman Catholic or Methodist Christianity, but the Christianity common to all,—a common religion, a universal Christianity."

This paragraph calls for some comment. Let it be noted that there is a vast difference between church freedom and individual freedom. When the papal church enjoyed the greatest freedom, during the dark ages of her supremacy, individual freedom was at its lowest ebb. Church freedom that is not compatible with the fullest individual freedom, is nothing else than despotism. It is this that should be secured to them by the Constitution.

And it is just this freedom that is always invaded by a union of Christianity—so-called—with the State. That union may leave the churches free enough, especially if they prove to be the dominant power under the arrangement—but it invades individual freedom by combining with religion a power which pays no respect to individual option. The State does not persuade; it commands and enforces; and when it is united with "Christianity," it is to command and enforce

"Christianity" in so far as the union extends. But it is the divinely-ordained prerogative of every individual to exercise perfect freedom of choice in religion. The State says, You *must*. Christianity says, "Whosoever *will, let* him come."

Hence there can never be union of real Christianity with the State.

Of course there is no such thing as "Episcopalian Christianity," or "Roman Catholic Christianity," or "Methodist Christianity." There is but one kind of Christianity in the world—one way of being like Christ. And for this reason a union of all denominations, or of the leading ones—with the State cannot possibly be a union of Christianity with the State.

The speaker said further:—

> "The recent unanimous decision of the Supreme Court is that this is a Christian nation, destroying as a precedent the famous Tripoli treaty in which the Mohammedan power was assured that the United States was not a Christian nation. The Christian is supported in independent but friendly relations with the civil power. Our Christian life and churches have moved forward most rapidly. The increase in church membership from 1890 to 1895 was over four million. The increase of population falls far below the rate of church progress. The church has steadily and rapidly gained upon the population.
>
> "Shall we surrender our Government to secular con- [*sic*.] control? That would be treason to liberty; that would be the betrayal of the sacred trust we hold for our children; as well as disloyalty to God, and this blessed Book, which is the Magna Charter of human rights and happiness.
>
> "We have evidence of the Christian character of the nation in the inaugural addresses of the Presidents.... This last inaugural has been most impressive. Listen to the opening words of the President:—

> "'In obedience to the will of the people, and in their presence, by the authority vested in me by this oath, I assume the arduous and responsible duties of President of the United States, relying on the support of my countrymen, and invoking the guidance of Almighty God. Our faith teaches that there is no safer reliance than upon the God of our fathers, who has so singularly favored the American people in every national trial, and who will not forsake us so long as we obey his commandments and walk humbly in His footsteps.'
>
> "This brings us to the religious significance of this ceremony. This ceremonial can be regarded in no other light than a mutual covenant. The oath of the President to serve the nation carries with it the unspoken vows of the people, to yield obedience to the laws, to support and defend the Constitution, and to invoke the same divine favor and help. The President must realize the sacredness of his office. If the powers that be are ordained of God, then surely the head of a great nation stands very near the holiest ministers of religion."

We are reminded by this of another occasion when some vows
[166] were made by a "Christian nation" of old,— the nation of Israel, as they were assembled around the basis of Mount Sinai. There was a covenant made there,—a covenant of the people to obey the voice of the Lord which they had heard from amid the flame and smoke upon Sinai's top. But only about a month later they were found worshiping a golden calf. This occurrence casts no light shadow of suspicion upon the vows of a "Christian nation" to live uprightly. With many, indeed, in the Church as well as without, it is a question whether the American "Christian nation" are not even now engaged in worshiping the golden calf. Considering this subject from the standpoint of its "religious significance," we are certainly warranted in these observations.

The speaker proceeded to define the duties of "the covenant into which we enter as a people" by virtue of the President's inaugural oath. These are, as defined, the duty of reverence for the laws and

for those in authority, and the duty of giving our best endeavors to the purification of politics. In this connection he said:—

> "We pledge ourselves anew to our country as a Christian commonwealth. The future of the nation is safe only as we are Christians. Those who are lifting up their voice against the Bible, against the sabbath, against our Christ, as the enemies of the best interests of the country. The nations of the past that have gone down in night have sunk because of corruption. Our present condition comes largely because of our lack of faith in God. Let public immoralities be suppressed; let the Lord's day be reverently held, and Sunday newspapers, Sunday traffic, and Sunday labor as far as possible be suppressed. Let our laws be such that it will be easy for men to do good, and hard for them to do wrong. The only bulwark of our nation is Christianity; and without it we have no hope of perpetuity."

This only makes still plainer the idea of the speaker that these "unspoken vows" of the people are to be fulfilled through Christianity. No other view, indeed, would be in harmony with the doctrine that "this is a Christian nation." No other view would invest the President's inaugural with a "religious significance."

The speaker would have done better if he had placed reverence for the right above reverence for the laws and for those in authority. The "laws" are not always right; and "those in authority" not above the right. Reverence for the right is the only safeguard of liberty.

What effect such teaching as this setting forth the "religious significance of the inauguration" will have upon the Administration, remains to be seen.

"The Right of Private Judgment" American Sentinel 12, 11, pp. 167, 168.

[167]

ATJ

AN article in the New York *Independent*, of March 11, contains the following:—

"No better illustration of the rigid control which the Catholic Church exercises over the consciences of its members can be given than the rules it lays down as to what they may or may not read. We give some of these rules as promulgated only last year by the present rather liberal pope as popes go. Here is one:

"'Books of apostates, heretics, schismatics, and all other writers which defend heresy or schism, or in any way tend to overthrow the basis of religion, are absolutely forbidden.'

"Every book which defends our Protestant forms of faith is thus absolutely interdicted. Here is another rule:

"'Likewise are forbidden books of non-Catholics which professedly treat of religion, unless it is known that they contain nothing contrary to Catholic faith.'

"It is not enough, it seems, to forbid books which defend heresy or schism, but any book on religion written by a Protestant is forbidden unless it is known that there is nothing in it that contradicts any part of the Catholic faith. But we are further told in another rule that books by non-Catholic writers which are not on religion, such as novels, we suppose, or scientific treatises, may be read even although they may 'merely incidentally touch on truths of faith.'

"Next follow, in the document from which we quote, the rules about the Holy Scriptures. No edition of the Bible in the original tongues, and no ancient version in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Armenian, Arabic, or any other language of the earlier church, prepared by a none-Catholic, is allowed to any except those engaged in theological or biblical studies, and to them only, provided no attack is made 'in the prefaces or notes, on dogmas of the Catholic faith.'

"Much more is it forbidden to read any edition of the Holy Scriptures in the vernacular prepared by a non-Catholic.

"'Since experience has proved that, on account of man's boldness, more evil than good arises if the Sacred Books are allowed to all without check in the vulgar tongue; wherefore all versions in the vernacular, even though made by Catholics, are entirely forbidden, unless approved by the Holy See or issued under the care of bishops, with notes taken from the holy fathers of the church and from learned Catholic writers.

"'Prohibited are all versions of the Holy Scriptures made by whatever non-Catholic writers, in whatever vulgar tongue, and those especially which are spread broadcast by Bible societies, again and again condemned by the Roman pontiffs, since they entirely discard the most salutary laws of the church relative to the issuing of divine books. But these versions are allowed to those who are engaged in theological or biblical studies, on observing the regulations set forth above.'

"If any Catholic wants, for any person, to read a book thus forbidden, he must ask permission not of his confessor, but of his bishop; and this permission must not be easily granted, for the rule says that this permission may be given 'only in chosen cases and for good and sufficient cause,' 'only in urgent cases' and 'for single books.' Furthermore, bishops must 'proscribe and take out of the hands of the faithful' any forbidden books that have been circulated. And still further, no Catholic layman is allowed to publish any book on religion without episcopal permission, and no priest can publish on any subject, religious, scientific or social, without such license."

All this is of course utterly contrary to the principle of individual freedom of judgment in religious matters, which is the very essence

of religious liberty. It shows how complete is Rome's antagonism to that liberty of which she has claimed to be the champion. Upon this point of the individual right of private judgment, Protestantism claims to stand in complete opposition to Rome. But how fully is this claim sustained by leading exponents of Protestantism? What difference is there in principle between Rome's dictum on the subject, as quoted above, and the following from that very Protestant journal, the *Golden Rule*, organ of the Societies of Christian Endeavor, in its issue of March 4:—"ENDEAVORER, *Princeton, Ill:*

> "You say that through your own unaided study of the Bible you have become convinced that you should change your church and denomination, and you are especially grieved that you must take this step in opposition to the earnest wishes of your mother. Pardon me if I say that no one should take such a serious step as this relying merely upon his own judgment. You should seek the advice of your pastor, and of others who are wiser than you."

In other words: After you have talked with God on the subject of your duty, and He has spoken to you, don't move in the matter until you have had a talk with some man! After consulting with God, don't fail to consult with your pastor and other fallible mortals around you, and thus avail yourself of their superior wisdom! It would not be safe to take God's word alone! Of course, God's word
[168] is all right in itself; but you need some human power and wisdom to make you understand it! This is Rome's position exactly, only Rome, with more worldly wisdom, simply brings the individual to the human authority direct, and thereby saves herself much trouble in the management of her adherents. The very essence of Romanism is the interposing of human authority between the soul and God, and the very essence of this "Protestantism" is the same.

We would not quote this if it were not fairly representative of most of the Protestantism of to-day. Protestant instructors are almost always ready to give this advice to those whom they would guide under such circumstances. They do not make it compulsory upon any, to be sure; they can present no commands from the Church

"authorities" forbidding an individual to be guided by his own conscientious understanding of God's Word. But they go as far as they can in the way of persuading him to set aside his own mind, and be moved, like an automaton, by the mind of another. They differ form Rome only in the means employed, not in the principle involved or the end sought.

What does God himself say about this? James 1:5 gives the answer: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask [*not* of his pastor or his 'wiser' friends, but] of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." True Protestantism believes these words, and leaves every individual free to make them a rule of life.

"A Week of Prayer for 'Sabbath Observance'" American Sentinel 12, 11, pp. 168, 169.

[168]

ATJ

APRIL 4-11 has been designated by a committee representing the Sunday observance movement, as a "week of prayer for the observance of the Lord's day." Three especial subjects of prayer are set forth in the announcement, as follows:—

> "1. That God will bestow such influences of the Holy Spirit as shall quicken the consciences of all Christians that they may give more earnest heed to His command to hallow the sabbath in their homes and in public by refraining from such acts as will tend to weaken regard for the Lord's day.
>
> "2. That He will lead Christians to obey the important part of the fourth commandment: 'Thou, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy stranger,' and to understand that it is a greater sin to require another to do a wrong than to do it ourselves; and that no one obeys God fully in this command until he has done all in his power to secure for those in his employ an opportunity for the enjoyment of sabbath rest and worship.

> "3. That He will lead to victory all who are striving to enforce the laws against the open saloon on the sabbath, and such amusements as disturb the peace and quiet of the day."

We are fully in sympathy with the desire that Christians and all others should be led to a better observance of the Lord's day, and trust that this special season of prayer may bear fruit to that end.

In reading the above, however, our eye is caught by the phrase, "the important part of the fourth commandment." This gives rise to some queries. What is the important part of the fourth commandment? This call to prayer for its observance sets forth "Thou, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy stranger" as the important part. In seeking an answer to the query it might be pertinent to
[169] inquire, What is the unimportant part of the fourth commandment? Is it that part which specifies which day it is that must be observed as the Sabbath or Lord's day? Certainly this committee did not mean to imply that Sunday observance is not a thing of great importance. Take Sunday out of their aims and calculations, and let no other definite day be substituted, and there would be neither point nor force in this call to prayer for sabbath observance.

That part of the fourth commandment specified in the call is important, certainly. But it is not *the* important part of the command. Every part of it is important. Every part of every divine command is important. It is of the highest importance. This is a characteristic which attaches to every word that God has spoken to man.

It is utterly useless to engage in prayer for Sabbath observance without believing that every part of God's Sabbath commandment is supremely important, not excepting that part which says, "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Those who would realize profit from this occasion, must believe this, and give every part of the command their sincere "Amen."

March 25, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 12, pp. 177, 178.

[177]

ATJ

THE Church to-day wants power. That is evident enough from her own testimony. She realizes that she is not making that stand against the world’s tide of sin and corruption that she should, and in various ways she makes confession of this truth.

But no less than this is it that there is unlimited power in readiness for her use. To deny this is to deny the very foundation of Christianity.

This power is the power of God. To his disciples Jesus said, as he commissioned them for their divine work among mankind: “All power is given unto me in heaven and earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations.... And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” Matthew 28:18-20. “All power” is certainly as much power as the Church can want.

There is no necessity, then, that the Church should scheme to get possession of more power. She has but to take the power that God provides. And as God has provided “all power” for his Church, it is certain that the Church needs nothing less than this. And it is equally certain that when the Church schemes and bargains for power from earthly sources, she gets only that which is infinitely less than the power she must have to be successful.

But God does not grant his power as an unconditional gift. He cannot allow his own omnipotence to be exercised independently of omniscient wisdom. To allow the Church to use omnipotent power as she might herself think best to employ it, would produce the worst

state of affairs that could be imagined. Finite wisdom directing infinite power would be a thing fearful to contemplate.

The possession of this power, therefore, depends upon the connection of the Church with God. And this is indicated by the words of Christ, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." He is the Head of the Church, and by the head all the body is directed. The power which operates through the body is also his. But it is possible for the Church to disconnect herself from her divine Head, and substitute another head in His place, even as has been done by the Papacy. It is possible for the Church to become united to the world and thus separated from Christ. But as decapitation means death, the Church in such a case becomes a dead Church, so far as concerns the purposes of Christianity, and being dead she is without the power of Christ.

It is Christ, the Head of the Church, who works in the Church when it is united to him. But Christ is God; and Christ in the individual, or in his Church, means godliness. The divine power of the Church is the "power of godliness." But there is a "form of godliness" which the Church may have, separate from the power of godliness. This is as the Apostle Paul said it would be "in the last days." See 2 Timothy 3:1-5. All the sins enumerated in this text may go with a "form of godliness;" in other words, may exist in the professedly Christian Church; but with them the Church cannot but deny the power of godliness. Like Peter denying his Lord, she says of this power, I know it not. And she says this by her failure to manifest this power to the world. Claiming to be the Church of Christ, yet having not the power of Christ, she virtually says to the world, that no such power exists.

If, then, the Church finds herself lacking in power, what is the reason? There can be no other reason than that, having become worldly, she has separated herself from Christ. For it is certain that so long as he is with the Church, she has "all power" "in heaven and in earth."

The Church is now seeking political power; but political power is not the power of God. In a sense, all power is of God; but the power of God in His Church must be manifested in godliness. To be
[178] seeking for political power is a denial of the power of godliness.

But why will the Church seek for political power? Why will the Christian seek for such power? The Church and the individual Christian are commission to preach the gospel, which is "the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth." Romans 1:16. Nothing but the power of godliness can suffice for the Church in any undertaking pursuant to her divine calling; and nothing but the "power of God unto salvation" can suffice to save any individual from sin. There is no lack of this divine power: and God is no less willing to bestow it now than he was to pour it out on his Church at Pentecost. The only question is, Will the Church give Him the opportunity?

"Strangely Inconsistent" American Sentinel 12, 12, p. 178.

[178]

ATJ

WHY is it that the nation is not more interested in cultivating the fighting spirit among its citizens? Why, instead of this, are the national and the State governments, with a single exception, doing everything to repress this spirit? The United States maintains a standing army, presumably for the purpose of fighting when such a thing is required. The States maintain their companies of the militia, and it is fair to presume that it is intended these shall fight when there is a call for their services. The same may be said with reference to the navy.

But what would be the use of an army or company of militia who could not or would not fight? Unless these men are both able and willing to fight, the sooner the military forces of the country are disbanded, the better. But if they are to fight, how should the fighting be done? It should be done well, of course; no one can dispute this. No nation ever wanted an army of poor fighters. Fighting, like everything else, is to be done in the most effective manner possible, if at all. This would be the only sane way of seeking to attain the end sought.

Now it will not be denied that the most effective fighting will be done by the army that is composed of the best fighters; are those who have most of the fighting spirit and instinct. Every commander who has had experience in actual warfare knows the value of the fighting spirit in his men for securing the victory. It is often said in

praise of men of this kind, in the narrative of a military encounter, that they "fought like demons." These are the kind of men every commander likes to have.

This expression, in fact, gives us the standard of excellence in the line of that which armies and navies are maintained to do. The nearer the men in them will come to acting "like demons" when fulfilling the purpose for which the Government employs them, the better will they do that which the Government wants done at the time, and the more valuable will they be to the Government in their military capacity.

We say again, therefore, it is strange that the Government should maintain an army and navy (which in time of war would depend for their efficiency upon the citizens of the States), and at the same time be against the development of the fighting spirit.

"The Hope of the Church" American Sentinel 12, 12, pp. 178, 179.

[178]

ATJ

IT is the hope of the Church to-day, according to the testimony of the words and actions of her most prominent representatives, that the kingdom of Christ shall "enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics." And this hope is, in her view, to be realized through her own efforts to obtain control of the world's political power.

Has the Church no better hope than this?

It is certain that no such hope as this is set before the Church in the Word of God. Does that Word then, provide no hope to be kept in view by the Church in her earthly warfare?

Every one who has read even a small portion of God's Word knows that this is not so. The Scripture is full of hope for our fallen race. It was given the race that they might have hope, in place of the despair which is the fruit of sin. No Christianity need be told of the "Christian's hope." No brighter hope was ever cherished than this hope. No hope ever rested on a more secure foundation, or was more sure of realization by the faithful seeker. And the Christian's hope is the hope of the Christian Church.

What, then, is this hope? Many portions of the inspired Word furnish the answer. By the Apostle Paul it is referred to in his epistle

to Titus, in his exhortation that we "should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Titus 2:12, 13. The same apostle, when under arrest before the Roman governor Felix, affirmed his "hope toward God," "that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust"; and again, when before King Agrippa, said, "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers, ... for which hope's sake, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" Acts 24:15; 26:6-8.

It would be needless to cite all the passages of Scripture which elucidate this subject. Their testimony leaves no room for doubt or misapprehension. The resurrection of Jesus Christ is set forth as the cardinal truth upon which the hopes of Christians depend. "If Christ be not raised," wrote Paul to the Corinthians, "your faith [179] is vain; ye are yet in your sins." And he adds, "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept." 1 Corinthians 15:17, 19. The resurrection of Christ from the dead is the sure pledge of the resurrection of all those who "sleep in Jesus." And this resurrection is to take place at the second appearing of Jesus Christ in the clouds of heaven, in the glory of his Father, and attended by all the holy angels. At that time the righteous will enter upon their eternal reward, which has been secured to them through the gospel. Matthew 16:27; 24:30, 31; 25:31-34, etc.

We are, then, upon this divine authority, to live "soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world, looking for that blessed hope"—not of the entrance of Christ's kingdom into "the realm of law through the gateway of politics;" not of the "regeneration of society" through the Church's political supremacy,—but of "the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;" even as we are exhorted by the Apostle Peter to consider what manner of persons we ought to be, "in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God." 2 Peter 3:11, 12. Our hope, the Christian's hope, and the hope of the Christian Church, is that of his coming again to earth in the power and glory of his Father, to raise the righteous dead, terminate the reign

of sin and sorrow, and take to himself and to their eternal reward all those who shall then stand justified by faith in him.

Is not this hope sufficient for the Church? Could there be a brighter, better hope to illuminate her pathway and cheer her in her warfare against earth's sin and error? Could she look forward to any better, more satisfactory termination of the long contest of sin and righteousness for the supremacy? Is the hope of "regenerating society" and "purifying politics" through the acquisition of political supremacy, a hope that can bear comparison with this?

Why, then, has the Church turned from this "blessed hope," established by God's own Word, to occupy her time and energies with the miserable and chimerical project of trying to usher in the kingdom of Christ through "the gateway of politics?" How long will she live so far beneath her privilege?

"Enforcing the Laws" American Sentinel 12, 12, p. 180.

[180]

ATJ

AT a recent meeting of the Christian Citizenship League, of Chicago, in Willard Hall, for the purpose of examining into the qualifications of aspirants for the office of mayor, the discussion turned upon the subject of the enforceability of the laws. One of the candidates for the mayorship, Mr. Hesing, declared that no mayor of Chicago could enforce the laws. The *Union Signal* quotes Mr. Hesing as saying:—

> "I am no hypocrite, gentlemen, and I tell you that many of our laws cannot be enforced. I want to be mayor of Chicago, and, if you vote for me I will enforce such laws as will be for the best interests of Chicago; not for the citizens who meet in Willard Hall; not for the saloon-keepers; not for the Prohibitionists, but for a great city of two million inhabitants!"

In a further description of the proceedings, the *Union Signal* says:—

> "A gentleman immediately arose and asked two pertinent questions. First, 'Who is to decide which laws

> shall be enforced and which shall not?' To which Mr. Hesing replied, 'Common sense.' Then, second, 'Whose common sense?' To which the response came, 'The common sense of the executive officer, after consultation with his advisory board.'"

Upon this the *Union Signal* comments:—

> "Surely this is the light we have long sought, the missing link in the dark labyrinth of municipal, State and national affairs. The laws of our cities and our nation are enacted by the people. The executive officers are elected by the people, and one of the requirements made of them is that they shall enforce the laws. Surely, what could be more simple than the chain of logic which seems to deduce that laws made by the people, for the enforcement of which representatives are chosen by the people, must, of necessity, be enforced as the people desire. But, nay, a hitherto unacknowledged quantity comes to the front as a determinative factor, viz., the 'common sense' of the executive officer. The people have made the laws, he is to say whether or not they shall be enforced, and the absolutely infallible test which is to be applied in determining this point is his *personal standard of common sense*."

The *Union Signal* seems to be striving, in common with many would-be reformers of the day, to establish the principle in the policy of the State and of the nation, that anything in the form of law must be enforced, good or bad, simply because it is "the law." This is not a safe principle to follow.

It is a fact, and one too plain to be denied, that measures often get upon the statute books which are not susceptible of enforcement. It is much easier to enact laws than to enforce them; it is, indeed, easy to enact as a law that which cannot be enforced at all. And whenever this is done,—whenever a measure is passed which either cannot be enforced, or which becomes obsolete after a short period of attempted enforcement, the result is highly detrimental to the interests of law and order.

The truth which, more than any other, is emphasized by this, is that greater care and wisdom should be employed in legislation. Only such measures should be passed as have the support of justice and good sense, and are therefore susceptible of enforcement. There is an obvious tendency at this day toward legislation of the "freak" variety. This is largely due to the idea, which has become so prevalent, that legislation constitutes a means of moral reform; and so long as this idea prevails, so long will statutes be enacted which can work only harm within the range of their influence.

What is needed is not more legislation, but greater care in legislating; less heed paid to the clamors of would-be moral reformers, and more paid to the demands of justice; respect for right, rather than for that which claims respect only by having usurped the throne of right.

Only upon this basis can there be in truth a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

"Why the Powers Favor Turkey" American Sentinel 12, 12, p. 183.

[183]

ATJ

THERE is something seemingly quite anomalous about the situation which has been reached in the Cretan difficulty. The "Christian" powers of Europe have taken the side of Mohammedan Turkey against "Christian" Greece; and this, not because the latter nation have been horrifying the civilized world by slaughtering defenseless and innocent men, women, and children in Crete or in any country; no charge can be brought against Greece of having violated the etiquette of "civilized" warfare. The Cretans, furthermore, are said to be mostly Greek Christians, who long to exchange Turkish misrule for the dominion of their own race, and who therefore welcome the attitude which Greece has taken.

When the Turks were slaughtering the Armenians, sparing neither sex nor age, and perpetrating upon their victims every cruelty in which a fiendish nature could take delight, while a cry of horror and indignation went up from other lands the world over, these "Christian" powers could not be prevailed upon to do more than threaten the Sultan and demand his acceptance of certain schemes of reform,

which afforded at best only a promise of relief for the situation. But now, when Greece persists in her course, not of massacre and rapine, but of establishing the independence of Crete against the Turk, these same "Christian" powers quickly arrive at a plan of concerted actions and force Greece at the muzzle of their guns to desist.

Why is this? Why do the great powers of Christendom act as though the Turk were a being sacred from interference even in the name of justice or humanity, while at the same time they promptly block the way against a "Christian" power engaged in a seemingly laudable undertaking?

The only possible explanation is that for some reason it is believed that interference with the Turk means war, in which the powers themselves would become involved; and the powers are not yet ready for the outbreak. We say, not yet ready; for it is certain that the powers are not averse to war in itself. If they were, there would not be any war. When two nations are both anxious to keep the peace, there is no more danger of war between them than there would be between two peace-loving individuals. Even if one or even two of the "Christian" powers were anxious to fight, if the rest were averse to war, they could by their combined power easily coerce the two belligerents into maintaining the peace. Hence, so far as war in itself is concerned, there is no reason for the persistent and extraordinary friendship of the powers for the Turk.

But with a general war, there will come an alteration of the map of Europe; and this is the overshadowing consideration with the powers. Some nations will gain by the change and some will not. It is generally agreed that the European domain of the "sick man" will be "thrown open to settlement" by the powers, and possibly some valuable territory in other quarters; and the supreme question is, which of the powers will be most successful in the "grab" for these new possessions. They are in no danger of losing territory that they now own; they do not fear any invasion of that, save as a possible result of quarreling over a division of the spoils. No one of the powers cares to go to war with any of the others, save as a last resort. But they do want new territory and new sources of revenue, and these are to be obtained out of districts which none of the powers now rule. Each one is determined to get its "share" of the spoils, and each is determined that the others shall have only what it considers

their "share." Each one wants to define its own share and also the shares of the others. Each one covets the same prize. Each one is determined that above all things, it must not be behind in the race for territorial arrandizement. This is a misfortune to be avoided at any cost.

As the situation now stands, the powers are afraid, individually, that they are not prepared to get what they want should the redistribution of territory now take place. They want no war just now, but a little longer time to prepare, by diplomacy and an increase of armament, to reap the fullest advantage when the fateful hour arrives.

In a word, it is covetousness that constitutes the secret spring of action in the strange friendship of the "Christian" powers for the "unspeakable Turk." Covetousness is the dominating principle in "Christendom" to-day.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 12, p. 183.

[183]

ATJ

WHEN the Church intermeddles in the affairs of the State, she forfeits the right of protest if the State intermeddles in the affairs of the Church.

"Raising Church Revenue" American Sentinel 12, 12, pp. 185, 186.

[185]

ATJ

IT is quite well known that secular entertainments play an important part in church economy as practiced by the popular churches to-day, but the recent action of a Baptist Church in Brooklyn speaks with a startling emphasis upon this point. The facts, as set fort [*sic*.] in a prominent New York daily, are as follows:—

> "The trustees of the Lenox Road Baptist Church, commonly known as the First Baptist Church of Flatbush, will apply to the Supreme Court for permission to sell the church building and the real estate connected with it.

> "This move was taken on account of dissatisfaction with their pastor of part of the society, and is the outcome of the Rev. H. J. Guller's refusal to allow any church entertainments.
>
> "The meeting of the trustees last night, when the decisive actions was taken, was stormy. The Rev. Mr. Guller had friends there, and they fought hard to have him retained, but before the meeting was ended they had been

[186]

> whipped around into line and at last gave their consent to the sale of the church property.
>
> "They were confronted with the payment of a $9,000 mortgage and an arrearage of $500 in the pastor's salary. Mr. Guller's friends urged that the church's expenses be reduced by one half in order that they might 'worry along.' The opposition, however, insisted on the sale of the church and its property and an immediate liquidation of its debts, the dismissal of the pastor and the holding of services in a hall. The society will not be severed.
>
> "One trustee said: 'Our pastor has been with us for two years. He refused to allow any church entertainment of any kind, and, as a result, our revenue fell off to such an extent that we have to sell out. Our little entertainments brought in a good deal of money, and the pastor's action was decidedly unpopular.'"

Surely there has been a most wonderful evolution—and revolution—in the method of providing church revenue, since the days of the apostles. Imagine the early Christian Church, as described in the Book of Acts, being on the point of financial disruption because of the refusal of Paul or Peter to sanction church theatricals as a means of providing funds for church work! And the sad meaning of this is that there has been an evolution from the spirit of self-sacrifice possessed by the early church, to a spirit exactly its opposite. There

is no reason why, with the possession of the Christian spirit of self sacrifice, an abundance of church funds cannot now be raised in just the way that means were raised by church in the days of Paul.

However, when the churches get control of the Government, as it now seems that they shortly will, they will perhaps have possession of sources of revenue, which will enable them to dispense with church "entertainments."

April 1, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 13, pp. 193, 194.

[193]

ATJ

“THE kingdom of God cometh not with observation,” that is, “with outward show.”

These are the plain words of the Lord Jesus, whose the kingdom is, who alone knows truly what the kingdom is, who is the rightful king in that kingdom; and who alone rules in the kingdom.

Yet the efforts of the Christian Endeavorers and the National Reformers generally are solely to have “the kingdom of God” come in this nation, altogether with outward show, by outward, worldly, political, means and methods.

They propose to make Christ king and have Him reign on Capitol Hill and in every State and city in the nation. Thus they propose that the kingdom of God shall come in this land, and that the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom.

Thus it is perfectly plain to all who read, that those people do propose to have the kingdom of God come first of all with observation, with outward show. That is to say, while the Lord says that the kingdom of God cometh not with observation or outward show, these people insist that it does come and shall come with observation and outward show. In other words, what the Lord says is not so, they say is so and shall be so.

Isn’t it singular that men will attempt to do a thing as Christian, which the plain word of the Author of Christianity repudiates and shows cannot possibly be done as Christian? The profession of Christianity demands loyalty to the principles announced by the Author of Christianity. Disloyalty here is antichristian.

No, no: the kingdom of God cometh not with observation or outward show. But "Behold the kingdom of God is WITHIN YOU;" and except a man be born again he cannot see it. For it is written, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Except a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

By this word it is again perfectly plain that the only right thing that anybody can do in behalf of the kingdom of God is to persuade men to be born again. For, it matters not how the kingdom of God may come, or when it may come, no man can ever see it for any good, no man can enter into it, unless he is born again.

What sheer fallacy it is then, what a perversion of the right way, for men to form organizations, hold monster conventions, and manipulate politics in cities, States and the nation, to get "Christians" into all the offices in order that the kingdom of God may be set up and that "Christ may reign on Capitol Hill"!

The kingdom of God comes in no such way as that. And any man who looks upon any such thing as that as the kingdom of God will be ruined by it. The kingdom of God, cometh not with observation or outward show. The kingdom of God can never be set up by men. Only He whose right it is to reign can establish his kingdom anywhere.

"The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say, Lo here, or Lo there, For behold the kingdom of God is within you." Unless a man finds the kingdom of God within him, he will never find it outside of him. Any man who does not see the kingdom of God within him will never see the kingdom of God outside of him. And "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God."

It is therefore conclusive that the only right endeavor that anybody can ever put forth in behalf of the kingdom of God and men's right relation thereto, is to persuade men to be born again. And by the same token it is also conclusive that the efforts of the Christian Endeavorers and other National Reformers to bring by worldly means and political methods, the kingdom of God in city, State and nation, are altogether earthly, vain, unchristian and antichristian.

[194] "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink;" it is not worldly honors; it is not political offices; it is not mayoralties, governorships,

nor presidencies; it is not eclesiastical [*sic*.] combinations controlling the civil power or the civil officers: it is none of all these, nor is it anything of any likeness to all these. It is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." And "Except a man be born again he cannot see" it. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into" it.

"The kingdom of God cometh not with observation." "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God."

"The kingdom of God is within you." And, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

"The kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." And, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

"The Church as a Light" American Sentinel 12, 13, p. 194.

[194]

ATJ

THERE can be no more important question for the Church than that of her proper attitude towards the world. This is, of course, a question that must be answered by the Word of God.

From the example of the Church to-day however, it might be concluded that the inspired Word gives no instructions upon this question which apply to the present time. For it is certain that the Church's attitude to-day, as indicated by her efforts to acquire political power and authority, and her hopes for the future in this respect, is not sanctioned by a wisdom higher than her own.

But the Scriptures of divine truth are not silent concerning the duties of the Church and of individual Christians in the midst of their worldly environment to-day. When Christian speakers and writers lament the awful depravity which civilization is unable to hide, and exhort the civil authorities to adopt measures for grappling with the moral emergencies of the times, it is not because all this iniquity was not foreseen and foretold by the Author of holy writ, and instructions given by Him for the guidance of the Church in the most critical hours of moral darkness.

The Scripture likens this period of the reign of sin and evil, to a night. Such indeed it is, with the light of righteousness so nearly obscured as it is by the black shadows of sin. But the Scriptures

are full of predictions of a coming day: and even here a light shines upon the pathway of the Christian, in which he is exhorted to walk. "Thy word," says the psalmist, "is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path." Psalm 119:105.

The night is not passed by the Church of God in slumber. Watchmen are upon the walls of Zion, to warn of lurking dangers and to herald the long-looked for dawn. In the prophecy of Isaiah an occasion comes when the inquiry is made from Zion, "Wachman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?" And the answer is returned, "The morning cometh, and also the night,"—the morning of an eternal day for the righteous and of eternal night for the finally impenitent.

The Apostle Paul exhorts Christians to act as becomes those who have the light of divine revelation. The Church is to know the approach of the coming day. "Ye, brethren," he writes, "are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief. Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day: we are not of the night, nor of darkness. Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober. For they that sleep sleep in the night; and they that be drunken are drunken in the night. But let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love; and for an helmet, the hope of salvation."

It is the night of sin, and the drunkenness and revelings of those who are of the night, that we see around us to-day. The terrible depravity that is seen in society at the present time is natural enough to those who are "drunken in the night." It is only such a feature as the reign of carnality may be expected to develop before the night is ended. That night seems now to have reached it [*sic*.] darkest hour; but the darkest hour comes just before the dawn.

The Church cannot help the fact that it is night. She cannot turn the night into day. She cannot take possession of the world, and eliminate the sin and evil which have brought night upon it. The divine Word which is her guide, nowhere instructs her to attempt such a thing. But she herself has light—the light of the Word, "that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn" (1 Peter 1:19),—and she is to reflect the light upon the pathway of those in darkness. The divine message now comes to her, "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. For, behold, the

darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people, but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." Isaiah 60:1-3.

This is a glorious privilege. It is one which the Church should eagerly embrace. But what is the Church doing? Is she appalled at the "gross darkness" which to-day covers the people? Then let her not appeal to the arm of flesh in the vain fancy that this darkness can be dispelled by civil enactments; but let her arise and flash forth the divine glory from the throne of God. That, and that alone, can dispel the darkness from the way of those who will turn and heed it.

"The Coming State Church" American Sentinel 12, 13, p. 195.

[195]

ATJ

IN recent issues of the *Christian Statesman*, an organ of the Church party calling for religious legislation, the editor has been discussing the question of Church union in the United States. He deems such union entirely feasible on lines which he points out, and is hopeful that it may be consummated in the near future. In designating the Church as it will then be he uses the phrase, "united Church of Christ of the United States." This is the first suggestion we have noticed for a name for the coming American State Church.

In pointing out the principles upon which Church unity is to be secured, the *Statesman* observes that the church must have "one uniform standard of practical morals," and adds that "even conceding that it may be a lower standard for the organically united Church than some portions of the divided Church would have maintained for themselves, the general gain will be incalculable." As no part of the divided Church maintains or even has maintained any higher standard of morality than the law of God, it will, in this view, be an "incalculable" gain for the Church to adopt a lower standard than this, if thereby her divided elements can become united.

This scheme of Church union also includes "an oath binding to the acceptance of the supreme authority of the Scriptures in matters of discipline as well as doctrine, a high standard of practical godly living linked with a full and faithful formulation of scriptural truth, and the consequent faithful proclamation of the latter together

with the faithful enforcement of the former." All of which is in the *Statesman's* view, quite susceptible of realization.

As regards "heresy" in the Church, we learn that "She has no physical force to meet it, as the nation may meet secession and rebellion against its rightful authority. But she is endowed by her divine Head with government and discipline adequate to such an exigency in her life." It is laid down that "all who rebel against her rightful authority cut themselves off from her communion as schismatics, and are not therefore to be recognized as any part of the visible Church of Christ. The question is not here whether those who thus resist the rightful authority of the Church may be true Christians or not. In the circumstances of this particular case it is a question of authority and insubordination."

And thus "true Christians" may be cut off as heretics and schismatics because of refusal to submit to the "rightful authority" of the Church. And such individuals may when they become numerous enough, form churches of their own, but they will still be heretics, and no part of the "true Church." It was precisely thus that the "schismatic" Protestant churches, as Rome views them, came into existence. They refused to recognize the "rightful authority" of the Church, as expressed in the decrees of church councils and of popes, and are still counted as heretics, and without the pale of the "true Church."

The *Statesman* says that "with the development of the Romish system this rightful authority of the church through anathemas and intolerance and persecution was dethroned to make way for the despotism of the 'mystery of iniquity' and 'the man of sin.'. But in the united Church of Christ of the United States, with principles as different from those of Romanism as light from darkness, rightful authority ought certainly to be able to maintain itself against all schism and ecclesiastical rebellion without any sacrifice of either civil or religious liberty." But it was not "through anathemas and intolerance and persecution" that the Church became what it was before the days of the Reformers, and what, as the papacy, it has since continued to be. The intolerance and persecution were but the manifestation of the change that had already taken place in the Church's character: they were the evil fruit being borne by the evil tree. The tree becomes evil before the evil fruit appears; the Church

became corrupt in character before she became intolerant. And this change in her character was nothing else than a change in her principles. It was a change by which human authority was put in the place of the authority of God's Word.

And these principles laid down by the *Statesman* for the "united Church of Christ of the United States" do not differ at all from the principles of the papacy. The papacy professes to act in perfect harmony with the Word of God; and all she asks of Protestants is submission to the "rightful authority" of the "true Church." And as the "rightful authority" of the Church must prevail, it is more satisfactory to believe that in the exercise of this authority she is infallible. Hence the doctrine of papal infallibility,—a doctrine which is certainly a necessity to any system which makes the separation of "heretics" from the Church a question not of their real Christianity as determined by the written Word, but of their submission to Church "authority."

April 8, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 14, pp. 209, 210.

[209]

ATJ

DO THE preachers of this day really believe that crime is a worse thing than sin? If not, why are they fighting crime so much harder than they are fighting sin?

It is a fact that the clergy are devoting their energies to the suppression of crime. They are preaching about the prevalence of crime, and calling upon the civil authorities to enforce the laws, or to enact new laws which they deem to be needed. They are discoursing persistently upon problems of national, State, and municipal government. The religious societies of which they are the leaders are putting forth their strength to get control of the civil power for the suppression, as they believe, of the iniquity which so abounds under the Government. All this is too plain to be denied. And in it all the clergy are combating crime *and not sin*.

It may be, indeed, that they believe they are combating sin. It is probable that this work is so regarded by the majority of the people. Nevertheless they are not dealing with sin, as such, at all. They are not even combating crime in a proper and effective way. They seek to mix religion with devil enactments, and so to manufacture, rather than suppress, crime; for, the more religion is incorporated into the civil laws, the more will those laws be infracted by people who do not believe in religion, or whose religious views are different from those embodied in the law.

Crime and sin are vastly different things. Crime is the violation of human law; sin is the transgression of the divine law. The divine law is “holy, and just, and good” (Romans 7:12); it partakes of

the attributes of its divine Author. Human law is often unjust, and therefore neither holy nor good. A transgression of an unjust law is not sin. On the other hand, a transgression of the divine law is very often not a crime. The divine law embodies the conceptions of Omniscience. It is therefore as much superior to human law as the thoughts of God are superior to those of man. The divine law is "exceeding broad" (Psalm 119:96), covering the domain of the thoughts and desires of the heart. Human law can be of force only in the domain of outward conduct, and even there to only a limited extent.

Hence a vast difference must exist between the means employed for dealing with these two phases of conduct. For the suppression of crime there exists the machinery of civil government, by which are enforced the penalties of the civil law. But this means is altogether inadequate for dealing with sin. And on the other hand, the purpose of civil government could not be secured by the use of the means instituted for the suppression of sin.

Now it must be admitted that from the standpoint of Christianity sin is a very much worse thing than crime. And as this is the standpoint professedly occupied by the clergy in this country, they must be supposed to hold this view of sin. Why then, we may ask again, do they devote their energies mainly to the combating of crime?

Sin cannot be suppressed by legislative enactments, for it cannot be reached by such means. And should all the measures by enacted which the preachers and the religious societies want enacted by Congress and the State legislatures, and should the churches and the religious organizations get possession of all the power for which they are grasping, all this would accomplish nothing toward the suppression of sin. The seat of sin is the heart; and from this secret citadel sin dictates that outward conduct which, when it invades the individual rights, is punished by the civil law. The suppression of these outward acts does not touch the sin that is back of them. The trimming of some of the branches of an evil tree does not in the least hinder the flow of sap from its roots.

It must be evident, then, that in calling for the application of
[210] the civil law to the evils which abound in the land, or for votes to accomplish the purification of politics, the clergy are not combating

sin. Were they combating sin, they would also be combating crime, in a very effective way; for crime, when it is the violation of just law, is always a manifestation of sin in the heart. But law, in opposing crime by another avenue of attack than the heart, they are leaving sin free to continue its work not only of destroying the soul, but of producing crime as well.

Sin is the transgression of the divine law. 1 John 3:4. The only effective means therefore for suppressing sin is that which enables the individual to keep that law. And as this law is infinitely higher and broader than man's law, only the Infinite One can provide the means required. And this He has done in the provisions of His gospel, which is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Romans 1:16. It is the privilege of Christian preachers to preach the power of God for the salvation of every sinner. It is their duty as well, and they are not true to their calling if they fail to do it. And what is "the power of God unto salvation"? The first chapter of Genesis furnishes an answer to the question. God said, "Let there be light," and "there was light." He said, "Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters," and "it was so." He said, "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed after his kind, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind," and "it was so." His word created that which did not exist before; and in "every one that believeth" His word, there is created by its power that which did not exist before, even a new heart, which is clean and without sin. Psalm 51:10. By faith, the sinner becomes a "new creature" in Jesus Christ. 2 Corinthians 5:17.

Can those who stand before the people as ambassadors of God do better than to devote their whole energies to the proclamation of the power of God unto salvation, through a new creation in Christ? Can they accomplish more by preaching the power of man for the suppression of crime? The SENTINEL thinks not.

"Theological Anarchy" American Sentinel 12, 14, p. 210.

[210]

ATJ

THE *Christian Statesman*, of March 13, says that "Sabbath breakers" it means all who do not keep Sunday.

"Anarchists at heart" are not essentially different from any anarchists. As it is true that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," It must be true that "anarchists at heart" will be anarchists in word and acct; and they are therefore to be subjected to the most rigid restraints of the law. This is the *Statesman's* idea of "religious liberty," by the plain logic of the premises it sets up.

But the question of "Sabbath breaking" is purely a theological one. It is purely a question of theology whether the *Statesman* is not itself guilty of "Sabbath breaking." For whether the Sabbath be the seventh or the first day of the week, is a question not determine by human law, but by the Word of God; and this question is warmly disputed by religionists to-day. It is a question which theologians would be called upon to decide and these having decided in any given case who were the anarchists, it would be left for the latter to be dealt with as such by the civil authorities.

This is precisely the regime which prevailed in the Dark Ages.

SEPARATION of Church and State means recognition of the fact that it does not belong to the Church to undertake the work of the State, or of the civil authorities or even though the latter may show themselves negligent or incompetent in the performance of their duties.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 14, p. 211.

[211]

ATJ

SEPARATION of Church and State means recognition of the fact that it does not belong to the Church to undertake the work of the State, or of the civil authorities, even though the latter may show themselves negligent or incompetent in the performance of their duties.

"Making It Easy To Do Right" American Sentinel 12, 14, pp. 210, 211.

[210]

ATJ

THE Saviour said to his followers, "In the world ye shall have tribulation;" and the Apostle Paul wrote: "All who will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." People who profess to be

Christians ought to believe that Jesus and Paul spoke the truth. Yet to-day, right in the face of their words, we hear this very class calling upon Congress and the State legislatures to enact laws in the interests of religion, so as to make it "hard for people to do wrong, and easy for them to do right."

Again: Of Christians the Word of God declares, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God;" and the Apostle Paul, speaking as a Christian, wrote: "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Galatians 2:20. This must be true of every Christian; for it is the very essence of Christianity. It is Christ who lives and who is manifested in the lives of true believers. Christianity is nothing less than the very life of Christ.

Therefore there is just as much need, and no more, of laws to make it "easy for men to do right," as there was of laws to make it easy for Jesus Christ to do right when he walked and taught in Judea. And we learn from the Scripture that Jesus Christ encountered every kind of obstacle, and the fiercest opposition, to right living; yet he did right continually. Can he not then still do right, living in his followers to-day, without the aid of man-made legislation?

It is easy now for people to do right, if they will only go about it right. God has made it easy to do right. It is only necessary that the Word of God should be received into the heart by faith. There is infinite power in that Word, and that power is for the purpose of keeping the individual in the right path. Hence it is no more difficult for a person to do right, under any circumstances, than it is for him to have faith in the Word of God. And the only difficulty about this is that people are so unwilling to lay aside their fancied greatness and wisdom and "become as little children," trusting the Father in [211] heaven with implicit confidence, as a little child trusts its father on the earth.

"Notes" American Sentinel 12, 14, p. 211.

[211]

ATJ

ARE the majority of the adult citizens of this country Christians? The total church membership is only about 20,000,000 out of a population of 70,000,000 people. And even admitting that a majority of the people are nominal Christians, can it be reasonably claimed

that real Christian are in the majority? Certainly no such claim could be admitted.

The religious people of the country, therefore, ought to realize that any attempt to control this Government in the interests of religion, must be dangerous to themselves. For this is a government "of the people, by the people;" and while a majority of the people no doubt have a respect for religion in its present status, an attempt to compel the unchristian majority to conform to religious customs and views held to by the minority, cannot but arouse bitter opposition; and in the storm thus raised their own religious temples may be beaten down upon their heads. They may then learn to appreciate better than they do now that provision of the Constitution which says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

"Noted" American Sentinel 12, 14, p. 211.

[211]

ATJ

IT is an ominous sign of the times that so many people are ready to take it for granted that a thing is good if it is done in the name of religion. The people need to be instructed, lest the Scripture be again fulfilled, which says, "The people perish for lack of knowledge."

"Noting" American Sentinel 12, 14, pp. 212, 213.

[212]

ATJ

THERE is something decidedly curious about the spectacle of a minister of the gospel stepping out from the sphere of his calling and posing as the champion of law. Why should this be done by the clergy more than by the representatives of any other calling? Are not those in other professions honorable, honest, and law-abiding? Are they not as anxious as the clergy to live under a government in which public peace and prosperity are properly safeguarded by law? These questions must be answered in the affirmative.

Why, again, should it be only in case of a Sunday-law that the clergy assume this pose? Are there not very many laws of the highest importance to the welfare of society, which need to be maintained against the assaults of the lawless? It must be admitted that there are.

The tendency of the times is toward an increase of lawlessness, in those forms which are most destructive of human rights. Homicide is alarmingly on the increase, claiming by the latest statistics more than 10,500 victims in this country in a single year. Does not the prevalence of this crime, the epidemic of arson, the increase of robbery and drunkenness and other forms of iniquity which threaten the safety of society, afford as good opportunity to the clergy to become the special champions of law as does the desecration of Sunday?

Of course, from the standpoint of regard for Sunday as a religious institution, this attitude of the clergy is easily understood. But they strenuously assure us that in upholding Sunday laws they do not speak from a religious standpoint, or as preachers, but merely as citizens upholding the laws of the land. It is mysterious, to say the least.

Or, consider that other ground upon which the clergy so often base their support of Sunday laws,—that of physical necessity to the race. Why should the clergy take precedence of all other professions in looking out for the physical welfare of humanity? How does it happen that they know better than any others what man's physical system demands for the maintenance of health? One would suppose that the physicians would know best about this, and that they would have discerned man's physical need of Sunday rest before it was discovered by the preachers. But by some strange oversight they allowed the latter to surpass them completely on this point of physi- [213]
ological knowledge. Indeed, it is only through the preachers that we learn that the medical profession are even now informed upon this point!

And here again we are left to wonder that the researches of the clergy in the realm of man's physical necessities, and their special concern for the same, should be confined to the single matter of Sunday rest. For all this, be it remembered, has nothing to do with the clergy's regard for Sunday as a religious day, but is set forth by them from a purely civil standpoint, such as is held by all citizens in common!

Is it so, indeed? We dislike to doubt the sincerity of those who make this claim; but it must be said that the appearances are sadly against it.

“Notings” American Sentinel 12, 14, p. 213.

[213]

ATJ

THE *Christian Statesman* says that people “will learn sooner or later that no civil right can be secured to any citizen on any other than a religious basis.” This it says with reference to a demand for the “civil right” of Sunday rest, and it is, of course, an admission that such demands properly reset on a religious basis. That which rests on a religious basis is certainly religious itself; and such is the case with all legislation which the demand for Sunday rest has evolved.

April 15, 1897

"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 15, pp. 225, 226.

[225]

ATJ

WE have formerly called attention to monarchical ideas that have become somewhat prevalent in this Republic of the United States.

As a faithful sentinel we are obliged to do this again, for the thing continues to crop out.

Not long ago an association of women, sending a communication to President Mckinley, addressed him as "honored ruler." And this is not the first instance, by a long way, in which this term has been used with reference to the President of the United States.

But the principle of the Government of the United States is a "Government of *the people*, by the people, and for the people." The national charter of government begins, "We, the people ... do ordain and establish this Constitution." Thus the people are the only rightful rulers in the United States.

According to this principle the President of the United States is the presiding officer of the people in the organization which they have formed by which they make themselves secure in the rights which they possess and according to which they govern themselves. He administers the will of the people in their rulership. He gives his oath to the people that he will faithfully perform their formally expressed will. So that the people are *his* rulers, and not he their ruler, according to the vital principles of the national government as established. Therefore the President of the United States is not in any right sense a ruler.

Now we are not saying that President McKinley holds the view that he is the ruler of the people of the United States. We are not say-

ing that he accepted this phrase that those women used in addressing him. We are perfectly satisfied that President McKinley understands himself, and the people, and the Government of the United States, better than that. We are satisfied that he understands these things well enough to be disgusted rather than pleased with such suggestive effusiveness. We fully exonerate President McKinley from entertaining any such suggestion of monarchism. But it is impossible to exonerate from monarchical suggestion those who thus addressed him; and this more especially as it is only one of a number of like offenses from such source.

Yet this is only one phase of the thing. The Washington correspondent of the *Chicago Times-Herald* is filled with it. His account of the late inauguration ceremonies was interlarded with monarchical terms. He actually went so far as to refer to the presidential seat as "the throne." With him the Secretary of State is "Premier." The other Secretaries are "Ministers." The House of Representatives if "the Commons."

If the presidential seat is "the throne," what is the rank of him who occupies the seat? It is only kings who occupy thrones. Thrones are associated only with monarchs.

As for the mere naked word "Premier," it means, of course, only "first in rank or position." But politically it conveys more meaning than that. Of course it is "English, you know;" and it is evident that that is one of the reasons why it is used in the United States. But England is a monarchy; and when these English political terms are used by a writer in the United States, it reveals the taint of monarchism.

Politically, the Premier is "the responsible head of the cabinet." But in the government of the United States the Secretary of State is not "the responsible head of the cabinet." The President of the United States is the head of the cabinet, and he is the only "responsible head of the cabinet."

Again, the Premier is "Prime Minister;" and if the Secretary of State of the United States is "Prime Minister," then, of course, all the other Secretaries become Ministers.

And, again, the Premier is "the representative of the country or
[226] of a party;" but in the government of the United States the Secretary

of State is not in any sense the representative of the country, nor of the party even to which he belongs.

As "the representative of the country or of a party," the Premier has "a representative will." But the Secretary of State of the United States has no representative will.

These ideas comport only with the political methods of a constitutional monarchy as in England. And when used by anyone in speaking of *English* politics, all these terms are strictly proper, for they mean something. But when an attempt is made to use these terms with reference to *American* politics, with reference to the governmental system of the United States, such terms are absolutely meaningless; unless he who uses them entertains the monarchical idea to such an extent that he would have this Government transformed to the extent that the terms should mean here just what their proper political meaning is.

And, in the late administration, wasn't the country given a taste of this view of American premiership? Didn't the Secretary of State of the late administration entertain just this idea of his position? Didn't he consider himself "the representative of the country," having "a representative will" of his own; and didn't he, in behalf of his "monarch," serve notice upon the legislative branch of the Government of the United States that their will, even if expressed in law, would be disregarded unless it conformed to his will? And if this idea could have been carried out to its logical extent, and there had come a crisis between the legislative will and this "Premier" will, what could have been done but to "dissolve the Parliament" and appeal to the country for a decision as to whether this "Premier" was really "the representative of the country" of not.

But every one will say, No such thing as that could ever be. True enough; and therefore it is perfectly plain that in American institutions there is no place for a Premier, and in the bright lexicon of American ideas there is no such word as "Premier."

If the House of Representatives in Congress is "the Commons," then what is the Senate? This correspondent has not yet expressed that in words, as also he has not yet expressed in words the rank of him who occupies "the throne." But if the House of Representatives is "the Commons," there is no escaping the implication that the Senate is "the Lords;" for where there are Commons, in the nature

of things there must be Lords; just as in the nature of things where there is a throne there must be a monarch, and where there is a Prime Minister there must be other Ministers, and where there is a Premier he is "the representative of the country."

It will no doubt be said by many that this correspondent did not mean all this in the terms that he used. Well, if he does not mean what the terms mean which he uses, why, then, does he use the terms? Will any say that terms which are freighted with meaning, are used by an intelligent writer in a way that is meaningless? If, with this writer, those terms have not the meaning that belongs to them, then why does he use the terms at all. In expressing himself with reference to American institutions, why does he use terms that are absolutely meaningless, upon any other hypothesis than that they reveal the presence of the monarchical ideas which the terms convey?

It is perfectly safe to say that both the present President and Secretary of State are men of too much sense and understand American principles too well, to be pleased with the application to themselves of any of these terms. But this is no surety at all that all the men which may ever be called to occupy those positions will be much of such good sense. Let these terms, used too frequently already, become a little more frequent, and it will not be long until men occupying those positions will respond to the ideas thus expressed. Indeed, as already stated, the country has had an inkling of this, and only very lately. Men cannot make themselves monarchs unless there are persons who want a monarch. There never would have been a Pope if there had not been people who wanted a Pope.

Let the people of the United States, who alone are the government, and the rulers, of the United States, see to it that all monarchical terms and ideas shall be resented and kept absolutely under the ban. This the people of the United States owe to themselves, and to all mankind, in order that as long as possible "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

"A Right of the People, Too" American Sentinel 12, 15, pp. 226, 227.

[226]

ATJ

THE Supreme Court of the United States, *by a majority of one*, lately rendered a decision which destroys the pooling of issues amongst railroads "in restraint of trade." The case that was thus decided came up from the West. At the same time there was on the docket of the Supreme Court a case from the East, in which the same principle is involved. Now it is determined to push this second case with the "hope that some one of the justices may change his view when the Joint Traffic case is heard."

So then the lawyers employed upon this Eastern case are to enter upon a course of argument and persuasion to get some one of the five justices, who made the other decision, to change his mind; and thus kill that decision and carry the Court the other way. We have not yet seen any statement from any source that this procedure is in any wise revolutionary or anarchistic.

About two years ago, the Supreme Court, *by a majority of one*, rendered a decision on the question of an income tax. One of the political parties in the campaign last year proposed to have one or more of the justices of the court change his mind upon that; and proposed to present arguments and persuasions that would in some [227] way bring this about. By leading men in the other party this was denounced as revolutionary and anarchistic.

But how can it be any more revolutionary or anarchistic for the people generally to present arguments and persuasions to induce a Supreme Court Justice to change his mind than it is for some lawyers to do it? Is it absolutely conservative and legal for a number of lawyers to do it, while revolutionary and anarchistic for the people to do it?

And if these lawyers shall succeed in getting one of the justices to change his mind, and so reverse the other decision and commit the United States Government to a directly opposite course from that to which the decision already rendered commits it; and if such a thing is to be accepted by the country as strictly proper, legal, governmental, and conservative;—wherein, then, was there anything else involved in the course of those who last year proposed to have a decision of

the Supreme Court reversed and the Government committed to an opposite course with respect to the question of an income tax?

We call attention to this matter now solely to emphasize the point that as a matter of fact, in the practical workings of things, the position which the SENTINEL holds, and has always held, is recognized: that is, that a decision of the Supreme Court is always subject to reversal; and that there is nothing revolutionary or anarchistic in endeavoring to secure a reversal of a Supreme Court decision.

And our contention is, further, that the people of the United States have just as much right to discuss any of these questions and to secure a reversal of a Supreme Court decision as any set of lawyers have. It is no more just to charge as revolutionary and anarchistic any of the people who try to do this, than it would be to charge the lawyers now employed in this railroad case with revolution and anarchy in their "hope that some one of the justices may change his view."

The people of the United States, on their own part, in their own behalf, are just as much concerned in the principles of the Government of the United States as the lawyers are; and they have all the rights that the lawyers have; for who are the lawyers but *some of the people?* And cannot a lawyer, as *one of the people*, in a political campaign endeavor to get the Supreme Court to change its mind and reverse a decision, with just as much right as he can *as a lawyer* in the Chamber of the Supreme Court endeavor to get the Court to change its mind and reverse its decision?

The sum of the whole matter is, that the American principle—the principle held by Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln, the principle always advocated by the AMERICAN SENTINEL—that the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States are subject to review and discussion and reversal if possible, *by the people of the United States*, is absolutely sound, and is vital to government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

"A Doleful 'Gospel'" American Sentinel 12, 15, pp. 227, 228.

