

The Daily Inter Ocean Articles (Chicago) (1889)

April 1, 1889

"Religious Liberty. The Relationship of Civil Government and Religion Defined" *The Daily Inter Ocean* (Chicago) 18, 5 (6,365), p. 7.

Professor A. T. Jones' Lectures at the New Central Bible School
The Bible and Declaration of Independence on a Legal Sabbath

LEGISLATIVE RELIGION

The first of a series of lectures "on the Relationship of Civil Government and Religion" was given Saturday night by Professor A. T. Jones in the chapel of the new Central Bible School, at Nos. 26 and 28 College place. Professor Jones is an impressive and enthusiastic speaker, and handled his subject with the earnestness of profound conviction. The chapel and adjoining rooms were filled to overflowing with absorbed listeners as he brought out principles to every man's civil and religious rights. He opened his lecture by quoting the words of Christ found in Matt. xxii, 21: "Render, therefore, unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." He said: At the time our Saviour spoke these words Cesar was the embodiment of all the power of civil government in the world. There were scattered people on the outskirts of the jurisdiction of Rome, but they were known simply as barbarians and uncivilized. Rome represented all . . . and state. He was the first one who ever declared this principle that divorces civil government and religion. The nations of the past had connected church and state. in Babylon and Medo-Persia, the king legislated concerning matters of religion, and Cesar himself was Pontifex Maximus, Supreme Pontiff, or Pope, and in him was vested the power to appoint fast days, etc.

It was through this very prerogative that Constantine, in the fourth century, made a law enforcing the observance of the venerable day of the sun. Not only in idolatrous nations was church and state united, but in Judea itself religion was made a matter of law, for the law of God was the law of the land. The government of Israel was a theocracy, a government of God. God spoke directly to the people through His prophets, and the king heard the word of the Lord from the prophet's mouth.

BUT THE LORD HAS DECLARED

that that order of government should be no more until Christ shall come.

David's throne was to be established forever as the throne of the Lord, and Christ, as the seed of David, was to rule on the throne of David, his father. But in the time of Zedekiah concerning the kingdom the Lord said: "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is, and I will give it to him." It was overturned by three successive nations, and then Christ came. But it was to be no more before it was to be given to him whose right it is. Christ did not receive His throne on earth at that time. He says himself: "My kingdom is not of this world."

It is after the judgment, after the renewing of the earth that Christ takes His throne on earth, and until that time any system that tends to theocracy is a false system, and the establishment of a government of God on earth is a false theocracy, one made by man and not by God, and will only result in putting man in the place of God, and in the multiplying of iniquity.

The Declaration of Independence reads "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and

THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers . . . that right without receiving an equivalent? We receive not merely nineteen times as much protection, but an almost incalculable protection. So it is with any . . . , property and everything pertaining to my civil rights. But what equivalent can government make if I surrender my right to believe? It can render nothing. The New Hampshire Constitution says that among the inalienable rights the chiefest right is the right of conscience, because for its surrender no equivalent can be given. The rights of conscience are eternally inalienable; for a man can not be a man and surrender them. To fill up the measure of manhood man must maintain his right to fear and worship God according to the dictates of his conscience; therefore, no man can favor legislation in favor of the religion he professes without destroying his own right to be a man is exceeding his right. He takes away his own religious freedom when he consents to legislation that

FAVORS HIS OWN RELIGION

We are Seventh-day Adventists, but there was a time when we were not. Some of us were Methodists, some Baptists, some Presbyterians, some of us were not connected with any church or religion. But more truth came to our attention and we changed our opinion. Suppose that while we were Methodists we had favored legislation establishing Methodism as the religion of our State, then when advanced truth came to us, and we changed our views, we would have been obliged to have opposed the very law that we had formerly formed. We would have found ourselves deprived of the right to think for ourselves, to worship according to our conscience by our own act. We would have said to the

State, "You have the religion; we will take it from you and surrender our right to think for ourselves."

You had a right to be a Methodist, or a Baptist, or not to be, just as you pleased. You have a right to keep the seventh day, or not to keep it, so far as civil government is concerned. You are responsible to God alone for your duty toward Him. As soon as you make a law that a certain day shall be observed as the Sabbath, you take away your right not to observe it.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

as far as it has been understood, in the past has asserted my right to believe as I pleased. But true religious liberty does not stop at the assertion of my right. It asserts your right to believe as you please, and when men undertake to declare what I or you shall believe, or when I favor legislation that enforces what I believe, religious liberty is destroyed. I render to Cesar what does not belong to him. Civil government receives what is due to God alone, puts itself in the place of God, and degrades the principles of civil and religious liberty.

Before a large audience in the Mission Rooms in College placed last night Elder A. T. Jones spoke at length on this subject. His argument was to show that, as the Rev. Mr. Cook has said, "Sabbath observance can only be enforced as a day of worship," and that as man can not give to a Sabbath the sanction that God put upon it, the result will be to enforce idleness (as men can not be