[227]

ATJ

IN the endeavor to establish "civic righteousness," upon which the religious effort of this day seems to be centering, the Church has

addressed herself to a doleful task. It is a doleful "gospel" which she is obliged to preach as its accompaniment.

For example, there appears in the *Christian Statesman* each week a column on "Christian Endeavor in Christian Citizenship," conducted by Rev. Chas. Roads, of Philadelphia. This column is filled with accounts of the corruption that exists in certain classes of society and in the sphere of municipal government, and which must be remedied by "Christian Citizenship" methods. In the *Statesman* of April 3, Mr. Roads dwells upon the evidence of this corruption which was afforded at the granting of licences for saloons by the license court. The plane morality upon which the judges of the court stood was sadly low. They were "familiar with the slang of the bar-room," and used it for the amusement of the audience. They granted licenses to saloon proprietors in the face of "most damaging evidence" of their bad character, given by himself and the secretary of the Law and Order League. They condoned flagrant violations of the license law because they were committed on "election night," or "football night," etc.

Previous articles by the same writer have described the flagrant criminality which could be seen on the streets after dark in the neighborhood of saloons and elsewhere, and which the police knew all about, but seemingly made no effort to suppress.

This is the familiar story which one reads to-day in "Christian Citizenship" literature, or hears from the pulpit of the would-be reformer, in our large cities. There is corruption everywhere, and plenty of evidence of the same which forces itself upon the attention of even the casual observer. Our great cities are "run" by corrupt "rings" or political organizations or political "bosses." New York City, for example, is largely subject to the unrighteous sway of "Tammany Hall;" and both city and State are, in matters of general government, under the Philistinic dominance of "boss Platt." In other cities and States the situation is much the same. And all this must be remedied before "civic righteousness" can be established.

Many efforts in this direction have been made, and are being made, but with unsatisfactory results. A few years ago, the Rev. Dr. Parkhurst, with others, undertook the overthrow of "Tammany" and the suppression of municipal corruption in New York City. They stirred the people of the city and engineered an election which

"turned the rascals out" in many cases, so that it seemed for a time that the effort was really successful. But the "rascals" who were turned out drifted back, or those who filled their places became like them, and to-day municipal righteousness is as far away as ever.

[228] The Church, however, is preaching that this "righteousness" must come; and the "Christian Citizenship" and kindred movements are the agencies by which it is to be brought in. The "gospel" of civic and political "righteousness" looks forward to the time when all the political offices will be filled by Christians, and righteousness be enforced by faithful men in all departments of the Government. It looks forward to an enthronement of Christ "on Capitol hill," the seat of national authority. It predicts that these things will be realized soon. But meanwhile it is forced to dwell upon the doleful realities which fill the field of vision in the place of its cherished dream.

And these realities must continue, and become more and more doleful, as long as this "gospel" continues to be preached. For not only is there no power in it to make the world one whit better than it is, but as the Church descends into the arena of politics to work out this plan for regenerating society, she must open the door to that corruption which dwells in politics, and thus part with her own moral power to elevate mankind. Politics is the congenial sphere of the hypocrite and the unscrupulous server of self; and when the Church incorporates politics into her own sphere of operation, she must take in the elements which are characteristic of political life. By espousing political methods, she offers an inducement to ambitious self-servers to join themselves to her in hypocritical union. She opens her doors to a flood of worldliness, and puts herself in the condition of a foundering ship at sea. While the Church herself is thus becoming, as the prophetic word has it, "the hold of every foul spirit, and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird" (Revelation 18:2), it cannot but be that in the world itself, "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." 2 Timothy 3:13.

The gospel of "civic righteousness" operates by means of the ballot. If the ballot fails, the "righteousness" is lost. And what is more uncertain than the ballot? If at times something is accomplished by its agency in the direction of civic reform, the gain is certain to be but temporary. The powers of evil rally their forces, and

the next election restores their lost supremacy. The people can be aroused at times to a spasmodic effort to "turn the rascals out" when corruption becomes too rampant in public affairs, but "the people" are mainly occupied with their individual interests, and constitute but sleepy sentinels around the camp of the public weal. As political reformations do not reach the heart, they can at best but remove the symptoms of the malady from which the body politic suffers. But as the disease itself remains, seated in the carnal heart, the symptoms must quickly reappear, and the situation become as bad as before.

The Church has a better gospel than all this to proclaim to the multitudes around her. She has that gospel which is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth,"—a gospel that contemplates not merely a clean administration of public affairs, but a clean heart in the individual; not the establishment of a man-made legal righteousness, but of the righteousness of Christ which is by faith; not "the enthronement of Christ on Capitol hill," and in the various seats of State and municipal government, but the reign of Christ on the throne of David in the glorious Capital of the earth made new; a gospel which operates not by the power of civil decrees, but by the power of love; which depends not upon the weak and uncertain agency of the ballot, but upon the word of Omnipotence; which comforts men not with an uncertain prospect of temporal good to come, but with that "love, joy, peace," which are the "fruits of the Spirit" now and here, in the life of every believer, and with the gift of eternal life through Jesus Christ.

Why, oh why, will the Church turn from this glorious gospel, for which all the world is dying, to preach the weak and doleful gospel of "civic righteousness"?

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 15, p. 228.

[228]

ATJ

WOULD it not be well for the preachers, as they are about entering on the year's campaign against Sunday baseball, to hunt up the Scripture which states that Jesus Christ opposed Sunday games; or, if they think this proposition unfair, let them find the text which mentions that Christ invoked the aid of the civil authorities to compel

men to observe the Sabbath. Do they not claim that Jesus Christ is their example?

April 22, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 16, pp. 241, 242.

[241]

ATJ

THE great ethical problem of the day is the problem of how to make good that which is bad.

This is not a new problem; it is as old as human nature. From the earliest times, human wisdom has persistently sought its solution in the spheres of both individual and national life.

This problem has entered the sphere of politics, and is to-day the center of movements which are engaging the thought and energies of vast numbers of people. This is nowhere more true than in the United States. We are told that the politics of the country are bad, and they must be made good; or as commonly expressed, they must be “purified.”

How shall the base metal of which politics now consists be transmuted into gold and silver? The political alchemists who have undertaken the task are the “Christian Citizenship” and “Good Citizenship” leagues which are springing up everywhere throughout the land.

In this undertaking they must certainly fail. But it is equally certain that their efforts will not be without important results.

These organizations propose to work by political methods. They resolve the problem therefore into that of politics purifying itself; which is just as possible of accomplishment as that a bitter fountain should make itself sweet.

It is certain that the good at which this movement aims in politics cannot be realized through bad men in politics. The problem of

making bad men good, therefore, is the one which is really sought to be solved by these impossible methods.

There is just one way in which that which is bad in human conduct can be made to give place to good. Upon this point we have the testimony of the wisest teacher who ever discoursed upon the natures of good and evil. That teacher is none other than Jesus Christ. It will be worth while to turn our attention to His words.

There was one occasion upon which a certain ruler came to Christ and asked him, "Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" The Master replied: "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but One, that is, God: but it thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments."

The ruler affirmed that he had kept the commandments. When the Saviour had enumerated them, the ruler said, "All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet?" The answer was, "One thing thou lackest; go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." "And when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful; for he had great possessions." Matthew 19:16-22.

The young ruler had sought goodness by works; but he had not attained to goodness. He thought that he had been keeping the law of God, but he had not been keeping it at all.

The Saviour's words to him expressed the truth that God alone is good. He is the personification of goodness, in and of Himself. There can be no goodness anywhere else except that which comes from Him.

A man can become good only by having goodness given him from God. He cannot make himself good. By the gift of God, through faith, a bad man becomes good; and he becomes good in order that he may do good. This is Christianity. The method of human nature, on the other hand, is to do good in order to become good; and this is heathenism.

The heathen race is continually seeking to evolve goodness from works. But it can never come in that way. It can come only as the gift of God, through that which connects the soul with God. And as politics does not connect with God, it is impossible that real
[242] goodness should be realized therefrom.

But there is very much in the world which passes for goodness that is not goodness. The young man who came to Christ thought that he was good. He made a show of goodness in his life; and being outwardly a keeper of the commandments, he no doubt passed—and could pass in this day—for a good man. But his goodness was spurious, and only involved him in ruin at last.

God alone is good; and "God is love." Therefore there can be no goodness apart from love. The young ruler thought he was a good man, but he failed on the test of love. He was not willing to use his riches for the benefit of his fellowmen.

"Good citizenship" and "Christian citizenship" aim to "purify politics,"—to put goodness in the place of evil, in politics. But what kind of "goodness" will it be which will thus be put into politics? Will it be genuine goodness, which is from God alone, or will it be a counterfeit? As certainly as it is a counterfeit, it will involve in ruin all that which depends upon it.

And it is no small thing which is made to depend upon the success of the "Good Citizenship" movement. It is proposed to accomplish by it great things, even to evolve a government in which "Christ and His law" will be the "supreme authority in national as in individual life" (See p. 250). It is proposed by it to usher in the millennium and set up the kingdom of Christ on the earth. If the scheme fails, therefore, what will be the result? What less than the spiritual bankruptcy of all who shall have reared the edifice of their spiritual hopes upon it?

Love is the test of goodness. Will the goodness of "Good Citizenship" stand this test? Will this test be applied to it? Can it be applied by any method of political procedure?

"Love is of God," and "without faith it is impossible to please Him." Faith is the link which connects the soul with God. There can be no real goodness without love, no real love without faith. Does "Good Citizenship" operate through faith? Is faith a method of political action?

Human conduct can be purified only through faith in the Word of God? Nothing that is shaped by human conduct can be good or pure apart from the power of God through faith. And faith cannot enter into politics.

Politics is of this world. It has no connection with "Christ and His law," or with the kingdom of God. It cannot bring "a clean thing out of an unclean." It can prove only a deception to those who trust in it for good.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 16, p. 251.

[251]

ATJ

ONE of the most mysterious things in the world is the "logic" which upholds the Sunday laws. It may be illustrated thus (borrowing from the theology of Sunday observance for the purpose):—

The Sabbath commandment is so indefinite that it does not specify any particular day as the Sabbath.

The world being round, it is impossible for a definite day to be observed on it anyway.

Hence, you must observe that particular day of the week known as Sunday.

Or, again:—

All the ten commandments have been abolished, including the command to observe the Sabbath.

We believe in full religious liberty.

Therefore, you must observe the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, or suffer the pains and penalties of the law.

April 29, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 17, pp. 257-263.

[257]

ATJ

WE are obliged to ask our readers to allow us briefly to review the position and work of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

The reason for this will be made apparent presently, and, we think, will be sufficient to justify this request which we make.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL was established particularly to defend the American principle of separation of religion and the State: because the people who established this paper are Christians, and separation of religion and the State is Christian.

Primarily, of course, this was in the interests of Christianity. But as it is a fundamental principle of the national Government in defending and preserving this principle, in the nature of things this is in the interests of the State.

In other words, as this Christian principle of separation of religion and the State is the fundamental principle, the chief characteristic, of the national Government, and was intended to be so by those who established the Government, it is plain that to work as Christians for the maintenance of this great principle is, in every sense of the word, to work for the highest possible interests of the State.

The establishment of the SENTINEL, and its work in behalf of this Christian principle, was timely, as we then knew and as the great mass of the American people have discovered since: because there was a religious combination calling itself the National Reform Association, that was determined to subvert this principle of the Government, and, by whatever means would accomplish it, to carry

the Government into a union of religion and the State, patterned exactly upon the system of the Dark Ages.

From the beginning we insisted, and we still insist, that for the American people to allow this religious combination to succeed in its endeavors would be to allow the setting up in this nation of an order of things that would be in the exact image of the papacy,—not merely because the papacy was the papacy, but because the papacy, with all the manifold evils inherent in it, was but the consequence of the disregard and subversion of the very Christian principle that is the fundamental principle of the Government of the United States.
[258] And for a religious combination again to disregard this principle would be to start upon a course whose end could not be in any wise different from that which went before for the Christian principle is for ever the same, and the consequences of the disregard of it will be ever the same.

As disregard of this principle in the fourth century made the papacy, with all that it has ever been since, so the disregard of this principle in the nineteenth century must make the very likeness of the papacy in all its aspects. The papacy has been in history what it has been, not because the men who made it and have been connected with it were worse than all other men. The men who made the papacy, and who have ever been connected with it, have always been simply human beings, just like all other human beings. What the papacy has been in history is not because of the men, but because of *the principles* which actuated the men.

Take men from any place on the earth, and let them espouse the principles of the papacy, and the history of the papacy will be reproduced just as far as the men have power to do it. In all our discussions of the papacy our attacks have not been upon the men, as such, who were connected with it; but upon the principles which characterize it and which have caused the papacy to present to the world the history that it has.

Therefore, in pointing out that the success of the National Reform Association would produce in the United States the living image of the papacy, and insisting always that this must be the inevitable consequence, we have done so solely because that the principles which actuate the National Reform Association, and which that Association were determined to fasten upon the Government of the

United States, are the identical principles that have produced the history that has been made by the papacy. It is the disregard of the Christian principle announced by the Lord for the guidance of the Church and the State as respects their attitude toward each other.

And in all this we have been maintaining the principle upon which the Government of the United States as founded. For those who made the nation, with its fundamental principle of separation of religion and the State said that "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." Whether they meant in this, to say that such a thing would lead the country back to the domination of the church of Rome itself, or whether they meant that it would lead back to the principles of the church of Rome in the hands of some other sect, is immaterial; because the distinction is so slight as to be indeed immaterial.

We have always said that ruin would come to the nation as certainly as this National Reform scheme should be allowed to succeed; because of the hypocrisy and general deviltry that by it would be made to prevail. We have pointed to the ruin that came upon the Roman empire as the consequence of just such a movement in the fourth century. It can never be too often repeated, and it must never be forgotten, that it was the "*Christian* Roman empire that perished under the barbarian raids of the fourth and fifth centuries. It was more than ... years after the Roman empire had become "Christian" before the flood of barbarians broke upon the empire. It was more than ninety years before the barbarians invaded the Western empire. It was more than thirty years after the three emperors, by a special decree, which required "all subjects of the empire, of whatever ... or name, to adopt the faith of the Catholic Church and assume the name of 'Catholic Christians,'" and had then made the whole empire "Christian," before any nation the barbarians fastened itself permanently upon Roman soil.

Thus all the evidence shows that it was the "Christian" Roman empire, and not the Pagan, that perished under the invasions of the barbarians of the North, and this because the so-called Christian empire was worse than ever the Pagan had been. For under the system of an established church, of enforced religious dogma, hypocrisy

had been added to the natural cussedness that already prevailed: and even as Dr. Schaff has stated: "Nothing but the divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian but essentially heathen empire could open the way for the moral regeneration of society."

A like course can not be followed in the United States without reaching a like result. So that the success of the National Reform scheme of Christianizing the United States Government; of making this a "Christian nation" placing all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on a legal basis, and requiring respect to them as legal by all the people, would be the surest token of impending ruin. This is as certain as the law that "like causes probable like effects."

But this evil is not, and cannot be, confined merely to the United States. We have pointed out that the influence of the United States Government, while it adheres strictly to the principles upon which it was founded, has been powerful to lead all the nations toward religious freedom; so that by foreign publicists this nation has been called "the classic land of religious liberty." And when, under the influence and power of the National Reform combination, this country shall be led to the perversion of these principles, to the recognition of religion in national affairs, the influence of this perversion will be equally powerful to carry the other nations backward again to religious despotism, and thus the evil thing becomes world-wide. Then when "the divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian but essentially heathen world" shall again fall, as surely it must fall, the destruction will be world-wide. And all nations will be involved in the evil, it will be impossible for the Lord to find on the earth any new nations by whom to sweep away this earth-breaking
[259] curse; and nothing more but for him to employ the armies of heaven to accomplish the inevitable result, even as it is written:—

"Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand; a day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains: a great people and a strong; there hath not been ever the like, neither shall be any more after it, even to the years of many generations.... And the Lord shall utter his voice before his army: for his camp is very great: for he is strong that

executeth his word: for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible; and who can abide it?" Joel 2:1, 2, 11.

And so, in the nature of things, the end of the world must come.

In view of all this, we have said, and we still say, that when the National Reform combination succeeds in its endeavor with respect to the United States Government, then the only safety, the only deliverance from certain ruin, for any man, will be to separate utterly from the whole wicked alliance, even as again it is written:—

"And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities.... 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."

Such, in brief, has been the position and work of the AMERICAN SENTINEL from the first number that was printed until this present issue. And such the position and work of the SENTINEL will continued to be, until the last number shall have been issued.

NOW we are ready to tell why it is that we have asked the indulgence of our readers while we should restate the position of the SENTINEL; and that is that the men who have been engaged in this evil work of subverting the Christian principles upon which the Government of the United States was founded, and in bringing about this system which, in its turn, can bring only this ruin,—these men are charging us with "sedition" and with "turning away the hearts of the citizens from the United States Government."

One of these, in particular, out in the Western Reserve, is making specially prominent this charge. He was born and bred a National Reformer. He has been a leader in the National Reform movement even since June, 1887, when the National Reform convention held that year at Pittsburg appointed him as chief of their "prayer league," to pray at noon every day for their religio-political "kingdom of God" to come on the earth.

This man is making himself now prominent as a special defender of the flag. It seems he carries with him a United States flag: and before his audiences enters against us the charge of "sedition," of "turning away the hearts of citizens from the United States Government;" and thus, with "disrespect for the flag." He gathers, if

possible, a number of veterans of the late war, and puts them upon front seats; and then, by systematic misrepresentation both of us and his own position, he uses the arts of the demagogue to turn their love for the flag, into the fire of bitter hatred for those whom he has thus set before them as "seditions." Then he caps his climax with drawing forth his flag and handing it to one of the veterans, and has him wave it while he himself leads the audience, or as many of them as he has succeeded in bamboozling, in giving a grand "Hip! Hip! Hurrah! Hurrah! Hurrah!" for the flag. And this "Hurrah" for the flag is expected to be led with the spirit to "kick out of all loyal fraternities" every one of us who "teach sedition" and "turn away the hearts of the citizens from the United States Government." The cut on the first page of this paper is a photograph of one of these scenes that he thus worked up not long ago out at Ellsworth, Ohio.

The trick in this is that our opposition *to the National Reform movement*, our warning against the iniquity and the ruin that must certainly come from the success of that movement, and our calling upon all people to keep themselves separate from the whole scheme and all its workings if they would escape the ruin that it must certainly bring,—this he takes and deftly turns so as to make it appear that it is all aimed *against the Government itself.*

In other words, all our opposition, and all our warnings, against the National Reform government, he takes up and so turns as to make it appear that they are all against the United States Government as it was originally founded: when the truth is, and as all fair readers
[260] of the SENTINEL know, that the very object of the existence of the AMERICAN SENTINEL is to maintain the principles upon which the United States Government was originally founded, and in this, in the best possible way to preserve the integrity of the Government itself as it was originally founded, and as our fathers hoped it would forever remain.

And now these men who have removed the very foundation stone of the noble edifice erected by our fathers; and who are now diligently and zealously engaged in remodeling the whole structure so as to make it altogether another government, modeled upon the principles of the church of Rome which our fathers hoped particularly that we should forever escape,—*these men* are they who charge us

thus with "sedition," with "disrespect for the flag," and with "turning away the hearts of citizens from the United States Government"!

It may not be amiss to give to our readers some of the specifications as samples of how this man "proves" against us his charge of "sedition." There are three specific counts upon which he does this.

"First," he says that we "arouse discontent against the United States Government, disturb public tranquility, etc., by teaching that the Bible identifies this Government with pagan Rome."

Every reader of the AMERICAN SENTINEL knows that this is altogether a mistake. No such suggestion has ever been made by any Seventh-day Adventist. Our friend simply doesn't know what he is talking about.

His "second" specification is that "they arouse discontent against the United States Government, disturb public tranquility, etc., by teaching that the Bible identifies the United States Government with the papacy."

This is another mistake just like the one before. It simply is not true. We have never identified the United States with the papacy. We have never even connected it with the papacy, except in the way that we have pointed out in this article: that is, through the mischievous working of the National Reform scheme of which this man himself is now a zealous champion,—this scheme by which they, adopting the principles of the papacy, subvert the true and Christian principles of the Government United States, and thus establish here a system of things in the exact image of the papacy.

An image of a thing cannot be identified with the thing itself, except in its relations. This is the only way in which we have ever identified the United States Government with the papacy. And that we are not in any wise amiss in this part of it, will be evident to every one who will read the following statement of fact concerning the National Reform combination in its different stages.

August 31, 1881, these National Reformers published in their official organ the following words:—

> "This common interest ['of all religious people in the Sabbath'—Sunday] ought both to strengthen our determination to work, and our readiness to coöperate in every way with out Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. We

> may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches—as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances and gladly to accept coöperation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the *necessities* of the situation."

December 11, 1884, in their official organ, they published this:—

> "Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to coöperate in resisting the progress of political atheism we will gladly join hands with them."

In his Encyclical of 1885, Pope Leo XIII. addressed to Catholics everywhere the following words:—

> "We exhort all Catholics who would devote candid attention to public matters, to take an active part in all municipal affairs and elections, and to further the principles of the church in all public services, meetings and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. *They must penetrate wherever possible in the administration of civil affairs;* must constantly use their utmost vigilance and energy to prevent the usages of liberty from going beyond the limits fixed by God's law. *All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States, and legislation to be modeled in the principles of the true church.* All Catholic writers and journalists should never lose for an instant from view, the above prescriptions. All Catholics should redouble their submission to authority, and unite their whole heart, soul, and body, and mind, in the defense of the church."

In an official report of a conference of leading National Reformers held at Saratoga, N.Y., August 14-17, 1887, the following occurs:—

> "REV. DR. PRICE of Tennessee—'I wish to ask the secretary, Has any attempt ever been made by the National Reform Association to ascertain whether a *concensus*, or agreement, could be reached with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, whereby we may unite in support of the schools, as they do in Massachusetts?"
>
> "THE SECRETARY—'I regret to say there has not ... But I recognize it as a wise and dutiful course on the part of all who are engaged in or who discuss the work of education, to make the effort to secure such an agreement.'
>
> "DR. PRICE—'I rise to move that the National Reform Association be requested by this Conference to bring this whole matter to the attention of American educators and of Roman Catholic authorities, with a view to securing such a basis of agreement, if possible.'"

The motion was seconded, and adopted. In November, 1888, the then most prominent leader in the National Reform combination, by personal request, secured the coöperation of Cardinal Gibbons with them in urging upon Congress the enactment of a national law to "promote" the observance of Sunday "as a day of religious worship."

November 12, 1889, at the Congress of Catholic laymen of the United States, the following statement was made:—

> "What we should seek is an *en rapport* with the Protestant Christians who desire to keep Sunday holy.

[261]

> ... We can bring the Protestant masses over to the reverent moderation of the Catholic Sunday."

At that time the American Sabbath Union was the leading element in the National Reform combination, and of this word of counsel of the Catholic laymen, the American Sabbath Union said:—

> "The National Lay Congress of Roman Catholics, *after correspondence and conference with the American Sabbath Union*, passed its famous resolution in favor of coöperation with Protestants in Sabbath reform.... This does not mean that the millennium is to be built in a day. This is only a proposal of courtship: and the parties thus far have approached each other shyly."

In 1892 the National Reform combination, in coöperation with the papacy in this country led by Archbishop Ireland, Archbishop Gross, and Archbishop Riordan, did, under threats of political perdition, secure from Congress legislation setting up Sunday as the Christian Sabbath in the place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment as it was read in Congress from the Bible, and as God spoke it from the top of Sinai.

All this is sober fact. And these references demonstrate that the National Reform combination did certainly for eight years, openly bid and work for the coöperation of the papacy in this country in bringing the United States Government under the domination of the religious power after the image of the original of the papacy itself. These facts demonstrate that by such means the National Reform combination did at last secure the coöperation of the papacy in its bad endeavor to subvert the original principles of the Government of the United States, and commit this Government to legislation in behalf of religion and in the service of the Church, exactly after the image of the papacy.

It is a fact also that, as the consequence of this very work of the National Reformers which they pride themselves has made this a Christian nation, the papacy has for four years been claiming as her rightful possession this nation as "a Catholic Christian nation." And upon this there comes as a consequence the further fact that to-day there is brewing a contest between the National Reform combination and the papacy, over the question as to whether this is a Catholic "Christian nation" or a Protestant "Christian nation."

And now, in the face of this undeniable history of which this man was a part he has the brass to stand up before a crowd of American
[262] people and charge us with "teaching that the Bible identifies the United States Government with the papacy."

If we had really been teaching this, it would have been teaching precisely what he and his fellow-workers were, in principle, both teaching and doing all these years.

And now, as he charges that such a thing is "sedition," and as he and his fellow-workers have been for years doing their very best to accomplish just that thing, both in principle and in practice, while all these years we have been using our utmost endeavor to prevent the first step toward any such thing, it is as plain as A B C that his charge of "sedition" lies against himself and his fellow-workers above all other people, and not against us in any sense whatever. That is the truth.

His "third" specification is that "they are seditious in teaching that the Bible identifies the United States Government with the archrebel Satan, in opposition to truth and righteousness in the earth."

To sustain this specification, he cites our teaching with reference to the beast brought to view in Revelation 13:1-11, of which it is said: "I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon." And, as it is plain from the context that the word "dragon" here refers to the devil, this is why he says that we teach "that the Bible identifies the United States Government with the archrebel, Satan."

Here again he plays that trick of taking what we have said, and all we say, of the Government *after it has been turned into a National Reform government*, and making it apply to the United States Government *as it was originally founded*.

This scripture as above quoted, refers to the Government in both these phases. The United States Government *as it was originally founded*, is beautiful [*sic*.] described by the word of the Lord, as a beast coming up having two horns *like a lamb*. That is a correct description of the United States Government as it was originally founded, and as it stood, upon the principles which characterized it,—the two grand principles of civil and religious freedom: separation of religion and the State; no king, and no pope.

Of all the symbols used in the Word of God to illustrate earthly governments, this is the only one that is given the mild and gentle characteristics of the lamb. And this is the word which God has set down as descriptive of the United States Government as it stood in

its original beauty, grounded upon the principle which God himself announced, the absolute separation of religion, and particularly the Christian religion, from the jurisdiction or cognizance of the State.

But an anomaly appears; a change occurs. This beast having two horns "like a lamb" comes to speak "as a dragon." This refers to the change brought about through the working of this National Reform scheme. This anomaly marks the result of the National Reform subversion of the principles upon which the Government was founded, and its dragging the Government into an espousal of the principles of the papacy. In the first half of the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, the papacy is represented under the symbol of a beast which has by no means the characteristics of a lamb; and which receives its power and its seat and its great authority from "the dragon," which, in the twelfth chapter, is declared to be "that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan." The symbol then, having two horns like a lamb yet speaking like a dragon, shows that the original character of the Government becomes so changed that the spirit of Satan is manifested instead of the characteristics of a lamb.

Our teaching has always been, and it is yet, that the scripture statement that the beast had two horns "like a lamb," is descriptive of the United States Government *as it was originally founded*. And it has been, our constant endeavor to keep the Government of the United States inseparably attached to these principles. Had this been done, benefits and blessings would from this nation have flowed forth to the nations of the earth beyond the highest dreams of the far-seeing, noble men who, under God, were instrumental in founding the Government as it was founded.

But the people of the United States, forgetting these principles, and losing sight of the high destiny and the wondrous privileges that God had set before them, have allowed these principles to be subverted, and have allowed the Government in its words and laws to be turned aside, so that already the oppressive, cruel voice of the dragon has been heard. And the same scripture goes on to tell how that this voice will yet further be heard in speaking, and causing that as many as do "not worship the image of the beast should be killed."

Under the deceptive workings of the National Reform principles, persecutions and cruelties after the very image of the system of the Dark Ages will yet be inflicted upon the people of the United States

in pursuance of laws of the United States, and in direct coöperation and alliance with the papacy itself in the United States and in the world. And thus a further deception is wrought, and another suggestion of the scripture is detected, in that, while the symbol stands in outward appearance with the characteristics of a lamb, yet it speaks and acts with the spirit of the dragon; and, as it stands in this ambiguous position, is described in another place in the book of Revelation as "the false prophet."

While pretending to represent the principles of liberty and truth, it actually is made to practice the principles of despotism and iniquity: and this change, which means so much to the people of the United States, and to all the world, and which is so vividly expressed in the Scriptures,—all this is brought about through the mischievous workings of the religio-political scheme of the National Reform combination of which this man has been for years, and now is, a prominent and zealous leader.

And now, after all this, in the presence of all the which is only undeniable fact, this man in Ohio, *this man*, charges us with "*sedition!*" [263]

Free men, Christian men, of Ohio: free men, Christian men, of the United States: free men, Christian men, everywhere: judge ye between him and us on this question.

May 6, 1897

"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 18, pp. 273-275.

[273]

ATJ

THE Bible is not difficult to understand when it is taken as it says.

Whoever will allow the Bible to *mean* what it *says*, will never have any difficulty in knowing what it means.

And whoever will allow that the Author of the Bible is capable of knowing what he wants to say, and that he has clearness of mind enough to say what he wants to say, *just as he wants to say it*, will have no difficulty in taking the Bible as it says, and consequently will have no difficulty in understanding it.

The Bible comes to us as the Word of God. In itself it claims to be the Word of God. It is the Word of God. And whoever will receive it as the Word of God, will find it to be that. Then to allow that the Author of the Bible had sense enough to know exactly what he wanted to say, and ability to say it just as he wanted to say it, is only to allow that *God* had sense enough to know what he wanted to say, and had sufficient clearness of mind to say it as he wanted to. In other words, it is only to allow that God in giving his Word knew what he meant, and meant what he said.

When the Bible is taken this way and treated thus, no one will have any difficulty whatever in understanding it. And for any man *not* to take it this way, and not to treat it thus: that is for any man to say that the Bible does not mean what it says, and that it is left for the man himself to say what it means—this is only to claim that he knows better than God just how it ought to have been said, and just

what should have been meant. In other words, he puts himself in the place of God.

But when the Bible is taken just as it says, and is allowed to mean exactly what it says because the Author of it knew well enough what he wanted to say to be able to say just what he meant, it is all plain enough. Even a child can understand it then, for it is written, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no case enter therein." Now the Word of God is the word of the kingdom. Through that Word we enter into the kingdom. And as whosoever does not receive that kingdom as a little child, cannot have it, it is perfectly plain that it is intended by the Word that a little child shall understand the Word, and that a little child *can* understand it. Even grown people must receive it *as little children*, and must become "as little children" in order to receive it.

Any system, therefore, any writing, any way that is taken, by any body, that has a tendency to mystify the sayings of the Bible, to turn them into hard problems or to make them difficult to understand, can never be the right way. And anything offered as an exposition of any doctrine that presents a problem difficult to be understood cannot be the truth. Therefore again, it is written, "I fear lest as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from simplicity that is in Christ."

The Word of Christ is simple. His Word is plain. It is as simple
[274] as A, B, C. And anything that tends to make it anything else than plain and simple, cannot be the right way. The simplicity that is in Christ is the perfection of simplicity. When he was on earth he taught all classes of people at once. The common people heard him gladly because he spoke with such simplicity of language, and such directness of meaning that they could understand him. And it was only the subtlety of the serpent in the Scribes and Pharisees that pretended not to be able to understand him.

It was so in the very beginning. When God placed in the Garden the first human pair, he said to them plainly, "Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Yet there came the serpent with his subtlety and proposed that the Lord did not mean what he said, that it was necessary that it should be explained, and that he was the one who was qualified to explain it and convey to them the true

meaning. He therefore said, "Ye shall not surely die, for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil."

Thus Satan proposed that God had not said exactly what he meant, and had kept back the real meaning, and had left his saying dark and problematical. That is the first explanation that was ever offered: the first comment that was ever made upon the Word of God. And everything since, that has ever tended to make problematical the Word of God, to make it mean otherwise than exactly as it says, is following the same lead. It is of the subtlety that beguiles from the simplicity that is in Christ.

It has been well written of Moses that "He gave God credit for wisdom to know what he meant, and firmness of purpose to mean what he said; and therefore Moses acted as seeing the Invisible." And it was "*By faith* that Moses endured as seeing the invisible." It is therefore *faith* to give God credit for wisdom to know what he means, and firmness of purpose to mean what he says. And "without faith it is impossible to please him."

NOW it is a fact that there is much discussion of the Sabbath question. Many people seem to have great difficulty in knowing just what day is the Sabbath; yet the Word of God says plainly "the seventh day is the Sabbath." Any person who will simply accept that statement as it stands, taking it simply as it *says*, will never have any difficulty at all in knowing exactly what day is the Sabbath. And the Bible throughout speaks just as plainly and is as easily understood in all its statements with reference to the Sabbath, as it speaks in this sentence quoted.

The people who accept the Bible statements exactly as they are on this subject, never do have any difficulty at all in knowing what day is the Sabbath. But those who will not accept it have endless confusion and difficulty: and in fact, never do get the question settled to their perfect satisfaction.

That "Great Discovery" lately made by the Christian Endeavorers is only another instance of the confusion, mystification and difficulty that people find by not taking the Word of God simply as it says. It is another instance of the subtlety that beguiles from the simplicity that is in Christ. It has taken years of subtle invention and contrivance, of

cutting and trying, of intricate elaboration, to produce what is now lauded as a "Great Discovery."

And now that it is presented to the world, instead of its being plain and simple as divine truth always is, it is so contradictory to the Scriptures that no man can believe both; and in itself is so intricate and involved that an examination of it forces the query as to whether the author of it himself understands it. If the subject of the Sabbath or any other subject in the Bible were set forth after any such order as this "Great Discovery" is, every man in the world would have just cause for saying that the Bible could not be understood: for it would then lack the essential element of a divine revelation—that is, simplicity.

He who knows most can always make plainest and simplest what he has to tell, however deep the subject he may be discussing. God, knowing all things, and being the embodiment of all wisdom, is capable of making subjects that are of eternal depth so plain that a little child can receive them and understand them. But when anybody, whether it be the devil or a man, not believing what the Lord says just as he says it, undertakes to interpret it and by subtle distinctions to tell what the Lord means, he produces only infinite and eternal confusion. And all who allow themselves to be so beguilded from the simplicity that is in Christ, inevitably find it to be so.

WHEN the Scripture is read that says plainly, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," those who do not believe it and will not accept it as the truth of God, and will not allow that he knew what he wanted to say and then said just what he meant, put on an air of child-like innocense [*sic*.] and inquire "The seventh day of *what?*" or "*What* seventh day is the Sabbath?"

In the very first chapter of the Bible the Word of God is, that in six days the Lord created the heavens and the earth and all things that are in them. Then the same word follows with a statement that on the seventh day he rested, and that he blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested form the work which he had created and made. And that particular seventh day, that *rest day* is the Sabbath, for Sabbath is rest.

That six days of creative work followed by the seventh day of rest, formed the first week of time that this world knows anything about. And from that record *just as it stands*, without any interpretation

or explanation whatever, it is perfectly plain that the seventh day, which is God's rest day; the seventh day, which is the Sabbath of the [275] Lord, is the seventh day *of the week*.

Such is the record that the Lord himself has given of his own creative acts through the first six days of the world's existence, and of his rest on the seventh day of the world's existence. These together compose the original week of the world's existence. And every one who will believe the record *just as it stands* and simply as it says, will know for himself and to his perfect satisfaction what seventh day it is that is meant in the Bible, when it says that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.

THEN if any one wants to have another statement of the case, he needs only to turn to the 20th chapter of Exodus and read what the Lord himself said with his own voice, speaking from the top of Sinai. To his people there assembled and for all people for all time who will be his people, the Lord himself said, "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; ... 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 allowed it."

Here the Lord says that the people are to work six days and rest the seventh, *because* at creation he himself had worked six days and then rested the seventh day. Now any one who is willing to allow that the Lord tells the truth, and was able to remember at Sinai what he had done at creation, will have no difficulty whatever in understanding what seventh day it is that is referred to in this language. For it is the identical day of his rest at the close of the six days of creation, which cannot possibly be any other than the seventh day of the week; for there was no other existing period of which it could possibly be the seventh day.

The people who stood at the base of Sinai that day and heard that voice, have continued, through their descendants, unto this day; and are scattered over the whole earth, amongst all the nations. And the day that there God gave them, upon his own count, by his own voice, in connection with the facts in which he himself was the actor, *they have never lost*.

IF any one wants yet further evidence, come fifteen hundred years still further down. Then he who made the heavens and the earth, who rested that seventh day at the close of the work of creation, he who spoke form the top of Sinai the word which we have just quoted, stood upon the earth himself in the form of a man as a teacher sent from God. He observed this same seventh day as the Sabbath. He ever called it the Sabbath.

And it was *the same day* that the people of Israel had observed as the Sabbath, from the day that he himself had spoken from the top of Sinai. And though there was constant criticism of all his words and ways on the part of the Scribes, Pharisees, Lawyers and Rabbis, yet there was never any shadow of a question raised as to whether he observed the proper day as the Sabbath. There was always agreement between day as the Sabbath. There was always agreement between him and them as to that. Their objections against him were solely with reference to his *manner of observing* the day. And he in this as in everything else was the grand exemplar of the right way for all mankind forever.

THUS three separate times the Lord himself has stated the facts concerning the origin and basis of the Sabbath, and has made plain exactly what seventh day it is. First, in the record of the original creation in the first and second chapters of Genesis. Secondly, in repeating with his own voice the record of the original creation. Thirdly, when upon the earth he repeated with his own voice and manifested in his own life the living truth as the example for all mankind.

O that men would believe the word of the Lord which he has taken all this pains to make plain to their understanding. Why will men continue to allow the same serpent that beguiled Eve, and in the same way, through his subtlety, to corrupt their minds from the simplicity that is in Christ?

May 13, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 19, pp. 289, 290.

[289]

ATJ

THE one leading principle of the AMERICAN SENTINEL is separation of religion and the State.

Every other subject, all discussion of other points, is subordinate to the one great subject of separation of religion and the State. And the one great reason for this, the sole basis of it, is that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is Christian.

It is solely because that the separation of religion and the State is Christian that we advocate it. Nor is this a mere sentiment or side issue of Christianity. It is one of the fundamental principles, one of the chief characteristics of Christianity.

The Bible, not merely the New Testament, but the whole book, is the book of Christianity. The New Testament is not a revelation new and distinct from the old: it is the culmination of the revelation begun in the Old Testament.

The Old Testament and the New are one book, one consistent, harmonious revelation of God through Jesus Christ; because Jesus Christ is the revelation of God before the world was made, when the world was made, and through all the history of the world from beginning to end.

The first chapter of Genesis is Christian as certainly as is the first chapter of John. The Book of Genesis is Christian as certainly as is the first chapter of John. The Book of Genesis is Christian as really as is the Book of Revelation or any other book in the Bible. We repeat therefore that the whole Bible is the book of Christianity, the

book of the Christian religion, the revelation of God through Jesus Christ.

And the separation of religion and the State is one of the great thoughts of this great book. It is one of the leading principles of that book which for man is the source of all sound principle.

Many people think that the two or three expressions of Christ as recorded in the New Testament are all that the Bible contains on the subject of the separation of Church and State; and many others are disposed even to argue against these passages and to modify them by other passages from the Old Testament. But separation of religion and the State is one of the original thoughts of the Bible, and reaches from the beginning to the end of the Book; and neither the book nor this subject can be fairly understood in reference to this matter till this is clearly defined in the mind. Therefore that the SENTINEL may be true to its mission and serve in the best way the great object of its existence, we purpose to give to our readers a series of studies of the Bible on this subject from beginning to end.

Being one of the great thoughts of the Bible, one of the great thoughts of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ, this subject is of vital importance to men everywhere in their relations to God, and not merely in their relations to the State. It is a principle that is involved in the daily experience of the Christian, in his relation to God, and not merely an abstract question that man can stand as it were apart and view simply as a speculative question of the relations between religion and the State.

The ways of God are right. His word is the only certain light, the only sure truth. The principles which he has announced are the only safe principles for the guidance of men. We hope, and shall seriously endeavor, to make each study so plain that every reader can easily see and readily grasp the truth of it.

The first of these studies we shall present now and shall begin at the beginning.

"The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the first commandment.

"And the second is like, namely this: Thou shalt love thy neigh-
[290] bor as thyself; there is none other commandment greater than these."

"On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

These two commandments exist in the very nature and circumstances of existence of any two intelligent creatures in the Universe. They existed thus in the existence of the first two intelligent creatures that ever had a place in the Universe.

When the first intelligence was created and there was no creature but himself, as he owed to his Creator his existence, as he owed to God all that he was or could be, heart, soul, might, mind and strength: it devolved upon him to render to God the tribute of all this and to love God with all his heart, and all his soul, and all his mind, and all his strength. And this is the first of all the commandments. It is first in the very nature and existence of the first, and of every other intelligent creature.

But the second of these would have no place if there were but one intelligent creature in the universe: for then he would have no neighbor. When the second one was created, the first of all the commandments was first with him equally with the other one: and now the second great commandment exists in the very nature and existence of these two intelligent creatures, as certainly as the first great commandment exists in the nature and existence of the first one.

Each of the two owes to the Lord all that he is or has, and all that he could ever rightly have. Neither of them has anything that is self-derived. Each owes all to God. There is between them no ground of preference. And this because of the honor each owes to God: because to each, God is all in all. Therefore the second great commandment exists as certainly as the first; and it exists in the nature and circumstance of the very existence of intelligent creatures. Consequently, "There is none other commandment greater than these."

These two commandments then, exist in the nature of cherubim, seraphim, angels and men. As soon as the man was created, the first of all the commandments was there even though there, had been no other creature in the Universe. And as soon as the woman was created, these two great commandments were there. And there was none other commandment greater than these.

Now, if these two great commandments had been observed by man on the earth, that is, had man never sinned, there always would have been perfect and supreme religion: *and there never could have been a State*.

Therefore it is certain that the observance of these two first of all the commandments, means the absolute separation of religion and the State. And thus the principle of separation of religion and the State inheres in the very existence of intelligent creatures.

But man did sin. Mankind did not love God with all the heart nor their neighbors as themselves. Christianity was introduced to bring man back to the position, and the original relations, which he lost. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

It being then the one great purpose of Christianity to restore man to his original condition and relation to God, its purpose is to restore him to the condition in which he can love God with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the mind, and with all the strength, and can love his neighbor as himself. It is to restore him to obedience to these two first of all the commandments. It is to restore him to perfect and supreme religion.

We have seen that such a condition maintained from the beginning would have been the absolute separation of religion and State, because then, there never could have been any State. And now as the one great purpose of Christianity is to restore man completely to that condition, it follows with perfect conclusiveness that Christianity in its very essence, from the beginning to the end and everywhere, means the absolute separation of religion and the State.

"The Trouble and the Remedy" American Sentinel 12, 19, p. 292.

[292]

ATJ

THE Rev. Chas. L. Bovard, a Methodist minister of Albuquerque, New Mexico, in a contribution to the N. Y. *Christian Advocate*, of April 22, on the subject of "Some Alarming Tendencies," says:—

> "Ponder this. It is estimated that in the neighborhood of one hundred thousand people flocked to Denver and Albuquerque to see the pseudo Messiah—Schlatter! There is no need of comment upon the intellectual, social, and religious character of so credulous a populace. They are prepared for the wildest vagaries. Can it be that we are two centuries from Salem witchcraft? Nor was the Schlatter following chiefly confined to the ignorant Mexican population, but the cultured yet godless leaders of society were his stoutest defenders. It sometimes seems as though a 'perverse spirit' had been poured out upon the people of this nation, furiously driving them to cut loose from their every conservative mooring."

What is the trouble? We are living in "the blazing light of the nineteenth century"; yet it may be doubted whether credulity and superstition were ever more prevalent than they are to-day. And not the ignorant alone, but "the cultured yet godless leaders of society," constitute the ready victims of their power.

What is the trouble? Do we want more science, more public schools and colleges, more newspapers, more civilization? There was never so much of all this as there is at present. Yet it is nothing short of the truth that "it sometimes seems as though a 'perverse spirit' had been poured out upon the people of this nation, furiously driving them to cut loose from their every conservative mooring."

Ah, there is a "perverse spirit" which works independently of all restraints of science and civilization, a spirit which runs riots in "the blazing light of the nineteenth century" as freely as it did in the ages before it. And that "perverse spirit" is the spirit of opposition to the gospel of Jesus Christ. It is the spirit of selfishness and of the prince of evil, which sets at nought [*sic*.] the counsel of the Most High. This is an age of Bibles, yet the Word of God is not in the hearts of the people. The power and wisdom of God find no place for operation in their lives.

There is but one antidote and preventive of this perverse spirit which drives the people to such displays of credulity and superstition; and that is, *truth;* and not "truth" merely, but "the truth as it [*sic*.] in Jesus." Ah, this is the education for the need of which the world is

dying,—the knowledge of "the truth as it is in Jesus." There can be no true education without the knowledge of Christ.

When the people know the "power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," they will have no desire to follow after other manifestations of power claiming to be divine. When they know the voice of the "Good Shepherd," they will not be ready to heed the voice of a stranger.

No one, however capable or qualified by nature and education, need expect to escape the "perverse spirit" of this age and the delusions to which it leads, unless his education shall include an acquaintance with Him who is the Author and embodiment of truth. And that acquaintance can be secured by any and every person by receiving His word into the heart by faith.

May 20, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 20, pp. 305, 306.

[305]

ATJ

“THE First of all the commandments is this: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.”

And the Second is like, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.”

“There is none other commandment great than these.”

“On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.”

It is certain that if these two commandments had been always observed by all men, there never could have been a State on the earth.

There would have been government, but no State. The government would have been altogether the government of God; He, the only King, the only Governor, on earth even as in heaven.

There would have been society, but no State. Because, men loving God with all the heart, and all the soul and all the mind, and all the strength; and their neighbors as themselves; the will of God would have been done on earth even as in heaven. All would have been one united, harmonious, happy, holy, family.

There is an essential distinction between society and the State.

SOCIETY is the union which exists between men, without distinction of frontiers—without exterior restraint—and for the sole reason that they are men.

The *civil* society of STATE is an assemblage of men subject to a common *authority*, to common *laws*,—that is to say, a society whose members may be constrained by public force to respect their reciprocal rights. Two necessary elements enter into the idea of the State: *laws* and *force*.—*Janet: "Elements of Morals*," *p. 143*.

This distinction, however, though clear and easily evident, is seldom recognized. Indeed, it is not recognized at all by those who are anxious to secure the union of religion and the State in the United States.

But men did not observe these two "first of all the commandments." They would not love God with all their heart: They would not love their neighbors as themselves. They rejected God as their only Ruler, their only Sovereign, and became ambitious to rule over one another. And thus originated politics and the State.

The Scripture outlines the story of this: "When they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things." "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind."

Note, that at the first, men *did know God*. But they chose not to glorify Him, not to honor Him, not to give Him the first place in all their thoughts and actions. Knowing God, they did not like to retain Him in their knowledge.

The next step was that they became vain in their own imaginations. They professed themselves to be wise, or themselves. The consequence was that they became fools; and their foolish heart was darkened.

In their vain imaginations they made gods of their own. And then to assist them in their worship, they made images of the gods which they had imagined.

The image was always the outward, tangible form of the god which they had already conceived in the imagination. Imagining is simply mental *image-ing*. The outward form of the god, whether it be the shining sun in the heavens or a hideously shaped block of

wood or stone, is only the outward form of the *image-ing* that has already been performed in the imagination.

Thus, from the knowledge of the true God, they went to the [306] worship of false gods. From the light, they went into darkness. From righteousness they went to wickedness.

This is the truth. And the records of the earliest nations witness to it. The earliest records—those of the plain of Shinar—witness that the people at first had a knowledge of the true God. The records of the next two of the earliest nations, Egypt and Assyria, bear witness to this same thing.

In all these places the earliest records testify that the gods were their first rulers and the real kings; while men, in the places of authority, were but the servants, the viceroys of the god who was held to be the real king.

For instance, one of the earliest records from Shinar runs thus: "To [the god] Ninridu, his King, for the preservation of Idadu, viceroy of Ridu, the servant, the delight of Ninridu." Another: "To [the god] Ninip the King, his King, Gudea, viceroy of [the god] Zirgulla, his house built." Another: "To Nana the lady, lady splendid, his lady, Dudea, viceroy of Zirgulla ... raised."

These are not only the earliest of the records that *have been found* in that land, but they themselves show that they are of the earliest records that *were made* in that land. And they clearly testify of the time when as yet, there were no kings amongst men. The gods were the kings; and the men in authority claimed only to be the viceroys of the gods who were held to be the real kings.

And all this testifies of a time further back, when the people knew and recognized God as the only King and rightful Ruler of men. They show also that this knowledge of God was so recent, and still so strong upon the minds of the people, that men who stood in places of authority had not the boldness to assume the title of king, even though they held the power.

The records of Egypt and Assyria testify precisely to the same things. And so far there was as yet no State. There was society.

There came a time, however, when even this lingering knowledge of God as King and only rightful Ruler, was cast off; and the man assumed the full title and prerogatives of king, himself.

The first man to do this was Nimrod. Nimrod was the first man in the world who had the boldness to take to himself the title and prerogative of king, in the face of the yet lingering idea of God as king. And the name which he bears, itself testifies to the fact that his action in this was considered by men and also by the Lord, as precisely the bold thing which is here indicated. The name Nimrod "signifies rebellion, supercilious contempt, and is equivalent to 'the extremely impious rebel.'"

The Bible record of Nimrod is that "he began to be a mighty one in the earth;" or, as another translation gives it, "He was the first mighty one in the earth."

That is, Nimrod was the first one to establish the might, the power, the authority, of human government, in the form of an organized State. He was the first man to assert the power and prerogatives, and assume the title, of king over men. "And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar."

Consequently, "With the setting up of Nimrod's kingdom, the entire ancient world entered a new historical phase. The oriental tradition which makes that warrior the first man who wore a kingly crown, points to a fact more significant than the assumption of a new ornament of dress, or even the conquest of a province. His reign introduced to the world a new system of relations between the governor and the governed. The authority of former rulers rested upon the feeling of kindred; and the ascendancy of the chief was an image of parental control. Nimrod, on the contrary, was *a sovereign of territory*, and of men just so far as they were its inhabitants, and irrespective of personal ties. Hitherto there had been tribes—enlarged families—Society: now there was a nation, a political community—the State. The political and social history of the world henceforth are distinct, if not divergent."

Such was the true origin of the State. It was the result of the apostasy of men from God. Such only could possibly be its origin; for if all men had always observed the two "first of all the commandments," it would have been impossible for there ever to have been any State. There could have been no human authority exercised. All would have been equally subject to God; He would have been the only Sovereign.

Before Nimrod there was society. Respect of the rights of persons and of their property was maintained. It was only when the apostasy grew, and men got farther and farther from God, that the monarchical idea was established and personified in Nimrod.

Let us not now be misunderstand. We do not say, nor do we intend to imply, that there should now be no human government, that there should be no State, nor even that there should be no monarchy. We simply say that which is the truth, that if there never had been any apostasy from God, there never could have been on earth any of these.

It is true that these things are the consequences of the apostasy from God. But *men having apostatized* from God, these things all, even to such Monarchy as that of Nimrod or of Nero, became necessary, just in proportion to the degree of apostasy.

It is better that there should be a government, bad as it may be, than that there should be no government at all. Even such a government as Nimrod's or Nero's is better than none at all. But without apostasy having gone to a fearful length, there never could have been any such government as Nimrod's or Nero's.

Nimrod's example was eagerly followed by all the tribes around, until they were all absorbed in it. Society had passed away, and only States remained: and these universally idolatrous. In all that region, only Abraham believed God, even his own parents being idolaters. "They served other gods."

God chose Abraham then to be the father of all them that believed [307] God; the father of all who will have God alone to be their God. Abraham represented then, the religion of God, the beginning of the Church of God.

And *from that State*, God *separated Abraham*. He said to Abraham, "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, into a land that I will show thee."

And in thus separating Abraham from that State, from his country, God taught the people then, and through all time, the separation of religion and the State, the separation of Church and State.

THE faith of Christ was not made to be guarded by the power of man, but to guard by its power the man to whom it is given.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 20, p. 307.

[307]

ATJ

THE faith of Christ was not made to be guarded by the power of man, but to guard by its power the man to whom it is given.

"'Christian Citizenship' Defined" American Sentinel 12, 20, p. 307.

[307]

ATJ

IN answer to the question "What is Christian Citizenship," the May *Christian Endeavorer* says that,—

> "We must not confuse the 'Christian citizen' with the idea of the Christian business man, Christian mechanic, Christian father, Christian soldier, or Christian church member; but the 'Christian citizen' is one who brings Christian principles to bear upon his political life."

In regard to which it may be said that the Christian, merely as such, is a Christian business man, Christian mechanic, Christian father, and Christian in every other relation of his life; for Christianity covers the entire range of life's activities. And as the "Christian citizen" is "not to be confused" with this, it plainly follows that something different from this Christianity regulates his conduct as a "Christian citizen."

And such, indeed, is the case; for in politics the aim is to compel men to a certain course of conduct; while Christianity knows no compulsion, but simply says, "Whosoever will, let him come."

"A Government of God on Earth" American Sentinel 12, 20, pp. 307, 308.

[307]

ATJ

IN a Christian government God is King, Judge, and Lawgiver, and the individual man or woman is the subject who is governed. There is a government of God on earth wherever there is an individual who has entered into governmental relations with God. This can

be done only by faith, for "the carnal mind is enmity against God," and only faith in God can eliminate the carnal or natural propensities from the soul.

It is in accordance with God's plan of redemption that the government of God should exist in this form among men. It is the only possible form in which it can exist under the conditions which have ensued since the fall. Every other "government of God," therefore, is not in the purpose of God, and is not God's government. It is as useless for men to try to set up a government of God on the earth as it would be for them to undertake any other form of opposition to God. The plan of redemption can be carried out only as it is now being carried out through the operation of God's grace upon the individual heart, bringing it into subjection to the will of God. And the grace of God must operate through faith.

In the government of God, God's law is the rule of conduct. This is a perfect rule—the only one in existence—being dictated by Omniscience. It would seem that all people who have the Bible should be aware of this; yet almost the first step that is taken by [308] certain professors of Christianity in their repeated attempts to set up God's government here, is to enact laws. There is no room for legislation in the matter. God's own law covers every possible phase of activity under His government.

What all men ought to do, and the only thing that any man or class of men properly can do, is to fall in with the plan and providence of God, which is working to gather out of all nations and peoples of earth subjects for the kingdom of God, by establishing a government of God in each heat that will yield to the gospel invitation.

When this work shall be finished, as ere long it will, the government of God will be set up on the "new earth," in visible glory.

TRUE reform effort aims to change the man himself, and not merely his circumstances; and this is why human laws possess no reforming power.

"Lawless Lawmakers" American Sentinel 12, 20, pp. 308, 309.

[308]

ATJ

THE chief law-making body of the country is involved in a scandal. The fact has come to light that several United States senators

have made use of their official positions for purposes of personal gain. By speculating in shares of sugar stock at a time when the price of sugar was dependent upon their own action, knowing that the price of sugar stock would be advanced as soon as certain Senate proceedings became known to the public, they were able to add thousands of dollars to their private wealth. There was no risk involved in the transaction. It was simply a matter of using the knowledge and power which were theirs by virtue of their official positions.

Such a proceeding is plainly dishonest, and therefore in violation of a principle which every law-making body is bound to uphold. More than this: it is a betrayal of a high public trust, and therefore indicative of a thoroughly selfish—or lawless—disposition.

Law-making cannot be safely entrusted to lawless men. And when men in the highest law-making assembly in the land themselves disregard the law, the spectacle affords the strongest illustration of the inability of law in itself to produce good government.

[309] The first need of all men—in positions of public trust or out of them—is an unselfish character. Such a character makes men good as neighbors and good as legislators. But law is powerless to produce this character. Self can be overcome and driven out of the heart only by the grace of God.

When the grace of God shall no longer work upon men's hearts—when by continued rejection the Spirit of God shall have been driven away from them—the Government is doomed. Its Constitution will not save it. No principles of right and justice which have been established in a government by its founders, however noble and great, can avail aught when that government is administered by selfish, unscrupulous men.

True, it is proposed to remedy the situation by removing all such men from office, and putting good men in their places. But of this it need only be said that it cannot be done. The cry, "Turn the rascals out," has long been the campaign motto of the "reform" forces, but the "rascals" are in office still. There is nothing in politics which has a tendency to evolve good men. And as long as men retain natures susceptible to corrupting influences, as long as the masses of mankind remain followers instead of leaders, so long will politics continue to be ruled by the "boss" and the "machine."

The influence of evil is spreading, its power is augmenting; and it cannot be overcome by law. Law will not administer itself. He who makes and administers the law much have his own heart safeguarded from the prevailing selfishness, or the law will not be made the instrument of justice.

Not law, but the grace of God, is first in the maintenance of peace and justice in the earth. Without the power of the Spirit, no reform from evil is possible.

"Longitude vs. the Week" American Sentinel 12, 20, p. 311.

[311]

ATJ

A CORRESPONDENT living in Brooklyn inquires of the SENTINEL how people living in "Fiji, Tonga Isles, and the extreme east of Siberia," can know which day is the Sabbath, "or in fact any other day of the week."

We know of no reason why people living in the regions designated should be obliged to determine the days of the week in any different way from those living in New York City or London or Pekin. And as a matter of fact the inhabitants of those regions have the week and mark the days of the week the same as is done elsewhere, and we have never heard that they experienced any difficulty or were involved in any uncertainty in the matter. Doubtless they would be much surprised to meet with anyone who would express a doubt upon this point.

Adventurous travelers have explored nearly every square mile of the earth's surface, but none of them have had any difficulty, even in the Artic realms where there is a "day" of six months' length, in keeping track of the days of the week or in knowing the beginning and end of each day.

God made the week and gave it to Adam and his posterity; and this primordial division of time has been maintained uninterruptedly from Adam's day to the present, being marked at its close by the Sabbath, which has always had some observers in every age of the world. The nation of the Jews has observed the Sabbath from the time of the falling of the manna, shortly after their exodus from Egypt, to the present time; and neither Jews, Christian Sabbath-keepers, Roman Catholics, Protestants or heathen, were ever in any

disagreement concerning the identity of the days of the week. So all anybody has to do who wants to keep the Sabbath is to take the week as he finds it in the community in which he lives, and observe the Sabbath as commanded when it comes to him. The Creator knew all this when He made the Sabbath, and knew that in commanding its observance He would not be requiring anything difficult or unreasonable.

"Applied Christianity" American Sentinel 12, 20, p. 313.

[313]

ATJ

"APPLIED CHRISTIANITY" is a phrase that is made much use of just now in discussions relating to social and political themes. It is spoken of as if it were a sort of new science, that needed to be quite fully explained before ordinary people could be expected to grasp its meaning.

But the Bible constitutes a text-book on applied Christianity, and anyone who will read and believe what it says, will know exactly what applied Christianity is; and on the other hand, whoever will not
[314] seek to this source of knowledge on the subject, cannot know what it is, no matter how much he may be told of what somebody says it is.

The Bible teaches that Christianity is itself an applied thing,—that it is manifested in no other form. For according to the Word of God, Christianity is not a creed, or a round of forms and ceremonies, but a manifestation of the life of Christ. It is the application of the wisdom, the power, the righteousness of God Himself, to the individual, through faith in Christ. It is the application of Divinity to humanity. This will of course be seen and felt in the community which environs it.

This is "applied Christianity," by the agency of the Holy Spirit. It is impossible for man to apply Christianity to anything. Nor is any application of Christianity needed further than that which it is the office of the Spirit to make.

"Christian Principles and Politics" American Sentinel 12, 20, p. 317.

[317]

ATJ

HOW can Christian principles be brought to bear upon political life? The question is one that demands an answer, for we are being continually exhorted to attend to this as one of our Christian duties.

The principles of the Christian life are, Repentance and confession of sin, and faith in Jesus Christ. The power of God operating through faith, produces in the life of the believer the "fruits of the Spirit," which are, "Love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Galatians 5:22, 23. In the Christian life the ever present, overshadowing fact in each case is, "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Galatians 2:20); and Christ living in the believer conforms the life perectly [*sic*.] to God's standard of righteousness, the Ten Commandments.

This is Christianity; and we are told that this must be brought to bear upon politics. It is built entirely upon repentance, and faith in the Word of God. And we have never yet discovered any principle of politics which necessitate confession of sin, while it is certainly obvious that faith in Jesus Christ may be exercised by persons of any and all political parties, without affecting their political views in the least, save as it may lead them to give up politics altogether.

Every principle of Christianity grows out of faith in Christ as the Saviour of man from sin; every step in Christian life must be taken by faith in Christ. But of this faith politics knows nothing.

May 27, 1897

"Editorial" American Sentinel 12, 21, pp. 321, 322.

[321]

ATJ

WHEN God said to Abraham, "Get thee out of thy country, and form thy kindred, and from thy father's house, into a land which I will show thee," Abraham went out, not knowing whither he went."

God had not yet showed him the land or country into which he was to go, and which was to be his. So far, the Lord had only promised to show it to him.

There were three things, however, which Abraham must do before he could fairly expect God to show him the country which He had promised, and which was to be his.

First, he was to get out of his country; *secondly*, from his kindred; *thirdly*, from his father's house.

He left his country; but when he did so, his father and his kindred went with him to Haran, and dwelt there. There his father died; and now, separated from his father's house, he went on to the land of Canaan.

But there accompanied him yet one of his kindred—Lot, his brother's son. While Lot was with him, and he was thus not separated from his kindred, though separated from his country and his father's house, the time could come for God to show to him the land, nor the country which he would give him.

But there came a day when Lot should be separated from him. Lot chose all the plain of the Jordan, and journeyed east, and "They separated thus, one from the other."

And just then it was that God showed to Abraham the land which He had promised to show him, the country which should be his.

"And the Lord said unto Abraham, *after that Lot was separated from him*, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever."

And the country which the Lord then showed to Abraham, and which He there promised him should be his for an everlasting possession—that country embraced the world—for "The promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith."

Therefore, when at the word of the Lord Abraham lifted up his eyes to see what the Lord would show him, he saw "the world to come," which is to be the everlasting possession of all them which be of faith. "For if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

And from that day forward Abraham "sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country;" looking for "a better country, that is, an heavenly;" and looking "for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." For, though God promised that He would give to Abraham that land, and to his seed after him, yet *as long as he was in this world* God really "gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on."

Now note: God had called Abraham out of his original country, and thus had separated him from that. Then He gave him not even so much as to set his foot on in any other country in this world.

Abraham at that time represented the religion of God. The Lord in His dealing thus with Abraham and in recording it, has shown for all time and to all people that it is his will that there should be an absolute separation of his religion from any State.

Abraham, representing at that time the Church of Christ, being thus totally separated by the Lord from every State and country on the earth, there is thus shown to all people, *as an original truth of the gospel of Christ*, that there should be total separation of Church and State, and that the church of Christ can never have any country
[322] in the world.

So also dwelt Isaac and Jacob, heirs with Abraham of the same promise, accepting with Abraham separation from every earthly State and country, confessing that they were strangers and pilgrims

on the earth, looking for the country which God had prepared for them, and the city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

And that they accepted this freely of their own choice, by faith in God, is shown by the fact, as recorded, that, "Truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly, wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for He hath prepared for them a city."

This dealing of God with Abraham, and the record of it, were for the instruction of all the people who would believe God, from that time to the world's end. For Abraham was the called, the chosen, the *friend* of God; the father of all them that believe. And all they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. And not the least element of instruction in this account of God's dealings with Abraham, is the great lesson it teaches that the religion of God means separation of religion and the State.

Further, "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not unto *seeds*, as of many, but as of one, and to thy *seed*, which is Christ." Therefore the promises recorded and referred to in the scripture, "To Abraham and his seed," are always to Abraham and Christ, and to Abraham in Christ. And therefore, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

And when Christ, that promised seed, came into the world a man amongst men, then in Him, as formerly in Abraham, there was represented the religion of God and the church of Christ. And as such he ever maintained the same principle of separation of religion and the State which he himself had set before the world in the life and record of Abraham.

He refused to recognize, even by a sign, the wish of the people to make Him king. He refused, when requested, to act the part of a judge or a divider over men as to the rights of property. He refused to recognize the national lines of distinction, the wall of partition, which Israel in their exclusiveness had built up between themselves and other nations. He refused to judge, or to allow any others to judge, any one for not believing on Him. He distinctly declared that, though he is a king, yet his kingdom is not of this world, and that it

is not in any way connected with this world. He distinctly declared the separation of His religion from the State: "Render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's." And when he sent forth his disciples with his heavenly commission to preach the gospel of his kingdom, he sent them *not to one particular nation*, but to "Teach *all nations*, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost." He sent them to preach the gospel; not to one particular, favored, exclusive people, but "*to every creature*."

Thus it is seen again that in every phase of the fundamental principle of the religion of God and the church of Christ, from the beginning to the end of the world, there is required the absolute separation of religion and the State: the total disconnection of his church from every State and country in the world, and from the world itself.

"What We Need to Bring Prosperity" American Sentinel 12, 21, pp. 323, 324.

[323]

ATJ

THE United States Government began with the setting up of the principle that "all men are created equal." Its founders asserted to the world the doctrine that all are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to preserve these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just rights from the consent of the governed." Upon this doctrine they essayed to establish a government which should afford to all persons under it the perpetual blessings of civil and religious liberty.

It is perfectly evident to-day that this idea of our forefathers has not been realized. We do not have to search for this evidence; one cannot look in any direction without seeing it. Instead of the peaceful country filled with inhabitants in the undisturbed enjoyment of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" which loomed into the perspective of our forefathers, there is seen a nation whose people are arrayed against each other in a bitter struggle for the mastery. And to the vast majority of those engaged in this contest, the struggle is one for the realization of those very conditions of life and liberty

which are supposed to be guaranteed by the fundamental law of the land.

We see around us the Trust, and all the various combinations of capital and labor, operating against the enjoyment of individual freedom. We see the strike, with its attendant misery to the families of the poor, only greater than the perpetual misery from which they seek by that hard means to escape. We see the power of wealth to create unjust conditions for its own advantage in political and social life. And from the enslaved and dissatisfied masses we hear the mutterings of threatened revolution.

And if anything were lacking to show the insufficiency of a theory of government in itself to secure the blessings of good government to a people, it is supplied by the fact that both plutocrats and populists invoke the name of Liberty and appeal to the same principles of free government in support of their diametrically antagonistic positions.

"Liberty, equality and fraternity" are good words; but in the mouth of the plutocrat they do not mean what they do in the mouth of the socialist. Whose meaning of the words, whose theories for the realization of these blessings, are to prevail?

There are many explanations put forward defining and locating the trouble with the workings of our governmental system. One explanation asserts that the trouble is with the Constitution: that this was long ago outgrown, and has since been only an incumbrance to good government and a protection to rascality. Another says that wrong political principles have been put in force; another says that the Government ought to be religious instead of secular; another affirms that republican government is a failure, and that a return must be had to some form of monarchy. The tendency in the last-named direction is already very marked.

But the real trouble is not with the Constitution, or with republican principles of government. As Abraham Lincoln said, there are men who would overthrow the Constitution, and pervert right principles of government. A "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," depends upon the people, and not upon principles and constitutions. Right principles in the Constitution are indeed essential, but these count for little when there are wrong principles in the hearts of the people. When the commercial spirit has

cast out the spirit of independence, when the love of gain is greater than the love of liberty, the people will certainly lose their liberty, in spite of the best constitution and the soundest governmental theories.

In other words, when the people lose the ability to properly govern themselves individually, they can no longer hope successfully to govern themselves collectively. In such a case it will avail nothing to shift back and forth between two or more political theories.

WHAT SAITH THE SCRIPTURE?

The position of the Christian, and that of the SENTINEL, is that "liberty, equality, and fraternity" are qualities which have their origin in God, and have descended to man from him. Or rather, they are in the hearts of men in proportion as God is in their hearts, being
[324] inseparable from Him. And they can be properly understood and appreciated only in the light of the knowledge of God. Of what use is it to the country that men of all classes from plutocrats to populists prate and dispute about these things, without ever arriving at an agreement? Of what use is it that politicians declaim about the virtues of political theories and promise prosperity that does not come?

How long will it take to usher in prosperity upon the nation by way of money "trusts" and labor "trusts?" How long will prosperity be in emerging from the clash of contending "combines," all embodying the spirit of selfishness and hatred? A long time, we venture to say.

In the literature of Scripture, "liberty, equality and fraternity" mean something. They are there used in no selfish sense. To his followers Jesus said, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." It is the theory of government in the United States that those in the chief positions are the servants of the people; but their practical attitude as well as the attitude of the people toward them, is more suggestive of the position of "honored ruler" than of that of servant. The actual exemplification of the theory is not found in any department of the Government. It never

was seen in the Government. It never existed anywhere outside of the Christian church.

Again, Jesus said: "Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." And to the same end the Apostle Paul wrote to the church at Corinth: "For who maketh thee to differ from another? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it?" Here is the doctrine of the equality of all men; and when this doctrine was enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the national Constitution, it was not a product of the human intellect, but a principle of divine government, as old as Christianity itself.

This divine principle of government cannot be worked out on a selfish basis, but only on the basis of Christianity. This is the trouble with its application to human governments. Men are willing enough to adopt the theory that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights; but for the most part they do this from a selfish motive. When this principle was appealed to and adopted by the people of this nation, they were seeking to defend themselves from the tyranny of an English king. They sought liberty, not for an oppressed people in Europe or Asia, but for themselves, and in proportion as the nation grew strong and ceased to feel the need of defense against an opposing power, the people relaxed their hold upon their liberties, and the change which Thomas Jefferson foresaw became a reality. Having liberty for themselves, securely, as they supposed, the people became absorbed in the occupations of gain, and their guardianship of liberty was relaxed. They held the precious boon in selfishness, and by selfishness they have well-night lost it. But how can it be held in any other way? The question can be answered only by the gospel of God.

"What things soever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, ... made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." Philippians 2:4-7. "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth." 1 Corinthians 10:24. This is God's method, and this is the example set by Him

who was equal with God. And in proportion as God is in men, they will adhere to this rule; they will hold the principle that all men are created equal and are endowed with equal rights,—not for their own benefit, but for the benefit of their fellows.

The trouble is that God is not to any great extent in the hearts of men to-day. They will not let Him into their hearts; they have driven Him almost out of their hearts. And when He is out there is only selfishness left, and selfishness means bad men, and bad men means bad government. A government cannot long rise above the level of the people by whom it is administered.

If there is to be a better government in the United States,—if we are to have prosperity in place of the hard times,—there must be an improvement in the people themselves. The Government cannot improve itself; the Government cannot improve the people. But the people can improve themselves by allowing the divine principle of unselfishness to come into their hearts and rule their lives. The great question is, Will they do it? And this means, for each individually, Will *I* do it?

"Who Should Run the Government" American Sentinel 12, 21, pp. 325, 326.

[325]

ATJ

THE country ought to be governed by the best men in it, and the best men are to be found in the Christian Church. Therefore, for the good of the Government and the people under it, the civil offices should be filled by Christians. So reason our friends, the Christian Endeavorers, and they have undertaken, no doubt in all honesty and sincerity, to put the theory into practice.

Or, what is a slightly different theory, but amounts to the same thing in the end, they believe that they themselves are best fitted to run the Government, by controlling the elections to public office, because they are Christians.

This reasoning is fallacious. The best men in the country are certainly Christians, but Christianity does not claim to qualify any person for public office. Christianity is designed to save people from their sins; and because a man is very pious and very good, it does not

follow at all that he is better fitted than other people to hold office or to nominate men for office.

Christianity acquaints men with the governments of God; but the government of God and all human governments are totally dissimilar. The one is a government of love; the others are governments of force. The one brings to view the power of God unto salvation from sin; the others bring to view the power of man for the regulation of outward acts. The one is based upon a spiritual, divine law; the others upon the laws of man. The purpose of one is to maintain a perfect individual character; that of the others is to establish a prosperous State.

The very fact that a person is led to espouse the principles of the government of God, must have a tendency to unfit him for service in a government of a totally different character. The governments of earth know nothing of love; the theory is that the offender, if caught, must be punished. If he escapes it is not from any governmental recognition of the principle of pardon upon confession and repentance. No earthly government can recognize such a principle. It could not proceed a day if it should do so.

That country will be most prosperous in which there is the least need of government; and there will be the least need of government where the people are best fitted to govern themselves, as individuals, in harmony with the principle of respect for the rights of their neighbors. Christianity enables a person to do this; and the more real Christians there are in a community, the less need will there be there for the services of the sheriff, the fewer jails and poor houses will be needed, the less taxation will be required, and the less occasion will there be for enacting laws for their benefit. In this way, *and this only*, is Christianity a help to good government.

The qualifications for being a Christian are totally different from those required for statesmanship. Any person can be a Christian, because every person has the power and wisdom of God pledged to make him one, through faith in Christ. But not every person can be a statesman. Not every person can successfully fill a public office. Nor has God pledged his power or wisdom to qualify any person in this respect. The qualifications for eminence in public life are in the individual at his natural birth. The "new birth" has nothing to do with them.

And when a *religious* organization, such as that of the Christian Endeavorers, sets out to control the Government for any other purpose, it is inevitable that their views will have a religious coloring, and their actions be influenced by a religious bias. Their very nature being religious, and the object of their existence being the furtherance of religion, it can but follow that their exercise of civil power in their organized capacity will be guided by religious reasons. Their endeavors will be as distinctively "Christian" in the matter of running the Government, as in anything else.

As we have often said, the principle of the total separation of religion and the State is a Christian principle; but the endeavor to keep religion and the State separate is not Christian endeavor in the view of the Endeavorers. Their aim is in quite another direction.

The result will be that when the control of elections falls into their hands, men will be nominated and chosen to office on account of their religion, and religion will be connected with their administration of office. Thus religion will work its way into the Government, and *with it will go the church;* for where religion is there is also some church or church combination. Thus religion in the Government means the Church in the Government, which means a union of Church and State, which means an image of the papacy.

The religious people of this day who want to control the Government need not fancy that they alone of all religious people who in
[326] former times have grasped the civil power, are upright and honest. The plan has always brought evil upon mankind in the past, this must be admitted. But we must give the religious people of past times credit for being honest, the same as we do those of to-day. They meant well, just as the Christian Endeavorers means well to-day. But the history of the papacy in Europe, and of the Puritans in America, testifies of the harm that resulted. It was so because it could not be otherwise. Christianity will not coalesce with a government of force; and it matters not how good and honest are the people who attempt to unite them, or how innocent and plausible is the appearance of things at the start. The only result that can possibly follow is that which has followed in the past—the establishment of a religious despotism.

As before stated, Christianity does not qualify any person for the administration of civil office. On the contrary, it separates a

person from the world, and from that which is of the world. It gives him citizenship in a different country. It enrolls him under another government, while it teaches him to live peaceably with all men here, and to be in subjection to the powers that be. The governments of the earth are not the product of the wisdom and power of God, but of man; and God rules in them by overruling. The fit symbols of the divine government are the dove and the lamb; of human governments, the eagle and the lion. In the screaming and tearing of the eagle, and the roaring and rending of the lion, God has not called His people to participate.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 21, p. 331.

[331]

ATJ

IN a Sunday-school quarterly of recent date Dr. Earl Barnes strikes at a popular religious fallacy by mentioning that "many children have formed their ideas of Satan from the picture on the cans of deviled ham." This is unfortunate enough, certainly; but it might have been still worse if their conceptions on this point had been derived from some pictorial representations of an approved orthodox type. The only authority on the subject is Scripture, and that speaks of Satan as appearing in the form of "an angel of light." 2 Corinthians 11:14. The people generally have been so fooled by what theology and tradition have taught them on this point that they have been prepared to see the devil only in that which to most minds is shocking and repulsive, and not in that also which is beautiful, "respectable," and even "pious;" and as a consequence they have been easily duped by the arch-deceiver. The devil knows enough not to appear with cloven hoofs, horns and tail when he wants to catch people whom anything outwardly repulsive would repel.

June 3, 1897

"Separation of Church and State" American Sentinel 12, 22, p. 338.

[338]

ATJ

IN the beginnings of Egypt the same course was followed as in the beginnings of Babylon and Assyria.

At first they knew the one true God; and he was their only King, their only Ruler.

But they did not like to retain God in their knowledge; and therefore they went into idolatry, and from idolatry into monarchy.

The Egyptian records state that the first rulers of Egypt were the gods; after them the demigods; and after these the kings.

In Egypt, however, the king was not content, as in Assyria, to call himself the viceroy of his god; he claimed to be the very embodiment of the god itself—the god was personated in the king; from him, it was declared, the people "received the breath of their nostrils;" he was "the giver of life."

And thus, though Nimrod was the first man to establish monarchical authority and assume the kingly title and crown, yet in Egypt his example was followed to the greatest lengths, as Egypt was undoubtedly the most idolatrous nation that ever was on the earth. There apostasy of every kind culminated: so that throughout the Bible the one word "Egypt" symbolizes everything that is contrary to God.

When the power of monarchy had filled the Mesopotamian plain, God called Abraham out of that country into the land of Canaan, where he could be free, and thus made a separation of Church and State, and preached the same to all people.

But in process of time, and by Egypt, the power of monarchy was spread over all countries, from Ethiopia to Ararat and central Asia. Then, as his people were obliged to live under the power of monarchy anyhow, the Lord put them where they could do the most possible good—he placed them at the very seat of the world's empire, in Egypt itself.

And there, through all the time of the supremacy of the Egyptian Empire, with Joseph and Moses beside the throne, and Israel amongst the people, of Egypt, God held before all nations the knowledge of Himself. And as soon as the time came when the Egyptian empire must fall, God would place his people once more in Canaan, the pivot of the highways of the nations.

To this end there must be again taught to the world the separation of religion and the State, the separation of Church and State. God's people must be called out of Egypt, in order that they and all the nations might be instructed in the great principles of the gospel, of supreme allegiance to God, of the separation of religion and the State, of church and country.

Moses understood this, and therefore he "refused to be called the son of Pharoah's daughter." Moses was the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter. Pharaoh's daughter was Pharaoh's chief wife, and queen. Moses, therefore, by the most complete claim, was heir apparent to the throne of Egypt. And as the king was then more than eighty years old, it could be but a little while till Moses would possess and throne of Egypt. The throne of Egypt was at that time the throne of the world; for the power of Egypt then ruled the world. It was the supreme State, the governing empire over all.

For Moses to refuse to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter was therefore to renounce the throne of Egypt. To renounce the throne of Egypt was to renounce the power of empire. It was definitely to disconnect from the State.

At that time Moses was called to have charge over "the house of God, which is the church of the living God." It was in obedience to this call that he renounced the throne of Egypt and the power of empire. It was because of this that he definitely disconnected himself from the State. And in recording it, God designed to teach all people that conformity to his will means the separation of Church

and State; that it means the renunciation of the throne and the power of earthly empire—the total separation of religion and the State.

And it was through the faith of Christ that Moses did all this. It was "through faith" that "Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt."

Therefore, from that day to this, it has been made plain to all people that faith in God, the faith of Jesus Christ, the original principle of the gospel and of the church, means the absolute separation of Church and State; the renunciation of the throne and power of earthly dominion; the total separation of religion and the State.

And this is what faith in God, the faith of Jesus Christ, the fundamental principle of the gospel and of the church, means to all people in the world to-day.

"Religion and Democracy" American Sentinel 12, 22, pp. 338, 339.

ATJ

AT a banquet of the Chamber of Commerce, of Cleveland, Ohio, given May 13, the chief oratorical feature was a speech by Archbishop Ireland, on the subject of "The Sure Foundation of a True Citizenship." Among his utterances on this occasion worthy of note [339] as showing the drift of papal teaching upon this important topic, are the following: "Patriotism is never so potent as when it is identified with religion." "The crisis for democracy will come when comes the crisis for religion." "The enemies of religion are the enemies of country and democracy."

What religion? it might be well to query in reply. "There be lords many and gods many," and there are religions many, and the archbishop's religion is one of them. But there is only one gospel—one revelation of God to mankind through Jesus Christ. And this cannot be identified with "patriotism;" and mere religion can be so identified, and we may not uncharitably infer that Archbishop Ireland hopes to see his own religion so identified. But what a state of things will exist in this erstwhile "land of the free," when to be

irreligious, or to fail to conform to the prevailing religion, will be counted unpatriotic, and subject the nonconformist to the charge of being an enemy "of country and of democracy"!

"The 'Trust' Evil Illustrated" American Sentinel 12, 22, p. 339.

[339]

ATJ

THE spectacle of the thousands of employés of garment manufacturers on strike in New York City, while their wives and children starve in their cheerless homes, affords, among other things, an illustration of the workings of the "labor trust." There is truth in the remark made by ex-Senator Edmunds: "They may talk about our honest men with wives and families to support who are willing to work for one and two dollars a day, but they can't get it,—why? Because their union, or their trust, won't allow them. The standard is set for them, and if they don't wait and starve their families until they reach that standard they can't get work anywhere."

Sad, indeed, is the condition to which industry has been reduced by the selfishness of man toward his fellows. The "labor trust" represents a desperate effort by the workingmen to interpose an effectual resistance to the relentless power which from some higher stratum of society is steadily forcing them and those dependent on their earnings, beneath the surface of a respectable existence. In reply to ex-Senator Edmunds a New York journal says:—

> "If he will go over to the East Side of New York, look into Walhalla Hall, or make a trip through the teeming tenements, he will gain some idea of a standard of wages and the standard of living which has resulted from free competition in labor. He will find tailors, to the number of tens of thousands, reinforcing their labor unions and saying to each other. 'We will starve if need be, we and our wives and our babies, but we will not return again to the practice of bidding against each other for work at starvation wages.' If he will look into the conditions which have caused the tailors' strike, he will find them bred of exactly the procedure which he would substitute for that of organized labor. One family,

> either out of the union or indifferent to its rules, agrees to work for a certain contractor for less than the union rates. Presently that contractor underbids his fellows. They investigate, discover the cause, and meet the unfair competition by cutting down the pay of their workers. The process is repeated until the wages become barely sufficient to support the workers, nor does it always stop there, for there are not infrequently some who will work for less than a living wage, supplementing it by vicious or dishonest practices. In every badly organized trade this process goes on."

Nevertheless the "labor trust," at its best, is an evil, however necessary it may seem to be. Man was not designed by his Creator to maintain his existence by means of the trust. To do this is to destroy his own individuality. God would have men learn the great truth that "man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." He would have men learn to put their dependence upon Him as the author and preserver of life, rather than upon a human organization.

Many remedies are proposed for this deplorable condition of affairs, but the Christian student knows that the only effective remedy is righteousness. And therefore the counsel of God's word to those who experience the evils of this situation is, "Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord." See James 5:1-7. Christ is coming the second time, in "power and great glory," to set up righteousness in the earth, by destroying sin and sinners out of it. This is the true hope for the toiling, groaning myriads of old earth to-day.

"'Not by Might Nor by Power'" American Sentinel 12, 22, pp. 339, 340.

[339]

ATJ

THE Lord does not carry on his work in the earth by might or by power. That is, he does not work by those agencies which appear most mighty and powerful in the eyes of man. "Not by might nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts." Zechariah 4:6.

In this day we see religious organizations grasping for power. We see the church associations—the Society of Christian Endeavor, the Epworth League, etc., holding conventions and discussing, among other things, what they can do to control elections and put good men into public office. Their hopes in this regard are based upon the millions enrolled in their membership. But what will all this might and power avail in the work of the Lord? Suppose they should get complete control of the Government—what good would it do them or the cause which they profess to represent? What is the use of might and power when the Lord does not work by that means?

Have they forgotten the record of the experience of the prophet Elijah at Mount Horeb? 1 Kings 19:9-13. The prophet was told to "Go forth, and stand upon the mount before the Lord. And behold, the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains and brake in pieces the rocks before the Lord; but the Lord was not in the wind. And after the wind was an earthquake; but the Lord
[340] was not in the earthquake. And after the earthquake a fire; but the Lord was not in the fire. And after the fire a still small voice." And the Lord was in that voice, and that voice set in motion again the work of the Lord which had been suspended by the prophet's flight from Jezreel. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

Do these religious organizations aim to produce a cyclone or an earthquake in the Government? Evidently, they hope to do something of the sort. But what good would it accomplish if they should? The Lord would not be in it. He would not be in it even were they able to duplicate all the awesome exhibitions of might and power displayed at Horeb before Elijah. The Lord is yet in the "still small voice," which is the voice of His Spirit.

"O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end! How should one chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight!" "By faith the walls of Jericho fell down," not by the assault of battering rams and the arms of the encompassing host. By faith the servants of God in old time "turned to flight the armies of the aliens." Hebrews 11:30-34. By faith the work of God moves forward in the earth to-day. The world will be deceived by exhibitions of might and power; but by the Word of the

Lord his people know that his work is not by might nor by power, but by the "still small voice" of his Spirit.

"The Lord's Day and Liberty" American Sentinel 12, 22, p. 340.

[340]

ATJ

A COMMON view of the question of securing Sabbath observance is expressed in the following from the *Outlook* of April 24:—

> "The question of Sunday observance is by no means a simple one. There are elements in the problem which make it difficult of solution. It is, perhaps, more difficult in this country than in any other because the population is so heterogeneous. In the old New England days Puritan ideals could be realized because the people were all of one class. The same may be said of Scotland. But our population is composed of representatives of many nationalities and of various phases of faith. Simple justice seems to make it imperative that the preferences of differing people should be recognized. How liberty may be granted and yet the Lord's Day preserved is a question not easy to answer."

All this applies to *Sunday* observance; but none of the facts set forth in this quotation interfere with the securing of Sabbath observance, for the simple reason that Sabbath observance is a part of the Christian life, which is secured through faith in Christ; and it makes no difference how heterogenous the population is, they are all alike susceptible to the grace of God. Nor do the "preferences" of the people affect the question; for when a person is a Christian, he will prefer to keep the Sabbath in just the way that God has commanded.

From the gospel standpoint, there can be no possible antagonism between liberty and the keeping of the Sabbath; for the Sabbath commandment is a part of the "perfect law of liberty" itself. See James 2:11, 12. "How liberty may be granted and the Lord's day preserved" is therefore a question which can never arise under the provisions of the gospel. God is the author of both liberty and the

Lord's day, and he has fixed their relation to each other; and the only thing that his creatures here need to do is to leave the matter just as he has arranged it.

If men would only do this, it would save them a world of trouble.

June 10, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 23, pp. 353, 354.

[353]

ATJ

FORTY years the Lord led and fed his people in the wilderness.

All this time he was teaching them the way of allegiance to himself—the way of faith.

This he did in order that his purpose might be fulfilled through them in the land whither they were going to possess it.

At the end of the forty years they were encamped in the plain of Moab, opposite Jericho, preparatory to entering the land of their possession.

While there encamped, the will of God concerning them was declared by an irresistible inspiration upon the prophet Balaam, and in words of instruction to his people for all time.

And the words are these: “LO, THE PEOPLE SHALL DWELL ALONE, AND SHALL NOT BE RECKONED AMONG THE NATIONS.”

At that time the Lord’s people composed “the church in the wilderness” (Acts 7:38); and in thus declaring that they should dwell alone and not be reckoned among the nations, he plainly declared his will that his church should be forever separated from every State and nation on the earth.

God never intended that his people should be formed into a kingdom, or State, or government, like the people of this world; nor that they should in any way be connected with any kingdom, or State, or government, of this world.

They were not to be like the nations or the people around them. They were to be separated unto God “from all the people that are

upon the face of the earth." The people were to dwell alone, and were not to be reckoned among the nations.

Their government was to be a Theocracy pure and simple—God their only king, their only Ruler, their only Lawgiver. It was indeed to be a church organization, beginning with the organization of the church in the wilderness; and was to be separated from every idea of a State. The system formed in the wilderness through Moses, was to continue in Canaan; and was intended to be perpetual.

"The government of Israel was administered in the name and by the authority of Jehovah. The work of Moses, of the seventy elders, of the rulers and judges, was simply to enforce the laws that God had given. They had no authority to legislate for the nation." For God had declared plainly: "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it."

Thus the principles of their government were solely those of a pure theocracy. And such "was and continued to be the condition of Israel's existence as a nation." In any government it is only loyalty to the principles of the government, on the part of its citizens, that can make it a success. Consequently, on the part of Israel, it was only loyalty to the principles of a pure Theocracy—God their only King, their only Ruler, their only Lawgiver—that could possibly make that government a success.

But loyalty to these principles demanded that each one of the people should constantly recognize, and court, the abiding presence of God with him as the sole King, Ruler, and Lawgiver, in all the conduct of his daily life. Yet it is "by faith" that God dwells in the heart and rules in the life. And "without faith it is impossible to please him." Therefore the existence of the original government of Israel, and the existence of Israel as a nation, depended upon a living, abiding faith in God, on the part of each individual of the people of Israel.

And just here, the only point where Israel could fail, Israel failed. The people did not abide in faith. They did not remain loyal to God as their King. "And Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of the Lord, died, being an hundred and ten years old.... And also all that
[354] generation were gathered unto their fathers: and there arose another generation after them, which knew not the Lord, nor yet the works which He had done for Israel.

"And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim: and they forsook the Lord God of their fathers, which brought them out of the land of Egypt, and followed other gods, of the gods of the people that were round about them, and bowed themselves unto them, and provoked the Lord to anger. And they forsook the Lord, and served Baal and Ashtaroth.

Then all the evils that came upon them only as the result of their apostasy and idolatry, they charged back upon the government of God. In their unbelief and apostasy, they could see in the continued raids of the heathen, by which their country was sacked, and themselves were oppressed, only evidence that for all practical purposes the government of God had failed.

They therefore reached the conclusion "that in order to maintain their standing among the nations, the tribes must be united under a strong central government. As they departed from obedience to God's law, they desired to be freed from the rule of their divine Sovereign; and thus the demand for a monarchy became widespread throughout Israel." Accordingly, they said to Samuel, "Make us a king to judge us like all the nations."

As their hearts were fully set on having a king like all the nations, and as practically they were much like all the nations anyhow, the best thing the Lord could do for them was to let them have their king. Nevertheless, He said to Samuel, "Protest solemnly unto them."

Samuel did so, but still they insisted: "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 for us."

And of it all the Lord said to Samuel, "They have not rejected thee; but THEY HAVE REJECTED ME, that I should not reign over them." And Samuel said unto them, "YE HAVE THIS DAY REJECTED YOUR GOD ... and have said unto Him, Nay; but set a king over us."

It was the same story of Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt, over again. When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God. And as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, the arch-deceiver seduced them into idolatry, and from idolatry into monarchy, in order that he might gain supremacy over them, and by worldly influence entire them, or by force prohibit them, from the service of God.

It was to save them from all this that the Lord had said of them, "The people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations."

If they had remained faithful to this principle, there never would have been amongst Israel a State or a kingdom.

Therefore, in announcing this principle, God intended forever that they should be completely separated from any such thing as a State or kingdom on the earth.

And as when that word was spoken they were "the church," it is absolutely certain that in announcing that principle, God intended to teach them and all people forever that his plainly-declared will is that there shall be a complete separation between his church and every State or kingdom on the earth: that there shall never be any connection between his religion and any State or kingdom in the world.

And, further: As that people were then the church, and as the Lord said they rejected Him when they formed that State and kingdom, it is perfectly plain by the word of the Lord that whenever the church forms any connection with any State or kingdom on the earth, in the very doing of it she rejects God.

And from ancient time all this was written for the admonition of those upon whom the ends of the world are come. Will the people to-day be admonished by it?

"The Mission of the American Sentinel" American Sentinel 12, 23, pp. 354, 355.

[354]

ATJ

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL stands in defense of a principle, and that is why the paper exists. From the day it was established it has been an uncompromising advocate of the absolute separation of religion from the State, not in name only, but in fact. This is a question that concerns every intelligent person in every land under the sun.

Government and religion are both essential, but the spheres of action of each are sharply circumscribed. One presides over the realm of conscience, taking cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart; the other deals with overacts, beyond which it cannot

go. One leads the individual to do right because it is right, the other restrains him from evil through fear of punishment of hope of reward.

Every individual is endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights. Government is simply a compact entered into whereby the united strength of the majority is exercised in the maintenance of these rights against the encroachments of selfishness and greed. One of these rights is the freedom to worship or not to worship God, according to the dictates of conscience. Jesus Christ, the author of Christianity, gave this liberty of thought and action to all his followers; but this privilege many who have claimed to be his disciples, have refused to their fellows. They have read from his teachings, and from their interpretation of them have formulated a creed. Everything that disagrees with this is wrong, as they view it. Failing by argument to convince those who differ from them, they have sought to invoke the arm of the law to compel an outward acknowledgment under penalty of physical punishment. At best this can only make [355] hypocrites, and a hypocrite is two-fold more the child of the evil one than the open opposer.

Now the point: The trend of passing events indicates that among many so-called Christians there is creeping in the idea that the civil law can be made an adjunct in the propagation of the gospel; and not in our own country alone is this true, but it is pervading Christian country alone is this true, but is it true, but it is pervading Christian lands everywhere. Pride, worldliness and Pharisaism are fast passing into the churches, and just to the extent that the churches have lost the primitive power of the gospel in their work, just to that extent is there a clamoring for civil power to forward their ends, and the logical result of this is but one thing—persecution pure and simple of dissenters.

Against all this the SENTINEL raises a warning voice. There is no power under heaven to make men good at heart but the transforming power of Jesus Christ, and this kingdom is not of this world. His weapons are not carnal, but spiritual; love, not force. In the light of the ... and of the sure word of prophecy, the SENTINEL beseeches the people everywhere to open their eyes and discern the signs of the times.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 23, p. 355.

[355]

ATJ

THE most practical education any person can receive education of the conscience. He will have more use for us than for any other, and more momentous issues will hang on its decisions. The teacher in this education is the Holy Spirit, and the text-book is the Word of God.

"Falling Back Upon Rome" American Sentinel 12, 23, p. 355.

[355]

ATJ

SPEAKING of a change of views recently experienced by a W. C. T. U. evangelist relative to the question of which day is the Sabbath, the N. Y. *Christian Advocate*, of May 6, says:—

> "The question between those who observe Sunday as the Lord's day and those who maintain that the only day to be observed as a sacred day is the seventh day, is a complex one, that the study of many years would not really exhaust. There are some questions upon which practical wisdom for busy Christians is to follow the teachings of the Church in all matters that are not flatly and unmistakably contradictory to the Word of God."

In other words, this question of which day is the sabbath being so complex and difficult of solution, it is impracticable for the individual Christian to undertake it, and his proper course is to follow the teachings of the Church. This is the principle of popery, as straightly put as it would be by an acknowledged spokesman of Rome.

It sounds odd to hear this leading Methodist organ falling back upon this purely papal principle in defense of Protestant practice in the observance of the Sabbath. Yet, after all, it is not strange, but perfectly natural; for Protestant practice in this important matter, as generally observed, is not Protestant at all, but papal; that is, the observance of Sunday as a sacred day rests not upon the Word of God, but upon tradition and the precepts of "the Church"; and when the champions of Sunday observance find themselves under the necessity of defending it, they at once fall back upon the papal

principle of directing conscience by the word of man, instead of the Word of God. Papal practice must be defended by papal principles.

"An Unchristian Petition" American Sentinel 12, 23, pp. 355, 356.

[355]

ATJ

AT a special meeting of the Charleston (S. C.) Ministerial Union, May 14, as reported in the Charleston *News and Courier*, the following petition to the Postmaster-General was presented and unanimously indorsed:—

"To the Hon. James A. Gary, Postmaster-General—

> "*Honored Sir:* The Sunday railway train, by its ready and wide-extended inducement to travel, both for pleasure and business, is undoubtedly the most influential agency now undermining public reverence for the divinely appointed sabbath.
>
> "The transportation of the mail, except in the vicinity of large cities, is the chief cause and support of the Sunday train.
>
> "The great facilities for daily intercommunication by rail, telegraph and telephone leave no excuse for the Sunday mail as a necessity, a fact sustained by the diminished mail service and almost universal closing of post-offices in England and Canada.
>
> "State legislation cannot stop United States mail trains, therefore the responsibility for Sunday mail service and largely for all Sunday travel rests solely upon the post-office department.
>
> "If the United States Government, through you and your department, by the approval and direction of the President, would set the example of reverence for the Lord's day by stopping the transmission of mails and closing all post offices on Sunday, it would evoke a

> divine blessing upon itself and the whole country; would teach a sublime lesson to the world; would confer a great boon upon thousands of its own and other officials and employés, and would put such a stamp of condemnation upon all acts of public desecration of the sabbath as would deter good citizens from their commission, and render all proper Sunday laws, State and municipal, easy of enforcement.
>
> "We, therefore, do most earnestly but respectfully petition you, and through you his Excellency the President, to forbid the transmission of any mails on Sunday, and order the closing of all post-offices throughout the United States on that day."

Let it be observed that this petition is avowedly in behalf of
[356] "the divinely-appointed sabbath." It does not claim to speak for any "civil" institution. Also, that it asks the Government to "set the example of reverence for the Lord's day," and thus—as it says—"evoke a divine blessing upon itself and the whole country," and "put such a stamp of condemnation upon all acts of public desecration of the sabbath" as would give life to "all proper Sunday laws, State and municipal."

As the matter now stands, these State and municipal Sunday statutes are for the most part shorn of their intended force by their manifest hostility to the spirit of the Constitution, which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The Postmaster-General is asked by this petition to take a step which will commit the Government to the recognition and enforcement of religion, and thus get over the objection offered by the Constitution.

All this is plain enough to the view of any person who will look at the facts; and that such undisguised Church-and-State demands are being made upon the Government is a fact which should cause American citizens who love liberty and believe in the separation of Church and State to do some serious thinking.

"A Menace to Liberty" American Sentinel 12, 23, p. 356.

[356]

ATJ

"OPEN the Convents," says the *Michigan Christian Advocate*, of May 22, in commenting upon the death of an unfortunate inmate of one of those institutions, while attempting to escape. The victim was a young woman twenty-two years of age, and her death resulted from injuries caused by leaping from a second-story window of the "Convent of the Good Shepherd," in Indianapolis, Ind. The *Advocate* says it is scandalous that such things can happen in "the land of the free."

It is very true that such happenings are altogether incompatible with the theory upon which this Government assumes to stand, and such involuntary servitude should be at once abolished by the strong arm of the law. To quote the *Advocate's* word, "Ecclesiastical prisons are not compatible with civil liberty. Barred doors, rusty keys, dark recesses, unscalable walls, mysterious secrecy, are forbidding enough under State auspices.... What was the American Government established for, anyway? If Spanish institutions are to be fostered and perpetuated here, Columbus might as well have refrained from his big discovery."

But what the liberty-loving people of this country need to realize is that more formidable than all the ecclesiastical prisons which Rome maintains, as a menace to American liberty, is the presence of Romish principles in the beliefs and practices of the American people. While these principles remain to enslave the understanding, there can be no safety for that personal liberty which is lost behind barred doors and unscalable walls.

"Notes" American Sentinel 12, 23, p. 356.

[356]

ATJ

THERE is reported to be a great surplus in the ministry of the Protestant church, no less than four hundred applications having been received for one pulpit in New York City. Nevertheless there is no surplus in the number who are preaching the glad tidings of salvation to sinners, or who are ministering to their unfortunate fellow beings in the name of Jesus Christ.

"Noted" American Sentinel 12, 23, pp. 358, 359.

[358]

ATJ

THE *Catholic Standard and Times*, of May 15, makes mention of the recent rebellion of the Catholic members of the Ninth New York regiment against an order to attend religious service in Bloomingdale Reformed Church. New York City; in justification of which it says:—

> "We believe there is no rule of the service compelling Catholics to attend a form of service offensive to their feelings and which, as individuals, they are prohibited by their own church under pain of sin from attending."

The Catholics were right in refusing to attend religious service at the dictation of the Government; and they would be equally right in refusing to do a religious act at the dictation of the church. In each case the dictation is that of man, and therefore essentially the
[349] same in character. The Government has as good right to compel the performance of a religious act as the church has to prohibit it.

The individual is responsible to God for the character of his actions. And when he submits to any human dictation in religion, whether from State or Church, he denies God's right to govern his actions by the divine principle of love, and to guide him by His Word and His Spirit.

"Noting" American Sentinel 12, 23, pp. 358, 359.

[358]

ATJ

SPEAKING of the humiliation of the Greeks and the rehabilitating of Turkey which has been the result of the war between them, an antichristian journal says: "There is a lesson in this, we hope. After the experience of Greece nobody should be deluded into a belief that the Christian God will help those who fight in His name; no people should depend upon the powers of Europe for defense; none should be misled by the fanatical jingoism of Christians; none should raise the question of religious differences between nations, nor go to war to settle them."

The Word of the Christian's God says plainly that His servants must not fight, because His kingdom is not of this world; hence it should not need the experience through which Greece has passed to convince people that God will not help those who fight in His name. The fact that some nations and individuals do fight in His name does not constitute an indictment of God, any more than the many crimes committed in the name of Liberty constitute an indictment of Liberty.

"Notings" American Sentinel 12, 23, p. 359.

[359]

ATJ

IT would seem that at last even Ecuador is to a considerable degree shaking herself free from the incubus and blight of papal priestcraft and Jesuitism. The Jesuits have been banished from the country by a government edict, and the distribution of Bibles is now freely permitted. As a result many of the inhabitants are calling for the Word of God. The weakening of the last strongholds of anti-biblical religion points to the completion of the work of preaching the gospel in all the world for a witness unto all nations, which the Saviour said should immediately precede his second coming.

June 17, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 24, pp. 369, 370.

[369]

ATJ

GOD had said of Israel, “Lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations.”

But, contrary to his expressed will, and against his solemn protest, Israel set up a kingdom and established a State.

They did this, they plainly said, that they might be “like all the nations.” Contrary to all the Lord’s wishes, the people *would* “be reckoned among the nations.”

But Israel was the church, while all the nations were States. Israel, therefore, could not be like the nations without forming themselves into a State.

But Israel, being the church, could not possibly from themselves into a State without at the same time, and in the very doing of it, forming a union of Church and State.

They did form themselves into a State, and did thus unite Church and State. But as this was contrary to the Lord’s plain word and against his solemn protest, it certainly stands as the truth that any union of Church and State is against the plain word and the solemn protest of God.

Israel as “the church,” which is “the pillar and ground of the truth,” was the depository and the representative of the true religion in the world. Then when Israel formed themselves into a State, this was nothing else than a union of religion and the State. And as their forming of a State was contrary to the expressed will and the solemn protest of the Lord, it is clearly the truth that any connection between

religion—and above all the true religion—and the State is positively against the expressed will and the solemn protest of God.

And as Israel, the depository and representative of the true religion, in order to form a union of religion and the State, had to reject God, it is certainly true that every other people, in forming a union of religion and the State, do, in the very doing of it, reject God.

Nothing can be plainer, therefore, than that the God of heaven and earth, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is eternally opposed to a union of religion and the State. He will never be a party to any such transaction.

This is why he desired that "the people should dwell alone." This is why he would have it that they should "not be reckoned among the nations." He desired that they should abide with him, and have him their only God, their only King, their only Ruler, their only Lawgiver—their "all in all."

God wanted not only that Israel, but that all people on the earth, should know that He is better than all other gods, that He is a better King than all other kings, that he is a better ruler than all other rulers, that he is a better Lawgiver than all other lawgivers, that his law is better than all other laws, and that his government is better than all other governments.

For this reason He would station Israel in Palestine, at the pivot of the highways of the nations; with the God of heaven as their only King, Ruler, and Lawgiver; with his law their only law, and his government their only government; the people dwelling alone and not reckoned among the nations—a holy, happy people; a glorious church.

Dwelling thus in the sight of all the nations that had forgotten God, those nations would be constantly taught the goodness of God and would be once more drawn to him. Accordingly he told them "Behold I have taught you statutes and judgments, ... that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people."

But Israel would not have it so. Israel would "be reckoned among the nations." Israel would be "like all the nations." And so it has been,
[370] from that day to this. God has never been allowed by his professed

people to reveal Himself to the world as he really is. his church has always been too willing to "be reckoned among the nations," too willing to be "like all the nations." She has always been too willing to be joined to the State, to be a part of the State, to have religion a matter of State and government, "like all the nations." And so it is with the church in all the world to-day.

"'Like all the nations.'—The Israelites did not realize that to be in this respect *unlike* other nations was a special privilege and blessing. God had separated the Israelites from every other people, to make them his own peculiar treasure. But they, disregarding this high honor, eagerly desired to imitate the example of the heathen.

"And still the longing to conform to worldly customs and practices exists among the professed people of God. As they depart from the Lord they become ambitious for the gains and honors of the world. Christians are constantly seeking to imitate the practices of those who worship the god of this world. Many urge that by uniting with worldlings and conforming to their customs, they might exert a stronger influence over the ungodly.

"But all who pursue this course thereby separate from the Source of their strength. Becoming the friends of the world, they are the enemies of God. For the sake of earthly distinction they sacrifice the unspeakable honor to which God has called them, of showing forth the praises of him who hath called us out of darkness into his marvelous light.

"The days of Israel's greatest prosperity were those in which they acknowledged Jehovah as their King—when the laws and government which he established were regarded as superior to those of all other nations." And such will be the days of any people's greatest prosperity.

God's laws, just as they stand, without any re-enactment, without any adding to or diminishing from, are superior to all other laws. His government, administered by himself through the operation of his own eternal Spirit, is superior to every other government.

But how shall the people know this, who know not God, so long as his own people will not have it so? How shall the nations know this, when his own professed church will not recognize it nor have it so?

Instead of holding fast God's laws and government as superior to those of all States and nations, the professed people of God consider that they must enter the politics and shape the policies, that they must tinker the laws and manipulate the governments, of the States and nations of the world.

Instead of magnifying God's laws and government before all the world, as superior to the laws and governments of all the nations, and showing unswerving allegiance to them as such, the people of the professed churches of God seek to mingle heavenly citizenship with earthly citizenship; and to bring down from their superior place the laws and government of God, and mix them up with the laws and government of all the nations in an unseemly and ungodly union of religion and the State.

And thus the people of the professed churches of God, of the young people's societies and leagues professing Christianity—of all the combined church elements of the land—are following directly in the track of the church of ancient Israel; they will not dwell alone; they will be reckoned among the nations; they will be like all the nations; they will join themselves to the State; they will form a union of religion and the State; they will reject God, that he should not reign over them.

"That Elusive Prosperity" American Sentinel 12, 24, pp. 370, 371.

[370]

ATJ

AMS the weeks go by it becomes more and more evident that the prosperity promised upon the inauguration of a new political administration at the seat of national government, is endowed with the elusiveness of a phantom. President McKinley tells the people to wait and be patient, and the wisdom of patience under the pressure of trials cannot be denied; but very many of the people and among them some erstwhile staunch supporters of the administration, have arrived at the conclusion that patience, however good in the abstract, has ceased to be a virtue as regards the regime which now prevails in our State and national governments. And there are ominous signs that ere long they will be ready to resort to desperate measures to obtain the needed relief.

There come reports from Western Pennsylvania that a vast army of starving men—the underpaid operation—in mines and mills—are planning an uprising which will be marked by bloodshed and conflagration. In many other parts of the country the industrial conditions are such as to invite an imitation of their example. It is human nature to seek to find relief from the injuries it receives, in an outbreak of human passion. This will bring ruin and more misery, but not prosperity to the community which it affects. The passions of human nature are at the bottom of all the trouble to-day.

While factories are shutting down and wages are being reduced on every side, while the resources of the laborers are dwindling and the ranks of the idle and destitute are being augmented, the coal trust in advancing the price of coal, and the beef trust in advancing the price of meat. And the only reason the price of everything else that is necessary to existence is not advancing, and that we do not have to pay for air and sunlight, is that in the wisdom of the Creator the circumstances governing their probation were so ordained as to secure the most of them against manipulation by a trust.

High tariff and low tariff, bimetallism or a gold-standard, may cause industrial disturbance and depression, and the country is made to shift from one to the other; but the country can in time adjust itself to the situation which results merely from a political policy. But the happiness and prosperity of the people can never be adjusted to the greed and selfishness which seek to turn the advantages of trade to [371] the benefit of the few, by arbitrary interference with the natural law of supply and demand.

The SENTINEL has no remedy to propose for adoption by the Government or by political parties. It would only point men to that individual remedy which consists in the cherishing of right principles for the control of the individual life, and of faith in Him whose throne is in the heavens, whose kingdom ruleth over all, and who overrules in the kingdoms of this world. It likewise would say to the people, "Be patient;" but it would say it in the language of Scripture, "Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord." See James 5:1-8. The hope of every lover of justice and peace is the coming of the Lord. "For yet a little, and He that shall come will come, and will not tarry." Hebrews 10:37.

"'Anarchy' in Monroe County, N. Y." American Sentinel 12, 24, pp. 371, 372.

[371]

ATJ

"Anarchy in Monroe County!" is the startling announcement which comes to our desk, printed in huge black letters upon a leaflet sent out from that section to "every law-abiding citizen." With the glance which takes in this appalling revelation, we catch also a sentence in large red letters calling for a "great law-and-order mass meeting" to consider the situation!

What has happened? Has the awful lynching epidemic broken out in that place? Has somebody been blown up by dynamite? or buildings destroyed by bombs? Hastily reading the statement of the facts, we discover,—what?—That some baseball clubs have been playing ball in the city of Rochester, ON SUNDAY. That is anarchy! for the clergymen of the place are agreed that it is such—speaking not as religionists, understand, but only as citizens.

Even the editor of the *Rochester Times* appears to share this extraordinary view. In his paper of May 26, speaking—or assuming to speak—for the law-and-order element of that city and vicinity, he says:—

> "We do not hesitate to say that so far as it goes, the playing of baseball on Sunday in Monroe County or anywhere in this State, is ANARCHY."

The circumstances which led up to this rather remarkable situation are these. The wave of agitation for an enforced "Sabbath" observance which has been disturbing so many communities in the land, has reached the city of Rochester, and, as stated in a city paper, "some excellent people, including clergymen and Y. M. C. A. officials," started a campaign against Sunday baseball "on the ground that it is irreligious, detrimental to morals, and against the law." They sent a committee to the ball grounds on Sunday to secure evidence against the ball clubs; but the managers having been informed of their purpose refused to admit them, which fact was of course reported and found its way, with accompanying comments, into the columns of the press. The outcome was a call for a mass meeting of

citizens in Fitzhugh Hall, on Sunday, June 6, to take measures for the suppression of "anarchy."

The *Times*, of June 7, gives a report of the meeting, which was attended by two thousand people. The speakers, as was to be expected, were clergymen, who wished it understood that they spoke not as clergymen, but as citizens. They betrayed their real standpoint, however, by their frequent references to the "Sabbath" and the moral law. Some of the utterances which gave character to the occasion, as given in the report, are as follows:—

> Rev. Ward D. Platt: "I know that this baseball question is properly a civil question, but in my own mind I cannot get away from the fact that I am addressing an audience that has not relegated to the moles and bats the ten commandments, and that you still have a wholesome respect for an old book that is called the Bible. Most men like to see a game of baseball under proper circumstances and on proper days, but when the owners of these league teams become abettors of violations of the law and attempt to override the best sentiments of our people, then, I am sure, the people will say that they will withdraw their support.... These highwaymen have come out and attempted to throttle the laws of our great State in order that they may fill their purses. Here is a law of the State of New York, that rests upon the enactment of a decree thousands of years old, that was consigned to the awe-stricken people that gathered around the base of Mt. Sinai, that is as old as humanity itself, and, I say, here is a law, and what is the fact that confronts us? Three saloon-keepers, owning a baseball nine, have placed themselves in open defiance of the statutes of the State."
>
> Rev. C. A. Merrill: "This fight against Sunday baseball is really insignificant compared with the greater issues at stake. We are battling for the sovereignty of our laws. We ask the people for patriotism. We want to show the poor man; that when a law is made it is

> to be enforced to the letter, and not governed by the sentiments and opinions of our public officers."
>
> Rev. W. R. Taylor: "Are these men who favor a more liberal Sunday aware that when they make a hole in the wall for Sunday amusements, that the employer of labor will also come in through the same hole? I have faith that when the American people learn that this Sunday rest is a national institution that they will show their teeth and claws and defy the person who dares attempt to take it away from them. And I have even hope for the baseball cranks when they learn that Sunday rest is an institution of our Government."
>
> Rev. C. A. Barbour: "It is no business of the executive officers what the law is, except to find out what the laws are, and then, whether they are good or bad, it is none of their business, it is their duty to see that they are enforced."

It is evident, according to this last quotation, that Mr. Barbour would have justified Pontius Pilate in crucifying Jesus Christ; for the law of the Roman government was squarely against Christianity, and it was none of Pilate's business to consider whether it was good
[372] or bad, but only to enforce it. So likewise was the law of the land against the martyrs who were put to death by Rome; and when the church delivered them over to the civil authorities, with a hypocritical recommendation for mercy, it was simply the duty of the latter to see that the law was enforced!

The Rev. Mr. Taylor's statement that "Sunday rest is an institution of our Government," betrays a surprising ignorance of the fundamental law upon which the Government rests. For that law—the Constitution—declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" and no religious institution can become an institution of the Government until this part of the Constitution is repealed.

The Rev. Mr. Ward omitted to explain how Sunday rest is based, as he asserted, upon the law of ten commandments given at Mt.

Sinai. That law says nothing about the first day of the week, as every candid person must admit. Why do Sunday advocates persist in citing a law which specifies the seventh day as the Sabbath, in support of the observance of the first day? But all history testifies that in nothing has the human mind exhibited greater blindness than in its theology.

Doubtless those who assembled this mass meeting for the suppression of "anarchy" were actuated by a sincere desire to better the morality of the community in which they live, and firmly believe that the enforcement of the Sunday law will contribute largely to this result. But the fallacy of this view is so apparent that a moment's careful thought should have sufficed to reveal it. Let us note a few facts bearing on this point.

1. There is no power in human laws to make men better morally. Even the law of God cannot in itself do this. The Scriptures plainly say that it cannot. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." Romans 3:20. The seventh chapter of Romans, from the tenth verse onward, is a graphic portrayal of the inability of the law of God to save or give any help at all to the sinner. It witnesses to his righteousness if he keeps it, and to his condemnation if he breaks it, and that is all. It furnishes him no power to do right, or to rise from the abyss of transgression. But (Romans 8:3, 4) "What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

It is the life of Christ—Christ living in man (Galatians 2:20) that makes him better morally, and there is *nothing else* that can do it. Yet in their human blindness men—and even clergymen—imagine that there is some power in human legislation to make men better, and much of the legislation which goes upon the statute books to-day is framed with that idea in view! It is the supremest folly.

No act of the legislature can put Christ into one human heart; and without Christ there can be no ascent from the low level of human nature. No man by taking hold of himself can lift himself. Humanity cannot lift itself.

.2. The whole subject of Sabbath observance is fully covered by the law of God, which specifies that the seventh day (not the first day)

shall be observed as the Sabbath of the Lord. That law is binding to-day upon every individual; it stands in the authority and by the power of the God of the Universe, and there is neither occasion nor room for the "Sabbath" legislation which man presumes to put forth.

And when men—clergymen especially—talk about the duty of obeying the laws of the land, they should remember that God's Sabbath law is binding upon every individual in the land, and that that law takes precedence in any law of the land that relates to Sabbath observance. "We ought to obey God rather than men," said the apostles, and that is the rule of Christian life to-day. And there is no greater anarchy than that which sets at naught the law of God.

"Mob Rule vs. Civil Government" American Sentinel 12, 24, pp. 372, 373.

[372]

ATJ

THE town of Urbana, in the highly civilized State of Ohio, was the scene recently of one of those tragedies with which the American public have become only too familiar, where the worst passions of human nature held sway upon the throne of judgment and justice. A negro guilty of a heinous crime, was under arrest in the jail guarded by the sheriff and a company of militia. A mob gathered about the jail, and while attempting to break in and get possession of the prisoner, the militia, by order of their captain, fired upon them, and two highly-esteemed citizens were killed. The mob, reinforced, and furious for vengeance, renewed the attack; the sheriff and militia fled, and the prisoner was dragged from his cell and killed by sheer mob violence before being hung in the manner customary to lynchers. The efforts of the sheriff and militia to repulse the mob were for days the theme of angry denunciation on the part of the citizens.

By such occurrences the participants thoroughly demonstrate their utter incapacity for self-government. The sheriff and militia were there for the express purpose of guarding the jail. They had not put themselves there, but had been put there by the citizens themselves—by the very men who came, as an angry mob, against them. They were appointed to their office for the very purpose of making the government something else than a mob—of dispensing justice in a different manner from that employed by a mob. The

citizens of Urbana attacked the government they had themselves set up, and for which they were responsible, and substituted for the government the rule of the mob. And by this they demonstrated that their own self-government was a failure, or in other words, that they could not govern themselves.

This occurrence, and the many similar ones which are of almost daily occurrence, speak with no uncertain voice concerning the future of American government. When a people can no longer govern themselves, they must be governed in some other way. They must be ruled by a power outside of themselves, and this means the establishment of a monarchy. Either the people must rule themselves, or they must be ruled by a monarch, or civilization must give place to anarchy. [37]

Following close upon this dreadful occurrence, comes another similar in kind which throws, if possible, a still more lurid light upon our national prospect. It has been said in defense of these lynchings that they are prompted by a desire to secure that justice which so frequently miscarries in the machinery of the courts. But at the town of Princess Anne, Md., on June9, a negro, who was under sentence of death by hanging, was taken from the officers by a mob while on his way to the jail, and after being kicked and beaten into insensibility, was hanged in sight of the court house. With such proceedings the securing or aimed at, in them, is the gratification of Satanic passion. The innate savagery of human nature easily breaks through the thin veneer of our "Christian" civilization.

But what is the remedy? The remedy is individual self-government,—right principles ruling in the heart. For self-government depends not upon some scheme of control exercised by each one over himself. Self-government and individualism stand or fall together. And every combination or "trust" of labor or capital stands as a menace to the continuance of self-government, by its restriction of individual freedom.

The purpose of the Creator is that every person shall govern himself; that there shall be, within him, a principle which directs and controls his whole life in harmony with the highest standard of right. If an individual has not this principle within him, it is the purpose of the Creator to supply it, through the provisions of his gospel.

Let that gospel with its subduing power over every evil passion, flourish and find free course in all the earth. It constitutes the only safeguard against the evils that threaten society and the individual to-day.

June 24, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 25, p. 386.

[386]

ATJ

“NOW therefore, if ye have done truly and sincerely, in that ye have make Abimelech king, ... then rejoice ye in Abimelech, and let him also rejoice in you. But if not, let fire come out from Abimelech, and devour the men of Shechem, and the house of Millo; and let fire come out from the men of Shechem, and from the house of Millo, and devour Abimelech.”

And so it came to pass; for in three years the distrust and dissension had so grown between the parties to the transaction respecting the kingship, that open war broke out, which ended only with the death of Abimelech; and, with that, the end of their experiment at setting up a kingdom.

Now all this was held up before all Israel who should come after, as a solemn warning and a forcible admonition of what would inevitably be the result of any attempt at setting up a kingdom. And when, in disregard of all this, and against the Lord’s open protest, they did at last again set up a kingdom, this very result, though longer delayed, did inevitably come.

Almost all the reign of Saul, their first king, was spent by him in envy and jealousy of David and a steady seeking to kill him. The reign of David was marred by his own great sin, which he never could have carried out if he had not been king; and was also disturbed by the treason of his chief counselor, and the insurrection of his son Absalom. The latter half of the reign of Solomon was marked by his great apostasy, and was cursed by the abominable idolatries that came in with his heathen wives and oppression upon the people.

At the end of the reign of these three kings, the nation had been brought to a condition in which it was not well that they should continue as one; and they were therefore divided into two—the Ten Tribes forming the kingdom of Israel, and the two other tribes forming the kingdom of Judah.

And from that day, with the Ten Tribes there was continuous course of apostasy, of contention, and of regicide, till at last, from the terrors of anarchy, they were compelled to cry out, "We have no king." Then the Lord offered Himself to them again, saying: "O Israel, thou hast fled from me. Thou hast destroyed thyself. Return unto me. I will be thy King." But they would not return, and consequently were carried captive to Assyria, and were scattered and lost forever.

When this happened to the kingdom of Israel, it could yet be said of Judah, "Judah yet ruleth with God, and is faithful with the saints." But this was only for a little while. Judah too went steadily step by step downward in the course of apostasy, until of her too the word had to be given, "Remove the diadem, take off the crown: 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."

Thus Judah too was obliged to say, We have no king. And Judah had to go captive to Babylon, with her city and temple destroyed, and the land left desolate. Thereafter the Lord was obliged to govern his people by the heathen powers, until he himself should come. And even when he came, because he would not at once set himself up as a worldly king and sanction their political aspirations, they refused to recognize him at all. And when at last even Pilate appealed to them—"Shall I crucify your King?" they still, as in the days of Samuel, insisted on rejecting God, and cried out, "We have no king but Cesar."

And this was but the direct outcome, and the inevitable logic, of the step that they took in the days of Samuel. When they rejected God and chose Saul, in that was wrapped up the rejection of the Lord and their choosing of Cesar. In rejecting God that they might be like all the nations, they became like all the nations that rejected God.

And such was the clear result of the union of Church and State among the people of Israel. And it is all written precisely as it was worked out in detail, for the instruction and warning of all people who should come after, and for the admonition of those upon whom the ends of the world are come.

"The Failure of 'Civic Reform'" American Sentinel 12, 25, pp. 386, 387.

[386]

ATJ

DR. PARKHURST, the noted apostle of civic reformation, has announced his retirement from active service in that line, on account of failing health. Upon is departure to seek its restoration in a foreign clime, he announced to his congregation that henceforth "my on devotion will be to my pulpit, to the life and work of this church, and to the interests of its families and individual members."

In a review of the work accomplished by this prominent clergyman as a civic reformer, the *Independent* (N.Y.) says: "It has been a great thing for the city that our people have been taught that religion has a right to meddle with its politics, to fight with and to master it."

A "great thing" it is, undoubtedly, for the chief city of this free commonwealth; but not a good thing. What religion is it that has this "right"? Is it the papal religion, or the Protestant? and if the Protestant, is it the Methodist, the Presbyterian, the Lutheran, Episcopalian, Quaker, or Adventist religion, or some other? When this point comes to be settled, will the controversy which must ensue be another "great thing" for this city? We are afraid it will.

But what religion has fought with and mastered the politics of New York City? Now a very good religion, evidently, if those politics are now obedient to their master.

In short, the result of this meddling of religion with city politics, is such as plainly to stamp the project of reform by such means as a total failure. "Tammany," so far from being eliminated from New York's politics, is as big a factor in them as ever. And while some [387] changes have been made in the features of civic life in this city, there has been no real elimination of immorality. And the simple reason for this is that immorality cannot be eliminated in that way. That result can be accomplished only by the grace of God.

The earnest and no doubt sincere efforts of Dr. Parkhurst to inject Christianity into the civic life of a great city have failed, as all such efforts must fail. But Christianity has not failed. That is as powerful to-day as it ever was, to triumph over sin in the individual heart.

"The Religious World Adrift" American Sentinel 12, 25, pp. 387, 388.

[387]

ATJ

IN its issue of June 16, the *New York Herald* gives expression to some feeling of solicitude concerning the outcome of the manifest drift in religious thought and teaching which is taking the masses into altogether new channels of belief. It says:—

> "What is the drift of religious thought in these latter days, and where will the current take us? Is it true that the dogmas of our fathers are slowly falling in innocuous desuetude; that we their children have slipped the old-fashioned moorings; and, if so, there dangerous rocks ahead, or the open sea where we shall have plain sailing?
>
> "This is a matter of very considerable consequence to us laymen. We have been brought up in certain ideas, and there is some solicitude among us to know whether the reverend clergy still cling to these ideas or whether their grasp on them is loosening. They certainly ought to be entirely frank with us, and if the basis of religious conviction is gradually shifting we ought to know it. It is not a subject in which concealment can be regarded as expedient. We don't wish to believe what specialists have discovered to be untrue, and if any modification of the old faith has taken place the pulpit should make open confession thereof.
>
> "Are we heading for the port of agnosticism? Is religion so far unlike the exact sciences that a large part of it consists of the unknowable, and have we reached that point when, if we are to be religious, we must regard

> all or not at all? What says the ripest scholarship of the age on this subject? The common people need some degree of bold speech by those who have the authority to speak. There should be no confusion in the public mind and it is not for the ultimate interest of the church universal that its teachers should hesitate to tell the truth, and the whole truth."

The condition of the religious world in general at this day is well expressed by the word, drifting. They have lost sight of the well-defined faith of their fathers, and are drifting on, whether to dangerous rocks or an open sea they know not, neither do they care. But one thing is certain; namely, that the soul which drifts upon the sea of religious thought without chart or compass, is in far greater danger of shipwreck than is the mariner under similar conditions on the literal ocean. For nowhere do treacherous currents cross the path of safety and more swiftly or insensibly drawn the voyager away, or more surely bear him upon the rocks, than in that spiritual sea upon which every soul embarks to find its destiny.

There are two opposing currents in this great sea, which to-day are bearing their freight of human souls to different destinies. The one is that upon which the observer finds himself drifting away from the beliefs of his fathers, while he queries, as in the *Herald* quotation, whether he is moving toward the open sea or toward the rocks. And this current—and to say—bears the masses of the people,—those who look upon the revelations of the inspired Word as hidden mysteries, concerning which they must seek to the "ripest scholarship" for explanation. They are becoming more and more unsettled in faith, more and more uncertain whether any definite bearings can be taken by which to shape their course.

The other current, on the contrary, is bearing forward a class of people whose faith and hope are even more definite than were those of their fathers. There is no drifting in their course,—no speculation as to their whereabouts, or seeking to the "ripest scholarship," to priest or pastor, for directions. They are following the plain directions given them by the Omniscient. More than fifty years ago God sent a message to the world which said, "Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come." Revelation 14:7. Those

who received that message, as many did and are still doing, knew that they had reached the hour of that great investigation, the conclusion of which would mark the termination of God's work for the salvation of men. Almost immediately following this message came another one, saying, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." And anon "the third angel followed them,"—a third message went forth,—saying, "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation." This called attention to the apostate spiritual power which has presumed to change the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, and points to that change as the mark of its spiritual authority; and thus those who received it were led to return to the keeping of the true Sabbath.

Thus on the one hand are those who are drifting aimlessly on—a vast multitude—knowing only that they are getting farther and farther away from the faith of their fathers and that their course must be taking them toward agnosticism or something else; while on the other hand there are those—only a small company, alas—who rejoice in a still more definite faith than that of their fathers,—not a
[388] faith that sets aside the old paths, but which reveals more clearly and beautifully the wonderful wisdom and love of God in his great work for the redemption of mankind. They behold wondrous things out of the divine law, and with a hope based upon the definite assurances of the infallible Word, they are waiting for the glorious appearing of their God in the clouds of heaven, to purify the earth of sin and sinners.

To which of these companies, reader, do you belong? Are you drifting carelessly on into the unknown, or are you guided by the chart and compass of God's Word?

"The Importance of a Theory" American Sentinel 12, 25, p. 388.

[388]

ATJ

IN answer to the question, "Christian Citizenship: What Is It?" a writer, in the June *Christian Endeavorer*, says:—

> "The world is sick unto death of theories. The demand of the times is for men of action—men who do something....
>
> "The strength of the great movement we call Christian citizenship lies largely in its being practical."

This is very true; but the importance of a theory must not be overlooked; for all practice is shaped by some theory, and if the theory be bad, the practical results that come from it will be of the same character. And of this the "Christian citizenship" movement affords an illustration. For this movement is based upon the theory that righteousness is to be established on the earth by means of the good works which "Christian citizenship" aims to perform. And this theory is false, being contrary to the express teachings of the prophetic Word relative to the conditions which would prevail in the last days. See 2 Timothy 3:1-6, etc. The theory of a temporal millennium is luring vast numbers of people on to a stupendous disaster, to which their eyes will be opened only when there rmains no means of escaping from it.

It is true the world is sick of theories; but it will be still more sick of the practices which must come in the effort to realize the "Christian citizenship" theory. For the theory that righteousness can be set up by means of the ballot and human legislation, can only lead to religious controversy, persecution, and confusion.

"Saint-making at Rome" American Sentinel 12, 25, p. 388.

[388]

ATJ

RECENTLY, as all the world has been informed, two additions were made to the Roman Catholic calendar of "saints," with due ceremonials and announcement in St. Peter's church, at Rome. The canonization ceremonies are said to have eclipsed in point of display anything that has been seen on like occasions since the pope lost his temporal power. Says a London journal, "There were the glittering uniforms of soldiers guards, robes of the clergy, jeweled mitres, waving banners, and swinging censers, all fitting accompaniments of the ceremony which blasphemously professes to exalt the dead to be objects of devotion."

The same journal adds that "Before declaring the two new papal saints, to whom petitions may be addressed, the pope, according to the formula, twice deferred granting the request for canonization in order to consult with the Lord." In what way he undertook this consultation it is not said; but evidently it was not by going to the Word of God, for that Word declares that dead men do not know anything, but are in their graves, oblivious to all that transpires in earth or heaven. See Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6; Psalm 146:3, 4, etc. According to that Word, there can be no occasion whatever for saint-making or saint worship. It is very certain, therefore, that the pope did not consult with the Author of that Word.

"Foreign Missionary Work" American Sentinel 12, 25, pp. 388, 389.

[388]

ATJ

WHEN the Great Missionary left his disciples, he commissioned them to go "into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." That was a gospel of religious liberty—not in its generally accepted sense, but liberty in Christ—freedom from sin. "The Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound."

Never in the history of the world was there more need of this gospel being given in its simplicity than to-day. Hungry, burdened, discouraged, sin-sick souls are appealing for help; and not alone from our own shores, but from across the ocean, from the darkness of heathendom and from the islands of the sea comes the Macedonian cry, "Come over and help us." These earnest pleas have touched the hearts of thousands of God-fearing, self-sacrificing men and women everywhere who have left their homes and taken their lives in their
[389] hands, as it were, to tell the people the good news of a Saviour who can save. The good they are accomplishing, the Judgment alone can reveal.

There are many whose hearts beat in union with this good work, to whom have been intrusted this world's goods, and who would gladly contribute of their means to carry it forward, did they but know where to send their contributions. To all such, and others as

well, we take pleasure in calling attention to the announcement in another column of the Foreign Missionary Board of Seventh-day Adventists, located at Philadelphia, Pa. This is headquarters of an aggressive gospel work that is being carried forward in foreign fields, and with remarkable results. Voluntary contributions will be thankfully received, and a cordial invitation is extended to those who desire to make such offerings to send them to the Treasurer of the Board, W. H. Edwards. We can assure our readers that every dollar sent there will be conscientiously expended in this great labor of love.

"Compulsory, Yet Free!" American Sentinel 12, 25, p. 389.

[389]

ATJ

IN an article treating on "The First Day of the Week," by Chas. Cuthbert Hall, printed in *The Congregationalist* and copied in organ of the "New England Sabbath Protective League," we find the following:—

> "As the day has become one of universal observance in many nations as a reset day, wherein large numbers of people are released from business, it has, of course, been necessary to have the civil government make suitable laws, which we must all obey, for maintaining the order and peace of society; but every Christian should joyfully remember that this institution of the Lord's day sprang out of love, not out of law. It is not a grievous commandment; it is a joyous consecration. It is not compulsory; it is voluntary, and as such we believe it is especially dear to Christ."

But if we "must obey" these "suitable laws" of civil government commanding the observance of the day, of what avail is it to us that in the divine economy the observance was not made compulsory, but voluntary? If we are compelled to observe it, what becomes of the liberty which we were granted in the matter by the Lord?

If the Lord made Sabbath observance free, will He uphold a law making it compulsory? Must He not be against any such law?

July 1, 1897

"Separation of Religion and the State" American Sentinel 12, 26, pp. 402, 403.

[402]

ATJ

ISRAEL'S venture of conducting a kingdom, a State, like all the nations, was a complete, a deplorable, and a ruinous failure.

Israel was the church at that time: and this awful failure in her attempt to conduct a State was traced in full detail as an instruction to the church in all ages.

The essence of that instruction is that it is not possible for the church properly to conduct a State or to manage a kingdom.

The result of that attempt of the church to conduct a State and manage a kingdom, was the ruin of the kingdom and the annihilation of the State, which they had created, and the subjection of the church to heathen powers forever after.

Then from all this the plain lesson plainly and emphatically taught is, that the heathen are better qualified to conduct States and manage kingdoms than are the people of the church: that the people who are of this world are better qualified to perform the things that pertain to this world, than are the people whose calling and profession are those of another world.

If any one will say that this is not so, then let him tell why it was that when the State which the church of Israel had established, had failed and perished, and the people had risen to the dignity of a church once more, they were put by the Lord, and kept, in subjection to the heathen powers—Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome—as long as they existed as a distinct people. And why He commanded

the Christian church forever after, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers."

No, the church is not in the world to rule men; but by love to serve men. It is not the office of the church to govern States, but to serve the Lord. She is not here to compel men, but to persuade men. She has no commission to enforce the law, nor to preach the law, but to preach the gospel. She is not to condemn men, but to save men. This has ever been God's will concerning his church: and whenever she has lost sight of this, and departed in any degree from it, she has only frustrated the grace of God, and spoiled herself.

It became necessary however for the Lord to reach the heathen nations and rulers that they could not of right exercise jurisdiction in religion.

Nebuchadnezzar set up a great image and commanded all to worship it.

Among the people present were three of the captives of the church of Israel, who refused to obey the commandment of the king.

He called the three men and repeated to them distinctly the command to worship his god, or else be cast into a furnace heated seven times hotter than usual, especially for them.

They replied that their God was able to deliver them, but that whether he would deliver them or not, they would not hearken to his decree nor worship the golden image which he had set up.

He therefore commanded that the three men should be cast into the roaring furnace. But immediately he was almost struck dumb with astonishment at what he saw.

He cried out to his counselors, "Did we not cast three men, *bound*, into the burning fiery furnace? They answered, True, O king. But lo! I see four men, *loose*, walking in the midst of the fire: and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." He then called them forth, and they were taken up out of the furnace, and there was not so much as the smell of fire upon them.

"Then Nebuchadnezzar spake and said: "Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants that trusted in him, and *have changed the king's word*, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god except their own God."

This thing happened unto them for an ensample: and, it was written for the admonition of kings and people who should come after. It happened, and it was written to teach all kings and people, that though people be subject to the power of States and kingdoms, this power does not in any sense extend to the religion of the people. It tells all, that when the law of king or State to the religion of anybody, such law is to be disregarded by the people, and must be changed. The religious right of the people must stand, and king and State must yield. It happened and was written to teach all kings and people that there must be no union of religion and the State.

When the kingdom of Babylon had passed away, and the united powers of Media and Persia had come in, the same lesson had to be repeated for their benefit. A law was enacted by Darius the Mede and his counselors that for thirty days nobody should ask any petition of any god or king, but King Darius. Daniel was chief minister of the empire, and he paid no attention to the law; he went just as before, and presented his petition to God three times a day. He was arrested, prosecuted, convicted, and the penalty according to the law was executed: he was cast into a den of lions. But God sent an angel and shut the lions' mouths, because that before God innocency was [403] found in him; and also before the king had he done no hurt.

Thus God regards, and declares, the man innocent who knowingly and openly disregards any law touching his duty or relationship to God, who disregards any law touching religion. And this second example happened and was written to teach all kings and States that they never can rightly have anything whatever to do with any question of religion: to teach all kings, States, and people that God requires the absolute separation between religion and the State.

And that it was done *twice*, is significant: when God showed to Pharaoh, by the seven thin ears of corn, and by the seven thin kine, the seven years of famine that were coming on the land, it was said to him, "The dream is one.... And for that the dream was doubled unto Pharaoh twice; it is because the thing is established by God." And when God has doubled unto kings and States for all time, the lesson upon the separation of religion and the State, it means that the lesson is one; and for that the lesson was doubled, it is because the thing is established by God.

And if kings and States, and churches, professing to know God, go directly contrary to this thing that has been established by God; if they will yet put forth edict and law touching religion, it can only be, because they are blinder than Pharaoh. For "the unjust knoweth no shame."

THE SENTINEL is against every form of despotism,—religious or civil.

"The Declaration of Independence" American Sentinel 12, 26, pp. 403, 404.

[403]

ATJ

EVERY reader of the AMERICAN SENTINEL is doubtless familiar with the fact that on July 4, 1776, the representatives of the English colonies of America formally declared to the world their independence of all foreign rule, and in justification of their action asserted the doctrine that all men have the same unalienable rights, and that to secure these rights is the proper purpose of civil government.

The situation as it was in 1776, and that which exists to-day in the American nation, cannot however be properly appreciated without looking beyond the action which has made the fourth of July a national day, to the antecedent conditions out of which that action was evolved.

The Declaration of Independence was not simply the result of a determination on the part of the American colonies to separate themselves from British rule, for the sake of being independent. At the time when that Declaration went forth, the civilized world was just emerging from the long reign of civil and religious despotism which had characterized the Middle Ages. One by one, as the spirit of liberty developed and asserted itself in the minds of the people, the chains of that despotism had been broken; until in the Declaration of Independence the world heard a bold assertion of the doctrine of the right of all mankind to complete individual freedom.

This was not an accident of the times. It was a providence. It has been well said that "History is the progressive disclosure of the self-government of man as the providential design." The Declaration of Independence appealed to the established decrees of Providence

for its justification. "We hold these truths to be self-evident," it says, "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, [404] governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." It asserts this as the order of government which God himself has established.

It was by a religious power that this order of government was perverted. There was never a despotism on earth until men had established false religions. The religion of love which God set up is in perfect harmony with free government. It must be so, for otherwise He who endowed men with the unalienable rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" would antagonize Himself. And anything which antagonizes that religion—which is Christianity—antagonizes free government.

It was a religious despotism which antagonized free government in the Middle Ages. The papal church dominated the States of Europe, and the civil power was employed to enforce her decrees. By her the Inquisition was established, and the power of the civil arm was made to invade conscience, the most sacred temple of human liberty. Under the tutorship of the church, the civil powers learned to disregard one and all of those unalienable rights with which the Creator had endowed the humblest being who bears His image.

The Declaration of Independence asserted again these rights before the world. It asserted not the rights of governments, or of organizations, but of the individual. And against nothing did it strike more directly or forcibly than against that ecclesiastical despotism which had so long claimed the right to control the conscience, and put fetters on the wings of the mind. It asserted the eternal truth of God against the error which had long enslaved mankind.

The value of the Declaration of Independence lies not in the fact that it accomplished our separation from the empire of Great Britain and our independence as a nation. Indeed, it was only by hard fighting that these things were accomplished, and if these be the things to be commemorated, the anniversary of Cornwallis' surrender at Yorktown would be a more fitting date than the fourth of July; for it was only then that our national independence had become, practically, an accomplished fact. But national independence means nothing to

the slave. Personal liberty, the enjoyment of the unalienable rights of the individual, is the thing of value, and it is the assertion of these that gives its value to the immortal Declaration.

No one can justly appreciate this great document who views it merely in the light of its national significance. Whether this Government be a better one to live under than the government of Great Britain, or what benefits have resulted from our national independence, are questions to which we can find no definite answer. Concerning these there may exist must difference of opinion. But all know, from their own experience, the individual blessings which are secured by a free government. And these blessings are as valuable to the inhabitants of one country as to those of another. The providential design in the Declaration of Independence was not that this nation should be made the greatest nation on the earth, by being different from all the others; but that all the others should become like it, in securing to the people of other lands the enjoyment of their God-given, unalienable rights.

As the Charter of individual liberty, the Declaration of Independence is as appropriate to our own time as the year 1776. To-day, more fully perhaps than at any time in the past, it needs to be borne in mind that the proper purpose of civil governments is to secure to the *individuals* under them, the enjoyment of the unalienable rights bestowed upon them by the Creator. The crisis of 1776 was not greater than that which confronts the American people in 1897. The rights which were threatened then were not more sacred and valuable than those which are in jeopardy to-day. The Declaration of Independence asserts those rights, but it does not secure them against invasion, even in the very name of liberty.

As Independence day is celebrated, then, let it be with an appreciation of the blessing of individual independence—individual freedom from all despotic control, and a lively sense of the perils by which that independence is now threatened. Let it be remembered that religious apostosy [*sic*.], which has become a feature and sign of the the [*sic*.] times, will breed despotism in government to-day as surely as it did in the past; that already this evil work is far advanced, as seen in an ever-widening stream of religious legislation. And may there be many who, with these facts and reflections in mind, shall

gather from the day new inspiration and zeal to do faithful duty as sentinels around the camp of freedom.

EVERY religion except the religion taught by Jesus Christ, is a despotism. There is no despotism in the gospel invitation.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 26, p. 405.

[405]

ATJ

OUR forefathers repudiated the principle of taxation without representation; they refused to be taxed in money to support a government. A Sunday law is a tax of one day in every seven to support a religion—and not the Christian religion either. Let us repudiate the tax and declare our independence.

"God's Service Not Compulsory" American Sentinel 12, 26, p. 405.

[405]

ATJ

A LETTER from Ticonderoga, N. Y., dated June 24, takes exception to a recent utterance in the SENTINEL, as follows:—

> "*Dear Sir:* In the SENTINEL of this date and under the heading 'Compulsory, Yet Free!' you say that the divine command of Sabbath observance is not compulsory; at least you say that we are granted liberty in the matter by the Lord. Now I would like very much to have you show by the Bible where we are granted this liberty.
>
> "The Sabbath observance is a divine command and not a divine permission.
>
> "You might as well say that man has his liberty in regard to any of the commandments.
>
> "WM. H. BROWNE."

We reply that every person is at liberty to disregard the fourth commandment and every other precept of the Decalogue, just as

he is at liberty to disregard the laws of health, which are no less truly God's laws. In the end, of course, if he turns not from his disobedience, the consequence will be death; but he has perfect liberty meanwhile to obey or disobey, just as he may choose. And this is just as God has ordained that it should be.

"Choose ye this day," says the Scripture,—"*Choose* ye this day whom ye will serve." "To-day, if ye will heart His voice, harden not your hearts." "Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." In every word and by every act, Jesus Christ invited sinners to turn from their sins and find life in him: but he never sought to compel anybody. And in his life as the man of Nazareth Jesus was a perfect revelation of his Father. He again and again expressly stated that he did nothing of himself, but that his Father who dwelt in him, did that which was manifested in his life. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." Every invitation which Christ uttered, was from his Father. The Father would no more compel men to do anything, than would Christ.

And the reason of this is plain. "God is love," and only love satisfies love. A forced service could not be acceptable to God; it is not even acceptable to one like ourselves. No father who was worthy the name would be satisfied to know that his children obeyed him because they were forced to do so. We recognize the service of love as the noblest, highest and best service; and can God be satisfied with anything short of the best? Will we dare offer Him anything but the best? Will we offer Him forced obedience, in place of the obedience of love?

Such a thing would be but a mockery in the sight of God, if not in our own sight. The whole purpose of God, as embraced in the plan of salvation, is to reveal Himself to mankind so that man shall be drawn and bound to Him by the cords of love. And therefore it is absolutely necessary that every one should be given perfect liberty to choose whether he will serve God or not. For the service must be of love to be acceptable, and love cannot be anything else than free choice.

And therefore any law of man which presumes to compel men to keep God's commandments, is anti-Christian,—contrary to the gospel and against every interest of God and man. This is the real character of every human sabbath law.

God sets before all men life and death. The ten commandments are the way of life, and God wants every man to walk in that way. But He cannot compel any one to keep them; for only through love can they be kept at all. And love is always an expression of free will.

July 7, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 417.

[417]

ATJ

JUSTICE is above statute.

IT is the business of legislators and courts to discover law, not to make it.

THERE is slavery in every other pathway than that of the law of God.

BEING a stickler for “the law” proves nothing more than that the man may be a good Pharisee.

GOD does not care anything about governments, but He does care a great deal about men.

IT is the business of the law to protect society; of the gospel, to reform the criminal. There is no reforming power in a statute.

THERE are a great many creeds and denominations in the world, but—from a moral standpoint—only two classes of people; namely, those who believe on Jesus Christ unto salvation, and those who believe not. From God’s standpoint, this is the only different there can be between any two individuals on earth.

IT was because of envy that Cain murdered Abel, and this evil sentiment has been the actuating motive in every case of religious persecution from Cain’s time to our own. The wicked envy the happy estate of the just, which is theirs by virtue of “righteousness, and joy, and peace in the Holy Ghost.”

“IN order that every man may enjoy the religious Sunday,” said the Rev. Mr. Reed, of Haverhill, Mass., in a recent discourse, “every man must observe the civil Sunday.” Was it then an oversight on the part of the Creator that in his Sabbath commandment he makes no

allusion to a civil sabbath, or provision for its observance? Sunday observance, to be sure, is not commanded by the Creator, but if it were, could not one person observe it independently of the actions of some other persons? Is our obedience to God dependent upon the uncertainty of the obedience of others around us? We think not.

"Christian Profession and Anti-Christian Practice" American Sentinel 12, 28, pp. 417, 418.

[417]

ATJ

IN the United States there are multitudes of people who profess to be Christians.

The vast majority of this multitude are diligently endeavoring to secure legislation enforcing their religious views upon all the people.

They desire and require that religion shall dominate politics, shape the laws, and control the State: they want a union of religion and the State.

In truth they want a religious State; an earthly, political, kingdom of God; with "Christ reigning as King on Capitol Hill" and throughout the nation, through themselves as his representatives.

All this is seriously proposed by people who seriously profess to be Christians.

What, then, is it to be a Christian? What is Christianity anyhow?

In the Scriptures it is written that Christ left us "an example that we should follow his steps;" and that "He that saith that he keepeth His commandments ought himself also so to walk even as He walked."

[418] It is Christianity to follow His steps alone, to walk only as he walked. For again it is written, "As my Father sent me, even so send I you;" "As he is, so are we in this world;" and we are "in Christ's stead."

What steps, then, did Christ take toward the domination of the politics of his day? What steps did he ever take to gain control of the government, or to dictate in the affairs of the State?—Just none at all. Everybody knows that he never in any way gave the slightest indication of any such thing.

This, too, in spite of many solicitations of different kinds. He was not only more than once openly invited to do do [*sic*.]; but it

was the longing expectation of the whole people to whom he came. So strongly was this implanted that they were willing to take him by force and set him at the head of the government.

Yet never by a word, a look, or any sign whatever, would he countenance any such thing. On the contrary he openly repudiated every suggestion of the kind; and withdrew himself from the people who were bent on having it so, and went away by himself alone and prayed for the people that they might have better views of himself and of his mission to the world.

Was this because politics was so pure, laws so just, and government so altogether correct, that there was no call for any readjustment, no room for any reforms? Was there at that time no need of careful watching to see that none but good men should hold office?

Were such as these the reasons why Christ had nothing to do with politics, nor with affairs of government in any way? Not by any manner of means. Corruption in politics and in office was never more rife than at that very time, and in Judea. Then as it was altogether from choice, and not at all from lack of necessity or opportunity that Jesus had nothing whatever to do with politics nor any of the affairs of the government, wherein do the churches, leagues and societies of the United States to-day follow his steps in their persistent intermeddling in these very things? And when they do not walk as he walked, wherein are they Christians?

It was his steady refusal to countenance the political aspirations of the people, which, more than anything else, caused the scribes, the Pharisees, the lawyers, the priests, and the Herodians, to reject and persecute him. These were the church-leaders of that time, and correspond to the sects, leagues, unions, and Endeavor societies of the present day.

It was to the Pharisees with the Herodians that he announced the everlasting principle of the separation of religion and the State, in the words, “Render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar’s, and unto God the things which are God’s.” And when the whole combination together had made against him the false charge that he would make himself a king, he answered them and all other combinations for all time, “My kingdom is not of this world:” “My kingdom is not from hence.”

Such was ever his word and his attitude. Such has been his will concerning his church, from the foundation of the world. He is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever;" and it was impossible that, when he came into the world, he should walk contrary to all the instructions that he himself had given before he came into the world.

And now to all the church combinations, leagues, unions, and endeavor societies, that are afflicting the politics, shaping the laws, and directing the government of the country, he pointedly exclaims, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

Why do you call him Lord, and then do your own will? Why do you profess to hold his Word in reverence, and then utterly disregard that which from beginning to end is one of the great vital principles of that Word? Why do you bear the name of Christ, while in this great matter you walk directly opposite to the way in which he walked?

Since the Bible, from beginning to end, treats so fully and so plainly on this subject; and since all history speaks with one continuous voice, warning all men of the essential evils that follow in the train of every step that is taken to unite religion and the State; it is difficult to understand how anybody who professes to have any respect for the Bible, or has knowledge of the A B C of history, and cares at all for mankind, can for one moment countenance any suggestion of a connection between the pulpit and politics, between church and civil government, between religion and the State.

Yet the ones who profess to be the only true believers of the Bible, and the ones who profess to be the best qualified to gather the true lessons of history—these are the very ones who are most diligently engaged in forcing upon this nation the evils of a union of religion and the State, of church and government, of the pulpit and politics.

Surely nothing can explain this contradiction between profession and practice, but worldly ambition that can never learn anything, and religious bigotry that is never content without power.

Yet though this may explain the contradiction between profession and practice on the part of those who are seeking to afflict the nation with this great evil; what suggestion can possibly be made in explanation of the indifference and unconcern on the part of the rest of the people? How is it that they can view with a listlessness almost

absolute the steady grasping growth of this power that is determined to bring the whole nation under the curse of a religious despotism after the very image of that of the Dark Ages itself?

"Liberty and Law" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 419.

[419]

ATJ

LIBERTY and law are not, as very many people think, two things set over against each other, and requiring to be properly balanced to secure a successful and happy existence. People who hold to this idea show thereby that they have no true conception of either the one or the other.

God is the author of liberty; he is also the author of law. He has not made two things which antagonize each other. In the truly Christian life, liberty and law meet and dwell in perfect harmony. They lead the individual in one and the same path.

Law is opposed to license; but license is not liberty, it is a form of despotism. Individuals who commit acts of license are the slaves of their vices and passions. He who is not such a slave has no desire to do an act which the order and peace of society, or the good of any of his fellows, demands should be forbidden. In his life is manifested "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." And "against such there is no law."

The pathway of perfect liberty coincides with the pathway of perfect law. Perfect liberty is the liberty of the divine life, and the divine law is an expression of the principles one life. The Christian life is the life that is actuated by these principles. The Christian life moves in the pathway of the perfect law, and finds only perfect liberty.

The law of God is the "law of liberty." James 2:8, 12. It is because of this that the Christian finds in it his delight. "O how love I Thy law!" is the testimony; "How sweet are they words unto my taste! yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth." Psalm 119:97, 103. "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More are they to be desired than gold,—yea, than much fine fold; sweeter also than honey and the honey comb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned; and in keeping of them there is great reward." Psalm 19:9, 10. He sees in God's law, as does every one who

becomes acquainted with it, the pathway of everlasting life, and of "the glorious liberty of the sons of God."

Man's law is for the restraint of evil doers, that there may be peace and order in society, without which men could not engage successfully in the pursuits of life. In pursuance of the purpose of that law, the transgressor, when caught, is forcibly deprived of his liberty. Either by incarceration, or by other penalties, restraint is put upon the evil-minded person so that he is forcibly kept with the pathway of civility. The law of man take no account of the individual further than this.

We are apt to form our conceptions of God's law from what we know of law as made and executed on this earth. It is natural and easy to do so, especially as the law of man often professes to re-enact or enforce the law of God. But all this is an egregious error. In character and purpose, the two are altogether distinct. They are different also in their methods of operation.

The law of man deals with the outward acts. It operates upon the individual only from without. God's law, on the other hand, deals with the secret thoughts and motives of the heart. It operates upon the individual from within. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Psalm 19:7. It leads the individual not only to conduct himself civilly, but to do that which is right in all things, because such is the desire of his heart. Having that law in his heart, he has a supreme love for the right.

The law of God therefore could not be made effective thought the restraints employed by the law of man. The former leads man into perfect liberty; the latter lead him into less liberty than he already enjoys. To try to make the law of God effective through depriving a man of his liberty is to endeavor to make it operate in precisely the opposite manner from that to which it is ordained by its Author.

This is the trouble with all sabbath laws, and all other forms of religious legislation. They are contrary to the divine law in the employment of coercion to secure obedience, if in nothing else. They would compel men to offer a forced tribute to his Maker, which would only be an insult to Him. He who has the law of God in his heart has perfect liberty, and in this perfect liberty offers to God a tribute of love; and this is acceptable and well-pleasing to Him.

"God is love;" and his law is a law of love,—the love of that which is holy and pure and just. But we can attain to this only in Christ. Only in Christ can the law of God get into our hearts at all. And Christianity is the manifestation of the power and wisdom of God in putting Christ into the heart of a man for his salvation. By this the individual knows the perfect liberty, love and righteousness of Christ's own life; for of such an one it is written, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Galatians 2:20.

The life of Christ is everlasting, and it is retained by faith. By faith, not by force, the law of God is made the rule of life; and faith is not of force, but of the free will of the believer. The fountain head of the Christian life is liberty, and the stream is liberty, through all its flow.

And thus it is seen that the law of God is but a delineation of the pathway of perfect liberty, which those enjoy who by faith have Christ in their hearts.

THERE are two laws in the spiritual world,—the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," and the "law of sin and death." The one means liberty, the other slavery.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 419.

[419]

ATJ

THERE are two laws in the spiritual world,—the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," and the "law of sin and death." The one means liberty, the other slavery.

"Not Pessimistic" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 420.

[420]

ATJ

CHRISTIANITY is not pessimistic; it is the most optimistic of anything on earth. While it says that "in the last days perilous times shall come", and that evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived, and that there shall be oppression and persecution of all who "will live godly in Christ Jesus," it also points with equal and even greater emphasis to the approaching end of all the evils which fill the earth with mourning,

and the establishment of the glorious and eternal kingdom of righteousness and peace. And to every individual, whatever may be his circumstances and into whatever evils he may have fallen, it brings peace and happiness now, and an assurance of eternal joy in the kingdom of God. "The mourning cometh," is its welcome word to the waiting believer; therefore "look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh".

The Christian religion is the sovereign remedy for "hard times", or for any trouble by which an individual may be afflicted, whether within or without. The SENTINEL would have every one whom it can reach accept and put in practice the principles of Christianity. These represent the highest optimism of which the mind can conceive.

"The Right of Private Judgment" American Sentinel 12, 28, pp. 421, 422.

[421]

ATJ

It is a favorite argument urged by Rome against the doctrines of Protestantism that Protestants adhere to the right of private judgment in the study of spiritual truth, and that this principle has caused the many divisions which exist to-day in the Protestant ranks. Rome points to these divisions, in contrast with the unity which pervades the ranks of her own adherents, as an evidence that Protestantism represents a departure from the truth and Church of God.

In this argument there is an appearance of truth, but no reality. As a matter of fact Protestantism does not lay claim to any "right of private judgment," and it is only Protestantism which rescues an individual from the fatal fruits of this error.

The whole papal system of doctrines represents the fruits of private judgment. This judgment has been set forth before the church and the world in various forms. In one case it is the "bull" of a pope, in another the decree of a church council, in another the pronouncement of some other church "authority"; but always it is a human judgment, an emanation from a fallible and sinful source. It is the fruit of an excercise [*sic*.] of private judgment.

Protestantism leads men away from the fallible human teach, to that Teacher which is infallible and divine—the Holy Spirit. Protes-

tantism does not for a moment claim that any individual ought to attempt to apprehend divine truth by the exercise of his own judgment. And it just as strenuously opposes his reception of any doctrine as spiritual truth by the exercise of any other person's judgment; while the papacy teaches that it is all right to receive doctrine and hang upon it the eternal destinies of the soul, provided that doctrine be the pronouncement of a fallible mortal called the pope, or of a collection of fallible mortals sitting in the capacity of a church council.

But the pope, it is said, when speaking "ex cathedra," is infallible. Who said so? Who proclaimed him to be infallible? The cardinals did so, at that memorable conclave which was assembled at Rome in 1870. But is a cardinal infallible? Were any of the cardinals of that conclave, or all of them together, infallible? And if not, was their pronouncement infallible? Out of fallibility, comes infallibility—out of the impure fountain, a pure stream! Strange phenomenon, unknown elsewhere in all the world of cause and effect!

Protestantism proclaims the Holy Spirit as the divine Teacher and Guide into all spiritual truth. It does this upon the authority of the word of God. For of the Spirit it is written: "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." John 16:13. And also: "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God" (1 Corinthians 2:10), and "God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." *Ib*. Therefore we are counseled, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." James 1:5. The true Protestant goes to the Word of God for wisdom in spiritual things, and with humility and faith asks God to enlighten his understanding. And the promise of Him who cannot lie is that it shall be done.

This is not exercising his own private judgment,—far from it. He first learns from that Word that his own judgment counts for nothing in the apprehension of spiritual truths, because such truths must be spiritually discerned. He lays aside his own preconceived opinions, and opens his mind and heart to the illumination of the Holy Spirit; and that illumination is shed always upon the Word. The relation of the Spirit to the Word has been well likened to that of a locomotive to the rails upon which it runs. The Spirit speaks through the Word, and departs not from it. "He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak." John

16:13. He speaks not his own words, but the words of Christ. John 14:10. And all Scripture is the Word of Christ. 1 Peter 1:10, 11.

Instead of coming, then, to a fallible mortal like himself, for enlightenment in those truths which pertain to salvation, the true Protestant comes to God, who is in truth infallible, and views his Word under the illumination of the Holy Spirit, the divine Guide who cannot err. But why, then, it may be asked, are Protestants so divided in their views of scriptural truth? The answer is, that they have not taken the truly Protestant course, but have too nearly followed the principles of the papacy. They have held too much to the opinions of men, either their own opinions, or those of some others. Their very denominational names indicate this, as do the creeds upon which they stand. God's Word is true, and his promises are sure, whatever may be the short-comings of his professed followers. And as certain as that his Word is true, so certain is it that the Holy Spirit does guide into all truth those who humbly seeek [*sic*.] the Lord for enlightenment. How he does this, it is not our business to inquire; nor does it matter. But he does it, as certainly as that there is any spiritual truth to be known.

[422] The unity of the papacy, is the unity of blind submission to the spiritual guidance of a man. Christian unity is the unity of intelligent submission to the guidance of the Holy Spirit. In the former there is the exercise of human judgment, which is private judgment, on the part of him who "as God, sitteth in the temple of God", and of his counsellors; in the latter there is the enlightenment of the individual understanding by the illumination of the Holy Shirit [*sic*.] upon the infallible Word.

And in the latter, also, there is spiritual growth; and only by it can spiritual growth be realized. For one cannot grow spiritually on a papal Bull, a decree of a church council, or a church creed. In short, he cannot grow on the word of man, because there is no element of growth in it. In the creeds and decrees which men have fixed there is no room for growth. Nor is it ordained that the child of God shall experience a fitful and uncertain spiritual growth by hearing an occasional pronouncement upon spiritual things by priest or pastor. He is to grow daily, hourly, if he will; and this can be realized only through the instruction of the ever-present Spirit.

"The right of private judgment" as exercised in spiritual things, is a papal principle entirely; and the more Rome inveighs against it, the more she condemns herself and justifies the Protestant principle of becoming wise unto salvation through the Word of God and the guidance of the Spirit.

July 15, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 433.

[433]

ATJ

IN this day a person can believe almost anything except the Bible without being counted a heretic.

ABOUT the gloomiest outlook in the world is that for the ushering in of the kingdom of Christ through the gateway of politics.

A VERY poor way of making a man a good citizen is to teach him that he must educate his conscience by the laws of the State.

THE lowest conception of the character and dignity of the law of God, is that which teaches that its effectiveness depends upon its being reinforced by State enactments.

HE who insists that it is a Christian duty to vote, is not consistent if he fails to designate the party for which Christianity demands the vote should be cast. Is that party the Republican, or the Democratic party, or some other?

THE Christian patriot must be he who loves the Christian’s country. But that country is a heavenly country. Hebrews 11:14-16. The individual who says “my country” of any land on this earth, either does not mean what he says, or proclaims that he is not a Christian at all.

LIBERTY, like every other valuable possession, is lost by not being put into use. “From him that hath not [or does not use what he has] shall be taken away even that which he hath.” This is a law of nature. He who does not prize a thing sufficiently to use it for its intended purpose, does not deserve to have it.

“THE Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver; the Lord is our King; he will save us.” Isaiah 33:22. The Christian’s life is

ordered by laws which are righteous and eternal, and judgments which are infallible and irrevocable. The government of heaven is as superior to the governments of earth as God is superior to man.

"What Only Can Be the End?" American Sentinel 12, 28, pp. 433-435.

[433]

ATJ

THE forces which worked in Greece and Rome wrought steadily and only to ruin as their end.

Those same forces are steadily at work to-day among the nations, and to no other end than they wrought before.

The forces that wrought in Greece and Rome are the chief forces at work in the great nations to-day: they are deliberately chosen to be the chief and all-guiding forces for to-day.

All through Europe, and all over the United States, to-day, the leading and all controlling forces in education are Greek and Roman. And by compulsory-education laws it is sought to oblige all to surrender to these forces. But as originally these forces only ruined Greece and Rome, to compel people to surrender to these forces is only to compel them to the way of ruin.

Nor is it only the States schools that are so led; but private, denominational, and independent schools, academies, colleges, and universities, are all conducted after the same lead; so that Greek and Roman conceptions and ideals practically dominate the whole educational world of Europe and America to-day. Greek and Roman literature, ethics, philosophy, art, and mythology, are the supreme
[434] models, they are indeed the goal of all intel- [*sic*.] forces which have worked in Greece and Rome, are at work in our century; why should he say that to what end these forces are now working "we may not know"?

Why may we not know? Do we not know to what end these forces worked in Greece and Rome? There is no room for any possible question, that irretrievable and awful ruin was the only end to which these forces worked in Greece and Rome.

That being beyond all question, and it being also perfectly true that the same forces are now at work in society and nations, how

then can there be any possible question that to this same end and no other, these same forces are now working?

Human nature is the same now that it was in the former days: the same in Europe and America to-day that it was in Greece and Rome in ancient days. Human nature being the same, and the forces working being the same, the end can be nothing else than the same that it was before. The material being the same upon which the same forces act, only at different dates, the like causes must inevitably produce like results.

In view of the plain and well-known facts of the history that records the ruin of Greece and Rome as the clear result of the same forces that are at work in the nations to-day, surely it is a willful shutting of the eyes to palpable truth to say that we may not know to what end those forces are working to-day. It will not pay to shut the eyes, even to unwelcome truth, for the dubious honor of being reckoned "an optimist." No, no; let all open wide the eyes to the truth as it may be, and prepare to meet that which it portends, rather than for a moment to gloze it, and thus we and our fellow-men be unprepared for calamities which, though unwelcome, the truth shows must inevitably come.

However, while professor thinks that we may not know to what end these forces are working, he says that "God knows." Very good. *But* shall it be said that God knows that which involves all the interests of whole nations of people, and yet will not let any of those people know?! Shall it be said, and even though said shall it be believed, that "God hath forsaken the earth"? Has he abandoned the nations to blind fate? No: with absolute certainty every person may say, No.

This is certain by the indisputable fact that when these forces were working in Greece and Rome, God, knowing, did tell to all the people precisely to what end those forces were working. He did this then. And with him "there is no variableness neither shadow of turning": he is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." Therefore, being ever the same, and have told Greece and Rome to what end the forces in them were working, it is certain that he has told and will continue to tell the nations to-day what the end is to which these same forces are now working.

In ancient time God did by the scriptures of his prophets distinctly, and more than once, name the nation and kingdom of Greece. By the prophet Daniel, "in the third year of Cyrus," the Lord told how that the fourth king of Persia from Cyrus should stir up all his dominion "against the realm of Grecia."

He then also told how that the power of Grecia through her "first king" should overthrow and break in pieces the kingdom of Persia. And then how the dominion of Grecia would be "divided toward the four winds of heaven."

He told also that in the latter times of these divisions "when the transgressors are come to the full," another nation "of fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences should stand up," and "break in pieces all kingdoms;" and how that it itself, in turn, should be broken in pieces.

Such was the end to which worked the forces that were in Greece and Rome. God knew it, and told it to Greece and Rome. Such also is the end to which these same forces are now working; and God knows it, and also in the scriptures of the prophets tells it to the nations to-day.

Thus doubly it will not do to say "We may not know" what is the end to which these forces are working in our century. It will not do, because the lesson of the history is plain enough to cause any one to know; and it will not do, because the Lord has told it as certainly to the people to-day as he did to those anciently. To hold that "we may now know," is only to shut the eyes both to the plain lessons of the history and the plain instruction of the revelation of God given for the express purpose that we may certainly know.

It is very likely that the most eminent scholars of Greece in the days of Alexander, observed that "The same forces which have worked in Babylon and Persia are at work also in our day, but to what end we may not know—God knows." Yet they *might* have known, not only by the plain lessons of the history, but from the revelation of God.

It is likely also that the most eminent scholars of Rome in the days of Theodosius and the Valentinians, observed that "The same forces which have worked in Persia and Greece are at work also in our century; to what end we may not know—God knows."

Yet they ought to have known full well—both from all the history itself, and from the clear statements of the revelation of God. To say that they might now know, was but to shut their eyes to both sources of all-sufficient knowledge on the subject.

Truly all through the history of Assyria, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome, God did know to what end those forces were working, and he told all those nations just what that end was: and it was ruin only. He had this information written out for their instruction. But when, against this specific instruction, and ignoring the palpable lessons of the history, clear to every observer, the people of those times insisted that we may not know, and the ruin came upon them unawares and found them unprepared, that was their fault—their supreme, unmitigated fault.

It is true that the same forces which worked in Greece and Rome [435] are at work in our century. And to what end we *may* know, both because of the clear lessons of the history, and *because God knows*. These forces are working to the same end now that they worked before. God knew it before and told those nations. God knows it now, and has told, and will continue to tell, these nations. That end is ruin. If eminent scholars and other people will insist that we may not know, that is certainly their fault; for the information is abundant, both out of the Bible and in the Bible.

We sincerely admire and honor eminent scholarship. But we must be allowed to remark that it is not the most eminent mark of the most eminent scholarship to ignore or evade the plainest lessons in both history and Revelation, on a subject which most eminently and imminently concerns all the greatest nations of the century.

The same forces which have worked in Greece and Rome are at work in our century, and to what end we may certainly know. We may know it both because the lessons of the history are so plain that none need to mistake; and because God knows, and he has told.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 435.

[435]

ATJ

THE trouble with a great many churches, spiritually, was unwittingly stated the other day in a funeral discourse, when the minister said: "Fourteen years ago to-day, this corpse joined this church."

When accessions of that nature have been going on for some time, it is but natural that the church should seek to be galvanized into a semblance of life by the power of the State.

"What the Lord Wants" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 435.

[435]

ATJ

"I WANT to give my appetite to the Lord," said a victim of intemperance recently, who had come forward for prayers at the close of the service in one of the missions of New York City. He thought that if the Lord would take his appetite for strong drink, and give him a simple, unperverted appetite, it would be just what he needed.

"Why, my dear man," came the reply from one better instructed in divine truth, "the Lord doesn't want your appetite; he wants *you*."

This reply states a vital truth of the Christian religion. The Lord wants the individual himself; and when an individual gives himself to God, the Lord takes along with the individual everything bad there is about him; not because the Lord wants these things in themselves or has any possible use for them, but because He must take them in order to make the individual what He wants him to be.

The same truth bears with equal emphasis upon the question of giving the Government over to the Lord. The Government is very bad, say a large class of the church people to-day; it is godless, corrupt, perverted from the principles of right, and we must turn it over to the Lord, and have Him make it what it ought to be. When we have a government of God here, everything will be all right.

Subtle delusion! The Lord doesn't want the Government. He wants the individuals who are carrying on the Government. By the provisions of his grace he is reaching after each one of these to-day; and if they would but give themselves to him, the problem of government would disappear. All God wants is a chance to make each individual as good as it is in his divine power to make him. Then the problem of good government will take care of itself. Under such conditions there could not possibly be anything but good government.

First, last, and always, the Lord wants the individual; and the idea that the Lord is going to save men by reforming the Government

is a subtle scheme of the arch-enemy designed to cheat men out of the salvation of their souls.

"Politics and Prosperity" American Sentinel 12, 28, pp. 435, 436.

[435]

ATJ

THE non-appearance of that prosperity which was promised by the political party now in power is emphasized just now by the strike of some hundreds of thousands of miners in the middle States. Together they constitute a host which far outnumbers the combined United States army and States' militia; and should they become turbulent, very serious consequences would certainly ensue. It is hoped that the controversy may be settled by arbitration, the miners themselves being so confident of the justice of their cause that they have already expressed their approval of this method of settlement.

At this rate of prosperity, the question bids fair to arise whether the United States does not need a large standing army like those of Europe; not to ward off an invasion from without or to conquer some neighboring country, but to keep the peace within her own borders. While it is no doubt true, as has been often asserted, that the vast majority of the American people are lovers of peace and order, it must be admitted that a point is reached under the pressure of destitution where even the most peacefully inclined men will resort to violent measures for the relief of their suffering families. That the destitution of the striking miners is appalling, is admitted by all observers; and it is certainly no less true that the miners represent but a small part of the number whom the prevailing industrial conditions are driving to the point of desperation. Let the forces of discontent and despair be once called into action under one leadership and with a common purpose in view, and nothing short of the repressive power of a great standing army would suffice to prevent the horrors of revolution.

The doctrine that national prosperity depends upon the kind of politics by which the country is dominated, is a fallacy. The causes of prosperity and of "hard times" lie deeper down than the agitated surface of politics. Not the organizations, but the people themselves, as such, are the arbiters of national prosperity. As it

[436] lies with each individual to determine, by the exercise of individual virtues, the degree of his own prosperity in this life, so it lies with the people as a whole to determine their prosperity as a united body. But that which greatly darkens the outlook for prosperity is the fact that individualism as a guiding principle of life is fast losing its hold upon the minds of the people. They are being taught to depend not upon their own individual virtues, but upon the power of organizations, in which their own individuality must be submerged and lost. This can never bring permanent prosperity, for it is contrary to nature and to the institutions and purposes of the Creator.

In the present condition of things, such a regimé seems an absolute necessity, it is true. And it seems such from the popular point of view. What can one individual do against a thousand? But it is the purpose of God in the gospel to answer just this question, and to show to people that the individuality He has given to each need not be sacrificed to opposing numbers. He will join the individual to Himself, so that, in this alliance, it is impossible he should ever be outnumbered. "One shall chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight."

While the people are seeking to vote prosperity into existence by turning "the rascals" who "have not fulfilled their pledges" out of office, let it be remembered that the service of God—the exercise of those virtues which are conserved by the power of God in the individual life, through faith in Jesus Christ—assures to each person the enjoyment of a prosperity sufficient for every temporal need, and a certainty of success with respect to that which is the true purpose of existence amid the vicissitudes and inequalities of this life.

"The Protestant Pilgrimage to Rome" American Sentinel 12, 28, pp. 438, 439.

[438]

ATJ

THE Protestant world is on a pilgrimage to Rome,—not a pilgrimage by railway and steamship, but one no less real; though with this difference from the ordinary pilgrimage, that it contemplates no return voyage to the place whence it started. It is a spiritual pilgrimage; and the waymarks of the journey are to be noted in the changed aspects in which the travelers view the Word of the Lord.

Upon this point we give three quotations from Francis de Pressensé, a well-known member of the Protestant society of France, and a writer for several Paris journals:—

> "In old times a Protestant would take his Bible, and, reading it, or simply turning over its leaves, every word shone before his eyes as a divine Word. To-day, when he opens the sacred Book, he must begin by asking himself: "This part, is it really authentical? Is that Word so? Was it said by our Lord himself, or is it merely the conception of John that I read? Is it from an eye-witness, or is it not more likely a statement to be looked on as a compromise opinion between Hebrews and Christians of that remote period?"

Of the work of modern theology of which this "higher criticism" forms a part, M. de Pressensé says:—

"Modern Theology gives us a Bible of which the disintegrated parts would require, indeed, to be printed in various colors—according to the various times and different writers—and a Bible that *savants* alone, after innumerable efforts, will be able to read with discernment."

> "Modern theology gives a Christ impalpable,

[439]

> intangible, something like a crepuscular phantom, with neither divinity nor humanity, without historical reality in the past, without heavenly divinity in the present."

And all this is only a repetition, with some variation in form, of what was done in the first centuries by the so-called Christian church, and which led to the establishment of the papacy. In other words, it is but traveling over again the road by which the early Christian church went from Zion to Rome, where she became established upon the throne of the Cesars. Then, as now, the first step was taken in an attack upon the Word of God,—not openly, but by the setting up of a system of mystical interpretations, by which the Word was robbed of its meaning, and consequently of its life giving

power. This opened the way for the doctrine that the common people could not understand the Word anyway, but must depend upon the pronouncements of the church prelates, and finally of the bishop of Rome,—the pope. In this day "higher criticism" is doing the same thing, and modern theology is leading the seeker after truth to look upon the Word as a barren field for his own personal exploration, and to depend more and more upon the opinions and traditions of men.

"Notes" American Sentinel 12, 28, p. 439.

[439]

ATJ

"STAND fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free" is the admonition that comes to us from the Apostle Paul. Christ hath made us all free, but there are very many who do not know that they have been set at liberty, and refuse to accept their freedom. They are letting slip the greatest blessing it is possible for them to realize. Is it so with you?

July 22, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 29, p. 448.

[448]

ATJ

IN this day a person can believe almost anything except the Bible without being counted a heretic.

ABOUT the gloomiest outlook in the world is that for the ushering in of the kingdom of Christ through the gateway of politics.

A VERY poor way of making a man a good citizen is to teach him that he must educate his conscience by the laws of the State.

THE lowest conception of the character and dignity of the law of God, is that which teaches that its effectiveness depends upon its being reinforced by State enactments.

HE who insists that it is a Christian duty to vote, is not consistent if he fails to designate the party for which Christianity demands the vote should be cast. Is that party the Republican, or the Democratic party, or some other?

THE Christian patriot must be he who loves the Christian’s country. But that country is a heavenly country. Hebrews 11:14-16. The individual who says “my country” of any land on this earth, either does not mean what he says, or proclaims that he is not a Christian at all.

LIBERTY, like every other valuable possession, is lost by not being put into use. “From him that hath not [or does not use what he has] shall be taken away even that which he hath.” This is a law of nature. He who does not prize a thing sufficiently to use it for its intended purpose, does not deserve to have it.

“THE Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver; the Lord is our King; he will save us.” Isaiah 33:22. The Christian’s life is

ordered by laws which are righteous and eternal, and judgments which are infallible and irrevocable. The government of heaven is as superior to the governments of earth as God is superior to man.

"What Only Can Be the End?" American Sentinel 12, 29, pp. 448, 449.

[448]

ATJ

THE forces which worked in Greece and Rome wrought steadily and only to ruin as their end.

Those same forces are steadily at work to-day among the nations, and to no other end than they wrought before.

The forces that wrought in Greece and Rome are the chief forces at work in the great nations to-day: they are deliberately chosen to be the chief and all-guiding forces for to-day.

All through Europe, and all over the United States, to-day, the leading and all controlling forces in education are Greek and Roman. And by compulsory-education laws it is sought to oblige all to surrender to these forces. But as originally these forces only ruined Greece and Rome, to compel people to surrender to these forces is only to compel them to the way of ruin.

Nor is it only the States schools that are so led; but private, denominational, and independent schools, academies, colleges, and universities, are all conducted after the same lead; so that Greek and Roman conceptions and ideals practically dominate the whole educational world or Europe and America to-day. Greek and Roman literature, ethics, philosophy, art, and mythology, are the supreme
[450] models, they are indeed the goal of all intellectual effort of the students, throughout the whole educational system of our time.

But what did all this, in its veriest perfect, do for Greece and Rome?—It wrought only their ruin. It is not enough to say that all of it could not keep them back from ruin: it all only helped forward their ruin. What less can it do for people to-day? When through all the formative years of children and youth, they are caused to dwell intellectually in Greece and Rome among the Greeks and Romans of the "classic ages," what can they be expected to be, but Greeks and Romans all the rest of their lives?—just such Greeks and Romans too, as their models were. And being such Greeks and Romans as

their models were, how many generations can pass ere the nations of to-day will have reached the same end as did the Greece and Rome that are their models?

To-day, in the schools, children as young as twelve years, are put through daily drills in Greek and Roman mythology. They are required to read and study the wicked and even abominable conceptions in which the myth is involved. These things they are taught and are required under penalties to learn, when it would be difficult for them to learn anything worse if they were turned entirely loose among the professional liars, thieves, adulterers and murderers, in the very dives of the worst cities in the land. And in this sink of abominable conceptions they are kept until they graduate from college or university, especially when they take the classical course.

It is nowise different when the youth are induced to take up the study of what passes popularly for art. For the chief models are Greek and Roman; and Greek and Roman art was idolatry, and Greek and Roman idolatry was abomination of every sort. Their extolled philosophy and their boasted wisdom were after the same order. Their philosophy was a lie; their wisdom was foolishness.

Such being the great forces that wrought in Greece and Rome, how could such forces work to any other end than ruin? And such being the deep and leading forces which are working to-day, by every means that can be invented, how is it possible for such forces to work to any other end than ruin?

Seeing the inevitable tendency of such education, it is not strange that sober thinkers in both Europe and America should begin to call for something better in education. In view of the situation as it really is, it is proper enough that the question should have been raised, "Does College Education Educate?" One leading educator who is striving for better things very pertinently remarks:—

> "There is another and most important point at which the subject matter of an educational system touches the well-being not only of the student but of the nation at large: that is the ethical influence.
>
> "It cannot but be manifest to every thoughtful observer that one of the most discouraging signs of the

> times, is the want of honest thinking and practical common sense which is daily exhibited in high places and in low, in the rulers of nations, the dispensers of law, the managers of great enterprises, and so on down to the political "boss," or, if there be a lower level, the politics of the saloon.
>
> "Trickery and juggling with words in absolute disregard of facts; plausible expressions disguising well-known facts and the disposition to build upon inequitable technicalities in defiance of the most manifest principles of right and wrong, are the things which give daily support to the views of the anarchist who regards all law, order and government with hatred, and is pleased to see that representatives discredit themselves and bring daily distress and alarm to those who would fain believe in an advancing evolution of the human race and a millennium in even the far-distant future."

Yet surely it should not be thought strange that these things should appear in the lives of people where education has been largely in a literature of which the warp and woof is composed of just such things. People whose minds have been taking in just such stuff as this, through all their formative years, cannot well be expected to let out anything else in their after years.

If the nations desire anything better to appear in their characters than appeared in the characters of Greece and Rome, they will have to give their youth an education better than that of Greece and Rome, their minds will have to be fed with something vastly different from the foolishness, the chicanery and the abominations generally that are found in the classical literature of Greece and Rome.

"'Christian Citizenship' in France a Century Ago" American Sentinel 12, 29, pp. 450, 451.

[450]

ATJ

THE duties of Christians with respect to the State were clearly defined in the "Imperial Catechism," which was imposed upon the

church in France by the new empire which had been evolved from the Revolution. They were as follows:—

"*Ques*. What are the duties of Christians, in respect to the princes who govern them? and what, in particular, are our duties towards Napoleon and the First, our emperor?

"*Ans*. Christians owe to the princes who govern them, and we owe in particular to Napoleon the First, our emperor, love, respect, obedience, fidelity, military service, the taxes usual for the preservation and expenses of the empire and of his throne.... To honor and serve our emperor is, then, to honor and serve God himself.

"*Q*. Are there not special motives which ought more strongly to attach us to Napoleon the First, our emperor?

"*A*. Yes; for it is he whom God has raised up in difficult circumstances to reëstablish the public worship of the holy religion of our fathers, and to be its protector. He has brought back and preserved public order by his profound and active wisdom; he defends the State by his powerful arm; he has become the help of the Lord by the

[451]

consecration which he has received from the Sovereign Pontiff, the head of the universal church.

"*Q*. What ought we to think of those who should be wanting in their duty towards our emperor?

"*A*. According to the holy Apostle Paul, they would be resisting the order established by God himself; they would be rendering themselves worthy of eternal damnation."

This catechism was highly approved at the time by the papacy, whose legate in France recommended its use in all the dioceses.

The "Christian citizenship" of that day failed. What will be the result to-day? In that day it professed to be following the dictates of Scripture, as it does to-day. And it cannot be denied that the principle of being in subjection to "the powers that be" applied as well in France a hundred years ago as it does in America to-day. That Napoleon was a wicked man and a despot, has not bearing upon the principle. That kind of subjection of which the Apostle Paul wrote in the thirteenth of Romans, is as proper under one government as under another. It did not mean that Christianity should be in subjection to the State, or joined with the State. It did not mean that "every soul" has two masters, of which the State is one, in the sphere of morality. And what it did not mean then, it does not mean now.

Christian citizenship is heavenly citizenship. It is a high privilege, much higher than any earthly government can grant, which is extended to men by the King of the Universe. It is a birthright privilege, obtained by being "born again," of water and of the Spirit. It is the privilege only of the sons and daughters of God.

"The Maintenance of a Good Cause" American Sentinel 12, 29, p. 452.

[452]

ATJ

IT is a truth which is made prominent in the volume of inspiration that "man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." "The words that I speak unto you," said Jesus to the Jews, "They are spirit and they are life." John 6:63. And the exhortation is given by the apostle Peter, "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the Word, that ye may grow thereby." 1 Peter 2:2.

The cause of spiritual truth must be maintained by the Word. The cause which opposes spiritual error must be thus maintained. The Word furnishes life and the principle of growth; and without the Word, they will soon fail and come to naught.

No man can live on an experience. He cannot live upon his opposition to something else. Nor can any organization of men maintain itself in this way. The experiment has been tried many

times, and has always failed. Many a would-be Christian tries to live on an experience which he had when he first started in the service of God, or perhaps at some other special season. It seems to go very well for a short time, but he soon finds that the power of it is gone. To repeat over and over the statement of the blessings he enjoyed on that particular occasion, becomes monotonous. It soon palls upon his listeners, and upon himself. It fails to produce enthusiasm or to stir people to action. They must have something new, something fresh. This is a law of their natures.

Neither does opposition to error furnish the principle of life and growth. Of this we have an illustration in the work of the "A. P. A." This organization exists for the purpose of combatting [*sic*.] the papacy. It maintains a number of journals, which aim to arouse public opposition to Rome by crying out the evils which are charged against her. In every way, the effort is made to spread before the people the real or supposed wickedness by which the papacy is endangering American institutions and liberty. The same thing has been done by other organizations in the past; but they have each failed and gradually faded into oblivion. The cause for which they stood had no food upon which to maintain its life. There was no life principle in mere opposition; and hence, while for a time the cause seemed to flourish, it came ere long to an inevitable decline, which could only terminate in dissolution.

It is all very well, of course, to call attention to the evil of the principles and work of the papacy, and the danger which they threaten to the national interests. But to repeat this day after day, becomes at last monotonous. No matter how great or how real these evils and dangers may be, the continual shouting of them becomes first a familiar and then a tiresome sound. Of itself, it can only tend to produce indifference, even in the minds of those who have lent their support to the work. The enthusiasm of the movement declines, and only time is then necessary for its complete extinction.

What is lacking is the power of the divine Word. It is this alone that can cause growth in true and right principles. A bad cause can flourish upon the depravity that is inherent in human nature; but a good cause which stands in opposition to the movements of the world's agencies of evil, must be maintained by the power of divine truth. It is not looking at error, or crying out against it, that

strengthens the heart in opposition to it, but a growth in the principles of righteousness. And it is by the Word that this growth must be attained. The Word of the infinite One is itself infinite in depth and breadth, and the finite human mind can never exhaust its treasures of truth. There are always fresh revelations, new meanings and vistas of truth afforded by it to the inquiring mind; so that as one studies the Word, he becomes more and more built up and rooted and grounded in eternal principles of truth and righteousness, and become more and more antagonistic to error and injustice, in their forms.

All other forms of opposing evil than by the eternal Word, must certainly fail. Evil is not to be overcome by evil; the devil cannot be successfully fought with fire. We are directed to "overcome evil with good." It is the Word that makes us good, by faith in it; and by the Word must our goodness be retained, and ourselves nourished and strengthened in adherence to the right, and opposition to the wrong.

"A Mystery" American Sentinel 12, 29, pp. 452, 453.

[452]

ATJ

ONE of the apparent mysteries of the Christian profession is the fact that so many good people who claim to believe the Word of God should be seemingly blind to some of the plainest truths of revelation.

Here, for example, are hundreds of thousands of Christian young people who have pledged themselves to "strive to do whatsoever he [Christ] would have me do, and yet deliberately and continually disobey one of his plain commands. In support of this statement we will ask who ever read a command or law of any kind plainer in its meaning than the following:—

"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."

Most of the words used in this expression of the will of the Creator are common words of one syllable. The whole expression, in point of simplicity, would not be out of place in a child's "First Reader."

Yet her are multitudes of the most intelligent young people in the land who are seemingly most anxious to do "whatsoever He would have me do," who never observe the seventh day at all from one [453] year's end to another. It is a singular thing, to say the least.

They are careful not to worship other gods, to bow down to graven images, to swear, dishonor their parents, kill, commit adultery, steal, bear false witness, or covet; there is no question in their minds for a moment that all these are things which He would not "have me do." Yet the thing stated in the fourth precept—the very bosom—of this same law, is set aside as though it were a matter of no consequence.

Oh, well, it is said, in this one precept of the Decalogue there has been a change; and we, as Christians, now keep the Sabbath on the first day of the week, in honor of Christ, who on that day rose from the dead.

But was it not Christ who commanded the observance of the seventh day? and must not that therefore be one of the things which he would have all people do, as well now as then? Aside from the self-evident fact that a moral law must in the very nature of things express the will of Christ and be the same in all ages, it is plain that Christ himself spoke the law which commands rest upon the seventh day. For the first words of the speaker on that memorable occasion were, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." The deliverer from bondage is Jesus Christ. He it is who was divinely anointed to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." Isaiah 61:1. He it was who went before the host of Israel in a pillar of cloud and of fire; and they "drank of that spiritual Rock which followed [or went with, margin] them; and that Rock was Christ." 1 Corinthians 10:4.

Would you strive to do whatsoever the Lord Jesus Christ have you do? Then consider who it is that has brought you up out of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Or have you not yet been delivered from the bondage of Egypt? "Out of Egypt," it is written, "have I

called my son." If you are a son of God, you have come up out of that realm of spiritual darkness and bondage into the spiritual Canaan. You have left the company of the idolators, and have "come out from among them," that you might be separate unto the Lord, one of "a peculiar people," unlike the nations of the world. 2 Corinthians 6:17, 18. And He who has brought you out of Egypt and its bondage says to you, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.... The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."

Many, no doubt, fail to discern this plain truth concerning the will of God, because they are among the "wise and prudent." It is to the "babes" that truths are revealed which the "wise and prudent" fail to discern. Matthew 11:25. Human "wisdom" and "prudence" can darken the plainest language in which God's will was ever spoken. Pride of opinion is exceedingly strong. This was almost the last thing which the disciples of Christ were willing to surrender, and which darkened their minds to the comprehension of some of his plainest and most important utterances. See Mark 8:31, 32; 9:31, 32. If human wisdom, human teaching and traditions, were set aside, there would be no disagreement among people respecting the identity of the duty imposed by the fourth commandment.

"Personal to Our Readers" American Sentinel 12, 29, p. 456.

[456]

ATJ

WE wish a few earnest words with you. We are not given to sensationalism, but we want you to look at matters just as they are, and then help us to save what can be rescued from a sinking craft. The immortal Lincoln once said in the dark days of slavery, "These are bad times, and seem out of joint." This was true then, but it is doubly so now. Society is rotten to the core; politics is the very essence of corruption; murder and rapine stalk like giants through the land; the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer. Only a short time ago thirty thousand employés of the sweat shops of this city marched passed the SENTINEL office, having struck against the oppression and tyranny exercised over them, and now well nigh a quarter of a million coal miners of the country are arrayed against the greed and injustice of soulless corporations. An unrest has taken possession of the toiling masses that amounts to frenzy; their minds

are filled with dreams of rebellion bordering on anarchy. Statesmen look into the future with deep forebodings. Men's hearts are literally failing them for fear, and the anxious inquiry on all sides is, "Whall [*sic*.] shall the end be"?

The religious world is fast imbibing the idea that the solution for this intricate problem—the panacea for the gigantic evils that confront us, is to be found in a recognition of God by legal enactment as the ruler of the nation. The devil never invented a greater deception. But nevertheless plans are being laid, stakes set and lines drawn to accomplish this very thing.

Now, as never before, an opportunity is presented to tell the people what all these things mean, and the only avenue of escape from the inevitable ruin that will follow. This can be done in no better way than by inducing them to become readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. Will you help us to help the paper in their hands?

Now, for the purpose of introducing the SENTINEL more generally among those not now readers of it, we have determined to make the following unprecedented offer: Any such person can have the paper sent to his address until January 1st next, for only twenty-five cents. This is but little more than the cost of the white paper on which it is printed, and it is made in the hope that every member of the SENTINEL family will lay his plans to send us at least one new subscriber under this special offer, for it is our experience that these short-time subscribers invariably become regular readers. Here is an opportunity to do real missionary work in a worthy cause rarely offered.

Of the future of the SENTINEL, just a word. It will endeavor to keep fully abreast with the times, and keenly alive to its mission. It will deal fearlessly and faithfully with every question within its province. It has in contemplation several substantial improvements, among them being a department called "Religious Liberty for Young People," which can hardly fail to interest hundreds of our young people who have heretofore paid little attention to the subject.

Can we not count on our friends everywhere for a long pull, a strong pull and a pull altogether for at least five thousand new subscriptions by September 1st?

July 29, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 30, p. 465.

[465]

ATJ

FREEDOM, to be enjoyed, must be deserved.

THERE is no other foundation of national greatness than individual virtue.

> “NONE are more hopelessly enslaved than those who falsely believe they are free.”

ABOUT the only proof that many people can give that they are free, is that they are residents of what is called a “free country.”

CONGRESS, in combination with the sugar Trust, is just now affording the country some object lessons on the point of what may be expected of a “Christian nation.”

THE great gold mines just discovered in the Klondike region are as nothing in comparison with the gold mines the Trust magnates of the country have discovered in the pockets of the masses who are compelled to buy their commodities.

THERE are plenty of people in the world who are willing to “contend” for the faith, by argument or by the sword, and even to lay down their lives for it on the field of carnal strife. But it is living for the faith—living out the faith in its meekness and gentleness and longsuffering—that tests the character.

GREAT attention is being given in the religious world to some alleged sayings of Christ heretofore unknown, discovered among documents recently unearthed at Behneseh, Egypt. If people would only give as much attention to the authentic record of Christ’s sayings

which they have in the Bible, their time would be spent to better purpose. There is plenty of meaning yet in the familiar sayings of the Lord which remains to be discerned. It is just as well and perhaps better to discover new truth in an old saying, as to discover some new saying, especially when the authorship of the latter is involved in great uncertainty.

THE world lost freedom in the beginning by departing from the truth, by turning to paganism; and those who would regain that freedom must turn from paganism to the truth—the gospel.

"Pagan or Christian—Which?" American Sentinel 12, 30, pp. 465-467.

[465]

ATJ

IN view of the facts of the every-day history of Greece and Rome, it is strange that anybody would ever think of giving the professed wisdom of these nations any place whatever in any system of education.

Yet, however such a thing may be excused in an education that is altogether of this world, and whose goal is only this world—education by the State—it is impossible to justify it in education that makes any claim whatever to being Christian.

Greece and Rome were absolutely pagan. Their education, their ideals, their literature, were essentially pagan. And what place can paganism ever properly have in Christian education? Pagan text-books in a Christian school! Pagan standards in a Christian education! The things are positively contradictory.

Christianity and paganism are at the most extreme opposites. Christianity came from heaven: paganism came from beneath. Christianity is of God. Paganism is of the devil. To give pagan literature
[466] preference over Christian literature, is plainly to prefer paganism to Christianity. To give the pagan classics a more prominent place in any study than is given to the Bible, is certainly nothing else than to allow that the author of paganism is worthy to be believed and followed more than is the Author of Christianity.

In the Bible, God reveals himself as a teacher. "I am the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit." "Who teacheth like Him?" "Learn of me."

Shall it be for one moment allowed then, and of all people by those who profess to believe in the God of the Bible, that Socrates, or Plato, or Cicero, or any other pagan, or any other man, is a better teacher than God is?

In the Bible, God reveals himself as the Source of the highest and best, indeed of *all true*, wisdom. His word, the Bible, is the storehouse of this wisdom which he has given to the children of men.

Shall, then, the words of men, and of *such* men as were the authors of these classics, be given the preference over the word of God? Why should the words of these men, or of any other men, be given, or allowed, more prominence *in any line* of study, than is given to the word of God? and of all people by those who profess to believe the Bible to be the word of God?

Are the doubting queries of the proud ignorance of Socrates worthy of more consideration than are the certain truths of Him "that is perfect in knowledge"? Are the vain imaginings of Plato to be accepted and studied as philosophy in preference to the original ideas of Him who is very Wisdom itself? Shall the dark abominations of the mythology of Homer and Virgil and other Greek and Roman poets occupy the minds of the youth, rather than the pure glories of the heaven which has been opened to men through the moral perfection of Jesus Christ? What right to the name of *Christian* has any school, institution, or scheme of education, that does do the things here indicated?

Yet the truth is that that which professes to be Christian education, does do these very things all over this and other professedly Christian lands. One of the leading infidels of the United States was graduated from the theological department of a college which was "founded for the purpose of fitting young men for the ministry" of the gospel, and in which all the teachers had to be Christians. And of the instruction there given he has made the following extremely suggestive statement:—

> "It struck me as rather curious that in a Christian college the main drift of all its teachings was to pagan literature. Hardly any attention was given to the Bible except in a formal way. That which really interested the

> students and professors was Greek and Latin. Homer, Zenophon, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Livy, and Cesar, entirely superseded Moses, Abraham, David, Solomon, and even Jesus. The spirit of the college corriculum [*sic*.] was non-Christian writings."

In this statement, the students in nine tenths of the professed Christian, and even theological, institutions in our land will readily recognize their own experience. The result of such training cannot possibly be anything other than infidelity. True it may not in all cases be the positive, outspoken, and professed infidelity of the one from whom we have quoted the above passage. It may be the infidelity of the "higher criticism," of the "Ethical ... ture," of the "scientific," or of the "philosophical" school. Yet it will none the less be infidelity. It will be paganism as really as was that of the authors, in whose "learning" they have been trained.

It is a recognized fact that "first impression are most lasting." It is a law of the mind that first impressions shall be the most lasting. In the study of a strange language, the student enters a world as entirely new as was the real world when he first became conscious that he was in it. The first thoughts and impressions that he gets in that language will be the most lasting and will inevitably color all that ever come after. Let the first thoughts that a student ever obtains in Greek, be pagan thoughts, then let him being the study of the Bible in Greek, and the pure and exalted thoughts of the works of the Lord will be over-shadowed and darkened by the pagan notions that have already pre-occupied the mind. This is the whole secret of the "Higher Criticism," the so-called scientific study of the Bible. The first studies of these men in Greek, for instance, were in pagan Greek. All their thoughts in Greek were pagan thoughts. The whole mold and impress of their mind, in Greek, was pagan. Then when they come to read the Bible in Greek, instead of reading it with God's thoughts in it they read it with pagan thoughts only. Thus God's Greek was in their minds, dragged down and confused with the pagan Greek. And as they knew full well that the world has got far beyond the ideas of the Greeks, when God's Greek is confused with pagan Greek, it is easy enough for them to "see" that the world has also got "far beyond" the Bible. Thus as it is perfectly proper

and scientific to test pagan Greek by advanced views, and accept or reject its statements accordingly, so when God's Greek is confused with pagan Greek it is equally proper and "scientific" to test the statements of the Lord in the same way.

Thus once more, and by precisely the same means, it has come to pass that what the Greeks new is sought after as wisdom, while what God has said is considered foolishness. And what God has said is considered foolishness *just because* of the fact that what the Greeks produced is accepted as wisdom. And the same result is fast coming to pass, that came before—by this very "wisdom"—the world does not know God.

At the first, when Greek thought prevailed, "the world by wisdom knew not God." It was by means of that very Greek "wisdom" that the world was caused not to know God. This same result will surely follow to-day wherever Greek thought is allowed to prevail. And as it is indisputable that in the great mass of the educational institutions of the land—professed Christian as well as other—the whole educational system is corrupted with this same Greek and Roman "wisdom," the result can be nothing else than that the world [467] will again be caused not to know God: and the end of it must be only that which came to Greece and Rome.

The sum of it all is, that in anything and everything that makes any claim to bring Christian education, the word of God—the Bible—must be given the leading place in every line of study that may be proposed or undertaken. And any would-be teacher who is not prepared to give to the Bible just this place in every line of study, it not fit to teach in any Christian school. Such teaching only is truly scientific as well as truly right. Only such a school can be truly called a Christian school.

"The Power of Christianity" American Sentinel 12, 30, p. 467.

[467]

ATJ

THE Christian religion is simply a manifestation of the life of Christ. The Christian is "dead," and his life is "hid with Christ in God." Colossians 3:3. As expressed in the language of Paul in his letter to the Galatians, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Galatians 2:20. As "God

was in Christ," revealing himself to the world, and "reconciling the world unto himself," when Jesus walked through Judea, so Christ is in his followers, and thereby God is still manifest to the world in human flesh. Colossians 1:27.

This is the testimony which the world has that Christianity is true and that Jesus Christ exists to-day as the Saviour of fallen men. The world beholds him in the person of his true followers; and beholding him, they see also his Father, of whom he is the express image. John 14:9, 10.

Christ does not give to the world hearsay evidence concerning himself. He does not ask men to believe on him because it is recorded that over eighteen hundred years ago he lived as a man on the earth, teaching the kingdom of God and working miracles. He does not ask them to believe because some person says that all this is true. To the question, Is there a Christ, the Christian answers, Yes. And to the query, How do you know? he replied: Because he is living with me. And that answer would be accepted as primary evidence in any court of law.

The world may scoff at the doctrines and creeds of the churches. It may ridicule the statements of Scripture and appeal to history and to "reason" to prove that Christianity is all a myth. But when it meets Christ face to face, it finds evidence which it cannot gainsay. All its specious arguments fall to the ground, and it is obliged to confess that there is a "mystery of godliness"—God manifest in human flesh. It sees a life that it knows is not the life of the individual as he once was—a life which bears the unmistakable stamp of the divine.

The Christian knows that Jesus Christ lives, by the evidence of his own experience; for he has been crucified, buried, and raised to life again with Christ; and Christ living in him, the world has also visible evidence that Christianity is true, and that its Saviour is no myth. It matters not that but few of those who profess Christianity have been "born again,"—that the vast majority of nominal Christians give to the world no sign of the life of that divine One whose name they have taken. If in but one individual there is presented the mystery of God dwelling in human flesh, the claims of Christianity are proved. And now, as in all ages, there are a number scattered through all lands and among all races, through whom this testimony of a living Christ is given to the world.

This is the power of godliness which is to convince the world and draw men and women from it into the pathway of righteousness. If all the church were but in this condition, Christianity would sweep all countries like a mighty tidal wave. But when the church seeks for power from the State, as she is doing in all lands to-day, she denies before the world that Christ exists and justifies the world in its unbelief.

"The Christian Warfare" American Sentinel 12, 30, pp. 467, 468.

[467]

ATJ

FOR what does the Christian soldier fight? A Roman Catholic journal, *The Pilot* (Boston), answers the question thus:—

> "The Christian soldier fights for his country, sustained not by the hope of subsequent political rewards, nor even by the nobler expectation of the gratitude of posterity, but simply for the love of his country, and his conviction that it is his duty before God to lay down his life for her at need."

And this is about the idea which many Protestants hold on the same point. But it is not Bible doctrine. The very first thing Christianity requires of any person, under all circumstances, is that he lay down his life. He must be "dead," and his life "hid with Christ [468] in God." Colossians 3:3. "Subsequent political rewards" and the "gratitude of posterity" are ruled out altogether. And God never calls an individual to lay down his life for the sake of his country. He must lay it down because it is full of sin, and take in its place the life of Christ, which is all righteousness. "Whosoever will save his life," said Jesus, "the same shall lose it." The truly Christian soldier lets Christ live in him (Galatians 2:20), and by that life wages ceaseless warfare against all sin.

August 5, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 31, p. 481.

[481]

ATJ

THE service of God is not servitude.

THE preachers are not the successors of the prophets. Only prophets can be the successors of prophets.

ENFORCED idleness on Sunday might not be so bad if the law could force the devil to be idle too.

WILL someone who takes exception to the view that politics should be kept separate from religion, please send us a copy of the moral law—the decalogue—of politics?

THE commission of Christ to his disciples,—“Go ye therefore into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature,” does not mean, Go ye therefore into all the world and control the politics of every nation.

THE person who claims to be a worshiper of God, while obeying some other power than God, by that disobedience to God proclaims himself a worshiper of a false God. In others words, we worship the power which we obey in religious conduct.

THERE is a principle in human nature which demands a pope in the Church and a monarch in the State. The divine nature which God puts in the place of human nature, substitutes the government of God for both that of pope and monarch, in the heart.

IT is very surprising how small an amount of Scripture proof will suffice to convince a person of something he wants to believe; and what a large amount is required to convince him of a plain truth which he does not relish.

IF the Church has the power of God, the Omnipotent, with her, why should she seek for power from the State? What else can her plea for State and national legislation be but a confession that she has lost the power of God, by having withdrawn herself from him?

"The Bible Is Science" American Sentinel 12, 31, pp. 481-483.

[481]

ATJ

OF all the mistakes that men have made with reference to the Bible, one of the greatest is in thinking that it is not scientific.

The truth is that the Bible is the most scientific book in the world: the foundation of, and the guide to, all correct science that is known, or that can be known, in the world.

Our word *science*, is from the Latin word *scientia*, which signifies *knowledge*. The Latin *scientia* corresponds to the Greek word *gnosis*, which signifies knowledge. Accordingly *science* is simply knowledge.

But is not the Bible knowledge? The Bible comes to the world from God: everywhere its claim is "Thus saith the Lord;" "God spake;" "the word of the Lord," etc. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

And does not God know?—He does. Is not that knowledge which comes from God for the instruction of men?—It is. Then as science is only knowledge; and as the Bible is knowledge, it certainly follows that the Bible is science.

It is true that science signifies knowledge of more than a common order. The Latin *scientia* signifies "being skilled in knowledge,"
[482] knowledge of a high order; and the Greek *gnosis* signifies "higher knowledge," "deeper wisdom." But is not God's knowledge of a high order? Is not he skilled in knowledge? Is not his wisdom deep? There can be no higher knowledge than that of God. There can be no deeper wisdom than his. Therefore as science is higher knowledge: and as there can be no higher knowledge than that of God, it is certain that the knowledge of God is science, and that it is science of the highest kind. And as in the Bible the knowledge of

God is revealed: and as the knowledge of God is highest science, it is certainly true that in the Bible is the highest science.

It is written: "He that is perfect in knowledge is with thee." Science is knowledge. Perfect knowledge is perfect science. The knowledge of God being perfect, is perfect science. This knowledge of God is revealed in the Bible. It is therefore perfectly certain that *in* the Bible, and the Bible itself, is perfect science.

Another definition of science is given as: "Accumulated and established knowledge, which has been systematized and formulated with reference to the discovery of general truths, or the operation of general laws." The Bible meets this definition more fully and exactly than any other book in the world. The Bible is the knowledge of God. This, being perfect knowledge, is established knowledge; for He is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever," and with him "is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." In the Bible this knowledge is accumulated, "line upon line, and precept upon precept; line upon line and precept upon precept." In the Bible this perfect knowledge has been, and is, systematized and formulated with reference to the discovery of general truths, or the operation of general laws—in other words, *of principles*. According to this definition therefore, the Bible is strictly science.

Yet another statement, by a scientific writer, is that "All sciences are the products of the mind." Very good. But shall it be said that the Bible is not the product of mind? Of course it will not be claimed that *whatsoever* is the produce of mind is science. But shall it be claimed that the Bible is not sufficiently the product of mind to be worthy of recognition as science? or shall it be said that it is not the product of a mind that may be recognized as scientific? All of this must be said, all of it *is* said, when it is said that the Bible is not science, or is not scientific.

The Bible is the word of God. Words express thoughts. The word of God, then, is the expression of the thought of God. It is therefore inevitably the product of the divine mind. And how can it possibly be said that the product of the divine mind is not science? How can it be thought that the divine mind is of such a low order that it cannot properly be considered scientific? With any recognition of God at all, no such thing can be said or thought. As certainly as God shall be recognized at all, he must be recognized *as God*. And He

who created the mind, shall not He think? He who created minds whose product is expected to be accepted as science—shall not the product of His mind be accepted as science?

Science, then, being the product of mind; and the Bible being the product of the divine mind, it is certainly true that the Bible is not only science, but it is divine science. And when the Bible meets fully and fairly each definition of science, it is not scientific for any scientist or anybody else to say that the Bible is not science.

By all these considerations, and many more that can be given, therefore, it is perfectly plain that the phrase "Science and the Bible," that is so much used nowadays, is altogether invalid. It is unsound from the beginning and has not a particle of merit. It is one of those boastful, self-assertive, things that are set forth with great show of knowledge, but which, having no merit of their own, are obliged to beg their way. This one begins at begging everything. It is expected that by the sheer weight of its appearance of superior knowledge, every being will at once fall prostrate and humbly pray it to accept all that it is forced to beg. Instead of this, however, the brazen thing should have its mask plucked off, and be made to stand upon merit only. It must not be allowed to receive anything to which it cannot present strictly just and valid claim.

Now, this phrase, "Science and the Bible," asserts in itself, that the Bible is not science. To admit the correctness of the phrase, as it is asserted, is to allow that the Bible is not science. But why should the phrase be admitted? There is not a single definition of science that is not fully met by the Bible as science. Strictly and truly, yea *supremely*, the Bible is science. Why then, upon what principle of reason or propriety, should the phrase be admitted as valid when on its very face it denies that the Bible is science?

If any one wants to deny that the Bible is science, let him do it. But let him do it by presenting what seem to him considerations that show that it is not science, instead of flaunting a phrase that begs all that it is bound to show. This however cannot be done: the very word "science," itself is against it. Every accepted definition of the word is against it. The root idea of the word, the very nature of the word itself, will have to be obliterated, before it can be shown, or even fairly claimed, that the Bible is not science.

There is therefore no place for any such expression "Science and the Bible" or "The Bible and Science" because the Bible *is* science. As the Bible is science, what such expressions really say is, "Science and Science." This indeed might be well enough, if that were meant, but when the only thing intended is the begging suggestion that the Bible is not science, there can be no place for it in the world.

No; the Bible, being strictly and truly science, the only way in which there can ever be any contrast or "conflict" between science and the Bible, is between God and science and man's science, between divine science and human science, between perfect science and imperfect science. [483]

Between God's science and man's science, there may very easily be a contrast; but with any one who has any respect for God at all, can there ever be any question as to which justly belongs the preference or which shall have precedence?

Between divine science and human science there may indeed arise a "conflict;" but in the mind of any one who recognizes God at all and has any respect for him, can there ever be for a moment any question as to which shall surrender or give way? And when such a conflict does arise, and the human refuses to surrender, or give way, to the divine, but continues the conflict, what is that but to argue that the human is greater than the divine, and that therefore the divine must surrender and give way to the human?

But for the human to continue a conflict with the divine, and thus to argue that the human is greater than the divine, is simply for the human to supplant the divine, and itself set up claim for recognition as such, or else to claim that there is no divinity.

And this is the essential defect of the phrase "Science and the Bible": it argues that the Bible is not science, and in that it argues that the Bible is not the knowledge of God, that it is not the product of the divine mind—in short, it argues that the Bible is not of God. The phrase "Science and the Bible" is therefore infidel on its very face.

But the Bible is the knowledge of God. The Bible is a product of the divine mind. It is accumulated and established knowledge which has been systematized and formulated with reference to principles. It is therefore easily and emphatically science in every true sense of the word.

"Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." "I will never leave thee, nor forsake them." "He that is perfect in knowledge—[science]—is with thee." "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge [science]." "If thou criest after knowledge [science], and liftest up thy voice for understanding; if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures; then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge [science] of God." "In God, the Father, and in Christ, are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge"—all the treasures of philosophy and science. That is the everlasting truth. And let all the people say, Amen.

"The 'Civil Sabbath' 'Corpse'" American Sentinel 12, 31, pp. 483, 484.

[483]

ATJ

THE likening of the "civil sabbath" to a corpse, which would become offensive and demand burial, was a feature of one of the speeches made at the late Christian Endeavor convention in San Francisco. The occasion was a meeting of the "Sabbath Observance Committee" of the convention at the Central M. E. Church, July 9. The speaker—who represented Wisconsin in the sabbath observance department of the society—said:—

> "The holiness of the [rest] day is the soul of it. Without that it becomes a dead corpse, something that will fill the land with poison, and the land would be ready to bury the sabbath whenever the soul is taken from it. We must teach the workingmen of the land that in order to secure the rest part of the day they must keep it holy."

Now, as the "civil sabbath" does not pretend to be a holy day, but is simply a rest day or sabbath prescribed by the civil law, it is according to this speaker's language nothing else than a dead corpse, whose burial the land will demand unless it can have a soul put into it to give it life. But the law cannot put a soul into it; the law cannot impart holiness to a day or cause it to be kept holy. All that the law can do is to make the "corpse," which in itself is a menace to the whole land. Is this a proper thing for the law to do?

The words of this speaker are true. Holiness is the soul the Sabbath; and robbed of this quality it becomes worse than useless. [484] But what is to impart holiness to the "civil sabbath?" There will be vast multitudes of people all over the land observing the day because the law has commanded it, and not even pretending to keep it holy, because they do not care anything about religion. The great majority of the people here, as in other lands, are not Christians—do not, indeed, even belong to any church. And to each one of these the "civil" or soulless sabbath will be as a "dead corpse"—a "savor of death unto death." This must be so, unless in some way these multitudes shall be converted to Christianity so that they will keep the Sabbath holy. But where is the promise that such a miracle will be speedily—or even—accomplished?

Yet the churches are calling for Sunday laws—for a "civil sabbath"—as if this were the one great thing which the country needs. Do they think the country needs the polluting presence of a "dead corpse"? Do the rest of the people think so?

If not, then let us dispense with the "civil sabbath."

It should be remembered, too, that only God can make a day holy; and there is no proof that He ever hallowed the day set apart by the Sunday statutes.

August 12, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 32, p. 497.

[497]

ATJ

HE who does not understand his own rights, cannot be expected to know what are the rights of others, and in the natural course of events must develop into a despot.

THE government of God is the only government which guarantees every individual under it the full exercise of all his rights, and actually secures for him all that it guarantees.

THE basis of all successful government is love. When the American people cease to love the principles of liberty upon which this Government was founded, the latter must give place to a despotism.

WHERE in all history is there any record of a good civil government managed by the church, or conducted upon a religious basis? On the other hand, it is easy enough to point to some exceedingly bad governments which have been run by the Church, or have been established upon “Christianity.” The pagan governments controlled religion, and they were bad enough: but the papal governments, in which religion—and “Christianity” at that—was the controlling power, were infinitely worse.

This question is meant especially for the “Christian citizenship” and Christian Endeavor people.

A LULL in the battle for the maintenance of religious liberty, does not mean that the enemy is idle or has abandoned his purpose of overthrowing it. We may confidently look for him to return to the attack suddenly, and with greater power and determination than ever before.

"Salvation Is Science" American Sentinel 12, 32, pp. 497-499.

[497]

ATJ

THE one subject of the whole Bible, is *Salvation*. Whatever other subject may be touched upon or dealt with in the Bible, it is always subordinate to the great subject of salvation.

This fact does not stand in any way against the great truth that the Bible is science. Instead of this fact arguing for a moment that the Bible is *not* science, it argues forever that Salvation *is* science.

Instead of standing thus: The Bible treats solely of the subject of Salvation, therefore the Bible is not science; the true argument runs thus: The Bible is science; the Bible treats solely of Salvation; therefore Salvation is science.

Salvation is truly a science. It is more than *a* science, it is the chief of all sciences, the one most worthy of investigation. It is the science of sciences.

That Salvation is truly a science is plain from this consideration: With the *mind*, man explores the realm, and delves into the secrets, of all other sciences. Indeed "Physical Science" is defined by a scientist as "a product of *our thinking* as to external things." But

[498]

while it is with the mind that man deals with all other sciences. Salvation deals with the mind itself.

The first word in the call to Salvation is, "Repent," which is literally "change your mind." The first of all the commandments is this, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all ... thy mind." And it is written, "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind." "So then, with *the mind*, I myself serve the law of God."

As it is with the mind that man investigates all other sciences, while Salvation has to do with the mind itself, it is certain that Salvation is a science as truly as is any other. Shall the product of that which deals with all other things be science, and the product of *that which deals* with that which deals with all other things, be *not* science?—That will never do. Assuredly there can be no other right way than that. While the product of that which investigates all other things is science, much more the product of *that which investigates* that which investigates all other things is science.

This just conclusion demonstrates not only that Salvation is science, but that it is greater than all other sciences. Because since it

is with the mind that all other sciences are dealt with while Salvation deals with the mind itself, in the nature of things it follows that the science of salvation is greater than the others. Beyond all question that which deals only with the thing that deals with all other things, is greater than those other things.

That Salvation is science is further suggested by the fact that those who are well acquainted with all other sciences, are deeply interested in this. And that it is the greatest of all sciences is further shown by the fact that those who most thoroughly understand all other sciences, are more deeply interested in this than in all the others; and while they thoroughly understand all the others, they are so deeply interested in this *that they may* understand it.

The ones here referred to as thoroughly understanding all other sciences, are *the angels of God*. Surely no man who admits the existence of such intelligences, can fairly question that the angels do, more thoroughly than all other created persons, understand the recognized sciences. Those who traverse the stellar spaces as familiarly as the florist his flower paths—shall it be said that they do not understand astronomy? Those who gladly joined in the joyful anthem of all the sons of God when the morning stars sang together at the laying of the foundations of the earth—shall it be suggested that they do not understand Geology? Those bright minds which *saw* the origin of every other form of living creature—shall it be intimated that they do not understand Biology?

No, no! They thoroughly understand all these things. Each one of them understands *all* these sciences infinitely better than all men together ever understood any one science. Yet with this thorough knowledge of all the recognized sciences, the angels "*desire* to look into" the subject of Salvation. For unto the prophets "it was revealed that not unto themselves but unto us they did minister the things that are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; *which things* THE ANGELS DESIRE TO LOOK INTO."

The Greek word here rendered "desire" means "to set one's heart upon." And the Greek word here rendered "look into" means "to stoop to a thing in earnest, to look at it; to look at, with head bowed forward, and to look into with body bent; to look carefully into, to respect curiously—of one who would become acquainted with

something." It is the word used to tell them the disciple "was stooped down and looking into the sepulcher."

Such is the attitude of the angels of God toward the subject of Salvation. They desire to look into the subject of Salvation to become acquainted with it, that they may understand it and learn by it. For again it is written, "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: *to the intent* that now unto *the principalities* and *powers* IN HEAVENLY PLACES MIGHT BE KNOWN by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Now if the men who are acknowledged to be the best of all men acquainted with certain sciences, should keep their whole attention intently to the investigation of another subject and should continue that to the exclusion of everything else, that subject, even though it had never before been thought much of, would be instantly raised to the dignity of a science: and not only to the dignity of a science, but to the dignity of *the leading* science. The very fact that such eminent scientists should give such attention to a subject, would of itself be the best possible evidence that they considered that subject more worthy of their attention than the other sciences; and would be sufficient evidence that they considered that a greater science than the others. And if any should treat lightly, or scoff at, such work of such men they would be looked upon as persons of inferior caliber and sadly lacking in the "scientific spirit."

Very well; here are the angels of God, who are thoroughly acquainted with all others sciences, yet turn their whole attention intently upon the subject of Salvation and have continued to do so age after age. This is evidence enough that they consider salvation a greater science than all the others put together: the one science most worthy of their thought. This being so with the angels, is not this ample evidence that all who slight or scoff at Salvation, or who count it second to any or all other sciences, are greatly lacking in the *true* scientific spirit?

Yet further: All sciences are the products of mind. Salvation is of God. It is God himself who reveals, and works out, Salvation. It is the product of God's thinking. It is therefore divine science, the [499] science of God himself.

From this and the other considerations here presented, it follows that Salvation is not only science, but that the science of salvation is the highest, the deepest, and broadest science that is known not only in this world but throughout the whole universe.

"Sin and Crime" American Sentinel 12, 32, pp. 499, 500.

[499]

ATJ

THE minds of religious people are naturally shocked at any exhibition of what they regard as a sin; and under the influence of this shock they are prone to forget the important distinction that is to be maintained between sin and crime. A failure to observe or to respect this distinction leads to very serious results.

Religious people are shocked alike at exhibitions of both sin and crime. And there are some sins which occasion a greater shock to the sensibilities of such people than do many serious crimes. To the mind trained to revere the name of God, it is as shocking to hear the street urchin shouting profanity as it is to see him appropriating an article which does not belong to him. A mock celebration of the "Lord's Supper," by some persons who wished to make sport of it, would be quite as distressing a sight to Christian people as an exhibition of assault and battery. But would the one thing be therefore as properly a subject of legislation as the other?

It is very distressing to some good people to witness "Sabbath desecration." And it distresses them for precisely the same reason that a mockery of religion would distress them. On their way to church of a Sunday morning, it may be, they pass a group of boys indulging in a noisy game of baseball. On any other day nothing more would be seen in this than an exhibition of healthy, innocent sport; but being Sunday,—the day which they regard as the holy Sabbath—the sight gives them a painful shock, and they naturally feel that Sunday baseball ought to be suppressed by law.

Now it is for religious reasons that these good people are shocked at the sight of a Sunday ball game, and it is a fact that whatever is

wrong for religious reasons, is a sin. What these good people really ask, therefore, is that the civil law shall forbid a thing because it is a sin. But it is certainly true that while good people are greatly shocked at some sins, they are but little disturbed by others which are quite as bad. A sin is to be viewed in the light of righteousness,—not the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, but the righteousness of God. Is Sabbath desecration any worse in the sight of God than covetousness, or idolatry, or pride? Is the self-sufficient person who scorns the gospel offer of salvation, or the proud church member who refuses to humble himself as the Scriptures enjoin, less guilty in the sight of God,—in other words, less guilty as a sinner—than is the youth who desecrates the Sabbath? Is the one sin to be passed over while the other is punished?

From the Word of God it is plain that Sabbath-keeping is a spiritual matter, and that mere cessation of work on the Sabbath day does not satisfy the requirements of God's law. They who worship God acceptably must worship him in spirit and in truth; and the proud or covetous person, or any person who is not truly a Christian, cannot keep the Sabbath, and is just as guilty of Sabbath desecration in God's sight, even though he may go through all the forms of worship, as is the ball player who spends the Sabbath in recreation.

Considered as a sin, therefore, it is altogether inconsistent and improper to demand that Sunday baseball be suppressed by law. It must be dealt with, is at all, as a crime. But it is not a crime, because, considered apart from religion, it would not be condemned as wrong.

A wound to our sensibilities may be felt as keenly as wound a wound to our bodies, or even more so; but this fact cannot justify the civil law in undertaking to guard our sensibilities against injury. Our training and education in religion may have been faulty. The heathen is trained to reverence his idols, and would be greatly shocked at an application to them of the doctrines of Christianity. The devout Catholic might easily be shocked at the actions of the consistent Protestant; and the good Protestant who has looked with horror on a game of Sunday baseball, may, by changing his religious views so as to regard the seventh day as the Sabbath, arrive at a condition where he would pass an exhibition of Sunday ball without any shock whatever.

Very little intellectual progress has been made in the world without a shock to some person's ideas and sensibilities. To say that these ought to be protected by law, would be to disregard alike the lessons of history and the dictates of reason.

God deals with sin. He alone understands sin perfectly and is competent to deal with it justly and effectively. Crime is a different thing. The law of man cannot properly take any cognizance of the question whether a thing is right or wrong or not it is sinful; and must be left to another and higher authority than that of man. Crime must be based upon a different ground,—that of the right of every individual to liberty in the pursuit of whatever he may deem essential to his welfare. And the individual rights of all being equal, the rights of one cannot interfere with the rights of another. "To preserve these rights, governments are instituted among men;" and this alone is the province of the civil law.

"Christian Unity" American Sentinel 12, 32, pp. 500, 501.

[500]

ATJ

WHILE the religious world is busily devising and discussing plans for securing Christian unity, there is a ... Christian unity in the world to which all are led who receive and love the truth of God. The Apostle Paul has written that in Jesus Christ—who is the embodiment of divine truth—there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian nor civilized, male nor female. All earthly distinctions of race, class, or condition, are broken down, and nothing is left but "a man in Christ Jesus." And this makes its believers one.

This unity, we repeat, exists to-day, as it has since existed since the day when it was first exemplified in the Christian church. Let a man who holds the Christian faith—the glorious truth which has brought to him the salvation of God—meet with others of "like precious faith," and whether it be an African, a Turk, a Russian, or one of any other race or class, there is a greeting like that between old friends, though they may never have seen each other before. They are acquainted though they have never met, and all difference of circumstances between them is ignored and lost in the significance of their one common and mighty circumstance of having been created new in Christ Jesus.

This mighty truth fills all the horizon of vision in the Christian life, and leaves no room for denominational divisions. In Christ, there is neither Methodist nor Presbyterian, Catholic nor Protestant; but the old self with all its connections and titles is gone, and only Christ is left.

Let people of all sects find the truth, and they will find Christian unity. They will find the truth when they find Christ, for he is "the way, the *truth*, and the life." In the same prayer in which the Saviour prayed for the unity of his followers, he said, "Sanctify them through thy truth; Thy Word is truth." By the study of the Word, and faith in
[501] it, is Christian unity to be realized.

This is not the way in which this unity is being sought by the churches. It is being sought through a confederacy; not through love, but through force; and the result will be not *Christian* unity, but a union which will bring persecution to those who put their trust in the Lord of hosts alone.

"Not Based on the Law of God" American Sentinel 12, 32, pp. 502, 503.

[502]

ATJ

IT is a common idea that certain human laws are based upon the law of God. For example, it is frequently asserted that the common statute against "Sabbath desecration" is based upon the fourth commandment of the Decalogue. There is an assumption in this which is but little, if anything, short of blasphemy. Does man's law rise higher than the law of God? Is the divine law a mere underlying principle upon which man needs to rear the superstructure of thought and expression which will apply it to human affairs? To affirm such an idea would be to deny that God has the attributes of deity. No; the law of God is as high as heaven itself and cannot
[503] be made a basis of anything by finite man. Moreover, it is perfect, and therefore will allow of no additions. Human law cannot be based upon divine law. Human law can be based only upon those principles of justice which govern the relations of each man to his fellows. If it is not based upon this, it has no foundation in truth and right.

"No Conception of their Own Rights" American Sentinel 12, 32, pp. 503, 504.

[503]

ATJ

FROM a personal investigation conducted amongst the immigrants from some of the more despotic governments of Europe, it appears, says a writer in a New York daily, that these victims of oppression have, for the most part, become so confirmed in the soul slavery which was their lot in the Old World, that they are utterly ignorant of the fact, and cannot be made to grasp the idea, that they have personal rights, which both individuals and governments are bound to leave inviolate. Only their children, born and reared in this country, are capable of assimilating the knowledge that they have a birthright to liberty.

With such facts before us, it is not difficult to perceive the providence of Him by whom all men were created equal, in setting up this free Government for a beacon light of liberty to the oppressed in all the world. But is it not true to-day that this Government has so far departed from the plan of the Creator, that it is most frequently the case that these downtrodden victims of European despotism, meet on these shores the same injustice and oppression, in a slightly less degree, from which they sought to escape by crossing the seas? Without the promulgation of the doctrine of individual liberty made by our heroic forefathers who put forth and maintained the Declaration of Independence, and founded a great republic upon the American Constitution, what would have been to-day the condition of the masses of mankind, under the rule of the classes?

It is bad enough, certainly, as it is. But when this Government shall become—as it is fast becoming—a despotism like those of the Old World,—when Liberty is chained and dies in her own home—when the experiment of a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" proclaims itself a failure—a condition of things will be reached which only the coming of the Lord can relieve.

August 19, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 33, p. 513.

[513]

ATJ

IT is never the legitimate business of the State to use its power in an attempt to settle a religious controversy.

ALL religious legislation is an effort to compel the carnal mind to act like the spiritual mind; in other words, to do an impossibility.

RIGHTS are independent of citizenship. The foreigner who becomes a naturalized citizen of the United States, neither loses nor gains any natural rights by the process.

THE power of the State, exercised through the policeman’s club, may soften the head, but it never softens the heart. The gospel, on the other hand, works by softening the heart.

THERE is much more honor given to the Deity in writing his name with a capital initial, than in trying to compel people to act in conformity with the religious ideas of some person or sect.

A “GOVERNMENT of the people, by the people,” whether by the majority or a small part of the people, cannot be a government of God. Any attempt to make it such can be nothing else than an effort to exalt man into the place of God. God governs by spiritual agencies alone. His rule in the kingdoms of men is only that of “an *overruling* providence.”

“YOU are a good man; but we have a law, and the law must be obeyed.” If this is a valid ground now for sending an individual to jail for working on Sunday, why was it not a valid ground for putting to death Him who taught a religion contrary to the law of the Roman State in the days of Pontius Pilate?

ONE very important question now before the American people, whether they are aware of it or not, is that of whether there shall be set up in this Government a State or national "conscience." Such a thing, of course, could not exist in peace with the individual conscience, and the latter would be forced to surrender or involve its possessor in persecution. Every Sunday law sets up a State conscience in the matter of the observance of the Sabbath.

"God the Teacher In the Sciences" American Sentinel 12, 33, pp. 513-515.

[513]

ATJ

THE mistake that men make in thinking that the other sciences are not to be found in the Bible, is second only to the mistake that they make in thinking that the Bible itself is not scientific, and that Salvation is not science.

God is the Author of all true science, and to all who will have God for their teacher He will give knowledge of the other sciences as well as of the science of Salvation. He has done this before, and the fact is recorded that all may know that he will do it always for all who will have him for their teacher.

Solomon was but a youth—about eighteen—when he became king of Israel. Yet with God for his teacher, in a short time he became the greatest scientist that ever lived either in ancient or in modern times.

He knew thoroughly the whole range of Botany "from the cedar that is in Lebanon to thy hyssop that springeth out of the wall." HE knew just as thoroughly, zoölogy and ornithology and entomology and ichthyology. For he spoke not only of trees from the mighty cedar of Lebanon to the tiny hyssop, but "also of beasts, and birds,
[514] and creeping things, and fishes."

Solomon was better acquainted with all these sciences together than any other man has ever been acquainted with any one of them. Yet this was not the complete range of his scientific attainments: for he was just as well acquainted with meteorology and others as with any of the ones named. Nor did he hold this knowledge in any exclusive spirit. He taught it freely to the people: and to all people, too, for they came to him from all nations to hear his instruction

in science and philosophy. Thus a thousand years before Christ, hundreds of years before the so-called and boasted wise men of Greece had ever breathed, there was in Israel an understanding of science that has never been attained in any nation since.

Nor did this knowledge pass away with Solomon. Four hundred years afterward, when the first captives were taken from Jerusalem to Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar had a selection made of certain youth from among the Jews to be taught in the learning of the Chaldeans. These youth were selected upon both their mental and physical standing. They were chosen by a strict examination. The requirements, in the examination which they must pass, were that they should have "no blemish" but should be "well favored, and skillful in all wisdom and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability in them."

It is well known that at that time Babylon itself stood high in scientific attainment; and was qualified to conduct an examination in science. And it is a fact that there were found even among the youth of the Jews those who were able successfully to pass such an examination. The fact that the Jewish youth understood these things, demonstrates that the sciences were understood and taught in Israel: and shows that the scientific instruction established by Solomon had remained among the people of Israel and was still taught in their families and in their schools.

Among these Jewish youth selected to be taught in the Chaldean learning, were Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah. Daniel was about eighteen. At Babylon they were put under the Chaldean instructors to be taught. They remained in the Chaldean school three years. At the end of that time there was an examination held. The result was that of all who were in school, none were found as learned as these four youth.

Nor was it only the other students in the school that were surpassed in knowledge by these four. They outstripped all the men in the empire. For "in all matters of wisdom and understanding that the king inquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm."

No man can teach what he does not know. No man can teach ten times more than he knows. This testimony therefore shows that Daniel and his three brethren knew ten times more than did

the men who were over them as instructors. It must be borne in mind that Babylon is held even at this day, to have been then well versed in a number of the recognized sciences. All these things were certainly taught in that school where were these four young Jews. Yet when examination came these four were found to be ten times better versed in all these things than were all the professed wise men in all the realm, and that is certainly ten times better than were their own Chaldean teachers.

Well then, since no man can teach ten times more than he knows or understands, the question is, How did these youth learn what the examination demonstrated that they knew? Whence came to them this knowledge that was so far beyond that of all the wise ones of Babylon, including their own teachers?—Here is the answer: "As for these four children, *God gave them knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom*."

God was their teacher. This is why they learned so much more than all the teachers knew who were placed over them as instructors. God was Solomon's teacher, and this is why he too had understanding in philosophy and science beyond all that the rest of the world knew or that it has ever known since. These examples are sufficient to make it plain that God is a capable instructor in the recognized sciences as well as in religion. Yea, more than this: these examples make it perfectly plain that God is a better teacher in all true philosophy and in all true science, than is any man or all men together. This idea that true science can be taught without God, or that heathen infidels and atheists are better able to discover it than God is to teach it, is a most pernicious error.

These examples are given in Holy Writ to teach all men that God is as ready and willing to be their teacher in all these things as he was to be the teacher of Solomon and the four brethren in Babylon. God will teach people to-day as truly and as fully as he did those in that day. All that is needed is the faith and devotion in people to-day, such as was in those of that time. There is no respect of persons with God. God favored Solomon and Daniel and his brethren, no more than he is ready to favor every soul every day. Let men, youth and children, to-day choose God for their teacher in all things, as did Solomon and the four in Babylon, and they will find him to be to-day the all-efficient teacher that he was then in all philosophy

and all science—we say *not* "as well as in religion," because the religion, the Salvation of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, is both philosophy and science.

But people do not believe, even many professed Christians do not believe, that the religion of Christ is philosophy; they do not believe that the Salvation of God is science. They do not believe that even the recognized sciences are known to the Lord or that, if known to him, he cares to teach anything concerning them. They do not believe that the Bible is science, nor do they believe that the Bible knows anything of the recognized sciences. They do not believe that God will teach these things to men. Therefore they go to the heathen, to infidels and atheists, to learn all that and think that such men are wondrous wise, and that they themselves are wise, in [515] following the "science" of such teachers, that is without God, that leads away from God and from faith in his word, his wisdom and his power.

A good illustration of this is found in the fact that Harper's "Haydn's Dictionary of Dates," the standard work on the dates of important events, says that the sun dial was invented by Anaximander, who lived about 530 B.C., when there stands in the Bible that is in everybody's house the plain circumstantial mention of "the sun dial of Ahaz" which shows that the sun dial was in use in Jerusalem two hundred years before Anaximander ever breathed. Thus it is expected that the people shall give to Anaximander credit for the invention of a thing that the Bible shows was in daily use two hundred years before he lived. If that was indeed a thing so new in Greece that Anaximander could claim it as an original invention, then the belated science of the Greeks may sincerely be deplored. But as for us we must be pardoned for not believing that Anaximander was the original inventor of a thing that we know was in use two hundred years before he was born. There are in the Bible more interesting facts and truths than many people think.

Oh that those who profess to believe the Lord would believe him indeed! Oh that they would believe that he is what he is! Oh that with a whole heart they would choose him, for all that he is to the children of men, that they might find him to be the great, wise, and blessed teacher that he is to all who will choose him for their teacher

in all things. "Behold, God exalteth by his power: who teacheth like him?"

"Human Law Cannot Deal with Sin" American Sentinel 12, 33, p. 515.

[515]

ATJ

GOD'S law fixes the penalty for Sabbath desecration, and what right has any man or any government to change that penalty? "Sin is the transgression of the law"; and "the soul that sinneth, it shall die." Thus says the Word of God, and that Word is truth, and must stand. Nothing short of the death penalty for Sabbath desecration, therefore, can be just. No other penalty than this was inflicted for it, when God inflicted the penalty upon the transgressor. If the Government therefore is to deal with Sabbath desecration, it cannot properly prescribe anything else than the death penalty for every instance of transgression.

The Lord, however, makes a further provision for the transgressor. He provides that the sinner who repents and exercises faith in Jesus Christ, shall be pardoned. Can the State also make this provision? Can it say to the transgressor, Repent, and you shall be pardoned? That is a just provision, certainly, for it is made by the Lord himself. But the law of the State can contain no such provision, for it would amount to a total nullification of the law itself.

It is plain, therefore, that human law cannot undertake to enforce the law of God, or to deal with anything as a transgression against God. It cannot enforce morality or punish immorality. It can, properly, undertake only to restrain men from the commission of such deeds as interfere with people in the exercise of their natural right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Upon this ground the law prohibits stealing and murder, and not because these acts transgress the law of God or are of immoral character. The proper aim of human law is to provide all persons the opportunity, so far as human power can secure it, of enjoying the life which the Creator has given them, and the opportunities this life affords for the pursuit and realization of happiness, without molestation from their fellow-beings.

But this does not afford the law any just ground for undertaking to prohibit the desecration of the Sabbath.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 33, p. 515.

[515]

ATJ

THE doctrine that an individual is morally bound to obey every requirement of the Government as being an act of God, depends for support upon the idea that God and not man made the governments of the earth. To expose the folly and wickedness of this idea it is only necessary to ask if the United States Government and the Turkish government were made by one and the same being. What God makes, is perfect; but where is there a perfect government on the face of the earth? The imperfections of all human governments stamp them as the work of finite man.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 33, p. 515.

[515]

ATJ

THE doctrine that an individual is morally bound to obey every requirement of the Government as being an act of God, depends for support upon the idea that God and not man made the governments of the earth. To expose the folly and wickedness of this idea it is only necessary to ask if the United States Government and the Turkish government were made by one and the same being. What God makes, is perfect; but where is there a perfect government on the face of the earth? The imperfections of all human governments stamp them as the work of finite man.

HOW far short the best human government falls in practice, of the ideal set up in the theory upon which it is built, may be seen from the miscarriage of the principle of majority rule in our own country, as set forth in another column. When the United States [516] is spoken of as "this free Government," the speaker probably has in mind the theory of popular government, with the principles of liberty which it incorporates. In practice, there is very little room for the exercise of individual choice in the filling of public offices and the enactment of State and national laws. The choice in such matters lies with the political "boss" and his henchmen who control the party, and the man of wealth whose gold can support a campaign and purchase legislation. So that, however the pious citizen may aim to cast his vote for the glory of God, he finds himself obliged in

reality to follow the lead of some politician to whom very likely the words of Scripture would apply that "God is not in all his thoughts." In theory, the Government is "of the people, by the people, and for the people"; in practice, as seen to-day, it is "of the people" but not by or for them. This is not the fault of the theory; it does not argue any lack of wisdom on the part of those who made this an independent Government. It is only the natural selfishness of the unregenerate heart manifesting itself in popular government, through the opportunities which present-day conditions have put within its reach. Selfishness seems to have quite as full opportunity given it to do its baneful work under a popular government, as it has under a monarchy.

September 2, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 34, p. 529.

[529]

ATJ

THE State is political; Christianity is not and cannot be, political.

CHRISTIANITY knows but one creed, and that is, “I believe the word of the Lord.”

IT is not possible that “civil righteousness” should be either civil or righteous.

THE aim of the SENTINEL is to be intolerant of no man, and tolerant of no wrong principle.

THERE can never be any permanent national prosperity which does not go hand in hand with justice.

FROM a political point of view, there is no subject more important, or one less understood, than that of natural rights.

LOOKING towards the Christian’s country, the view is the same in all countries. Hence the Christian can feel as much at home in one part of the earth as in another.

THE man who asks people to believe that the first day, or any day, is as good as the seventh day which God sanctified, asks them to put no difference between a holy thing and that which is common.

Fashion in religion, like fashion in anything else, is of the devil. Religious legislation is always an effort to force people to follow the religious fashions of the times.

IN secular matters the minority can properly acquiesce in the decision of the majority; but in religious matters this cannot be. In religion no man can determine duty for his neighbor; the majority cannot decide for the minority. Hence a civil government cannot justly undertake to be religious.

"Science With the Bible, and Without the Bible" American Sentinel 12, 34, pp. 529, 530.

[529]

ATJ

SALVATION is the one great subject of the Bible.

Other things are referred to, and to some extent discussed in the Bible; but always in subordination to the one great and only *subject*, which is Salvation.

Salvation itself is science, and while this is treated in the Bible as the one great science—the science of sciences—yet other sciences are not ignored, but are often referred to.

It is true that in the Bible no science is considered without God; yet this is nothing against its being science. The idea of science without God is a vain and fallacious thing, infinitely more incongruous than the drama of Hamlet with Hamlet left out. It is a palpable contradiction, for how can there be true knowledge where the very Source of knowledge is ignored?

In all science without God, "There is a painful uncertainty, a constant searching and reaching for assurances that can be found only in God." In all the discussions of such science there is betrayed a conscious inability, sometimes acknowledged, to trace things back to the first great principle, to that which is fixed and final, and where the mind can rest in assured certainty.

In the Bible, however, that is, in science with God, there is none of this uncertainty. In that there is no feeling about for a standing place; there are no proffers of "a working hypothesis;" but

[530]

everything is placed at once upon God as the origin and ultimate of every phenomenon, the sure resting-place of the mind after every "last analysis."

In science without the Bible, that by which things are held together is Cohesion. But when it is asked, What is Cohesion? the only answer is "That by which things are held together." In science without the Bible, that by which all things are held up or held in place, is Gravitation. But when it is asked, "What is Gravitation?" the only answer is, "That by which all things are held up or held in place." But such answers as these are not answers at all: they are simply the saying of the same thing in another way.

Yet it is a fact that such is just the instruction that is given in the books, and such is the teaching that is given to students. But by it the mind of the student is caused to travel in a circle, and is left wandering there, ever inquiring and finding no certain or satisfactory answer. It is proper for a student to ask, "What holds, in their places, the worlds and all things?" And it is proper enough that the answer should be, "Gravitation." It is then proper for him to ask, "What is Gravitation?" But it is not in any sense proper to answer that, "Gravitation is that by which all things are held in their places." It is proper for the student to ask, "What is it that holds things together?" And it is proper enough that the answer should be, "Cohesion." It is then proper that he should ask, "What is Cohesion?" But it is not in any sense proper, nor is it at all sensible, to answer this question by saying that "Cohesion is what holds things together."

Yet that and such as that throughout the curriculum, is what is offered as science. It is science without God, science without the Bible; but it is not genuine science. By it, all that any person can ever know is merely something *about* things; he cannot know the reality of the things themselves.

In science with the Bible, it is altogether different. In that, when a child or a student asks, "What holds all things in their places?" he can be told that it is Gravitation. And when he asks, "What is Gravitation?" he can be answered, "God made the worlds by his Son, who, being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and *upholding all things by the word of his power*." Hebrews 1:1-3. Thus, gravitation is the power of God manifested in his word through Jesus Christ. When it is asked, "What holds all things together?" and it is answered, "Cohesion;" and when it is asked, "What is Cohesion?" the true answer is, "God hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, ... by whom all things were created, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers, all things were made by him and for him; and he is before all things and by him *all things consist*"—[hold together]. Thus Cohesion is the power of God manifested through Jesus Christ our Lord.

All things came neither by evolution, nor by the "nebular hypothesis," but by the word of God. For "by the word of the Lord were the heavens made and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth.

For he spake, and it was." And "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things that are seen were not made of things which do appear."

Gravitation was taught in the Bible more than twenty-three hundred years before it was discovered by Newton. That the air has weight and that dew is formed by distillation, was taught in the Bible more than twenty-five hundred years before science without the bible had "discovered" it. That there is a difference in the ... ance of the stars, and not simply a difference in their distance, was declared in the Bible more than fifteen hundred years before modern science had learned it. That there is healing in the sunshine was taught in the bible twenty-three hundred years ago, and medical science has only lately "discovered" it. The science of meteorology—the sources of the wind and the rain, the circulation of the waters and of the atmosphere—was revealed in the Bible more than twenty-five hundred years before science without the Bible had become at all acquainted with it.

The world of science and philosophy to-day is going farther and farther astray, "in wandering mazes lost," because of its persistent ignoring of God in the Bible. By such pretended knowledge and wisdom the world is just coming to the point where again it does not know God. And through the glamour of this so-called science and philosophy, even the professed Church of Christ is fast forgetting God.

He who believes the Bible and thus becomes so acquainted with God and the power of his word, that he knows and rests with perfect confidence in the knowledge that God possesses and has revealed in the Bible a philosophy and a science that is as far beyond any that this world ever knew, as heaven is higher than the earth, is counted as fairly beyond the pale of respectability. But all that makes no difference with the truth. And it is the everlasting truth that in the Bible there is more and better science, truer and more profound philosophy, than this world ever knew or ever can know without this book.

God is. He is the former of all things. He is the only true teacher. He is ever ready and is waiting to be the teacher of all. He will willingly teach all who will be taught by him. And to all such he will teach all knowledge and all wisdom, all science and all philosophy.

For in him are hid all the treasures of philosophy and science, and ye are complete in him who is the head of all principality and power.

"'Civil Righteousness' and Religious Prejudice" American Sentinel 12, 34, p. 533.

[533]

ATJ

THE Martinsburg, Pa., *Weekly Herald*, of August 12, makes this allusion to the recent arrest of W. H. Armstrong, in that State, for "Sunday desecration":—

> "The evil power of 'civil righteousness' and the religious prejudice of a lot of 'good' church people is in sad evidence at Washington, Pa. Rev. W. H. Armstrong, a devout minister of the church of the Seventh-day Adventists, was last week fined and imprisoned in the Washington county jail, for serving God according to the way he believes. His arrest was due to a number of 'zealous' church people, who charged him with 'Sunday desecration.' The first words of the justice of the peace before whom Rev. Armstrong was brought, were: 'There is a nest of Adventists in town that will have to be cleaned out.' Thus religious jealousy and prejudice was allowed to prejudge his case. Religious persecution and not the evidence, decided.
>
> "The same forces are organizing for an aggressive campaign against 'sabbath desecration' as they term it, in Redford County and similar persecutions are bound to follow. How rapidly the events are leading us up to a closer union of Church and State. Reader, if you are in favor of complete religious freedom, express your sentiments without fear of preacher or people, and help stay the tide that is trying to sweep away our civil and religious liberties."

"Religious Liberty" American Sentinel 12, 34, p. 541.

[541]

ATJ

Religious liberty is simply the liberty to worship or not to worship God, unmolested by the State, whose province it is to control men's actions by physical force.

Religious liberty, in its accepted sense, is an inherent right to every man, and is not transferable.

Every man is possessed of a will and the power to exercise it. In religious matters there is, in the economy of God, no such thing as compulsion. Every individual is left free to obey or not to obey, just as he sees fit. Christ himself declares, "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge [condemn] him not." John 12:47. One man may consider it his duty to obey the word of God, another may not so regard it. It is the right of all men to follow the dictates of conscience, no matter what their opinions on the subject may be, unmolested by police authority, so long as in its exercise they do not deprive anyone else of an equal right.

September 9, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 35, p. 545.

[545]

ATJ

ALL just legislation is not for the purpose of making men do right, but of compelling them to respect human rights.

IF God had intended that men should be compelled to do right, he would have made it impossible in the first place for them to do wrong.

STATUTES and decisions of courts that are not entitled to respect do more to produce anarchy than all the incendiary speeches that were ever uttered.

IT does not belong to man to say what is morally right. Only God can tell that, and he makes it clear to each individual by his Word and his Spirit.

A MAN-MADE sabbath law is a robbery upon both man and God. It robs man of his freedom of choice, and it robs God of the service which might be rendered to him through man’s free choice in Sabbath-keeping.

SIN cannot be separated from the individual sinner. A “corporation sin” is simply the sins of its individual members. A corporation, as such, cannot sin. If it could, it could repent, and be saved, as such; and we would have in heaven the spectacle of saved corporations,—a strange sight, indeed.

IT is impossible that Christians should let their light shine before men by a strict observance of Sunday, because in this there is no light. The world is getting to understand the subject well enough to know that there is no good Scriptural argument in favor of Sunday

as the Sabbath. Hence they can see in strict Sunday observance only an exhibition of fanaticism or hypocrisy.

WHETHER the Sabbath shall be preserved or lost, is not the question that is before the American people, or any people. The question is whether the soul shall be lost or not, and this is the question of whether an individual—any and every individual—shall believe on Jesus Christ for salvation. To the soul that thus believe, the Sabbath cannot be lost; and to the soul that does not believe, the Sabbath counts for nothing. Let ministers and religious workers therefore seek to have souls believe on Jesus Christ, and not to have the Sabbath "preserved" by legislation.

"The Science of Salvation" American Sentinel 12, 35, pp. 545, 546.

[545]

ATJ

THE angels of God are acquainted with all the natural sciences, yet they are more interested in the science of Salvation than in all the other sciences.

This testifies that in the estimation of the angels, the science of salvation transcends all other sciences, and is more worthy of their attention than are all the other sciences together.

The prophets were acquainted with natural science, yet the only use they ever made of this knowledge was to employ references to it as a means of making clearer to men the science of Salvation. This testifies that in their estimation the science of Salvation transcends all other sciences.

Solomon was a universal scientist. He knew more of all the sciences than any other scientist knew of any one of them. For twenty years he taught the sciences to the people. Yet, after all, he sums up all in the words, "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter; the sum of all that hath been said is, Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it

[546] be good or whether it be evil."

This, being the candid conclusion of the greatest scientist that ever lived, is worthy of respect as valid testimony to the fact that

the science of Salvation is more important than all other sciences together.

It must be borne in mind that the science that Solomon knew, was divine science; it was science learned under the teaching of the Lord himself. It must be borne in mind too that the prophets and all the other writers in the Bible, wrote only under the inspiration of God, they wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; then the fact that the Lord himself in writing for the instruction of men that which is most for their good and the best for them to know, put all the stress upon the subject of Salvation. Other sciences are glanced at, yet only for the purpose of making plainer to the understanding the subject of Salvation. This testifies that in the estimation of the Lord the science of Salvation is more important than all the other sciences; and all who believe in God can only acknowledge that it is so.

Why is this so? How is it that God gave to Solomon and to Daniel such deep knowledge in the sciences, and yet has not preserved for men any treatise of Salvation? There is a reason for this, and the reason is that Salvation is the one thing that men need first of all, and more than anything else, or than all other things together.

Solomon indeed had understanding of the sciences more than any other man who ever lived: yet a man might have all that, he might understand all that, as Solomon did, and what good would it do him, if he did not have the science of Salvation first of all? Solomon had it all; yet when he turned his heart from God, from the science of Salvation, what good to him was his knowledge of the other sciences? How much power was in the sciences to hold him back from sin? How much power was there in his great scientific knowledge to keep him back from his natural self, and from the deviltry and corruption that was in him.

Everybody knows that when he turned his heart from God's science, from the science of Salvation, though he had all the others, he was just as bad, he was just as wicked, he was as thoroughly swallowed up in idolatry and every profane practice, as though he had not known the A B C of anything.

Here we see a master mind; and yet the one who had such an understanding, such wisdom, in all the sciences, demonstrated in his life that all such knowledge is absolutely impotent for any good in

a man or to a man, without the science of Salvation being there to control, and hold in righteousness the balance over all.

Mention was made a moment ago, of the fact that God did not bring to us any of Solomon's treatises on science. Now we call attention to the fact that he *did* bring to us a record of Solomon's life after he turned away from God. He did bring to us a record of the enormous failure which that man made in spite of all this knowledge, when he forgot the science of Salvation. Why, then, did God consider it more important for you and me to record all that man's life after he turned from God, than to bring to us a record of the scientific instruction that he gave? The record of the failure, the enormous failure, made by Solomon is of more value to mankind than would have been all the scientific teaching that Solomon ever spoke put in a book for mankind to-day. Because in that failure it was demonstrated to all the world how altogether vain and less than nothing, is a knowledge of all things without the knowledge of the salvation of God.

Another great example is seen in the Greeks. The natural mind never can attain to a higher, closer and more perfect thinking than the Greek mind did. In this is portrayed the perfection of human thinking without God.

But what did it do for them? That is the question. What did their literature do for them? What did their philosophy do for them? What did their art do for them? What did their religion do for them?—It sunk them into such wickedness as is unfit to mention.

Rome learned from Greece and followed her example and came to the same end.

It must be borne in mind that the Greeks and Romans were not low, degraded, ragged, ignorant heathen; they were aristocratic, cultivated, and most highly educated heathen. The things which they knew and taught are the pinnacle to which teachers of to-day aspire. Thus Cesar was one of the most accomplished men that had lived—in courtliness, etiquette, esthetics, and ... generally. But what was his character? The most guarded description of it, to be anywise full or fair, would be unfit to print.

Therefore, when the fact stands thus demonstrated in threefold measure before the world, of the absolute impotence of every effort of the human mind in its perfection to attain to any good when the

heart is turned from God, what can the Lord do for the world if these three world-lessons will not teach the people? What can he do for men if they will follow in that way, in spite of these examples of solemn warning? In all this history, men are taught the impotence of the highest effort of the mind in all branches of science, art, and literature, to ... men any good, to keep them back from sin, to lead them toward any good of any kind whatever, when they forget the science and literature of Salvation, which God has given to purify the hearts of men.

"Religious Office Seeking" American Sentinel 12, 35, pp. 546, 547.

[546]

ATJ

IT is announced from Washington that the news of the vacancy in the grade of chaplain in the army, has brought in applications from three hundred ministers for the situation. This matter being under the direction of the under-secretary, that official has fixed an age limit for the office and has decided to require a physical examination of candidates, as in other departments of the service.

In the service of God the office seeks the man, and not men the [547] office. "The eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to show himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him." 2 Chronicles 16:9. God wants men; and when he finds a man that he can use, he has an office to put him in. The true Christian is never an office-seeker. He simply seeks to know and do the will of the Lord, and be faithful in whatever work God may call him to. There could be no stronger proof needed that the office of army chaplain is not of God's establishing than the fact that it is besieged by supplicants and is under the control of the civil government.

"Why We Have Rights" American Sentinel 12, 35, p. 557.

[557]

ATJ

GOD is the Creator of all beings upon the earth. But it is not merely as the Creator that God reveals himself to us in his Word and in his works. In these he reveals to us his *character*.

God might have made men without giving them any *rights* at all. He might have made them merely for his own amusement, as boys make their play men of snow, or as dolls are made for the little girls.

He might have made mere automatons,—that is, people who would have no will or choice of their own in anything that they did, but would act just as some power outside of themselves obliged them to.

Some people wonder why the Lord did not make automatons who would have been compelled to do right, instead of men and women who have the power to choose to do right. Such people seem to have no idea of the of freedom.

The Bible tells us that "God is love." It is this that God reveals to us in his Word and in his works. This is his *character*. Everything that God does is prompted by his love for the beings he has made.

This is why he has given to us those unalienable rights that are spoken of in the Declaration of Independence.

God made all his creatures to be happy; so he gave them a right to life, to liberty, and to all things that they must have to make them happy. God himself never takes any of these things from us; but sometimes men take them from us, and sometimes we lose them by not caring enough for them ourselves.

If we were automatons we would never have any character. If we only did what we could not help doing, we would have no credit, nor any blame, for doing it.

We all like to have credit for doing well, and God means that we shall have credit for it. When we come to the end of this world, he is going to say, "Well done," to everyone who has done well here in this life.

It would only be ridiculous to say "Well done" to an automaton. So God gives us all *freedom of choice*, in order that we may have the credit of having done noble deeds of our own free will.

God has a character, and his design is that the beings he has made in his own image, shall have a character. We would not be in God's image if we had no character. What an honor it is that God has bestowed on us in making us in his own image! This is the highest proof that he does not mean us to be slaves.

God's character is love, and he wants men to have the same character that he has. Did you ever know any one of a very loving

nature who did not want to be loved in return? This is the way it is with God. He is more loving than any of us, and he wants to be loved in return by all the human family.

So he wants love to be our character, the same as it is his. But if we should do right only because we had to, there would be no love in that. If you, my boy or girl, did what your father and mother wish you to do, from no choice of your own but only because you could not do differently, would they see in it any proof of your love for them? Of course not; and so we must have freedom of choice to show our love for God.

How perfect and how beautiful is God's plan for the happiness not only of himself but of all his creatures! And how strange it is, and how wicked, that anyone should interfere with this plan, and try to take away man's freedom. Yet this is just what men have been doing all the way along in the world's history since Cain killed Abel; and they are doing it still.

Men are trying to have laws made to compel other people to do right, or rather to do what they think is right, for it does not rest with man to say what is right, but only with God. One of the most common ways in which some men try to compel others to do what they think is right, is in passing laws to compel people to keep the Sabbath.

God does not want any one to be compelled to keep the Sabbath. Real Sabbath-keeping is one way in which men can show their love for God. Yes; it is one of the greatest and most important ways in which men may show that they love God. And God longs for their love, and in the highest degree deserves to have it. But when men pass laws to compel people to keep the Sabbath, they not only rob the people of their God-given freedom of choice, but they rob God himself of the love which would come to him through the free choice of people in the keeping of his holy day.

The men who make such laws do not generally realize how they are interfering with God's perfect plan and robbing him, and what a wicked thing it is. We must do what we can to enlighten them and save them from the consequences of such terrible mistakes.

September 16, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 36, p. 561.

[561]

ATJ

NO human law can add anything to the law of God.

ENFORCED idleness is never promotive of good order nor of morality.

GOVERNMENTS were made to serve men, not men to serve governments.

THE wrong side of the question always tries to make up by the use of force, what it lacks in argument.

HUMAN law cannot strengthen the moral and religious safeguards which protect society. These can be strengthened only by that which purifies the heart.

SOME persons would get along very much easier in life if the time and effort they spend in trying to “get around” the truth and evade their duty were spent in searching out the truth and living it.

EVERY individual has an unalienable right to rest on Sunday, in accordance with what may be his convictions of duty. But his right to rest on Sunday cannot be secured by taking away another person’s right to work on that day. Rights do not thus conflict with each other.

GOD made men different from one another; he gave to each an individuality. But there is a power working in the world that tries to for men to act as though they were alike,—a power that sets fashions and prescribes customs for men in dressing, eating, thinking, and worshiping,—a power that has a few worldly moulds in which it would have all human thought and action run. All this is directly contrary to the plan of the Creator.

HUMAN law is powerless to stay the flood of degeneracy which is sweeping in upon the world in these last days. Human law can (to a large degree) prevent crime; but it cannot prevent that corruption of the heart which incites men to the commission of crime. There must be laws against crime; but our hope of safety must be not in legislation, but in the saving power of God given to the world in the gospel, both for society in general, and our own selves in particular.

"The Science of Salvation" American Sentinel 12, 36, pp. 561, 562.

[561]

ATJ

FROM the history of Solomon, and of Greece and Rome, which we have reviewed, we can see why it is that the Lord did not preserve to man any of the treatises that even he himself gave upon science. Suppose that men had it all, as had Solomon, and could teach it as Solomon taught it. With the heart not surrendered to God, with the soul not saved, what good would science do them? It could not restrain them from any kind of wickedness or corruption that is in the human heart.

The sciences are not what the world needs to-day, first of all. More than all else, the heart needs to be purified, the soul needs to be saved, the whole character rebuilt, the mind transformed into the very image and glory of God, so that the life shall reflect his righteousness, to make manifest the knowledge of God alone to all the world. Though men have all that all the sciences can give, it will profit nothing without salvation; for it will be but a little while till they will have none of it at all.

There is another thing: God wants all men to think right on every
[562] subject. There are men to-day thinking on scientific subjects, but they do not think right. They get so far along that they find no place for God at all. The man without God, without the guidance of the thought, the mind, of God, is not able to think right on these subjects. And the mind is not right until it is renewed in the image of Him who created it. The mind is to be transformed, renewed. We are to have another mind altogether. Every thought is to be brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.

That is the work of salvation. It is to restore the image of God in the soul; to bring the mind where it will be but the reflection, of the living God. When that is done, and the work of God is finished in this world, in making known the knowledge of God to all people, then the Lord will open to men the whole universe for all eternity. Then all these other subjects will be open for our study, and the Lord can say to us, Go where you will, I can trust you. The wide universe is open to you. There is nothing kept back from you. It is all your own. It belongs to you. Go where you please, stay where you please, do what you please, *think on whatever subject you please*, delve into it as deeply as you please, you will do it rightly.

This is not at all to say that men are utterly to ignore all other sciences till we reach the other world. It is simply to say that the science of salvation is to lead in the study of all others. Has not the Lord set us an example as to what attention we should pay to these things, and what use we are to make of them? What is the purpose of reading and studying upon the other sciences?—That these may help us better to understand and to teach the things of the science of salvation, than we could do without that knowledge. That is the use made of them in the Bible. By this the Lord shows us that the science of salvation must take the lead of all the other sciences known in the universe.

It must take the lead of all others in this world, and when we get into that other world it will still take the lead even there. For "the cross of Christ will be the *science* and the song of the redeemed throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity."

When the Lord has shown how absolutely vain is all science, all learning of all kinds *without his salvation*, then we say again, What can he do for men if these things which he has set before the world will not instruct them that that is not the way to take? If men will not be instructed by these things to take the right way, to allow that God's science is the chief, and that what he knows is the best, then how can mankind hope to escape the evil that has come upon all these that have gone before?

The science of God's salvation is the one thing for men to know, first of all: that it may lead us, guide us, balance us, and hold us everywhere in all things, and against all things evil. And it will do all this. That is the blessed truth:—

"Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is his grace
[564] given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." Ephesians 3:8, 9.

What is that mystery of God?—"Christ in you, the hope of glory." Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God, the gospel, the power of God unto salvation, that is the mystery of God; that is the science of salvation. That is the scientific truth, around which all other sciences center. That power of God unto salvation every man must have to hold him back from the evil that is in him. The evil that is born in every man will carry him to perdition, in spite of all science, all literature, all art, all religion, that the world can furnish, or that it could furnish, unless he lays hold upon the power of God unto salvation, which comes to men by faith of Jesus Christ.

Without that power in the heart, even the science which God taught—to say nothing of the literature, the art, the religion, and all that the heathen taught—is impotent to hold back man from sinning. Without that, every vestige of evil that is in a man will show itself, in spite of all the science that he can eve know.

The mystery of God, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory; Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God, Christ and him crucified—that alone, that all in all, that over all, in all, through all, now and through eternity,—that is the science of salvation, the chief of all sciences. That is the science which leads all other sciences, which rightly takes precedence of all, and which must guide in the study of all. Let it be so with all forever.

Then let the Lord by his Spirit so draw us to himself, let the heart be so opened to that power, to the fellowship of that mystery, to the Spirit of God, that he may implant there Jesus Christ, his grace and his virtue. And as we hold our hearts open to him always, and to none but him, as a flower to the sun, we shall obtain in all its fullness, his righteousness, his power, his salvation, his mercy, his truth, his joy, his gladness, his peace—O, and, his eternal life!

"'Faith Cure'" American Sentinel 12, 36, pp. 563, 564.

[563]

ATJ

IT seems evident that the boasted enlightenment and progress of the nineteenth century has done little if anything to free the minds of the masses of the people from superstition. For never, apparently, were there so many bogus "healers" in the country claiming to exercise divine power, as there are to-day; and all seem to be doing a thriving business.

The term "faith cure" is commonly applied to the work of these frauds, about which there is, in strict truth, neither faith nor cure. The only "faith" that is present in such cases is a blind confidence in the powers of the "healer," and the only cure that follows is a product of the imagination or of the unseen spiritual agencies of evil.

There is a true faith cure; and its existence is argued by the presence of that which is counterfeit. Not only this, but that we have reached a time when it is to be especially manifested, is indicated unmistakably by the marked revival of superstition which is seen in the land to-day. It is the devil's plan to flood the world with counterfeit imitations of that which is genuine, in order that people may be deceived and accept the false for the true.

What, then, is true faith cure? The answer is simple. It is the power of God manifested in the healing of disease through faith. And what is faith? Is it a mere blind confidence in somebody? Is it something devoid of reason? No; certainly not. There is nothing more reasonable than to believe in the power of God.

We see the manifestations of God's power on every hand. What is it that causes life and growth in all the world around us? It is not our power; no, nor the power of any man nor of any government. Is it then power that creates itself? To believe this requires the credulity [564]
of a "freethinker." If power could create itself, the problem of a "perpetual motion" would have been solved long ago. If nothing could create something, could not man, who is much more than nothing, create something? Yet he cannot create the very lowest and simplest form of life.

Faith is the characteristic of the Christian. The Christian knows God, for he has experienced the power of God in making him a new being—giving him a new creation. He has experienced crucifixion and death of the "old man"—his former self—with Jesus Christ, and with Christ he has been raised up and exalted to heavenly places, and experiences the divine life working in him, which is Christ living in

him. When Christ lives in an individual, that individual cannot be ignorant of him. He is in the closest companionship with Christ, and can only look with pitying amazement upon the one who would try to persuade him that Christ does not exist.

Thus knowing the Lord, knowing God's companionship and power in his own experience daily, and seeing God's power in all the forms of life and growth around him, is it unreasonable that he should believe in that power? Would anything be more unreasonable in him than that, knowing this, he should refuse to believe in that power?

The Christian believes that He who created all things and maintains them in life, can heal the sick of all diseases. This is only reasonable in the highest degree. He believes that God's Word is true; and finding that Word full of gracious invitations to ask of his heavenly Father for that aid which it is beyond his own power to supply, for the healing of both body and soul, he simply takes God at his word, and thus experiences true faith cure. It is the same power, and the same faith, whether it be for the healing of the body, or of the soul. The soul of the unregenerate man is sick unto death; and that which is called conversion, is its healing,—a true instance of faith cure: for it must all come through faith.

Faith being thus in the highest degree reasonable, is the direct opposite of superstition. The two cannot go together. The superstitious person knows nothing of true faith, and the man of faith is never superstitious. And wherever faith is not, there superstition has access. Faith, not education, is the safeguard against superstition. Faith, indeed, is itself an avenue to the highest education,—the knowledge of God. But that education which is without God, prepares no one to detect spiritual error when it appears in the form of truth. And this is abundantly proven by the ease with which "educated" people fall victims to the "faith cure" "Christian science," and kindred delusions of the times.

Faith cure—the genuine—is all right; it is the only salvation for the race, or for any individual. And therefore it is of the utmost importance to each individual that he should obtain the genuine faith cure, and no counterfeit; for it is something each one must obtain for himself.

"Truth and Freedom" American Sentinel 12, 36, p. 564.

[564]

ATJ

JESUS said to the Jews (and the words apply equally to all people), "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

In this, as in everything else that Jesus said and did, he was revealing the mind of God, his Father; for he came to manifest his Father to the world. It was the Father who spoke through Christ, in all that Christ said.

God wants every person to know the truth, and God wants them to know it in order that they may be free. God has no use for salves. Only in freedom can an individual serve him. The service of God is to love God and do what he has commanded because we love him and our fellow creatures. In love there can be no slavery.

The truth of God delivers the soul from bondage. And no chains or fetters that can be forged by man can shut out this truth from the soul. God's truth breaks the bonds of a perverse disposition, of evil habits, of fetters and of everything that can hold back the soul from the pathway of righteousness that leads to eternal life.

If we would be free we must know "the truth." But what is this? The answer is found in the words of Jesus, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." We must know "the truth as it is in Jesus." Is this a narrow view of truth? No, indeed; it is the broadest view of truth, the *only complete* view of truth that can be had.

He who sees not Christ in his investigation of truth, sees not enough of the truth to escape falling into some delusions concerning it.

God wants all persons to serve him; not for his good, but for their good—in order that they may realize all the good and the happiness that life can contain. And to serve him they must be free; no forced service can be acceptable to him. No plan to force men to serve him can for a moment have his approval.

And to be free, men must know the truth,—which is to know him who is "the truth"—"Christ, the wisdom of God, and the *power* of God." In the spiritual life—which is the true life—knowledge is not power, save as it is the knowledge of Christ as the power of God unto salvation. He who holds this knowledge, and only he, has truth and freedom.

"The Object of Civil Government" American Sentinel 12, 36, pp. 571, 572.

[571]

ATJ

WE have seen that all persons have rights; and that these rights are given each person by the Creator, and are unalienable.

We have seen also why it is that the Creator gives to each one these rights,—that it is because he has a purpose to be fulfilled in each member of the human family, and a claim upon each one, which would utterly fail if men were not left free to choose between good and evil. Only in this way can God receive what is due him, and man attain to the highest pinnacle of blessing.

But how are these rights to be preserved? How are the life and liberty of each one, which God has given them, to be protected from violence and destruction in this evil world?

Is each one to defend his own rights, using what force may be necessary to repel any invasion of them?

If it were left that way there would be no government at all. There would be no laws against crime, and each one would determine for himself what was a punishable offense and what punishment was deserved by the offender. And he would decide this, as individuals are so prone to do, not after calm reflection, but under the excitement and anger which the offense produced.

In addition to this, his rights would be defended by no power stronger than his own arm.

Such a state of things would be anarchy, worse than anything that we have seen or imagined.

To avoid this, men have formed civil governments; and by means of these, laws against crime are enacted by assemblies of chosen men; the person accused of wrong-doing is tried by men who can proceed in the mater with calmness and impartiality; sentence against the offender is executed without anger, haste, or barbarity; and the power of the whole people together is exercised to defend the rights of each individual.

The Declaration of Independence sets forth the purpose of civil government, in the declaration that "to preserve these [unalienable] rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Thus it is seen that the civil government exists for the benefit of the individuals who enter into it. But the natural tendency in governments is to reverse the proper order, and to hold that the individual exists for the benefit of the government.

When this is done, the rights of the individual, instead of being protected by the government, are sacrificed to the government. Human life and liberty, which the Creator gave to man, and which no [572] government can give him, are considered to be at the disposal of the government. This perverted state of things—this false conception of the purpose and province of civil government—has come to be the prevailing one all over the world.

Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence, said: "Our legislators are not sufficiently apprised of the rightful limits of their power, that their true office is to declare and enforce only our natural rights and duties, and to take none of them from us.... The idea is quite unfounded that on entering into society we give up any natural right."

And when society, or the government, tries to compel us to give up some of our natural rights for the sake of its purposes, it is going contrary to God's order, and our obedience must be to God rather than to it.

Civil government is not the greatest thing in the world. It is, as we have seen, only an instrument to serve something else; and that which it is designed to serve must be greater than it. And that greater thing is MAN.

Man is the most important thing in the world,—the crowning work of God's creation. Man is made in God's own image; to him alone, of all things in the world, is given this overwhelming honor.

The civil governments were made by man; but man himself is a work of the infinite God.

Man, it is true, seems but an insignificant thing,—a being of faults, and weaknesses, appearing only for a moment, as it were, amidst earth's myriad forms of life and then passing again into oblivion. And of himself he would be only this.

But ah, he is connected with the purposes of God, which reach throughout eternity! Can this be said of any civil government? No, indeed; earthly governments are but transient things; once dead, they have no future. But who can fathom the eternal purpose of Jehovah

in the creation of man? To what heights is man, in the unfolding of that purpose, to attain in the eternal ages?

And that this life may afford the conditions suitable to man's preparation for the future life, civil government has been instituted here by the ordinance of God. But it derives all its importance from the greater importance of man,—the importance of the human individual.

God deals with man individually; his eternal purpose relates to each individually: and in his view, which shows all things truly, no one individual is of more importance than another. He gave his only-begotten Son to save you, reader, as an individual,—not partly to save you and partly to save some one else, or many others, but *wholly* to save you, wholly to save each one by himself, of the human family.

And this reveals the estimate which God has put upon the *individual*,—a value which far transcends any that can belong to earthly governments.

September 23, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 37, p. 577.

[577]

ATJ

RENDER to Cesar the things that are Cesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.—Mark 12:17.

IT is not more legislation that the people need, but more religion.

WE would not discount law; we want good laws, and we must have them; but we want also something to make such laws effective.

LAW is the instrument and public sentiment the power which makes it effective. There can be no good government without a good public sentiment; and public sentiment cannot be created by legislation.

THERE is but one genuine “sure cure” in the earth to-day, and that is the grace of God. The richest man has not money enough to buy it, and the poorest has not poverty enough to shut him from it.

THERE are a great many people in this country who seem to be not yet convinced that two wrongs do not make right. A lynching, for example, is an effort to set one wrong right by perpetrating another.

THE “sabbath laws” of the States are as numerous and as well enforced now as they were fifty years ago; yet they have not prevented the incoming of a flood of moral degeneracy since that day.

“THE powers that be are ordained of God;” but this fact does not set the fiat of civil government above the commandment of Jehovah.

NO MAN or assembly of men have the power to manufacture right, or to absolve any individual from the obligation to obey the dictates of conscience.

THE weekly Sabbath is a holy day, because God made it holy, and it is impossible to change this fact. And being a holy day, its

character cannot be other than religious. Any other kind of weekly sabbath is a counterfeit.

THE Sabbath is God's, but he forces no man to keep it. Why should men go further than God and try to force people to render to God the tribute of Sabbath observance.

"'Who Is He That Condemneth?'" American Sentinel 12, 37, pp. 577, 578.

[577]

ATJ

"GOD sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world."

And to his disciples forever he himself says: "As my Father sent me, even so send I you."

Then no Christian is ever sent to condemn anybody in this world. No Christian has ever been made a minister of condemnation.

As to transgressors, the only office of law is to condemn. Then, as no Christian is ever sent to condemn, no Christian is ever sent to enforce law or to demand of others the enforcement of law.

As the only office of law, with respect to transgressors, is to condemn; as in this world there will be in every place, transgressors of law; and as no Christian has ever been made of Christ a minister of condemnation; it is certain that no Christian has ever been made by Christ a minister of the law.

[578] Therefore it is perfectly certain that all these preachers, people, organizations, and combinations, professing to be Christian, who are making such a clamor for the enactment and enforcement of law, have forgotten the mission of Christ and of Christians in the world and are engaged in a work to which the Lord never sent them.

The Son of God was not sent to condemn the world, and he did not condemn. He said: "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world."

When there was brought to him for judgment that woman who had been taken in the very act of gross sin, he said to those who brought her, "Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone at her." And when none could cast a stone because they themselves were wrong-doers,—none were without sin,—and they all had gone out and left him alone with the woman, he said to her, "Woman, hath no man condemned thee?" And she said, "No man,

Lord." Then said the Son of God, "Neither do I condemn thee. Go, and sin no more."

Now all who believe on him are counted the sons of God. And to all such he says, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." "Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned."

Therefore it is perfectly plain that all these preachers, people, organizations, and combinations, professing to be Christian,—professing to be the sons of God—in all their work of throwing stones at supposed or even actual transgressors, in condemning them to arrest, fine and imprisonment, have forgotten the spirit and the method of the Son of God. In all this they have taken upon themselves an office, and are performing a work, to which the Son of God was not sent and which he never performed: and to which they as sons of God were never sent and which as sons of God they never can perform.

Condemnation is not what the world needs. The world is already condemned, overwhelmingly condemned, and needs no more condemnation. Every soul in the world is already condemned many times over; for all have done wrong many times over. For every wrong deed each soul is condemned by the law of God which he has certainly transgressed: and in addition to this, each one condemns himself, and has already many times condemned himself for the wrong things that he has done. With everybody thus doubly condemned, and many times at that, surely it is not condemnation that this world needs.

Now what kind of a spirit can it be anyhow that cannot be content without heaping more condemnation upon people who are already condemned, even to death, many times over? Surely it can be only a spirit of vindictiveness akin to that of the devil himself, that cannot be satisfied with seeing people twice condemned many times over, but must hunt out and spy and set traps for opportunities to condemn them yet more.

In no such business as that will or can the disciples of Christ ever be engaged. These are of another spirit. "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world." And "As my Father sent me, even so send I you.... Receive ye the Holy Ghost." This is the spirit that characterizes the children of God, the church of Christ. It is the Spirit of Christ; and "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he

is none of his." The Spirit of Christ, it does the work of Christ. He condemns not.

God knowing that men are so fully condemned already: and not being of such a vindictive spirit to want to put more condemnation upon people since doubly condemned; sent not his Son, nor his Spirit into the world "to condemn the world, but that the world through him MIGHT BE SAVED."

It is salvation, not condemnation, that the people of this world need. And what a fearful perversion of the gift it is, when people professing the knowledge of Salvation, and professing to be the preachers and ministers of Salvation, turn to preaching and ministering condemnation, instead of salvation—and this too upon people who are already doubly and many times condemned.

There is more power in salvation, than there is condemnation, to turn and hold people away from worse courses. When the Lord Jesus said to that woman who was actually guilty of gross wrongdoing, "Neither do I condemn thee, Go and sin no more," there was more power in that gentle, forgiving word to turn her into the way of righteousness and to keep her there, than there ever could be in all the condemnation of all the Pharisees in Judea and in the United States put together.

Oh that professed Christians would be Christians indeed. Oh that they would study to represent Christ indeed. Oh that they would court his Spirit, instead of indulging the vindictive spirit that cannot be sent without condemning people who are already repeatedly condemned even to death.

"Let this mind be in you that was also in Christ Jesus." "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." "As my Father sent me even so sent I you.... Receive ye the Holy Ghost." "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." "As he is so are we in this world." "Condemn not and ye shall not be condemned. Forgive and ye shall be forgiven."

"Christianity" American Sentinel 12, 37, pp. 579, 580.

[579]

ATJ

"GOD was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."

The great trouble with men is that they have gone away from God, and have become enemies in their minds by wicked works.

They have gone so far away that they have lost sight of God; their minds have become so confused that they have forgotten him; their eyes have become so blinded that they cannot see him; their hearts have become so perverse that they cannot discern him even though they be standing in his very presence.

"There is none righteous, no not one. There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips. Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness. Their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways, and the way of peace have they not known. There is no fear of God before their eyes."

This is the kind of world that God had, and has yet, to deal with. Yet in Jesus Christ he came and dwelt among men to reconcile the world unto himself. He sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He made peace through the blood of his cross that he might reconcile all things unto himself. And you that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable [*sic*.] and unreprovable in his sight.

Thus to a world steeped in sin, God brought reconciliation: with a world overwhelmed with rebellion he made peace. To the people of this world, God send neither condemnation nor antagonism, but peace and reconciliation only.

In Jesus Christ is this peace and reconciliation given to the world. All who truly receive Christ truly receive this peace and reconciliation. And every one who receives this peace becomes a peacemaker in the world and to the world—he preaches only peace, peace to all, by Jesus Christ. Every one who receives this reconciliation, in it and with it receives also the ministry of reconciliation—he antagonizes nobody, he condemns nobody, he ministers reconciliation to all, he persuades men to be reconciled to God.

"All things are of God who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. To wit: that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation."

"So then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." Thus every Christian is an ambassador for Christ to the world: he is an ambassador of peace, an ambassador of reconciliation. No Christian is ever an ambassador of condemnation, of legislation, nor of law: every Christian is an ambassador of salvation, not condemnation; of justification, not legislation; of gospel, not the law.

Every Christian preaches *peace* by Jesus Christ; for he is our peace and Lord of all. To the Christian is committed no ministry but the ministry of reconciliation. To him is committed no word but the word of reconciliation. No Christian has anything to do with governing or managing men: his business is solely to serve the Lord, to beseech other men to be reconciled to God, and to persuade them to serve the Lord.

The bane of Christianity, and the curse of the world, ever since the days of the apostles, has been the consuming desire of professed Christians to "boss" other people and to control and run the world. But God did not send Jesus Christ on any such mission as that, nor has he ever sent any Christian on any such mission. For "as he is, so are we in this world."

"We have seen and do testify that God sent his Son to be the
[580] Saviour of the world." And he never attempted to save anybody by superintending the police, by running the politics of cities, by regulating the affairs of the State, nor by any other worldly means or method. He sought to save men only by spreading the knowledge of God and winning men to God. He did it only by ever revealing to men the Fatherly love and care of God for all mankind. When he found himself obliged to tell the scribes, the pharisees, and the lawyers, that they were hypocrites, it was not done in a spirit of denunciation: but rather with sorrow that such was the truth and that he was obliged to state it.

It is eternal life to know God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent. God desires that all men shall have eternal life. And as nothing but the knowledge of God can bring eternal life, the Lord Jesus came into the world to give to men the knowledge of God. This was his sole mission to the world. To this one thing all the faculties and energies of his whole being were devoted.

This is the sole mission of Christians in the world. Men need the knowledge of God to-day as much as when Jesus was in the world. Yet Jesus is not now in the world as he was then. But believers in him are here *in his stead*. These are sent as was he. And as he is so are we in this world.

Christians are sent, as verily as was Jesus, to be the saviours of the world—not of themselves nor by themselves, but of God and by God. Jesus said of himself, "I can of mine own self do nothing." He did not come to save men of himself and by himself: he came to save the world by bringing and revealing to men the knowledge of God. So likewise Christians are not sent to save men of themselves nor by themselves, not by any plans or methods of their own; but by bringing to men and holding before the world *the knowledge of God*.

This is the only mission, the sole purpose of existence of Christians in the world. To this one thing all their faculties and energies are devoted. And wherein any Christian comes short of this, so much he fails of being the Christian that Christ has sent him to be in the world. Here is the Lord's design for every believer: "Now thanks be unto God who always causeth us to triumph, and maketh manifest the savor of his knowledge by us in every place."

Thus the purpose of existence of the Christian in the world, is to glorify God, to make manifest the knowledge of God in every place, and so to bring to men eternal life. And every sincere Christian shuns, as he would a viper, anything and everything that would tend in the least degree to exalt itself against the knowledge of God. He brings every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ, in whose stead he is in the world. The only person whom he ever has any ambition or desire to control, is himself. The only rulership he ever cares for is that over his own spirit. The only power that he ever chooses to exercise over flesh, is power over *his own flesh*.

This is Christianity—the Christianity of Christ. These are Christians, for they are like Jesus. God is seeking for such. The world

needs such, that it may find the knowledge of God and Jesus whom he sent, and may find eternal life.

"'An Extraordinary Utterance,'" American Sentinel 12, 37, pp. 580, 581.

[580]

ATJ

WHAT the New York *World*, of September 16, styles "an extraordinary utterance," was delivered in this city on the preceding Sunday, by a Roman Catholic priest "Father" Ducey. He said:—

> "No law of man which conflicts with the law of God can exact obedience and submission from men. There is a higher law, as Seward said before he was stricken down for his efforts to preserve the independence of man. And we claim to-day, as moral teachers, that the higher body still exists. And no laws passed by corruption in the interests of trusts and monopolies, against the interest and welfare of God's creatures in contradiction of the laws of God, are binding on the conscience of any man."

The *World* says it feels in duty bound to protect against "the dangerous doctrine preached" in this utterance, and inquires:—

> "What is it except an incitement to every man, no matter how ignorant or reckless, to become his own interpreter of the validity and the justice of laws? What practical difference is there between the anarchism of Goldman and Most, ranting against all law, and the broad assertion of the existence of a 'higher law' for the consciousness of men? Who is to decide when 'the law of man so conflicts with the law of God' as to keep men from obedience? Is it to be Father Ducey or his hearers? And what will become of government or of society if this doctrine of every man his own judge does not prevail?"

Does the *World* mean to deny that there is any "higher law" than the statutes of men? If so, it is most certainly in the wrong.

And if there be a "higher law" which is binding upon the consciences of men—even the law of the Most High God—what attitude shall men assume toward it? When man's law comes in conflict with it—as it has very often done in the history of this world—who is to point out the duty of the individual? Will the State do it? The State says, Obey my laws. But in case of a conflict between them and the law of God, the individual's duty is to the latter. There is no condition or circumstances whatsoever under which any individual is absolved from the duty of obedience to the law of God.

How then is the duty of the individual to be determined? That is the inquiry of the *World*. Does the individual become "his own interpreter of the validity and the justice of laws?" No; not in the case of the Christian; far from it. But that is the way it appears in the eye of the State. And the State usually proceeds to deal with him accordingly. This is precisely what happened in the case of the martyrs who went to the dungeon and the stake for conscience' sake.

It is the function of conscience to guide an individual in choosing between right and wrong. It is not the business of the State to define right and wrong. The State is exercising its legitimate function when it is protecting the individual in the enjoyment of his rights. Nor can conscience, alone, define right and wrong. Conscience must be educated in the principles and precepts of right and wrong, as revealed by a higher authority, before it can become a safe guide. The Word of God defines right and wrong for every individual; the Spirit of God illuminates the Word of God in the mind, when its meaning is earnestly and prayerfully sought, so that the pathway of right and duty is clearly seen. And thus the individual is not alone,—a self-constituted "interpreter of the validity and the justice of laws"—though he appears to be so in the eye of the State. The State deals with him as such; but God sees to it that nothing befalls such an individual that is not for his own good.

The genuine Christian is never an anarchist. His doctrine is the doctrine of the Prince of Peace. No anarchist, no foe of law and order and peace, was ever at the same time a humble, conscientious, prayerful student of the Word of God.

The really "extraordinary utterance" is not that given by "Father" Ducey, but that made by the *World*, in asking "what practical difference" there is between this obedience of conscience to the higher law of God, and "the anarchism of Goldman and Most, ranting against all law." That is an extraordinary question, indeed.

"The 'Sabbath Logion'" American Sentinel 12, 37, p. 581.

[581]

ATJ

NO small amount of discussion has arisen in the religious world over the alleged discovery of certain unknown, or lost, sayings of Christ, one of which relates to the Sabbath and has been designated as the "Sabbath logion." "Except ye keep the Sabbath," it declares, "ye shall not see the Father."

Whether one of Christ's sayings or not, it is true, and it may well be read with an emphasis on the word "keep." Not everything is Sabbath-keeping which claims to be such. God has not left it to the caprice or short-sighted wisdom of man to determine what is a proper observance of the Sabbath. In the fourth commandment he has said, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy"; and a further commentary upon this point is given in Isaiah 58:13, 14.

God made the Sabbath for a purpose: and that purpose must be fulfilled. Only that is true Sabbath-keeping which fulfills that purpose. What that purpose is we are told in the words of God to his chosen people: "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever." Exodus 31:13, 17. See also Ezekiel 20:12, 20.

The Sabbath is a "sign" between God and his chosen people. His chosen people are the children of faith, the seed of Abraham, or children of Israel. See Galatians 3:7, 29; Genesis 32:28. But of what is it a sign? We find an answer in the words, "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 Creator is the true God; and in the keeping of his Sabbath we find a sign that we are worshipers of the true God. It makes all

the difference in the world to the worshiper whether he is worshiping the true God, or some other. And in the Sabbath he is to find an evidence that he is truly a worshiper of Jehovah. But this he cannot do unless he keeps it holy, as God has specified. Otherwise he will see nothing of God in the Sabbath, and it will be to him but as any other day of the week.

"Politics and Religion" American Sentinel 12, 37, pp. 581, 582.

[581]

ATJ

A WRITER in *The Vanguard*, Mr. John Ratliff, argues for the union of religion and politics, and lays down the principle that a man's religion and his politics are not divorceable. This is a principle that is getting a good deal of sanction in the religious world at the present time.

How is it when two "Christians" conscientiously vote, one the Republican ticket and the other the Democratic ticket, at an election? Is Christianity joined to opposing political principles? If so, there are occasions when it opposes itself.

Mr. Ratliff speaks of "political sins." What is a "political sin?" It is the support of the "other faction," or the "other party," of course. A definition of "political sin" would amount to this and nothing more.

Who can make a just standard of right and wrong but God alone? Men have set up many standards of right and wrong, but they have all been unreliable, because they were the work of fallible beings. In politics we have only those standards of "right" which men have set up: and we find as many such standards as there are parties.

To make men understand right and wrong,—to convict them of sin, in other words—is the office work of the Holy Spirit: and to impress the truth upon the soul, the Spirit uses the Word of God. But politics commands neither the agency of the Word nor of the Spirit.

In Judea, over eighteen hundred years ago, Jesus Christ walked among the people, and taught them of the kingdom of God. He is the perfect example for every Christian. To the extent to which he engaged in politics, the Christian may rightfully engage in politics. To the extent to which he sought to get control of earthly power, the Christian may properly exert himself for the purpose to-day.

Jesus Christ was the mystery of the manifestation of God in human flesh. And every true Christian presents the same mystery
[582] to-day, for in him Christ lives and manifests himself to the world. In his true followers Jesus Christ lives on earth to-day, and what he does to-day is what he did in Judea so long ago. For he changes not, but is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." If he was a politician then, the Christian will be one now. But it not, then the Christian will not concern himself in that way.

"The 'Continental Sunday'" American Sentinel 12, 37, pp. 582, 583.

[582]

ATJ

FROM statistics published by a reliable European journal, it appears that so far as concerns the cessation of Sunday work, the "Continental Sunday" will bear comparison with the "American Sabbath."

In Germany, we are told, all employers of labor in industrial lines of work are forbidden either to compel or permit their employees to work on Sunday. This prohibition does not apply to persons working alone, or to those engaged in agriculture, fishing, or the professions or liberal arts.

In commercial establishments (such as retail stores, banking, insurance, and similar institutions) all work is prohibited during the first days of the three special holidays of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, and is limited to five hours on all ordinary holidays and Sundays.

The individual German States may extend these restrictions at their pleasure.

In Austria, there is a general prohibition of Sunday work, the only general exception being for work that is deemed absolutely indispensable and for commercial establishments, in which Sunday work is permitted during six hours of the day.

In Switzerland, no woman can work on Sunday except at home or in a small shop, and no minor (a person under eighteen years of age), except in a few specified industries; and adult males are allowed to do Sunday work only in some specified industries, and in certain cases of emergency, the nature of which must be demonstrated.

In England, a distinction is made between the work of adult males and that of women and minors. The former are not restricted in the matter of Sunday work, but no woman, "young person" or child can work in factory or workshop on Sunday except in certain special cases. Jews are allowed to work on Sunday provided they observe Saturday as a day of rest. [583]

In Germany, Austria and England, much of the legislation governing Sunday work is of recent origin, as late as the year 1895.

It will be observed that the prohibition of Sunday work is more rigid in Austria and Germany than in England; yet in the latter country the Continental Sunday is not nearly as conspicuous a feature of the week as in the former. Except in the matter of open public houses, Sunday is observed quite as well in England as in the United States. The "Continental Sunday" is not therefore a product of lax Sunday legislation. It is rather the result of the general indifference of the people toward religion; and nothing can more surely foster this indifference than the idea that the Sabbath is an institution that can be properly subjected to State regulation.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 37, p. 586.

[586]

ATJ

ONE of the most curious mental phenomena of the times is the persistence of some good church people—men who essay to be ministers and teachers of divine truth—in calling the United States a Christian nation. Who would think of calling an individual a Christian who would spend more money many times over for strong drink, for tobacco, for firearms, for sports and amusements, for jewelry and for unnecessary display, than he would give to the cause of God! Yet this is precisely what is done by this "Christian" nation.

September 30, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 38, p. 593.

[593]

ATJ

“HAMST thou faith? have it to thyself before God.”

NOT right, but rights, are properly enforceable by legislation.

TO invade the rights of a single individual, of whatever race or belief, is contrary to the interests of the whole community.

THE Sabbath was made *for* man, but not *by* man: and He who made the Sabbath, and not he for whom it was made, may rightfully legislate concerning it.

LEGISLATION which is simply for the majority is often oppressive to the individual; but that which is for the individual can never be against the interests of the majority.

GRAMMARIANS teach that there is a decided difference between “a man” and “the man;” but theologians teach but there is no difference between “a seventh day” and “the seventh day.” Which is right?

THE more of the spirit of brotherly love and helpfulness toward the unfortunate there is in the land, the more prosperity it will have; and without this it will not have prosperity though every ship which enters its harbor should come loaded down with gold.

THERE is a wide difference between stating facts, and condemning men. Facts in which are involved the conduct of men, may be plainly stated without at all judging or condemning the men who are connected with the facts. In other words, principles can be dealt with without reference to men.

THERE are two things which have been long and earnestly sought, the discovery of which may be expected to be announced on

the same day; namely, a perpetual motion, and the Scripture which states that Sunday is the Sabbath.

TO believe that the so-called wrist-bone of St. Ann can work miracles is a great exhibition of credulity: but still greater credulity is required to believe that this bone could (and actually did) manufacture itself. If it could do the latter, there is no question but that it can do the former.

"'Follow Thou Me'" American Sentinel 12, 38, pp. 593, 594.

[593]

ATJ

THE work of Christians is not to set other people straight, but to keep *themselves* straight.

"My brethren, be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation."

To assume mastership over others is only to incur condemnation, therefore the more masters, the more condemnation.

"One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth."

"So then every one of us shall give account of *himself* to God. Let us not therefore judge one another any more; but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way."

Thus the Lord intends every disciple to be "quiet and to do his own business," and not to be "a busybody in other men's matters." In other words, the Lord instructs and expects his people to mind
[594] their own business and to let other people's business alone.

This is the only true course of Christian conduct. Accordingly, he says, "Make straight paths for *your feet*, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way." The Christian has nothing to do with making paths for the feet of other people: he is to make straight paths for his own feet. By going straight himself, any man can do far more to help the weak and those that are out of the way than he can by going out of the way to set the others straight.

This is well illustrated in the last instance [*sic*.] recorded in the book of John: Jesus said to Peter, "Follow me." "Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following.... Peter, seeing

him, saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me."

The Lord said to one man, "Follow me." Instead of doing so, he *turned about* to see what another man was doing. But when he had turned about, it was impossible to follow Jesus that way: for no man can follow Christ *backward*.

More than this, he would not have seen the other man if he had not taken his eyes off Jesus and turned about from following him. Thus every man has to take his eyes off Jesus and turn from following him, before he can raise questions about the conduct of other men.

And when this man had turned about from Jesus and so saw the other man, what was that other man doing?—Oh, he was *following Jesus*—he was doing the very thing that the Lord had told the first man to do. But the first man, instead of doing what he was told by his Master to do, turned away from that to question about the other man who was doing the very thing that he himself had been told by the Lord to do, but which he had turned away from doing. Thus it is always with those professed Christians who think it devolves upon them to set other people straight.

But this man, with all others, got the answer from the Lord: "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me." In other words, what the other man shall do is none of your business: your business is to follow me.

Therefore, this principle is, Make straight paths, *not for the other* man's feet, but for *your own feet*. It is true that the lame need help and guidance in the straight and narrow way. But you can do infinitely more to help them thus, by making straight paths for your own feet, than by undertaking to make straight paths for their feet.

Again, it is written, "Take heed to thyself, and to the doctrine; continue in them, for in so doing thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." You can do infinitely more to save others, by taking heed to *yourself*, than you can by taking heed to the other man.

Note, too, that you are to take heed to *yourself* even before taking heed to doctrine. No man is qualified to take heed to doctrine till he has taken good heed to himself. Take heed to thyself, make

straight paths for your feet, follow Christ yourself, first of all things, then the doctrine will be of benefit: but without this the doctrine will be of no benefit to you nor to anybody else so far as you are concerned.

Yet some man will say, "What! are we not our brother's keeper?"—Yes, we are; and this is the only right way to be that. Please remember that it was Cain to whom the inquiry came, "Where is thy brother?"

If Cain had himself followed the Lord, if Cain had kept his eyes on Christ and off his brother, instead of on Christ and on his brother: if Cain had made straight paths for his own feet, instead of trying to make a path for the other man's feet; if Cain had taken heed to himself, instead of taking heed to the other man, then that inquiry never would have come to him. He would then have proved such a faithful keeper of his brother that he would have been only a constant blessing to his brother, and approved and accepted of God as a true worshiper.

Remember, too, that, like so many of those others who are ever meddling with other people, and who think their place in the world is to set other people straight. Cain was a professor of religion. He considered himself the only true worshiper, and that whoever did not choose to conform to his views of conduct must be compelled to do so. And if they still chose to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, they were considered not fit to live. And as at that time there was no civil government which he might make the instrument of his wicked will, and behind which he might shield himself with the plea that he was "only enforcing the law," he was obliged to carry it through himself. And he did.

And though professed Christians to-day do have civil government which they can make the instrument of their will in requiring others to conform to their views of conduct, and behind which they can shield themselves with the miserable excuse that they are "only enforcing the law," this does not in the least relieve them of the essential character and guilt of Cain. For thus it is written, "Woe unto them, for they have gone in the way of Cain."

"A Man of Peace" American Sentinel 12, 38, pp. 594, 595.

[594]

ATJ

THE Christian is emphatically a man of peace. The whirl of political strife, the agitations which mark the contest of class with class, the rumbling of coming storms which distract statesmen and fill the hearts of men with fear, pass him by unscathed. In his heart there is peace. He stands upon a foundation that cannot be moved which is the Word of God.

To every servant of the living God the divine is forgiven, "Fear not." The commotions that fill this world, or the worst that can come, are powerless to sever himself from the steadfast purpose of God which embraces not only his existence here, but a future one that runs throughout eternity. All earthly agencies of evil are powerless to take him out of the hands of God. "There is no power but of God," and of that power he is not against, for to him it is the agency of [595] salvation. The gospel is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

The Christian will never think of stirring up strife and revolution. He has nothing to gain in that way. His work depends not upon the power of votes nor the force of arms, but upon the Spirit of his God. He will be accused of fermenting rebellion and treason, but there will be in the charge no more truth than was in the charge brought by the Jews against Christ before Pontius Pilate.

"The Power of the Church" American Sentinel 12, 38, pp. 595, 596.

[595]

ATJ

POWER belongs, and rightly belongs, to the church of Jesus Christ.

But it is not the power of this world nor of anything that is connected with this world.

Before the Lord Jesus left his church to ascend to heaven, he said to them, "Tarry ye in Jerusalem till ye be endued with power from on high."

It is power from on high, and *only* from on high, that belongs to the church of Christ. If she has not this power, whatever else she may have, she is only weakness itself for any good in the world.

This power from on high is given directly from heaven to the church. It does not come through the number, wealth, nor influence of its adherents; it does not come by means of society, the State, nor any other mediumship whatever.

Before he went away from the earth Christ, the Head of the Church, said to his disciples, "Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you." This is the only power, and the only means of power, that belongs to the church of Christ.

And this power is open full and free to believers and the church to-day, as it was on the day of Pentecost so long ago. God poured out his Spirit then to believers and his church, *without measure*, and he has *never taken it back*. There is just as much of the Spirit of God in the world to-day as there was on the evening of the day of that wonderful Pentecost.

Why then does not the church have this power as abundantly as she did on that Pentecost?—The answer is easy: *The world cannot receive the Spirit of God*. He is not the spirit of the world, he is the Spirit of God. The God whose the Holy Spirit is, and who gives the Holy Spirit, is not "the god of this world." The Spirit of God cannot be received while retaining the spirit of the world. The church has too much of the spirit of the world to have the fullness of the Spirit of God.

The Lord started his church in the world with the full endowment of his Holy Spirit. His church was at that time entirely separated from the world: for Jesus said, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." Complete separation from the world was an essential condition—precedent to receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit: and complete separation from the world was essential to retain that precious gift.

But there came "a falling away." The influence, the numbers, and the power of the world were sought after. Men arose from among the believers who desired to multiply disciples for worldly honor. They perverted the right way, they spoke perverse things to draw away disciples after them. They succeeded in this bad ambition: disciples

were drawn after themselves in such numbers that the leaders found it impossible to maintain discipline among them.

If the Holy Spirit had been retained and courted and honored, the genuine discipline of the Lord would have been maintained through the prevailing love of God, the unity of the Spirit, and the bond of peace. In order that this might be so, it was necessary to separate completely from the world. But the professed church of Christ had gone after the world, she had courted the world, and had won the world. And now she found herself unable to control the world which she had won.

To hold her own with the world which she had won, she must have power. She had separated from "the power from on high" when she went after the world and courted the world. If she would have this power again, she must separate from the very world which she had won, but which she found herself powerless to control.

Here was a dilemma. What should she do? Power she must have. The "power from on high" was as fully and freely open to her as it was at Pentecost and onward. This she could have in all its fullness as at the first. But alas! she could not have this and the world too. The world cannot receive the Spirit of God. Would she not separate from this world, even from the world which she had won, that she might drink to everlasting fullness of "the powers of the world to come"?

No, she would not. She would go still farther from the power from on high. She would go still farther toward the world. She had courted and won the world, she would not court and win the *power* of this world, that she might control the world which she had already won. She would go as far as it was possible to go from the power from on high: she herself would become a world power.

All this she did. She secured an illicit union with the State. She committed fornication with the kings of the earth. She ruled the world with the world's power in its fullness, unrestrained. And she ruled the world with the world's power, *as this world's power, unrestrained, rules* —wickedly, despotically, abominably. She herself [596] became the very "mistress of witchcraft and the mother of abominations."

The professed church of Christ is again, to-day, sorely in need of power. She knows it. Again she has so far won the world that

she finds herself in need of power to control the world which she has won. What now will she do? Already, on every hand, there are too many tokens of the disposition to go the full length of the first apostasy—she is grasping for the power of the world, she is seeking illicit connection with the State, she desires to rule the world with the world's power, she is giving evidence that she herself desires to be a world power.

But the power from on high still, even to-day, awaits her demand and reception. There is as much of the Holy Spirit, as much of the power of the Holy Ghost, in the world to-day as there was at the close of the day of Pentecost long ago. And still *the world* cannot receive Him. Let the church to-day separate from the world and from all worldliness, and she can be endued with power from on high, she can be filled with the Holy Ghost.

He that believeth on me, saith the Lord, from his body "shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive." Do you believe on Him? Then, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," "whom *the world cannot receive*, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him: for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."

"Ye are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I have chosen you out of the world." "Now we have received, *not the spirit of the world*, but the spirit which is of God." It is simply a choice that all people are free to make, whether they will have the spirit of the world or the Spirit of God. And all people are always making the choice.

But Christians, by that very name, profess to have made the choice of the Spirit of God and not of the spirit of the world. And yet so many of them incline to the spirit of the world, defer to the world, and desire the favor and approval of the world, that it is impossible for the Spirit to witness with their spirit that they are the children of God.

If the churches and religious organizations and combinations in the United States would seek for the power from on high as earnestly as they seek the power of the police, of the courts, and of the world generally; if they would petition God for the Holy Spirit as diligently as they petition Congress and the State legislatures for Sunday laws, there would be such a reformation in religion as the world has never

seen since the days of the first apostles, and the world would know of a surety that God sent Christ to be the Saviour of the world. Why will they not do it?

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 38, p. 596.

[596]

ATJ

TO follow Christ and at the same time follow a political "boss," is as impossible as it is to serve God and mammon. And to eliminate the "boss" from politics is equally impossible. But Christianity knows no "boss."

"Will It Steer Clear?" American Sentinel 12, 38, pp. 596, 597.

[596]

ATJ

THE New York *Voice*, in speaking of the growth of "Christian Endeavor," says:—

> "So far the Christian Endeavor movement has escaped the reaction which generally has followed such a marvelous and rapid growth in other organizations. Numerically it continues to be the greatest thing in modern religious activity. Meeting a growing demand for less division and more union on the part of Christians, it has more than met the ardent expectations of its most ardent admirers. If it can steer clear of the rock on which moral organizations wreck their usefulness, and that pride in the mere power of numbers, its future days may be its best days in advancing the cause of Christ's kingdom in the world."

In every work in which the Endeavor movement follows the example set by Him whom it recognizes as Lord and Master, we wish it the fullest success. And what care should be exercised by those entrusted with the leadership of the great host, to prevent any departure from the path marked out by Him! What care should be taken to safeguard it from the wiles of unscrupulous men who have some political or religious axe to grind, and see in this movement

a splendid opportunity to get possession of the power required for their purposes.

Will the Christian Endeavor host avoid becoming intoxicated by a realization of their own power? Will they remember that power and numbers do not constitute proof that their cause is either strong or right? For they only are on the side of strength and right—they only are in the majority—who are on the side of God.

[597] We hope so. But it they do—if they "steer clear of the rock on which moral organizations wreck their uselessness"—they must steer clear of the would-be leaders who are even now endeavoring with all their energies to bring the Endeavor host down from the heights of true Christian activity to the plane of politics.

Will they depend upon the promise of the power of him who has said, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world"? or will they depend upon the power of votes? Politics recognizes no other power, and depends upon no other, than the latter.

"The 'Powers That Be'" American Sentinel 12, 38, pp. 604, 605.

[604]

ATJ

IT is a self-evident truth that all men have been "endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights," and that "to protect these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

This self-evident truth is in harmony with the truth stated by the Apostle Paul, in Romans 13:1, that "the powers that be are ordained of God." Truth cannot conflict with itself. That which is ordained of God is the power for the protection of the unalienable rights with which he has endowed each member of the human family.

This is altogether different from ordaining any particular person to exercise power over his fellow creatures. The person in civil office is simply entrusted with the exercise of a portion of this power. This power entrusted to him is not arbitrary power, but only such power as may be necessary for the proper discharge of the duties of his office.

It used to be a common idea that God had ordained certain persons, or a certain line of persons, to be rulers over the rest of the

people in the State or nation, and that these persons were privileged to exercise their power in any way that they might choose. This idea gave right to such expressions as "the divine right of kings," "The king can do no wrong," etc.

But God did not ordain any person to exercise arbitrary power. He himself does not exercise such power.

The power that is in the persons, and not the persons that are in power, is "ordained of God."

It is natural for an individual when in office to take to himself more power than belongs to him; and it is also very common for an individual to get into some seat of power who has no scruples about the manner in which he shall use it. In this way it frequently happens that injustice is done to men by those in positions of power, and their rights, instead of being preserved, are violated.

This is the way it has been in the cases of those who have suffered persecution for conscience' sake. Those in power have exercised the power entrusted to them, for an altogether different purpose than the protection of human rights. They have used it to invade the right of freedom of conscience.

The Bible tells us that we are to be in subjection to the "powers that be," and that whoever "resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." Romans 13:1, 2. But, as we have seen, there is a vast difference between resisting the power which God has ordained, and resisting a decree which represents a perversion of that power.

Yet the Bible does not authorize us to resist even an unjust decree, in the sense of employing force against it. As John Bunyan stated in his reply to the clerk who had been sent to admonish him to submit himself to the king. "The law provides two ways of obeying: the one, to do that which in my conscience I do believe that I am to do, actively; and where I cannot obey actively, then I am willing to lie down and suffer what they may do to me." And Bunyan was even then giving an illustration, in Bedford jail, of this second way of being in submission to the powers that be.

The Lord permits men to exercise power here in this world, but he has not resigned his own power, as the Sovereign who is over and above all things. He intervenes in the affairs of men and overrules their counsels and thwarts their purposes, in whatever way his omniscient wisdom may dictate. The word of the Lord carries

with it an authority superior to that of any man or set of men on earth.

The very fact that the power that men exercise is derived from God, is sufficient proof that it cannot be rightfully exercised to compel people to act contrary to God's will.

A good illustration of the truth on this point is furnished us in the case of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. God had himself set Nebuchadnezzar upon the throne of earthly dominion, and commanded all people to be it subjection to him, even the chosen people of Israel. The Lord had even declared that he would punish the nation that would not submit to Nebuchadnezzar. See Jeremiah 27:4-8.

Yet when Nebuchadnezzar made a decree that the people should bow down and worship the golden image which he had set up in the plains of Dura, the three Hebrew captives, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, flatly refused to obey Nebuchadnezzar's decree, and the Lord by a wonderful miracle upheld them in their refusal and justified their course; so that Nebuchadnezzar himself bowed before the Lord and acknowledged that his own word had been righteously changed in the matter concerning which he had made his decree.

God had raised up Nebuchadnezzar and entrusted him with power for a purpose: not such a purpose as the king might conceive in his own heart and wish to carry out, but for the purpose which God had in his on mind. God did not do this for the sake of exalting Nebuchadnezzar, but he did it in order that he might through Nebuchadnezzar proclaim the knowledge of himself.

The power that is ordained of God is not to be used to thwart the purposes of God. It was so in Nebuchadnezzar's time, and it is so to-day. When this power is exercised, as it should be, to preserve human rights, it cannot interfere with God's plans. But when this
[605] power is perverted, and used for a purpose for which it was not ordained, its decrees are not binding upon any person.

But the only way to know what is right, is to be instructed by the Lord, through his Word and Spirit, which are given to guide believers into all truth.

October 7, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 39, p. 609.

[609]

ATJ

THE best way to restore Sabbath observance, is to observe it. A good example will accomplish more in this direction than law or precept.

THE Sabbath of the Lord is a gift: the man-made sabbath is an institution thrust upon the people by the force of civil pains and penalties.

THERE are always plenty of men in the world who are willing to become lawmakers for other people and by their zeal in this to atone for their own shortcomings.

THE “concert” of “Christian” Europe will evidently always remain a thing to be, judging from the length of time the would-be participants have been vainly trying to get in tune with each other.

THE rights of a Christian do not include the prohibiting of other people from going contrary to his own religious belief or practice. His rights are not concerned by his religious belief.

THERE are a great many more heathen in the United States than there are in Christians, determined by the Bible rule that all persons are heathen who do not know the Lord.

THERE is a vast difference between being directed by the Lord, and being under the direction of some man who claims to speak for the Lord. We prefer to be guided by the Word of the Lord, interpreted by his Spirit.

A DISPATCH from Rome says that “the pope has instructed the papal nuncio at Madrid to insist upon the clergy opposing Carlism and to urge the clergy to earnestly support the Spanish ministry and

present Spanish dynasty." And the pope and clergy of "the church" never have anything to do with politics, no never—well hardly ever, unless the interest of "the church" or something else demands it, and their own inclination justifies it.

IF it be true that the government has a right to enact laws for the preservation of morality, is it also true that morality can change with every change of the government and its regulations? Since every government on the earth does change (and none more frequently than a republican government), and since morality does not change, how can the latter be properly a subject of governmental regulation? When human laws are altered, is there ever, in any case, an alteration of right and wrong?—Certainly not; and this is conclusive evidence that human legislation is not adapted to deal with right and wrong: or, in other words, with morality.

"Religious Right" American Sentinel 12, 39, pp. 609, 610.

[609]

ATJ

RELIGIOUS right is the greatest boon that ever was given, or that ever could be given, to men.

That is the truth: and, being the truth, in the nature of things such a boon could come from God only.

Religious right, as generally understood and as contemplated in these lines, is the right of every person to choose for himself in things religious without constraint of any kind from any person or source whatever.

This freedom God has given to men, as is declared in the motto of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, in the words of the Lord Jesus, "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not." The right is given by the Lord to men, and is thus recognized by the Lord in men.

This is illustrated in the transaction in the garden in Eden. The
[610] man was made in the image of God, to glorify God, yet left perfectly free not to do so if he should choose; and was left perfectly free to choose for himself whether he would or not. He was left as free to choose *not* to serve God as he was to serve him.

This freedom God gave to man, and recognizes in man; and it is this, more than anything else, that enables man to be really a man.

Any person who would in any degree infringe this right of man aims a destructive blow at the dignity and the manliness of man, and at the honor and glory of God.

Therefore it is to the honor and glory of God, and in the interest of the everlasting dignity and manliness of man, uncompromisingly to oppose every attempt in whatever degree to infringe or to disrespect the right of any person to choose for himself in all things religious—to choose for himself as to all religious beliefs, rites, customs, and practices.

No State can ever have any shadow of right, by legislation or in any other way, to circumscribe the perfect freedom of every man to choose for himself whether he will regard or disregard any religious belief, or rite, or custom, or practice. And every man's right utterly to *disregard* everything of the kind is as complete as it is to regard it.

No church has any shadow of ground for condemning any man or any number of men who disregard everything which that church holds sacred. Every person has perfect right to disregard all that any church or all churches together believe or practice. The professed Christian church or individual who condemns or criticises or sets at naught any person for disregarding any religious belief, or rite, or custom, denies the God of Christianity.

Loyalty to religious right does not consist in asserting *our own* right to be religious or not religious at our own unconstrained choice; but in the unswerving recognition of the right of *the other man* to be religious or not religious at his own personal and unconstrained choice. This is so plain that it must be recognized at once by every one. In the garden, God did not assert his own right to be religious for himself and other people too; that matter could take care of itself. But he did establish and recognize the right of the man to believe or not believe him, just as the man himself might freely choose. This he did again, in the divine motto of religious freedom, "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."

This shows, too, that when one who is religious condemns one who is not religious for not being religious or for not believing what he preaches, he hinders the salvation of the one who does not believe. Then, religious friend, will you frustrate the salvation of men who do not believe, by bringing upon them your condemnation through

denunciation from the pulpit, or the instrumentality of the police, the courts, and fines, and imprisonments? Will you not rather forever present to all people the winning blessing and grace of salvation, by recognizing his divine right not to believe and treating them all with the merciful and gracious consideration which the Lord has shown to the man whom he created?

Let every one who professes to believe in religious right show by his conduct that he really believes in it. Let the believing neighbor respect in Christian kindness, the unbelieving neighbor. Let the unbelieving neighbor respect in manly dignity the right which his believing neighbor exercises in choosing to believe.

Let the believing wife respect her unbelieving husband, let her request his exercise of the right to choose for himself whether he will believe or not. Let the unbelieving husband in true manliness regard his believing wife's exercise of the right to choose to believe.

Let the believing husband respect the exercise of the right of choice not to believe. And let the unbelieving wife show that she believes in religious right, by respecting the choice of her husband to be religious just as he chooses.

This will show that you do indeed believe in religious right, in religious freedom. But so long as you *act* any other way than this, your *profession* of believing religious freedom is a fraud.

Let the precious divine boon of religious freedom never be dimmed by the actions contradicting the words in those who profess to love it!

"The Two Principles" American Sentinel 12, 39, pp. 620, 621.

[620]

ATJ

THERE are two principles in the world by which human conduct is sought to be controlled,—love, and force.

Love is the principle by which God works. The Bible tells us that "God is love," and consequently, "love is of God." Love is the highest principle of conduct that can exist.

Force is a lower and altogether different principle. Force is employed by the enemies of God in seeking to make people act contrary to God's will.

Love acts upon the individual from within; force is applied to him from without. Love leads; force drives.

Everything that God does is prompted by love. He cannot act from any other motive, for he "is love." And God wants all his creatures to act from the same motive, and so to be like him.

"God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16.

And Christ so loved the race that had fallen through Adam's sin, that he willingly left all that he had in heaven, to live a life of humility and suffering here, and finally to die upon the cross for man's redemption.

As love moved God and his Son to do such wonderful deeds in serving us, so the Lord wants love to move us in doing high and noble deeds to serve him.

God wants people to love him, and to love all that is pure and right and just. In this way, by planting this love in our hearts, he seeks to control our actions so that our lives will be upright.

This way of controlling people does not in the least interfere with their personal freedom.

But force, on the other hand, does interfere with personal freedom. It would not be effective if it did not. Force takes no account of the will or belief or the love of the person on whom it is brought to bear. It secures certain results touching the outward conduct of people, and this is all that it can do.

Force is necessary in this world; but for what and for whom is it necessary?

It cannot make any person do right, nor is it necessary for good people.

Love makes a person do right; and it is love in the heart that makes a person good. We know from the Bible that this must be so; and we can know it also from our own experience and the experience of others.

The Bible says, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." 1 John 5:3. And also, "Love is the fulfilling of the law." Romans 13:10. The one who keeps the commandments of God—who fulfils the law—does right. He is a good person. And

also, since "God is love," he who has love ruling in his heart has God there, and therefore has the goodness of God.

Force is necessary to restrain evil-doers. A good person does not do the things that an evil-doer needs to be restrained from doing. He chooses to do right, not because there is a law against wrong doing, but because he loves what is right.

Is a good person then without any law? No, indeed; he has the perfect law of God written in his heart. This is what gives him a love for the right. The law of man cannot be written in the heart and cannot give any person a love for the right. So the law of God is very much more effective to prevent wrong doing any an individual, if he will only receive it, than the law of man possibly can be.

A person may keep the laws which are made by Congress and the legislatures, and yet not be a good person.

For instance, he may not do any work on Sunday, because he is afraid that if he does he will be arrested and sent to jail, or punished with a fine. Or he may consider that it is good policy not to work on Sunday, in order to stand well with the people in the community. Is such a person any better for not working on Sunday?—Certainly not.

And it would be the same if it were the seventh day—the Bible Sabbath—instead of Sunday. If he does not keep the Sabbath because he loves it,—because the love of God is in his heart,—it is of no benefit to him to go through the form of keeping it. He is not a good man, in the true sense of the word, and to refrain from work does not make him any better.

Even the one who truly keeps the Sabbath does not become good by doing it, but he keeps it because he has become good already, by opening his heart to the love of God.

Force cannot make any person do right, however fully he may yield to it; because it cannot touch the heart, which is the fountain head of all our actions. If the fountain head is not sweet, the stream will not be sweet.

It may be walled in or dammed [*sic*.] up or restrained in any other way; but its condition of purity or impurity will not be changed by any such means.

Force is to preserve rights. In doing this, its use is in harmony with the ordinance of God. But all along through the history of

the world, from the time of Abel down to the end of the nineteenth century, some men have been using force to try to make them do right: or, rather, to make them do what these men thought was right. They have been using force to try to make people better, and so to secure their salvation instead of their destruction by the final judgments of God against sin. It is this that has caused the religious persecutions that have stained with blood so many of the pages of [621] history.

In securing the preservation of rights, force is entirely proper; but in securing moral or right action it has no proper place; but the arch-enemy of God and man uses force—not to make men moral, for he hates morality; but to make them conform to some standard of morality which he himself has set up in opposition to God, and palmed off upon the world. And all who employ or advocate force to make people do right are really working in harmony with him.

Even if force were used to make people conform to the true standard of morality,—the law of God,—it would be contrary to God, for it is not God's way. And the person upon whom it was used, instead of becoming better, would learn to hate instead of to love that law,—because he would see in it only an instrument of slavery to himself.

October 14, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 40, p. 625.

[625]

ATJ

A DENIAL of the validity of Sunday laws is not at all a denial of the right of any person to a weekly day of rest.

THE rest why a good many “reforms” do not succeed is that it is impossible to reform an evil thing into a good thing.

HE who spends the Sabbath day with God will enjoy a quiet and restful Sabbath, whether any one else around him is at rest or not.

THE right to do that which God commands, can be solely claimed by any individual without reliance upon any other power than God.

THERE is no right more important to mankind, none left more unguarded at the present time, and none so seriously menaced to-day, as that of individual freedom of conscience.

THE civil law cannot undertake to enforce morality, without being forced to turn aside from its legitimate work of preserving human rights, and becoming an instrument of their destruction.

IF the nation if a moral personality, as is claimed, it must have a conscience, and its conscience and must direct the latter in any matter with which it has to do. And this being so, the nation becomes the individual’s god, and nationalism the individual’s religion.

IT is a sure sign of a bad law that it is largely made use of by bad people, or with malicious motives.

THE effectual cure for evil is not repression, but eradication; and the work of eradication must always be done in the heart.

IF it is fitting that the mighty work of creation should be commemorated by the setting apart of a weekly day of rest, what is there

fitting about the setting apart of such a day by the State, which never created anything, nor has any power to create even a grain of sand? Is not such an act highly presumptuous?

"Civil Law and Morality" American Sentinel 12, 40, p. 628.

[628]

ATJ

CIVIL law is not fitted to deal with matters on the basis of their character as moral or immoral; its province is to consider them on the basis of their compatibility with human rights.

The Declaration of Independence sets forth that governments are instituted to preserve the natural rights of mankind; and the truth of the statement is declared to be self-evident. But it is a lie if the doctrine be true that civil law can properly concern itself with questions of morality.

The *Christian Statesman*, however, and the "reform" party which it represents, evidently do not believe in the Declaration of Independence. In a late issue of the *Statesman* the editor makes note of the objection to National Reform work, that moral reforms must be put into the hearts of the people before they will come out in the life, and says:—

> "But if the civil law has properly nothing to do with Sabbath, temperance, or other reforms, as matters of public morals, why should it have anything more to do with the moral principle of ownership in property or the sacredness of human life? Are we content to have regard for human life or property or the marriage relation wrought into the hearts of the people and left there without any expression of civil law concerning impurity, stealing, and murder? No civilized commonwealth dreams of carrying into effect any such limping code of morals."

This may look and sound plausible, but it is mere sophistry. The answer is that civil law does not prohibit theft, murder, and adultery *in order to prevent immorality*, but in order to *protect the rights* of the individual. If its object were to prevent immorality, it would utterly

fall of its purpose; for according to the testimony of Scripture—and of human experience as well—the man who covets, or hates his fellow men, or harbors impure thoughts, is as verily immoral as is the one who steals, murders, or commits adultery. Immorality is not an act, but a condition. It is impossible for an individual to commit an immoral act before he has become an immoral person.

He does not become immoral by committing the immoral act, but he commits the immoral act because he has become immoral. "Out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh."

Therefore, as stated, the civil law would utterly fail of its purpose it if should undertake to prohibit immorality. If that has been its object, it has utterly failed from the first.

But civil law is not a failure. It is necessary to civil government, and civil government is necessary to the preservation and enjoyment of individual rights, without which this life would fail to realize the purpose which it is designed to serve.

And as no question of the violation of individual rights is concerned in the observance or non-observance of the Sabbath, but only a question of morality, the civil law can properly have no concern with it. The law is bound to protect every person in his right of exercising his own judgment and free will in such a matter.

"A 'Non-sectarian' Myth" American Sentinel 12, 40, pp. 628, 629.

[628]

ATJ

IT is entirely proper that the Roman Catholic press should protest against governmental recognition of "non-sectarian" Protestantism. This is a myth which certain Protestant religious journals have persistently assumed to be a reality. They have assumed, in other words, that a union of Church and State could only be where the State was joined with some particular religious denomination, and that where State aid was given in behalf of principles and dogmas held by a number of denominations in common, no union of Church and State could be charged.

These Protestants have always maintained emphatically that State aid or patronage given to the Catholic Church constituted a union of Church and State, but they have denied that a similar relation

of the State to the Protestant Church in general, as distinguished from the adherents of the papacy, constituted a similar union.

Now comes the *Catholic Review* (New York) with a strongly-worded demand that Protestants shall stand by their professions of regard for a secular government,—professions made when opposing the advances of Rome,—and that the government shall give no aid or recognition to Protestantism, just as she is asked to do toward the Church of Rome.

The program of reform which this Catholic journal demands is given as the following:—

> "Put the Protestant version of the Bible out of the public courts and the public schools; do away with the religious oath at the taking of testimony; discharge the Protestant ministers who are chaplains of legislatures, prisons, and reformatories; dismiss preachers and priests who are drawing money from the public treasury in payment for their services in preaching their beliefs in the

[629]

> Christian religion to soldiers and sailors; forbid the election or appointment of a clergyman to any political office; and let the so-called American principle of the separation of Church and State drive God and his Christ and the Word and his rule and his kingdom and his clerical representatives out of the official life of this nation. Let it not be only Catholic Indian schools or Catholic charters that are 'sectarian.' Let Protestant schools, and Protestant teachers, and Protestant ministers, and Protestant institutions fall under the same ban. It is Protestants who are prescribing this treatment. Let them take their own medicine."

Rome frequently displays the virtue of being consistent, and does so in this instance. The Protestant preachers should not refuse to take their own medicine, and cannot refuse without standing discredited in the public place. But Rome does not want the Protestant bodies to

"take their medicine," and of course, knows full well that they will not do so. Her object is to force them to assist from their opposition to herself, by exposing their inconsistency in the matter.

Let it be noted that the Church of Rome stands fully ... of any Protestant church in claiming that the American principle of separation of Church and State since "God and his Christ and his Word and his rule and his kingdom ... out of the official life of this nation." The Church of Rome does not admit that all this can be in the official life of the nation without having Protestantism first driven out: and on the other hand, the "national reform" Protestant bodies are equally positive that the rule of God and his Word in the seat of national government is entirely incompatible with any recognition of the Church of Rome. The principle which leads any religious body to seek for governmental support of its principles, dogmas, or institutions, is an intolerant principle, and always leads to bitter sectarian words. It is not *a* Christian Church in any sense.

It the Roman Catholic Church be a sect, the Protestant Church is likewise a sect, for the two bodies stand over against each other. And when any Protestant body calls for a non-sectarian government, it calls for its own exclusion, and that of all other religious bodies, either singly or combined, from any position of government patronage or aid.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 40, p. 629.

[629]

ATJ

THE attempt to suppress immorality by civil law when logically and consistently carried out, leads directly to the establishment of the Inquisition.

October 21, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 41, pp. 641.

[641]

ATJ

THERE is no worse slavery than that of selfishness.

CREED has been well-defined as the cloister of thought.

THE truly free man never desires to enslave any one else.

THE upas-tree of popery flourishes in the soil of human nature.

CHRISTIANITY knows no “league;” it knows only the “unity of the Spirit.”

THE right to observe a weekly day of rest is the only one which is sought to be forced upon people by law.

IF you are a “doer of the law” yourself, you will find neither time nor occasion for judging your neighbor.

THE most distinguished monopolist in the world is the devil. He is trying the hardest to force everything to go his way.

THE largest society in the world, the easiest to get into and the best one to get out of and avoid is the Society for Setting Other People Straight.

EVERY person has a right to refrain from the exercise of any right that he may possess. Otherwise it would not be a right, but an obligation.

THE Christian goes to his warfare taking the “shield of faith.” Ephesians 6:16. That which is of faith, is a defense to its possessor. If the first-day Sabbath were of faith, it would not need so much defending.

THE accepted way of “defending” the Sabbath is to compel somebody else to keep it! If there were any defense in this method,

the seventh-day Sabbath would long ago have perish for the lack of it.

"Our Government and God's Sovereignty" American Sentinel 12, 41, pp. 641, 642.

[641]

ATJ

THE signers of the Declaration of Independence were men who believed in God and acknowledged his rightful sovereignty in earthly affairs.

This is set forth in the statement—which constitutes the very foundation on which the Declaration rests—that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Only upon the basis which these words set forth could the appeal have been made to mankind which was made by our forefathers in this immortal document. If there is not God, then it is not true that all men are created equal and endowed with certain unalienable rights which it is the business of civil government only to secure and never to molest. We appeal from the decisions of majorities to that Being who constitutes the true majority; to Him whose way is always just, and whose word true; but if there be no such Being, then we can only fall back upon the decisions of majorities, fallible as such decisions must be, and unjust and untrue as they are often found to be. The doctrine of unalienable rights is swept away altogether; for if the

[642]

decision of the majority be our highest rule of guidance, then it rests with the majority to say what our rights are, or whether we have any at all. For if the individual is alone, he cannot properly set himself up above two or more others equal with himself.

The doctrine of unalienable rights, which underlies the American system of government, rests thus upon the acknowledgment of the sovereignty of God as the Creator of all men. But it is through the Constitution of the United States that this system of government was put into practical operation. And this being so, it is perfectly plain that the Constitution cannot rightfully be called a "Godless" document.

The doctrine of the unalienable right of mankind rests upon the acknowledgment of the sovereignty of God as the Creator. And it is the only doctrine in harmony with such an acknowledgment; all other doctrines virtually deny it.

The American system of government is based upon that doctrine; and,—

The United States Constitution is the instrument through which this system is put into operation.

Therefore, the United States Constitution is the right constitution, and the only one, consistent with the real acknowledgment of the sovereignty of God in human affairs. Let that acknowledgment, and this Constitution, forever remain.

"Religious Monopoly" American Sentinel 12, 41, pp. 642, 643.

[642]

ATJ

NOT the least of the monopolies for the establishment of which determined efforts are being put forth at the present time, is one which is designed to cover the field of men's conduct in religion.

Religious monopoly is not a new thing—a creation of the nineteenth century. It is as old as the history of mankind. The first man to set one up was Cain, who killed his brother because he practiced a different religion from his own.

A religious monopoly is the worst of all forms of monopoly, both because religion is of all the things the most essential to human welfare, and because such a monopoly not only seeks to drive all other religious out of the field, but to force everybody to take religion from it as well.

It declares not only that nobody shall practice a religion contradictory to itself, but that everybody must have religion—of the kind which it supplies—whether the individual wants it or not.

The religion which is aiming at a monopoly to-day, in this and other "Christian" lands, has for its distinguishing feature the observance of the first day of the week.

It demands that all men, of whatever race or belief, shall incorporate this distinguishing feature into their conduct, thus becoming in a true sense its adherents.

This monopoly has behind it a gigantic force of church workers and religious societies. It has already received the support of Congress, the courts, and the State legislatures.

But there is one other religion in the field which will not yield to this monopoly; and that religion is Christianity. The distinguishing feature of Christianity is faith in the Word of God; hence, it is in contrast with the religion of the monopoly, since the Word of God does not command the observance of the first day of the week.

A clash between the two religions is inevitable, for Christianity will not yield her ground or turn aside from her appointed course. All false religions can compromise upon some essential feature common to all; but Christianity cannot compromise with anything.

A religious monopoly which was prophesied for the closing period of earthly history is described in the latter half of the thirteenth
[643] chapter of Revelation. There a power is spoken of which should perform miracles in the endeavor to cause the people to "worship the image of the beast," and it is said of it that "he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive the mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark or the name of the beast, or the number of his name."

The Sabbath is declared in the Scriptures to be the sign of the true God—he who has creative power. Its observance constitutes a mark upon those who are his people. See Ezekiel 20:12, 20. The Sabbath of the Lord is the seventh day of the week.

On the other hand is the Sunday, which is claimed by the papacy as the sign of her spiritual power, and the observance of which properly constitutes a mark of adherence to her. In proportion as the clash between Christianity and the would-be religious monopoly becomes more fierce, these opposing marks will acquire the prominence in the field of controversy. They will become the standards, as it were, at the head of the conflicting forces.

Every opposer of monopolies should understand that opposing the worst of all monopolies he is called to take his stand on the side of Christianity. Christianity has no monopoly. Its whole aim is to bestow freedom, to exalt the race, as individuals, to the plane of that independence of thought and action which is consistent with the highest human welfare.

"What is Righteousness?" American Sentinel 12, 41, p. 643.

[643]

ATJ

THE "National Christian Citizenship League," in its "proclamation" and call for a million volunteers to for ... the "Christian citizenship" cause, appeals to "the right-minded, true-hearted men and woman of the Republic who believe with Charles Sumner that 'righteousness is preservation.'" As it is undoubtedly true that "righteousness is preservation," and as the class of individuals to whom the league appeals recognize this fact, it is assured that they will join in the Christian citizenship movement, as the proper method of giving practical expression to this belief.

But to say simply that "righteousness is preservation" without any additional words of qualification, is but to give expression to a "glittering generality," and one which fails to furnish any indorsement or justification of the "Christian citizenship" campaign.

What is righteousness? The only authority to which one can turn for an answer to the question, is the Word of God. There we find it stated that "all unrighteousness is sin," and that "sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4; 5:17. From this it is clear that righteousness is the keeping of the law. But it is also written that "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Romans 3:20. This is because all flesh is by nature "under the law" and "guilty before God," having fallen in the transgression of Adam. "But now," the apostle adds, "the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; 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; ... being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Verses 21-24.

Therefore apart from faith in Jesus Christ, there is no righteousness for any being on the earth. Righteousness, as it must be known by every person who has it, means the result of faith in Jesus Christ, and the statement that "righteousness is preservation" means that there is preservation in the faith of Christ.

And this is very true. He who fights "the good fight of faith" lays "hold on eternal life." 1 Timothy 6:12. Jesus said that whosoever should lose his life for his sake should preserve it. He who gives

away treasure through faith in Christ, preserves the same "where moth and rust do not corrupt," and where riches will never take to themselves wings and fly away.

But what has all this to do with "Christian citizenship"? What has it to do with the preservation of the government or institutions of the country in which "citizenship" is held? Of what significance to these is the statement that "righteousness is preservation"? For it is evident from the nature of righteousness, as set forth in the foregoing texts, that it is not a thing that can be applied to these at all. Whatever preservation they are to have, they must obtain in another way.

Faith is the one and only source of righteousness. And faith is not a profession, it is not anything that can be set forth in legal or political documents; it is an actuating, governing principle of life, sent to save the individual sinner, and applicable alone to him. "Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God."

"Duty not Based upon Rights" American Sentinel 12, 41, p. 644.

[644]

ATJ

"LAWS forbidding labor on the Sabbath," we are told by those who advocate them, "are based upon the right of every man to enjoy a day of rest." This is strange "logic" to apply to the doctrine of human rights.

Every man has a right to get married; must we therefore have a law compelling all men to marry?

Every man has a right to acquire property; is it therefore necessary that the acquisition of property should be made compulsory?

Because some one else has a right to do a thing, must I be forced to do the same thing in order that he may enjoy his right?

If so, then individual rights are not equal; for my own choice in the matter is made to give place to that of another.

But individual rights are equal. What another person does in the exercise of a right, I have an equal right to refrain from doing.

An act done under compulsion is not the exercise of a right. The basis of compulsion is duty, and the power which compels also prescribes duty in respect to the thing compelled.

When the State, therefore, compels the observance of the Sabbath, it prescribes the duty of every citizen with respect to Sabbath observance. It removes Sabbath observance from the realm of privilege to that of duty.

The duty of Sabbath observance does not grow out of the right to observe the day, but out of the relation of man to the Author of the Sabbath. The question of the duty of Sabbath observance is first settled in the mind of the individual before he considers it as a matter of personal right.

It was in the sphere of man's duty, and not of his rights, that Sabbath observance originated.

This duty was set forth and commanded by the Creator, the Author of the Sabbath.

In prescribing Sabbath observance as a duty, the State sets itself in the place of God. It is not the business of the State to prescribe duty.

The duty does not grow out of the right, but the right out of the duty. The right of Sabbath observance affords no basis for compulsory legislation; it cannot be made the basis of any human law for Sabbath observance.

Any such law rests upon another basis, and that basis is nothing else than religious intolerance.

It is the prerogative of God alone to prescribe duty. His law prescribes for mankind, but he leaves men free to choose whether they will walk in that pathway or not. But what the State prescribes by law is taken out of the realm of man's free choice.

And when the Sabbath observance is removed from the realm of man's free choice, by that very act it is denied that Sabbath observance belongs within the sphere of individual rights. The law which claims to be "based upon the right of every man to enjoy a day of rest" each week, in reality denies that any such right exists.

"Revising History" American Sentinel 12, 41, pp. 644, 645.

[644]

ATJ

IT would be a congenial task for certain Roman Catholic authorities to revise the history of the Middle Ages especially as regards

certain important occurrences in which "the church" was a conspicuous actor.

> For example, in the *Catholic Mirror* of October 9, the Rev. Jos. V. O'Connor comes forward with the statement that "the new spirit of historical research, which seeks the simple truth of fact irrespective of theories or consequences, has settled certain points in the controversy over the [St.] Batholomew massacre;" and that "these succinctly, are: religion had nothing whatever to do with the massacre; it was a measure of Machiavellian social policy. It was not long premeditated, but adopted by the impulse of fear, chiefly of Coligny, and the number of slain cannot be proved to have exceeded 2,000."

[645]

The writer then goes on to state that the Huguenots had plotted to kidnap King Charges IX., had "incited such provinces to rebellion," and had "introduced foreign hostile troops into France;" that "the French court, gave a lying report of the massacre, deceived Pope Gregory VI., and he, good easy man, thinking that the king of France had been saved from assassination, publicly praised God;" that Charles IX. and his mother, Catharine de Medici, were "worthless Catholics" anyhow, and that the latter was not a Catholic, but a "free-thinker," and so it is evident(?) that "religion, either Catholic or Protestant, had nothing to do with the massacre"!

It is rather remarkable that "facts" can be brought to light at this date which set aside the conclusions observed by the people who lived when this occurrence took place. That these conclusions, as set forth in history were such as to-day reflect anything but credit upon the church," is a fact for which "the church" is alone responsible. She had every opportunity at the time, and afterwards, to secure a correct version of the affair for transmission to posterity. "The church" ruled almost supremely in the nations of Europe at the time when such occurrences as this passed into history. Why did she allow history to be written and stand as authentic, which is not only false but unfavorable to herself?

The truth is that the history of those times, as it has come down to us, is essentially true. But in that day the papacy had no wish to change that history; it was not then regarded as of a nature to reflect odium upon her, it was not then deemed, as it is generally to-day, a wicked thing to persecute and put to death "heretics." The terrible event of St. Bartholomew's day was regarded as a profitable and even laudable proceeding, and not calling for any apology. And hence Pope Gregory, "good, easy man," that he was, in giving public thanks and having a ... struck commemorative of the event, did not imagine he was doing anything which might make trouble for the apologists of "the church" in future times.

The Jews tell us that they did not crucify Jesus Christ, and that it was done by the Roman, Pontius Pilate. And it is true enough that in that and subsequent proceedings of a similar nature against the followers of Christ, the State has been the actor by whose authority and in whose name the persecution was done. And this is why it is so convenient to have a union of religion with the State, and why such a union is always sought by a church which wants power to enforce her religion, and has lost the power which comes from union with her divine Lord.

It is altogether too late at this date to revise the history of the Middle Ages. The attempt to do so will only expose more clearly the weakness of the claim that "religion had nothing to do" with the tragedies of those times in which the actors were known as papists and Protestants. The would-be explanations by which it is sought to remove all stigma from "the church," are fitted only for an appeal to credulity and ignorance.

October 28, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 42, p. 657.

[657]

ATJ

“JUDGE nothing before the time.”

CIVIL government was never designed to be a rival to the gospel in saving men from immorality.

THE one necessary qualification for admission to the society for discovering what is proper for other people, is to have a good-sized beam in your eye.

RELIGIOUS intolerance is only one form of selfishness. “For the glory of God” is a phrase which very often, properly translated, would mean “for the gratification of self.”

THE Almighty has undertaken to provide a country in which there shall be a righteous citizenship; and his plan alone, of all those that are being tried, will prove successful.

IT is just as possible to realize national prosperity independently of individual prosperity, as to secure national righteousness independently of individual righteousness.

THE God of heaven and earth put the stamp of his own image upon man at his creation, and yet this has not saved man in many instances from sinking to the moral level of the brute. What salvation then can be expected for the nation from merely inserting the name of God in the Constitution.

ONE thing that is very much neglected in the attempted solution of the “labor problem,” is the divine call and invitation, “Go, work to-day in my vineyard.” Here is work for all who want work, and an Employer who is invariably kind and just to his help.

A BAD principle or a bad religion—as, for example, the papal religion—is as much the foe of the one who has espoused it, as of the one who opposes it. Bad principles underlie all bad religion; and in opposing them the SENTINEL is not opposing any man, but is seeking rather to rescue men from their most dangerous foes. What it says in the advocacy of its principles, it says in behalf of all men, regardless of their race or belief.

"The Cross and the Flag" American Sentinel 12, 42, pp. 657, 658.

[657]

ATJ

THE symbol of the new crusade which calls itself "Christian citizenship," is a cross, twined about by the flag of the United States.

We do not question the fitness of this symbol to represent that proposed union of religion with the state for which "Christian citizenship" stands. It is very suggestive on this point. But considering the cross as the symbol of Christianity, the emblem becomes altogether incongruous.

The American flag stands for the nation, as distinct from all other nations; for the interests of the United States, as distinct from those of all other countries on the earth. It has no meaning or significance which is not distinctly sectional.

Christianity, on the other hand, is distinctly non-sectional. It is for all classes and races of people alike. There is an American flag, but there is no American Christianity; there is an English flag, but there is no English Christianity. Nor is there French Christianity, nor Scandinavian Christianity, nor any other national Christianity.

[658] There is Christianity,—simply that, and nothing more.

Christianity is not susceptible of subdivisions into species and varieties. It is one and the same thing for all individuals on the earth.

And this is why there can be no such thing as national Christianity. Such a thing would partake of the distinctive qualities of the nation to which it pertained; otherwise there would be no force in calling it national. So we would have as many different kinds of Christianity as there might be nations who should choose to join themselves with it.

Christianity says, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." It sees not the cross and the flag, but the cross only.

The American flag, or any other national flag, stands for war as much as it does for peace. It is borne at the head of the armies and navies of the nations in deadly combat with each other. Nor does it change one iota on such an occasion from that which it is when wrapped about the cross to form the symbol of "Christian citizenship." But Christianity stands for peace, and that always. Christianity is love, and not variance and bitterness.

The cross stands infinitely above the flag. The flag is of the earth: the cross is not of earth. No added meaning need or can be given, by anything on earth, to its wondrous significance as the token of salvation for a lost and dying race. Nor can the cross impart any significance to the flag. Taken together, the two can symbolize only something incongruous, unchristian, and un-American.

"The 'Question Before the House'" American Sentinel 12, 42, p. 658.

[658]

ATJ

AN individual may be pardoned for not keeping track of all that is going on in the world in this "fast" age, but there is a dangerous negligence in this particular revealed in the language of an esteemed correspondent who writes us that he does not see what use there is for the SENTINEL at the present time. "It seems to me," he says, "that there is no question before the house, and that the SENTINEL is firing at dead issues."

We had supposed everybody who read the SENTINEL was aware of the movement that has now for some years been on foot in the churches of this country to "enthrone Christ" in the politics of this nation. That movement was never so formidable as it is to-day. It is represented by the "Christian Citizenship," "Christian Endeavor," and other organizations of a religious nature, numbering millions of young, active, and zealous adherents. And these millions of young people are only the latest recruits to the army which is working to secure this "national reform."

Shall Christ be "enthroned" in our politics? is the question before the house. Or in other words, Shall the religious movement succeed which, its adherents claim, will "enthrone Christ on Capitol Hill," but which in reality will unite church and state? A very live issue is this, and one which concerns the welfare of every individual in the country. And—we repeat—this movement was never so formidable as it is to-day.

IF to observe a weekly day of rest is a matter of personal right, it should be recognized as the privilege of the individual to so rest *if he chooses* to do so. But the Sunday law denies that any person shall exercise their own choice in the matter, and thereby denies that a weekly rest is a matter of individual right. Professing to uphold the right, it in reality denies it altogether.

"A Threatened Union of Church and State" American Sentinel 12, 42, pp. 658, 659.

[658]

ATJ

TO the Mormons in Utah President Woodruff of their hierarchy has proclaimed: "Unite in your temple work and unite in your politics." And the newspapers are calling this a "threatened union of church and state in Utah.

Yes, that is what it is. But that is nothing new, nor is it peculiar to Utah. For years the same thing has been threatened, and in the same way, by the professed Protestant churches of the whole country, and with respect to the politics of the nation.

In 1893 these churches throughout the whole country united in their politics and showered Congress with their united pledge "never to vote for, nor support in any way, for any office or position of trust," any member of Congress who refused to vote at that particular time as they dictated.

We said all the time that this work of these churches threatened a union of church and state. This was so plain that all could see it; yet the press generally, for some reason, would not denounce it as such. But as soon as the Mormons propose the same thing, only in the little State of Utah, it is heralded over the country as a threatened union of church and state. This is right: but why be so partial? It is

no worse in the Mormon Church than it is in the professed Protestant churches of the whole country.

The Christian Endeavorers, the Christian Citizenship Leagues, the Law and Order Leagues, and a number of other organizations, have for some time been making prominent this very matter of uniting in their politics. Why is not this noted as a threatened union of church and state? For that is exactly what it is.

The Mormon Church proposes to unite in their politics, in order that they can have the will of their church combination respected and carried into effect by the State of Utah. All these other church combinations did the same thing in 1892 and 1893, and they are doing it yet, in order to have the will of *their* church combination [659] carried into effect by the national government.

The Mormon proposition is to make in Utah a *State* religion: the proposition of these other church combinations is to make a *national* religion. They are alike in principle, but the latter is as much worse in practice as the nation is greater than the State of Utah.

Yes, that Mormon proposition does threaten a union of church and state, and as such it should be opposed. By the propositions of these professed Protestant churches and other religious combinations threaten precisely the same thing. Let this be opposed also. And let this be watched the more closely and opposed the more strongly, as it means mischief on a larger scale than the other. Let there be no respect of persons nor churches in any "threatened union of church and state."

"The Workingman's Palladium" American Sentinel 12, 42, p. 659.

[659]

ATJ

THE *Independent* (N. Y.), of October 14, makes this very truthful statement: "The fourth commandment is the workingman's palladium, his best defense against oppression, and was so intended from the first."

The fourth commandment was designed by keep men in constant touch with the Author of liberty. Whoever shall keep the fourth commandment will know freedom in its highest sense.

The fourth commandment is not only a command to every individual to rest on the Sabbath day, but it is the guaranty of the highest power in the universe that every person shall enjoy the privilege who will take it. For does the God of heaven command any person to do that which he is not fully able to do?

All that is necessary is for the workingman to have confidence in God. God offers to all men absolute freedom and independence; in other words, a noble, upright manhood, which never need bow its head in servility and cringing fear. "God made man upright," is the declaration of the Scriptures of truth. God made man to be upright, and not the less so in this age of the world than in any other. All the bossism and the servility which characterize the relations of man to his fellow man in this day, are not of God's ordering, but are directly contrary to it.

God has not made the privilege of Sabbath rest contingent, for a single one of his creatures, upon the lofty condescension of some other man in giving him permission to enjoy that rest; or upon the happen-so of some other man's choosing to keep the Sabbath himself. It is the duty of employers to keep the Sabbath himself. It is the duty of employers to throw no obstacle in the way of their employés as regards the keeping of the Sabbath, as is said in Deuteronomy, "That thy man servant and thy maid servant may rest as well as thou." But this statement is not a declaration that men servants and maid servants cannot have a Sabbath rest if their employers do not see fit to rest themselves or to grant them the permission.

In Christ, there is no distinction of master and servant, but all are free and on a perfect equality; and the duty and privilege of one, in respect to Sabbath observance, do not vary one whit from those of another.

Let the workingman, and every other man who has them not, accept the freedom and manhood that are in Christ. They are worth more to him than anything else.

November 4, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 43, p. 673.

[673]

ATJ

THE principles of right government are based upon unselfishness.

THE goodness of God cannot be framed in a creed or a law of man.

NOT all is the gold of true principle that manifests itself in “glittering generalities.”

HE only is not an anarchist who is loyal to the eternal law which governs the universe.

IT is a mistake to think that a man has to go into politics in order to serve the state.

THERE is nothing that human nature blossoms out into more readily than Phariseeism.

SHOW me a man who is trying to force other people to keep the Sabbath, and I will show you a man who can’t keep the Sabbath himself.

THE man who wants to force people to do right by law has forgotten—if he ever knew it—that the “weightier matters of the law” are justice, mercy, and truth.

CONSIDERING the absolute confidence which the political factions display in the coming success of their opposing candidates at the polls,—which is of course an absolute impossibility,—one is led to reflect that it would be sad indeed if Christianity offered no surer ground of hope and belief than does politics, or so often lured its adherents into “knowing things that are not so.”

IT is a mistake for the state to act as though it were the creator of the people, and held their rights at its disposal. The people are the creators of the state.

IF I am not permitted to choose whether I will keep the Sabbath or not, Sabbath-keeping cannot become a part of my nature; for only that can be wrought into my nature which comes through my own consent.

"The Test of Loyalty" American Sentinel 12, 43, pp. 673, 674.

[673]

ATJ

THE test of loyalty is one that no person in this world who arrives at the age of accountability can escape. And the test is one of loyalty to law.

But what law? Is it that law which is continually changing with the rise and fall of political parties, or the variations in legislative assemblies? Is there a varying standard of loyalty? It is manifest that such a standard could not serve as a universal test for mankind.

No; the standard is unchanging—the same for all men in all ages—because it is based upon an unchanging and unchangeable law. The only law which changes not is the law of Him who is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever."

The principles of this law come in contact with the daily life of every individual. No one can escape them. And they are the principles of religious liberty. No one, therefore, can stand in the position of a looker-on while the struggle for the preservation of that liberty is in progress. Unconsciously to himself, it may be, but none the less certainly, he is standing under one or the other of the
[674] opposing standards; and if not an active participant in the contest now, he is receiving a training which will make him such in days to come.

Jesus Christ, the divine expounder of the law of God, said that "the weightier matters" of that law are justice, mercy, and truth. There can be no loyalty to that law, therefore, without an adherence to the principles of justice and mercy. The Pharisees, to whom Christ addressed these words, held the opposite idea, or at least put the opposite of it into practice. They were the greatest sticklers for "the law," and made a most elaborate formal compliance with it; but at the

same time they laid grievous burdens upon other people's shoulders, and cared naught for the welfare and the rights of their fellow men.

It was by displaying the opposite spirit that Jesus Christ manifested his loyalty to the law of God. He came to undo the heavy burdens, to break the yokes under which men were held in bondage, to open the prison doors, to relieve in every way the distress which had become the common lot of humanity. And it is in the same way that loyalty to the divine law will manifest itself to-day.

The movements for "setting other people straight,"—for laying obligations upon their shoulders out of professed regard for "the law," for putting upon them the yoke of Puritan theology and inflicting the penalty of fine or imprisonment upon all who refuse conformity with their ideas, partake of the Pharisaical spirit and not of the spirit of genuine loyalty to law.

It is upon the law of the Sabbath that the Pharisaical spirit fastens itself most readily. For no part of the law were the Pharisees more zealous than for that which commanded Sabbath observance. How frequently they accused Christ of Sabbath-breaking, because he had broken—not the Sabbath, but—their ideas of Sabbath observance. The record of their mistaken zeal in this respect should furnish a warning to others of a later day to beware of any movement which would force people into uniformity in the matter of observing the Sabbath.

Loyalty to the law of God will be manifested in opposition to the spirit of all such movements. Such movements are in the earth to-day, and are rapidly swelling in volume and intensity; and it is in this way that the test will be brought to the people of this day. Let those who would stand for law, stand for the law for which Christ stood, and stand for it as he did. That means that they will manifest the spirit of Christ and not that of the Pharisees. The "weightier matters of the law" are justice, mercy, and truth. Without these, a zeal for the law becomes only a cloak for anarchy.

"Note" American Sentinel 12, 43, p. 674.

[674]

ATJ

IT was wisely said by Melancthon that God has not made "our knowledge all of a size any more than our bodies," and that therefore

people should "be afraid of making the articles of their faith too numerous lest they shortly become heretics themselves by disagreeing with themselves; and should be afraid of making too strict laws for those who differ in judgment on controvertible points, lest they should shortly change their own judgments, and so make a rod for their own backs." The wisdom of that observation has been demonstrated in every case of legislation in behalf of religious customs, rites, or institutions, that there has been in the history of the world.

> THE *Christian Citizen* says, "Except the state believe on Christ and accept and apply his law of *righteousness* and love as the fundamental law of the land, it cannot be saved."

And the Lord said, "He that believeth and he baptized, shall be saved."

Now will the *Christian Citizen* tell the people how the state can be baptized when it does "believe on Christ?"

Will the *Christian Citizen* tell the people, in a plain deliberate, and thoughtful way, just what the state is?

"Tobacco and Christianity" American Sentinel 12, 43, pp. 674, 675.

[674]

ATJ

MR. E. A. KING, author of "The Cigarette and the Youth," has gathered many facts relative to the use and effects of this most deadly instrument of modern civilization, among which we mention the following:—

> "During the fiscal year 1895, the total output of the cigarette companies was 4,042,391,640. During one month nearly 358,000,000 were produced. During the fiscal year 1896, 4,043,798,737 were produced, making an increase of over one million for the year. During the month of October, 458,929,090 were produced.... It is stated on good authority that there are nearly 5,000 cigarette smokers in Chicago public schools."

"This is a Christian nation," declares the Supreme Court, and the statement is echoed in many places by pulpit and press. Yes; we are a *smoking* Christian nation,—four billions and over of cigarettes consumed in a single year by the youth, besides all the tobacco that is manufactured into cigars and smoked in pipes. Very suggestive is smoke of Christianity and all that pertains to it! Is this "Christian nation" to find at last in a realm of smoke its congenial home? An observer might well be pardoned for coming to this conclusion.

"Swearing like pirates, smoking like chimneys, and headed straight for the saloon, go young America by the thousands," says an authority upon the subject of the tobacco habit in this country. And the cigarette habit is the first step in this downward career. And yet our Sunday laws allow the sale of tobacco on Sunday as a necessity, and prohibit the sale of bread! There is nothing to equal the sagacity and fine discernment of a Sunday law.

It steps are to be taken to save this nation and make it Christian, let them be first and foremost in the line of checking this terrible tide of evil that catches its human prey in the very outset of their lives. But what can be done to rescue the children from the tobacco demon while fathers and older brothers and even mothers voluntarily [675] bring him into their homes; yes, while these and even ministers of the gospel set the example in the use of the filthy weed?

The trouble with the youth of the country is first of all with those to whom the youth must look for guidance. The trouble with the whole country is not primarily with the bad men, but with the "good" men who, in their ambition to reform others, have become insensible to any applied reformation in themselves.

"Notes" American Sentinel 12, 43, p. 675.

[675]

ATJ

THE present day theocrats continually ring the progress on the statement that "Jesus Christ is the Saviour of the state and the nation, as well as of the individual." But not one of them spends any time in telling the people just what and where the state and nation would be, if there were no individuals. Yet this is just the point upon which turns their whole contention, without a plain and distinct

exposition of this point, all their words are simply a darkening of counsel without knowledge.

"Activity in Time of Peace" American Sentinel 12, 43, p. 675.

[675]

ATJ

NOT long since we received a communication from a personal friend, who in a kind manner took occasion to suggest that we were setting up men of straw—that as there was no actual persecution going on, why discuss the principles of religious liberty so earnestly as we do?

Many years ago one with keen foresight declared that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." This is just what the SENTINEL believes. When this paper first made its appearance, a short life was predicted for it, because, it was said, the evils it contends against do not exist. True, they were not full grown, but they were in embryo; and almost before the people were aware of it, they had developed into full-grown giants, stalking through the land, showing themselves as living realities. And while there is just for the time being a lull in the direction of active persecution, yet there is no real diminution in the activity of the forces that are behind the movement. Indeed, they are continually gathering strength, and no intelligent, observant individual can confirm that the SENTINEL made its appearance any too soon.

When it is known that a midnight smoldering fire threatens the inmates of a home, shall the alarm not be given for fear of disturbing their peaceful dreams? Indeed it should be given, and in no uncertain tones.

True, there is a little lull just now, but pernicious influences are at work blinding minds as to the true issues at stake; and the SENTINEL wants all the people to know it. It is for this reason that "in times of peace we prepare for war"—not with carnal weapons, but with the dissemination of the principles of civil and religious liberty before the world. It is for this reason, too, that now we are preparing for more aggressive action than ever before; and whenever the opportunity presents, we shall expect our friends everywhere to help along the good work by putting their shoulders to the wheel. We shall be heard from further along this line.

November 11, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 44, p. 689.

[689]

ATJ

THERE is no worse form of depotism [*sic*.] than anarchy.

TRUE liberty is inseparable from the principles of the Golden Rule.

LAW, in its true sense, is but the defining of the pathway of peace and prosperity.

THE man who cannot govern himself is of no real use in any system of popular government.

THE best patriotism is that which champions the rights of all individuals, regardless of nationality, color, or belief.

THE liberality of the present age is mostly of the kind that has its origin in the commercial instinct. It is manifested only in return for value received.

WILL America return the same answer to the question whether democratic government can be permanently successful, that has been given by Greece and Rome?

WHEN the people vote to be governed by a dictator, as in the late election in “Greater New York,” “popular government” means government by a dictator and nothing more.

“WHILE they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption,” is a scripture which applies well to the promises of liberty made in this day by most of the political leaders.

AMS well might one think to build a fine edifice without paying any particular attention to the laying of the individual brick, as to think that there can be good government through any scheme based upon the idea of converting people by wholesale.

IT is useless to think of raising the standard of allegiance to God's Sabbath law by devising means for an improved observance of Sunday. When you miss the mark altogether, it doesn't matter whether your bullet would or would not have been more effective on the target than one you had been using before.

"What Army Chaplains Are For" American Sentinel 12, 44, pp. 689, 690.

[689]

ATJ

RECENTLY, at a "Grand Army" banquet in Buffalo, N. Y., tendered to the President of the United States, Archbishop Ireland spoke in response to the toast, "The Chaplain." As a statement of what are deemed the proper functions of the chaplain's office, the words of this eminent churchman are worthy of consideration. The quotations following give that part of his speech most directly pertinent to the subject:—

> "But why in an encampment of veterans mention the army chaplain? Has he had a part even most slight in their achievements? Apparently the part of the chaplain was small, if a part is at all to be credited to him. The chaplain bore no gun upon hes shoulder. The chaplain was a non-combatant, a man of peace, whether in camp or on the battle-field. In fact, however, the part of the chaplain was most important. I am making a plea of my own patriotism. I was a chaplain.
>
> "The chaplain invested the soldier's fighting, the soldier's whole round of labor and suffering, with the halo of moral duty."

[670] We have never believed in the utility of the office, but this statement makes it worse even than we had thought. We had never before conceived of the chaplain's duty as being that of casting a halo about the business of killing people.

Unquestionably the soldier's business is one that will admit of a service of this kind. This is no natural halo about it, certainly. To deliberately shoot down men, made in the image of the Creator,

to smash their skulls with clubbed muskets in fierce hand-to-hand conflict, to cut and stab them to death with sword and bayonet, to pour their life blood out upon the earth, to make widows and orphans of those they have left at home,—these are actions which, unsurrounded by any halo, would strike the minds of ordinary people with horror. Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, who certainly knew what the soldier's business is, said, "War is hell." Putting this statement of this eminent military authority with that of Archbishop Ireland concerning the chaplain's office, we are brought to the conclusion that the legitimate business of the army chaplain is to cast a halo about hell!

But casting a halo about hell does not at all change the character of that place. And that which needs to be invested with a "halo of moral duty" in order that people may be led to espouse the support it, would far better be left to appear in its true light, and be accepted or rejected upon its merits.

Proceeding with his line of thought, the archbishop went on to say that,—

"The appeal of the chaplain to the living God, as approving war and consecrating battle-fields, is in the fullest harmony with the teachings of religion. God is, indeed, the God of love and peace while love means no violation of justice and peace implies no surrender of supreme rights."

As soon, therefore, as a person feels that he is treated unjustly, or that his rights have been invaded, he may properly go to war with his enemies, relying upon the protection and aid of Heaven! This view will scarcely harmonize with the divinely given exhortation, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you."

The archbishop was not, in this, stating something peculiar to his own views, or to those of his church: otherwise it would not be so worthy of notice. The conception of God as "approving war," whenever people are suffering injustice, is a very general one, and is the idea by which the horrors of war are theoretically justified. But it has no foundation in truth.

The archbishop continued:—

> "The servants of God must ever seek peace so long as it is possible to obtain peace. They must never proclaim war so long as war is not absolutely necessary. But times come when war is absolutely necessary, when naught but war can avert great wrongs and save the life and the honor of the nation. Then the God of peace becomes the God of armies; he who unsheathes the sword in response to country's call finds favor before God, and the soldier who is a coward on the battle-field is a culprit before heaven's tribunal."

Yes; "the servants of God must ever seek peace so long as it is possible to obtain peace," and "must never proclaim war so long as war is not absolutely necessary." But when is the point reached where peace becomes impossible and war "abolutely [*sic*.] necessary"? Oh, it is when somebody is not treating us right and will not stop misusing us as soon as we think they ought to; or it is when we have been insulted by somebody and the offender will not apologize to save our "honor" from being stained. It is, in short, whenever *we think* that war is necessary. And what we think on such occasions is inspired by the aroused passions and pride of fallen human nature. But God has not left the matter of living peaceably or otherwise to be determined in this way.

People generally, and nations, usually find it quite "possible to obtain peace" when they do not feel strong enough to ship their opponents in the event of hostilities. And when people—and nations—are naturally belligerent, or have something to gain by fighting, and feel confident as to the result, it is very easy for them to reach the point where war is "absolutely necessary."

In the late war between Germany and France, the contestants on each side "unsheathed the sword in response to country's call," and I so doing, both sides of the controversy found "favor before God," no doubt!

One more quotation from the archbishop's speech will be in place. It is this:—

> "The chaplain—let him remain to America—to America's army and navy. It is sometimes said that

> the chaplain is an anomaly in a country which has decreed the separation of state and church. America has decreed the separation of state from church; America has not decreed and America never will decree the separation of state from morals and religion. To soldiers upon land and sea, as well as to other citizens, morals and religion are necessary. The dependence of soldiers upon the government of the country is complete. The government of the country must provide for soldiers teachers of morals and religion. In providing for them such teachers the country performs a duty which she owes to the soldiers and she serves her own high interests. For the best and bravest soldiers are men that are not estranged from morals and religion."

Yes, it is true that "the dependence of soldiers upon the government is complete," under such a system as that for which the archbishop was speaking. But "pity 'tis 'tis true." There never ought to be such dependence in the case of any individual. The archbishop frankly admits that, to the soldier, the government stands in the place of God. "The government of the country must provide for soldiers teachers of morals and religion." But the government has no higher wisdom or power than that which is human, and human wisdom is altogether inadequate to provide for the needs of the soul.

In providing teachers of morals and religion, the government will select such persons as it fancies, and these will be persons who [692] will teach in harmony with the government's ideas. They will teach the morals and religion of the state, and nothing else. But what every individual needs and must have in order to obtain salvation, is the teaching of the morals and religion of the divine Word. And the teacher of these is the Holy Spirit, provided by God himself.

It is also true enough that "the best and bravest soldiers are men that are not estranged from morals and religion," and by no people is its truth better illustrated than by the Mohammedans. With sword or lance in one hand, and the Koran in the other, one of these fanatics will rush on to what he knows is certain death, without the least hesitation. It is only a perverted religion that will harmonize with the spirit of war.

Let not this perverted religion be palmed off as Christianity. Let not the government usurp the place of ... as the teacher of morals and religion. Let not the miserable business of killing people be invested with a halo of moral duty; let it stand upon its own merits—if such exists. Let the government keep separate from religion. Let army chaplaincies be abolished.

"True and False Democracy" American Sentinel 12, 44, pp. 691, 692.

[691]

ATJ

THE philosophy of Jefferson, to which allusion is made in another column, must not be understood as being synonymous with the socialism, communism, etc., which have clothed themselves in the mantle of democracy at the present time. The principle of true democracy is the principle of the Gold Rule. It is the principle of seeking the welfare of others equally with that of ourselves. It is the principle of unselfishness.

There is a sense in which Christianity itself, as embodying the principles of God's government, is synonymous with democracy—with "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." For in God's government, nothing is done without the approval of the people, though God is himself the supreme ruler. All is done for the people and by the people, to the extent at least of their voluntary consent and approval. It is to secure this voluntary consent and approval of his created intelligences upon that which he has done hitherto, and will do to the end of the world, that the Almighty will conduct a final judgment. In that great investigation he himself will be on trial equally with the humblest of his subjects who has lived on earth. And then, when all facts are brought forth to the view of all, and the light of truth is turned full upon all his dealings with mankind, mankind and angels will with one accord signify their approval.

The judgment will afford the strongest possible proof that it is a fixed principle of God's government to do nothing without the voluntary approval of his subjects.

The real character of that which claims to be democracy may be tested by the principle of unselfishness. Socialism says, What's

yours is mine. Christianity, on the other hand, says, What's mine is yours. There is a world of difference between these two sentiments. They represent principles that are as unlike as light and darkness.

The best and highest form of democracy is found in Christianity alone. It is Christianity that the world needs,—Christianity for the working men, to bring them into an unselfish attitude toward their employers and toward each other, and Christianity for the men of wealth, to bring a similar change in their attitude toward their fellows. The application of the principle of unselfishness to the dealings of men with each other, would solve every problem of labor and capital in a single day. But so long as the principle of selfishness is embodied [692] in these dealings, these problems will remain unsolved, in spite of all the measures that can be devised by all the labor combines, the trusts, and similar organizations on the earth.

Christianity—the application of the principle of unselfishness to the individual life, is no Utopian dream. It is a divine reality, set up by its Author right amidst all the unfeeling selfishness of earth, and one which all may know. Let us work to spread it among men, and to usher in the day when it will be universal over all the world.

November 18, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 45, p. 705.

[705]

ATJ

IF a state religion is bad, a United States religion is forty-four times worse.

WHEN Christianity is mixed with politics, the mixture is good for political uses only.

EVERY law in “support” or for the “protection” of religious dogmas or institutions, is an effort to induce people to have faith in the state, instead of faith in God.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN is credited with saying, “Where liberty is, there is my country.” And such is the sentiment of the Christian’s heart, as he looks by faith to that country where alone is true liberty.

TO his followers Jesus said (and still says): “If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.” John 15:19. Christianity means *separation from the world;* and Christian citizenship cannot possibly mean anything else.

AN example in theological mathematics: Given, 1 rest day following 6 days of work, 1 commandment to keep holy “the seventh day,” and 0 Scripture statements commanding the observance of any other day, to find 1 or more proofs that Sunday is the true Sabbath and ought to be made obligatory upon all persons by law. To solve this problem so as to obtain this result is the test of your orthodoxy.

THE harvest that is being sown by the preaching of the principles of “Christian citizenship”—the union of religion with the state—will certainly be reaped. We are on the eve of mightier and more startling

developments betokening a union of church and state in this country, than have ever appeared in the past.

"It Needs Explanation" American Sentinel 12, 45, pp. 705, 706.

[705]

ATJ

ONE of the speakers at a Christian Endeavor convention held recently in Lynn, Mass., was the Rev. C. P. Mills, who, in defining the relation of Christian Endeavor to citizenship, said this:—

> "Christianity is essentially political. The church as such does not go into politics, but it makes politics go."

It is such doctrine as this that the Christian Endeavor youth of the country are imbibing from their clerical instructors. Both by precept and example on the part of the latter these youth are being taught that Christianity is essentially political, and that the chief mission of the church is to make politics "go." The only result of such training that can possibly follow, will be the setting up in the great Christian Endeavor society of a union of religion with politics, which can mean nothing else than a union of church and state.

[706] It would certainly be very much in order if the Rev. Mr. Mills would explain how it is that the church is to make politics "go" without going into politics. Politicians find it necessary to go into politics to the fullest extent of their powers, if they succeed in making politics "go" in a manner to suit them; and even then they do not always succeed in their efforts. To think of making politics "go" without going into politics at all, would be scouted by any politician as the most visionary idea that could be mentioned. And yet we are gravely assured that the church is going to accomplish this very thing. It is strange that those giving such an assurance can successfully appeal to such an extent to the credulity of intelligent people.

No; the church will certainly go into politics when she makes politics "go." And why should she not, if Christianity itself is "essentially political"? History tells us over and over again just how the church will proceed in such a matter. She will proceed as she has done in historical instances of gaining control of the civil power, and the result will be just what it was on those occasions.

November 25, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 46, p. 721.

ATJ

LET us have less state religion, and more home religion.

WHATEVER invades the rights of one man, denies the rights of all.

TO be patriotic does not mean that an individual shall make the state his god.

TRUE reverence cannot exist in the mind that has not learned respect for individual rights.

THE secular system of education is the only system that is incompatible with free public schools.

IT is useless to try to remedy an evil in society by any measure which invades individual rights.

IT is a sad feature of our modern civilization that it tends more and more to circumscribe the sphere of parent’s influence upon the child.

ANY man who essays to force people in a matter of religious belief and practice, sets himself in the place of the Holy Spirit, to which alone men can safely look for guidance in the religious life.

ANY public measure that tends to stifle the free sway of the individual conscience, tends to degrade the individual to the level of a machine, and to make him fit only to serve the purposes of despotism.

NO person can be a traitor to his country who has not first been a traitor to his conscience.

“To thine own self be true,

And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou cans't not then be false to any man.'

WHAT is the patriotism of the Christian? Is it love of country? If so, then of what country? Is it of that country which Abraham and the faithful worthies of old sought, as mentioned in Hebrews 11? That, and that alone, is the Christian's country.

"Some Absolute Certainties" American Sentinel 12, 46, pp. 721, 722.

[721]

ATJ

IT is certain that the great majority of people in this world, evening enlightened and civilized lands, are not moving in the pathway of righteousness.

Jesus Christ said that the pathway to life would be followed by but few, but that the way to destruction would be filled with many. If his words are true, it is certain that the many to-day are traveling in the broad way, which leads downward and away from goodness and from God.

And that these words of the Saviour of men are true, is a fact abundantly confirmed by observation. The only ones who can think differently are those who mistake the polish and veneer of civilization for genuine goodness of heart.

It needs only an average election to demonstrate the fact that the majority of the people do not really want good government. If they did, they would eliminate the saloon, which is universally recognized as a curse to society, and with which good government is wholly incompatible. But the people who vote for government without the saloon are usually a small minority.

[722] It is certain that the minority cannot eliminate the majority from the government. They must, on the contrary, acquiesce with the majority's decisions.

It is certain that the minority cannot convert the majority by their votes. There is no power in the ballot to reform the heart.

It is a fact nevertheless that the minority,—the good people (assuming all the church people to be of this character)—have undertaken to reform the government, to put righteous government in the

place of unrighteous government, by the ballot. And this minority is strong enough to be able to secure a compromise form the worldly majority.

It is certain that such a compromise will be the result of the reform efforts of the minority who represent the church in politics to-day.

This compromise will set up the *forms* of righteousness without the spirit; for the world has never objected to the mere forms of righteousness. These in fact are useful to world lovers as a means of respectability.

It is certain that a government in which the forms of righteousness are administered by a majority who have not the spirit of righteousness, will not be a righteous government. It is certain that it will be altogether unrighteous.

And it is certain that nothing else than this can be the ultimate outcome of the church in politics, as concerns the government of the United States.

"Teaching the Pagan Conception of the State" American Sentinel 12, 46, pp. 722, 723.

[722]

ATJ

IN Carnegie Hall, New York City, on the morning of Sunday, the 14th inst., an assembled congregation listened to a seriously uttered plea by the president of the Society of Ethical Culture, Felix Adler, to put the state in the place of God. The subject of Mr. Adler's discourse was, "What has religion done for civilization?" and in concluding his remarks he said:—

> "Religion has aided civilization, then, by raising the standard of morality, and it has done this by personifying its ideas. But now the personification is going. Men are gradually passing from the belief in a personal God. What shall take its place? In the passing of the belief in this personification, men's lives have become flexile and dry, because they have no longer a personal God. Their ideals are gone. What course remains open to them? They may go back to the fountain head of these ideals.

> They may remember for what those ideals stood. They may try to lead the good life. They ma have the reality back of the ideality. They may have the knowledge of the reality first hand, instead of a secondhand knowledge of the personification.
>
> "This course presupposes a perfect race. Ah, friends, we've got to advance or sink to the level of the beasts. In most things we have advanced. In morality the most of us remain dunces."

At this point the speaker made an impressive pause of several minutes' length, and then continued:—

> "I could well stop here, my friends, as my main argument is closed, but I have something else to say, and it may as well be said now as at any time. Religion has done another service for civilization in influencing politics. The first civic state was a religious state. In the old city states the words 'fellow citizens' had a different meaning from what they have now. 'Fellow citizens' then meant those who worshiped the same God, for each city had a god. Later, we remember that the idea of the king was that he was sacred; that he ruled by divine right.
>
> "To-day we care nothing for kings. I fear we are losing our care for the state. In the old days the state was for the common weal. Each sacrificed something for the other. In the moral night that fell upon the city after the late election, we may think that men care nothing for the state. The morning after election I met persons who said they were going to move away from New York. They were the hasty, peevish ones. What we should do is to stay here and learn a holier feeling for the state. Let politics take the place of religion. If we care nothing for kings, let us devote ourselves to the state. In the state let us find the personal deity which is passing out of men's

> lives. Let the state be the object of our worship. Let us make it sacred, and when we have done so, the state will have taken the place of the personification. Let the state be that personification."

This proposal to deify the state is of course nothing less than pure paganism, out and out. In itself, as the outspoken plea of a teacher of modern ethical culture, it is significant enough. But it is vastly more so in view of the circumstances and conditions in which it finds support. "Men are gradually passing from the belief in a personal God." Candid observation confirms the truth of this statement; and for those of whom it is true that deification of the state cannot be an altogether strange and illogical measure. For it is human nature to deify something; and the state, more readily perhaps than anything else in the present age, furnishes the ideals which human nature is prone to worship.

"Let politics," said the speaker, "take the place of religion." Here again, the proposal to deify the state finds support in the tendency of the times. For it is a well observed fact that politics is taking the place of religion, not only in the home, but in the pulpit. It is being taught that "Christianity is essentially political"—as was said by Rev. C. P. Mills at a recent Christian Endeavor convention in Massachusetts—and that it is the proper business of the church to "make politics go." Religious legislation, another marked tendency of the times, constitutes another force working directly to put the state in the place of God. With all these evident facts and tendencies, the idea of deifying the state is in perfect accord. They could have no other logical result.

Do the American people want this kind of a deity? The state as a deity becomes no merciful, loving, and forgiving Father, but an exacting despot. Do the American people prize their liberties enough to repudiate this pagan corruption, with the despotism that is inseparable from it?

"Reverence and Patriotism" American Sentinel 12, 46, pp. 725, 726.

[725]

ATJ

WE wish it to be understood that we are in entire sympathy with the desire which many excellent people feel, in this country, for the inculcating of a greater degree of reference in the minds of the young.

If there is one feature more conspicuous than another in the lives of the youth in this land, it is their fast-growing irreverence for any power and authority higher than themselves.

It is perfectly proper that the situation should be viewed by good people with genuine alarm. The spirit of irreverence is essentially the spirit of lawlessness. It is certain that it bodes no good, but great evil, to the future welfare of society and the prosperity of the nation.

Something ought to be done, and that as speedily as possible, to check the growth of this baneful feature of our modern civilization; which is, indeed, becoming so widespread a feature of that civilization as to constitute a sign of the times. Everything should be done to this end that can be done by all lovers of good government. And unquestionably there is much that might be done by judicious planning and effort.

Our only want of sympathy in all that relates to this matter is with the misconceived—though doubtless well-meant—efforts that are being made to remedy the situation by people whose views are not broad enough to take in the full scope of what it demands. Such efforts do not get down to the root of the difficulty, and by their superficial work only aggravate the evil which they are meant to cure.

Such, for instance, is the effort which finds expression in the "patriotic salute" innovation in some of the public schools, which is noticed at length on another page. For it is not difficult to believe that a desire to inculcate reverence in the minds of the youthful pupils of the public schools is the real motive from which this innovation has sprung. We are heartily in sympathy with the motive; but as we have pointed out elsewhere, we are most heartily opposed to the means through which it is sought to be carried into effect.

The trouble is not one which lies with the public school system of education. It is not one which any change in that system can eradicate. It is an evil which lies primarily at the doors of parents. Parents have not taught their children to be reverent toward the things which can of right command their reverence. They have not

conducted themselves in a manner to command the reverence of their children; and the latter have grown up to acquire and use such expressions as "the governor" and "the old man," in the place of "father." There can be no real and permanent remedy for the evil until parents take up this long-neglected duty. The influence of the parent upon the child is one which cannot be ignored, and which will produce its effect for good or ill upon the character in spite of any system of public education that can be devised.

The spirit of reverence is essentially the spirit of religion. As this spirit has become lost out of the hearts of the people, in the great spiritual declension of these times, the natural result has been the loss of the reverential spirit by those who should be teachers of reverence to the rising generation.

We are in the great spiritual declension of "the last days,"—of the time when, because of abounding iniquity, the love of many should wax cold. See Matthew 24:12, 13; 2 Timothy 3:1-4. Without religion, there cannot be reverence; and without Christianity, there cannot be reverence for that to which reverence rightfully belongs.

Christianity, and that alone, will reach the root of the difficulty. The wider diffusion of Christianity is the pressing need of the hour. And there is but one way for this diffusion to be accomplished, and that is by faith in the Word of God.

We are also heartily in sympathy with the desire to foster the sentiment of true patriotism in the minds and hearts of the people. But what is patriotism? Is it something which makes people belligerent,—which fills them with the idea that their country can whip any other country on the earth, and with a desire to demonstrate their ability in this line at the earliest opportunity? Is it an altogether selfish sentiment, which ignores right and justice in the endeavor to gain some advantage for the object on which it is bestowed? If it is, then we have no wish to see it fostered; for there is selfishness [726] enough, and much more than enough, in the world at the present time.

But this is not patriotism in its true sense. There is a sentiment which leads men to seek the welfare of their fellows, regardless of condition, belief, or color, and even of nationality. The Declaration of Independence sounded forth the words of freedom for all the world. And under the system of government for which it stood, the

oppressed of all nations found a haven of refuge. Under the operation of the principles of liberty which it enunciates, there arose in a single country one of the greatest nations upon the globe. Cannot the nation continue to prosper under the inculcation of these same principles? Is it not in them that the truest patriotism is to be found?

Let us have a patriotism which reaches out beyond the boundaries of the American continent, even to the afflicted people of other lands; not to seek to kill as many of them as our armaments will enable us to do, nor to cripple the interests of other countries that those of our own may be enhanced; but one which seeks to further the welfare of a sorrow-laden humanity in all lands: and which stands in defense of the God-given rights and liberties of the people, whether at home or abroad.

December 2, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 47, p. 737.

[737]

ATJ

THE seat of conscience is the heart of the individual; and it has no other.

THE heart that is truly given to God, is given to the best service of home and country.

THE sacredness of a right does not depend in any degree upon the number of people who possess it.

THE Sabbath is the Lord’s day, but this does not mean that the day should be monopolized by the church.

IT is easy enough to do right when you are allied with God, whether there is any law of the state backing you up or not.

EVERY step in the direction of forcing people to keep the Sabbath proclaims to the world that the gospel of God is a failure.

WHAT I ask of you, and you ask of me, is not that you shall decide for me in matters of conscience, but that you shall respect my rights.

THERE is not a Sunday law upon the statute books of any State in the Union which is strong enough to meet the wishes of the people who want the State to be religious.

A UNION of religion with the state means a religious state; and a religious state means a state religion. And where was there ever a state religion without a union of church and state?

“GET a Sunday law enacted, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and ye shall find the needed rest.” Is this the language of the divine Counselor?—No; but “Come unto me, all ye that labor and

are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Is the Saviour right in this statement? Try it and see.

IF the Lord had not wished Peter to forgive his trespassing brother seventy times seven times, he would not have labored to convert him to the true religion. In other words, the true religion is only for those who can forgive trespasses against them seventy times seven times. Can the state do this? and if not, can it profess the true religion?

"No Reform Possible by Law" American Sentinel 12, 47, pp. 737, 738.

[737]

ATJ

THERE can be no such thing as reform by civil law.

This is a fact that should be evident to every Christian, and to every thoughtful student of history.

There never was any such thing as reform by civil law since human history began.

There never was a law enacted by any power whatever that could make a good man out of a bad man, or bring a good life out of an evil heart.

Even the law of God is powerless to produce good in the life of an individual fallen, as all upon earth are, under the power of sin. This is a fact plainly set forth in the scriptures of truth.

Yet the law of God is a perfect law; every other law that was ever passed, or that ever can be, is inferior to it. How, then, can it be expected that a law of man can produce results which are beyond the power of that law?

[738] Yet reforms are necessary. Without them the world would have gone to destruction long ago. And there have been great reforms accomplished, which have brought benefits that have reached down through the ages. There is nothing to which history testifies more plainly than to this.

What, then, is the true agency in real reform? Both history and inspiration answer, The Word of God.

In the first place, the Word of God formed all things, and made them perfect. This being so, it is evident that the same Word has power to re-form all things and restore them to their original state.

When God would destroy the world by a flood because of its wickedness, he sent Noah, "a preacher of righteousness" unto the people, for a hundred and twenty years. The world would not be reformed, it is true; but not Christian will question that God employed a means which would have wrought a reform, if the people had received the message which Noah preached.

When God's ancient people, Israel, fell into sin, he sent to them, from time to time, the prophets, who proclaimed the word that the Lord had given them. And when the people heeded that word, it brought them again into the ways of righteousness.

Coming down to modern times, we note the great Reformation which swept over Europe in the sixteenth century. What was the power of the Reformation? Was it any other than the power of the divine Word, proclaimed by Luther and his associates?

After them, Wesley, Whitefield, Bunyan, and others, by the same preaching of the Word, wrought reforms which swept over wide communities, and contributed powerfully to the realization of the peace and prosperity which English-speaking nations enjoy to-day.

And now come the great organizations which number in their ranks to inaugurate another great reform—to turn the people again into the way of righteousness and peace—by an agency of which the great reforms of the past know nothing. They propose to inaugurate their great reform through politics.

They propose to mass all their forces at the polls. They propose to have politics preached from the pulpit. They propose to desert the prayer meeting for the primary when the two assemblies are held on the same evening. They propose to lay siege to every legislature until they shall have such laws enacted in every State, and by Congress, as they deem necessary for the regeneration of society and the preservation of good government.

In the face of the fact that no reform was ever in the history of the world accomplished by such means, and of the equally plain fact that the Word of God is the one divinely appointed agency of true reform, they propose to reform society and the nation by civil law. This very next month, one great division of these church forces will send in a petition of a million and a half names to Congress, calling for a recognition of God in the national Constitution.

What will be the result of this work? It will have some result, that is certain. It will have a tremendous result; the magnitude of the forces employed, and of the interests affected, afford sufficient evidence upon that point. But as it cannot produce a genuine reform, the result will be of that nature which every counterfeit must produce,—that of damage to the people. It will bring ruin upon their interests, both material and spiritual.

"By the law is the knowledge of sin;" and by the law is condemnation. But the trouble with the world is not that it has no knowledge of sin, or is not condemned. The world does not need more law; but more of the preaching of the power of love, and of the righteousness of God, which is not by the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ.

THE important question is not that of whether we are citizens of this or that country on earth, but whether we are "fellow citizens with the saints," or belong to the "strangers and foreigners." Ephesians 2:19. No foreigner can set foot on the shores of the land of promise.

"State Recognition of God and the French Revolution" American Sentinel 12, 47, pp. 738, 739.

[738]

ATJ

THE oft asserted idea that social disorder and revolution are the outcome of non-recognition of God by the state, receives a rude shock from the facts of history. It is not generally known that the worst scenes of the French Revolution, which is so much pointed to as illustrating the results of national repudiation of God, followed hard on a formal recognition of God in the constitution adopted by the revolutionists; but such is the fact. The first two articles of that constitution read thus:—

> "ARTICLE 1.—The French people acknowledge the existence of the Supreme Being, and the immortality of the soul.
>
> "ARTICLE II.—It acknowledges that the worship most worthy of the Supreme Being is the practice of the duties of man." (See Theirs's "French Revolution," Vol. III, p. 354.)

Just two days after the adoption of the constitution, June 10, rivers of blood began to flow from the deadly guillotine; and between June 10 and July 17, twelve hundred and eighty-five persons put their necks under its descending knife.

But did not a national convention at Paris repudiate belief in the Deity, and institute in its place the worship of reason? it may be asked. Yes, that is true; but that was before the adoption of the revolutionary constitution. When this document was drawn up, there was put into it a formal recognition of God; and under this constitution the terrible work of the Revolution went on to its greatest climax of horror. The streets of Paris ran red with blood, and this was after God had been put into the constitution! [739]

Of course, there was no real putting of God into the constitution; but the very thing had been done which it is proposed to do with the United States Constitution, in order to avert national demoralization and disorder.

But in the light of the French Revolution, what good may be expected to result from a formal recognition of God by the state?

THAT government is the best government which leaves most freedom for the development of individuality, by the exercise of every useful faculty of the individual organism. And not the least among these is conscience.

"The Right of Freedom of Conscience" American Sentinel 12, 47, pp. 748, 749.

[748]

ATJ

FREEDOM of conscience is something that hardly needs to be defined to any person of intelligence, old or young. All persons have a conscience, and each conscience should be left free to dictate the conduct of its possessor.

Conscience is our natural monitor. Its office is given it by the Creator. The person who is not guided in his conduct by conscience, is not a safe person to be at liberty.

This does not mean that conscience may not become perverted, so as to become an unsafe guide. The Creator himself is the ultimate Guide of mankind, and conscience is designed to act always in harmony with him.

He has given to mankind his revealed will—the Bible—and his Spirit is continually striving with men, to lead them in the pathway of right and truth.

This is included in the provisions of God's government. There is a government of God on earth, as well as a government of man.

"The Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all." This statement of Scripture includes the earth as well as all other portions of the universe.

God's government on the earth is not a visible government like those of the nations; but it is none the less a reality. And it is the highest government upon the earth. It is universal, and to it every person owes allegiance.

The governments of men are instituted to protect rights. The object of God's government includes this, but it aims at that which is vastly higher—the development of a perfect character.

The free exercise of conscience is absolutely essential to the government of God. Without this the purpose of his government cannot be realized. When it is taken away from a person, the government of God comes to an end with that individual, until it is restored.

Hence when an earthly government sets up a state conscience, as we may call it; that is, when the state dictates to an individual in regard to his religious conduct, the state sets itself squarely against the government of God.

Earthly governments are a necessity: and we should give to those in authority the most willing honor and obedience. But as Christians, we must remember that God has also a government in the earth to which we owe supreme allegiance. We cannot maintain this allegiance to God's government when we go contrary to the dictates
[749] of conscience. No person can discard his conscience without at the same time discarding his allegiance to God.

God's government on the earth is not now what it was in the beginning, when the earth and man were created. It is the same in principle, but it is different in form. This change in form was made necessary by the fall.

When sin came into the world, man became in his very nature contrary to God and prone to violate the laws upon which God's government is established. God then withdrew his visible presence

from men, because, having become sinners, they could not dwell with him and live. No sin can abide in God's presence.

Instead, then, of having God as a visible ruler and source of authority, men had only themselves for visible rulers, and were obliged to set up some government of their own. Yet for a long time they acknowledged that God was the real ruler, and that their earthly rulers were but acting in the capacity of God's agents.

Finally, however, in the days of the mighty hunter, Nimrod, they disclaimed God as their ruler, and set up independent governments of their own. Acknowledging no higher ruler than the state, they virtually put the state in the place of God; and in process of time earthly rulers came to be deified and worshiped as gods.

This would not have happened if men had maintained their allegiance to God's government, as still set up on the earth in the realm of conscience. The governments of the earth have no rightful concern with conscience. They cannot have, because they are administered by finite, sinful men, and are in no way fitted to direct conscience.

They are fitted, however, to maintain the rights of individuals, so that people can live in the enjoyment of peace and civil liberty; and in so doing these governments are in perfect harmony with the government of God.

But when they try to dictate to the consciences of men, they usurp the place of God's government, and set up finite, sinful man as a being to be worshiped.

To allow freedom of conscience is to recognize that there is a higher government on the earth than the civil governments,—the government of God. To interfere with this right is to interfere with God's government, and also to turn civil government out of its proper channel, and bring it to a disastrous end.

December 9, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 48, p. 753.

[753]

ATJ

CONSCIENCE is made to direct man, and not man to direct conscience.

“IF the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.” You will be free seven days in the week.

WHEN the church allies herself with an earthly power, she demonstrates that as a church she is fatally weak.

HUMAN law cannot be “based upon” God’s law, unless it can be that human law rises higher than the divine law.

THE principle thing that is learned by the children from the religion that is taught in the public schools, is irreverence.

WHEN the church sets out to reform the world, the usual result is that the world reforms the church. Not the world, but individuals, are to be reformed.

IF this be a Christian nation, why is not citizenship in this country synonymous with Christianity? and why may one not depend upon such citizenship for salvation?

TO say that a thing which is proper and right on one day of the week can be a crime because done on some other day, is to say that there is no distinction between crime and sin.

HUMAN government and divine government are two vastly different things, both in nature and purpose: and it is a great mistake to look upon the former as supplying the place, in this world, of the latter.

HUMAN government demands the prompt execution of legal penalties upon the transgressor of the law. God’s government names

death as the penalty for every violation of law. God's government provides mercy for every offender: human government demand's only justice without mercy. Without mercy for all transgressors, God's government would fail: and with mercy for all transgressors, human government would not survive a day.

"The Letter Killeth" American Sentinel 12, 48, pp. 753, 754.

[753]

ATJ

"THE letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life." 2 Corinthians 3:6.

This is a plain statement of the inspired Word, and ought to be believed by every Christian, at least.

And that it is a fact, and one which is capable of practical illustration in human affairs, can, we think, be demonstrated to all candid people, whether Christians or not.

It is just the danger that we shall have a practical illustration of it in this government, that now demands the attention of every American citizen.

What letter is it that killeth? The verse in which the words occur says that it is the letter of the New Testament, and there is also a Spirit; and it is said that the "Spirit giveth life."

The apostle in this chapter of his epistle to the Corinthians speaks of the ministration of the letter, and the ministration of the Spirit, and says (verse 6) that Christians had not been made ministers of the letter, but of the Spirit.

In the following verse he speaks of the "ministration of death"—the ministration of the letter, which "killeth"—as being that which
[754] was "written and engraven in stones" in the days of the children of Israel. That was the law of God—the ten commandments.

In that law there is death, but no life, for the sinner; and this truth embraces every individual on the earth.

Yet that law is an essential part of God's government. It is the standard of righteousness, and could not be altered, even to save the life of the Son of God. For it was the penalty of the violation of that law which the Son of God paid in man's behalf, upon the cross.

The ten commandments are the letter of righteousness; but they only condemn the sinner to death. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth," or giveth life.

Now it is proposed by a very large part of the religious population of this country, to "put God into the Constitution," by inserting in that document—which is the fundamental law of the land—a clause recognizing God as the ruler of the nations, and making his Word the basis of national and State legislation. This change in the basis of our government has been attempt several times already, and is about to be attempted again.

This, then, if it succeeds, will be to put into the fundamental law of the land the letter of righteousness. But inseparable from this will be the terribly significant fact,—"the letter killeth."

Let us see. The letter of righteousness—the decalogue—demands the death penalty for every violation of it. This is the penalty which God himself has fixed, and it can no more be separated from his law than God himself can be.

But this law, with its death penalty, all people, even the best, are prone to violate. Since this is so, therefore, how long will it be after the letter of righteousness has been put into the fundamental law of the land, before every man, woman, and child in the land will be under sentence of death?

God's government provides a means by which this death sentence is suspended, and an opportunity given the transgressor to escape it altogether; but human governments cannot proceed upon this basis. Their laws must be executed; and the only delay that can intervene is that necessary to establish the guilt of the violator. Everybody knows that this is the plan upon which all human governments are, and must be conducted.

What, then, do these religious people want by their scheme to "put God in the Constitution"? Do they want to kill off all the people of the country, themselves included? This is the only logical result which the success of their scheme could have.

No; it cannot be that they want to put themselves under sentence of death; for no "reformer," even of the most fanatical sort, ever wanted to reform himself in this way. It will be necessary to exempt themselves, and all who are willing to be reformed to their standard and scheme of righteousness. But they will have enough appreciation of the logic of the situation to bring the penalty upon such as stand out against it; and persecution, imprisonment,—yes, and even death,

will assuredly be the lot of some. In this, the promoters of the like scheme have never failed in the past.

Civil governments can appropriate the forms of righteousness, and the forms only. And whenever this is done, it becomes literally and visibly true that "the letter killeth." But life, not death, is the object of government; and only the government of God can provide the Spirit which "is life, because of righteousness."

December 16, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 49, p. 769.

[769]

ATJ

THE appreciation of force in religious matters always drives the soul upon which it is directed farther from God.

CHRISTIANITY can no more be advanced by the ballot than by the bullet, since both alike are the emblems of force.

THE “sword of the Spirit” is effective enough to accomplish all the work that is committed to the church to do.

A “CRIME” that cannot be recognized as such by reason and common sense, deserves no recognition from the law.

CONSIDERING how much trouble the state has to enforce its own laws, would it be wise for it to undertake to enforce the laws of God?

“PUT up thy sword into the sheath,” is the word of Jesus Christ to such of his professed followers as desire to propagate Christianity by force.

RELIGIOUS legislation tends always to break down conscience, make hypocrites, and obliterate the distinction in men’s minds between right and wrong.

TO force a man to do right, is to put force in the place of conscience. Men must be forced to respect rights, but beyond this force cannot rightfully go.

“EXPCEPTIONS prove the rule,” but they do not always prove the rule to be a good one. The exemptions of a Sunday law do not prove the law to be just and right.

THE hardest work of all work is to be obliged to do nothing,—to maintain one’s mental, physical, and moral equilibrium under a

condition of enforced idleness. And this is the work which is thrust upon multitudes by the enforcement of a Sunday law.

THE people are calling for Sunday rest by law need to learn that there is an essential difference between rest and idleness. The law can force an individual to be idle, but it cannot force him to rest.

"The Rest Question" American Sentinel 12, 49, pp. 769, 770.

[769]

ATJ

JESUS CHRIST said, "Come unto me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." This is not one of the "recently discovered sayings" of Christ, but has been in the Bible all along, and we may suppose, therefore, that it is familiar to, and firmly believed by, every member of the Christian church.

And to all such, this saying ought to come with peculiar force at the present time; for it is a fact, as everybody knows, that the "rest" question is agitating and troubling the industrial world more than anything else at the present time.

Yet it is also a fact, too plain to be denied, that the church forces are advocating a method of settling this question which is wholly different from that set forth in the Scriptures. Their method is not by invitation, but compulsion. They would compel every person in the land to refrain from work upon each first day of the week.

For years the working men have been agitating for an eight-hour day. That is their method of gaining the rest which they desire. Nor is it a surprising one to be advocated by associations of a worldly
[770] character. But it is surprising that an association which claims to be altogether unworldly in character, should, in the very face of the words of Christ, propose to give men rest by civil enactment.

From the Christian standpoint, these words of divine invitation constitute the true basis upon which this rest question must be settle for all men. For it is actual rest which this invitation holds out to all. It is no figure of speech, but a literal statement. And everybody who has accepted it, and tried it, knows that it is literally true. No one who has found the rest that is in Christ, is complaining to-day that he does not have rest enough to satisfy every physical need.

And it is easy enough to see why this is so. For when an individual comes to Christ, he brings himself into harmony with the

purpose of God for humanity in this fallen world, and that purpose embraces everything that is for man's benefit. And God, who created man, knows better than any one else just how much rest man needs. It was God who, in the beginning, ordained that man should live by the sweat of his brow, and who provided for him the weekly day of rest.

The Being who made man has himself provided *a* rest for man: and he has set forth that rest in the words of the fourth commandment. It is recorded that God himself set the example in this respect, and that "on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed." In the rest which God has provided there is refreshment: but in the rest which the state provides, there is only turmoil and trouble. For it will not be denied that the police have harder work in taking care of a city full of people which they are idle, than when they are at work.

It is to this rest, with its refreshment, that the individual comes when he accepts the invitation, "Come unto Me." There is rest in Christ at all times,—rest for the heart, rest for the mind, rest for the whole being: but there is the special rest of the Sabbath,—the seventh day, which God blessed for the benefit of mankind. Let an individual come to Christ, accept the seventh day of rest from work as God has commanded, and see if he does not find all the rest that he needs. We have never heard of a case in which it was not so.

The working men are, many of them, under a heavy yoke. But the Saviour says, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me;" "for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light;" and he gives the assurance, "Ye shall find rest unto your souls." It is not surprising that the world should not believe these words; but it is certainly to be expected that the church will believe them, and will make them the basis of her work for the betterment of mankind. It is certainly to be expected that, as the church views the prevalent conditions which emphasize the world's unrest, she will throw all her energies into the proclamation of the divine message which alone can provide the remedy.

Does not the rest ordained and provided for man by the Creator, exactly meet the requirements of man's nature to-day? Is it not the only rest that will supply man's need? and is not this rest to be secured alone by acceptance of the gospel invitation? Does not the church, at least, believe this? and is it not her mission to proclaim

this to all the world, and that to the full extent of her ability? Is it not, then, "another gospel" to which the church is turning, in proclaiming rest for mankind by the force of civil law?

"'Higher Criticism' of the Calendar" American Sentinel 12, 49, pp. 770, 771.

[770]

ATJ

THERE have been several changes made in the calendar since it was first known to man, but it appears that there is yet need of another "reform," more radical than those made by Julius Cesar and Pope Gregory. What this is, is indicated by the following words from the annual address of Miss Frances Willard, at the late W.C.T.U. Convention:—

> "We must be careful always to let it be understood that those who observe some other day than the seventh, are to be respected in their belief by any law that we are working to help obtain."

By "some other day than the seventh," was meant some other day than Sunday: which is to say that Sunday is the seventh day, instead of Saturday. But as everybody knows, the calendar makes Saturday the seventh day of the week and Sunday the first day.

Now, when persons of the intelligence of the World's W.C.T.U. president hold and proclaim that Sunday is the seventh day of the week, why do the makers of the almanac persist in holding to the old style of calling Sunday the first day instead of the seventh? Why can we not have a calendar that will be abreast of the "advanced thought" of the times, especially in so fundamental a matter as the numbering of the days of the week?

This is evidently what many of our Sunday-observing friends who still believe in the fourth commandment would like. But alas! even if the calendar could be so "reformed" as to make Sunday the seventh day of the week, and so harmonize its observance with the fourth commandment, it would only throw them hopelessly out of gear with other Scripture texts upon which they depend for justification of their practice. For they hold that the New Testament

Scriptures plainly teach that Christ rose from the dead on the first day of the week, and as their Sabbath observance is based upon the resurrection of Christ, it can never be any other than the first day of the week upon which that observance must fall. Hence, to make Sunday the seventh day of the week would only be to throw the "Sabbath" over to Monday, which would be the first day of the week according to this new reckoning. [771]

And as this is so, and as the calendar cannot be "reformed" so as to make Sunday anything else than the first day of the week, we can only wonder why intelligent people will persist in calling it the seventh.

NOTHING that is good in this world can be forced upon people against their will, without entirely losing its power to benefit them.

"The Spirit of the Constitution" American Sentinel 12, 49, p. 771.

[771]

ATJ

THE local union of Christian Endeavorers of Hackensack Valley, N. Y., have sent in a petition against Sunday mail service to the postmaster of Hackensack, on the decidedly novel ground that such service is "in violation of the spirit of the Constitution of the United States." The petition will, it is said, be sent to Washington to be passed upon by the post-office authorities."

Inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States forbids, to the extent of its jurisdiction, any law "respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," it would be in order for these Christian Endeavorers to explain how a regulation which does not deny to any the free exercise of religion, can be "in violation of the spirit" of that document; and how, also, a regulation which linked this department of the government with a religious dogma, can be in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution.

In other words, since the Constitution discountenances any union of the government with religion, by forbidding Congress to make any law on the subject, ought a department of the government to keep Sunday? We think not.

December 23, 1897

“Editorial” American Sentinel 12, 50, p. 785.

[785]

ATJ

THE mission of the church is not to decide what is right. God has already decided that by his Word.

THERE are quite a number of people in the world besides Leo XIII who believe that they can, upon demand, speak with infallibility.

THOSE people who think the government would be made better by professing Christianity, should remember that the very worst hypocrites do that.

IF only the grace of God can enable even a good man to do right, what is there short of the grace of God that can make a bad man do right?

THE name of God put in the Constitution can no more make that a Christian document than can a crucifix make a Christian of him who wears it.

THE devil doesn’t care how religious a thing is, so long as it embodies what is wrong and unjust. The most wicked of all evil deeds have been done under a form of piety.

IF all the ministers in the land should take hold of politics, to “elevate them,” this would not at all change the nature of politics. Politics are what they are to-day because it is the nature of politics to become corrupt.

IF the clergy were all in agreement upon the subject of religion, to which they have so long devoted their attention, we could with more assurance accept their dictum on the subject of politics, to which they are comparative strangers.

THE idea that the state can properly teach morals is the idea that a man can teach himself morals; since the voice of the state is only the voice of the men composing it; and this is only the old pagan idea that a man can be his own saviour.

"The New Leaders in 'National Reform'" American Sentinel 12, 50, pp. 785, 786.

[785]

ATJ

THE Christian Endeavorers, who are now the leading National Reformers, have announced that they intend to present to the Congress now in session, one and a half million petitions for the passage of a resolution to amend the national Constitution so that it shall recognize God and the Christian religion.

As these folks are following the lead of the original National Reformers, it is proper to raise an inquiry as to the character of those positions. Those who have gone this way before, have pretended to present the names of more than twenty times as many petitioners as they really had. A few were multiplied into thousands; one was multiplied into millions. As the Christian Endeavorers think they must now take up this matter, it is seriously to be hoped, even though their enterprise in this direction is decidedly bad, that they will at least conduct it honestly.

Of all the people in the United States who desire legislation on the subject of religion, it is but just to say that those who propose to bring it about by constitutional amendment are the only ones who are entitled to any respect in this connection. Of these it must be
[786] said that however wrong and ungodly may be the thing which they attempt to do, the means by which they propose to accomplish it is strictly legal.

Amendment of the Constitution is a perfectly legal thing. The Constitution itself makes provision for its own amendment. Of the legality of such a procedure, therefore, there can never be any question. The Constitution is the voice and will of the people. Whatever the will of the people may be which they choose thus to express, whether civically it be good or bad, conservative or ruinous, yet legally it is strictly valid.

Now no worse thing could possibly be done *by amendment to the Constitution* than to establish "the Christian religion." No more ruinous step could be taken *through amendment to the Constitution* than this proposed recognition of God and establishment of religion. Yet if such thing were done by amendment to the Constitution it would be perfectly legal, and nothing could properly be said against it on that score. So likewise these people who want a religious despotism established in this nation; so long as they hold to amendment of the Constitution as the means of accomplishing it, it must be said that legally their course is beyond question.

But when this is said, every concession, every allowance, has been made that can possibly be made in any way whatever in reference to that thing. The thing itself is evil and only evil, and that continually and continually increasing. So far also the methods of endeavoring to accomplish this thing, even legally, have been dishonest, hypocritical, and fraudulent. Therefore it is a thing sincerely to be wished that with the accession of this new element of Endeavor, square and honest methods may characterize their attempts to accomplish a purpose which, though legal in form, is evil in itself and ruinous to the nation.

While the worst thing that could possibly be done by amendment to the Constitution, is the establishment of religion; still a worse thing than that is the establishment of religion *without* an amendment to the Constitution. To do it by amendment to the Constitution would be legal, though exceedingly bad. To do it *without* an amendment would add to its inherent badness the further elements of illegality and usurpation. Yet this latter things has been diligently striven for by the predecessors of the Christian Endeavorers; and has actually been accomplished by the government, in principle and in fact.

It is a curious thing, too, that the predecessors of the Christian Endeavorers in this matter actually endeavored to accomplish their purpose by *both these methods at once*. They tried to get passed a resolution to amend the Constitution so as to legalize legislation and governmental action on questions of religion; while at the same time by threats of political perdition backed by fraudulent petitions they were doing their utmost to force legislation and governmental action on the questions of religion. The curious feature in all this lies not in the fact, nor in the methods employed,—all that seems natural

enough to these folks,—but in that they should be so blind as not to be able to see that what they were doing was self-contradictory.

Their call for a religious amendment to the Constitution was, and is in itself a positive argument that without it any governmental recognition of religion would be unconstitutional, and therefore illegal and voice—a usurpation. Yet in the face of this positive argument of their own devising, they did their utmost to get the government to commit this very usurpation; applauded every item of such usurpation when it was committed; and even while applauding it, openly declared it unconstitutional.

No greater effort to undermine constitutional government has ever been made in the United States than has thus been made by the people who have urged upon Congress and the government the enactment of Sunday laws and other acts of a religious character, without an amendment to the Constitution.

And now that the Christian Endeavorers have taken the lead in this campaign and are calling for a constitutional amendment establishing religion, it is but proper to call their attention to the crooked and self-stultifying course of those who have led in this thing before, and ask that they shall not disgrace themselves by following the same course.

To ask for an establishment of religion in the United States by the strictly legal course of an amendment to the Constitution is enough disgrace for any body. We really desire that the Christian Endeavorers may spare themselves the greater disgrace of demanding the governmental recognition of religion *without* such an amendment.
A. T. J.

"The American Sentinel for 1898" American Sentinel 12, 50, p. 799.

[799]

ATJ

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is in the field to be that which its name implies,—a sentinel, to give warning against the foes which threaten the sacred rights and liberties of the people.

As such, there is every evidence that it has a most important field of usefulness before it in the year 1898. The dangers against which it would warn the people are not imaginary, but are dangers which

have already appeared in tangible form, dangers which have been met and fought in the halls of Congress, in the courts, and before the legislatures of the States.

A zealous but misguided element of the people are bent upon substituting false and despotic principles of government for those upon which this government was established by the wise and liberty-loving statesmen who gave it birth. Within recent years there have been some sharp conflicts fought for the preservation of these principles in American government, and success has, in a measure, attended the efforts of the SENTINEL and the men who have stood as champions of the liberties of the people.

But the crisis is yet to come. And now, the forces whose aim has been the subversion of the principles of free government, have returned to the attack, reinforced by associations which have suddenly sprung up with the church, numbering millions of members. This very month petitions are pouring in upon Congress, calling for a recognition of God in the national Constitution and for a Sunday law for the District of Columbia.

Stirring times are before us; and now, as never before, it is necessary that the AMERICAN SENTINEL should lift up its voice like a trumpet and sound an alarm throughout the length and breadth of the land. The enemy have inaugurated a campaign of education by means of National Reform literature, which they purpose to have scatted everywhere by the Christian Endeavor and kindred societies, calling for the enforcement of Sunday laws and other religions legislation by Congress and by the States. Upon this line the battle for civil and religious liberty must now be fought. Now, as never before, literature bearing the truth upon this great subject must be set before the people.

It is our aim to make the SENTINEL for 1898 a most effect agent for this work. A varied corps of contributors has been secured, which includes those of long experience as writers and speakers upon these themes. No pains will be spared to fill the paper with live matter, and keep it in touch with the latest developments of the times.

The SENTINEL will be illustrated with original drawings, made expressly for its use. We feel sure this will be a feature that will be appreciated by all.

A new head will appear on the first issue for the new year, which we think will be pleasing to our readers generally.

Altogether, the aim of the publishers will be to make the SENTINEL for 1898 just what it ought to be to meet the emergency that has come upon the country. The SENTINEL offers every person a chance to work, and NOW is the time to do it.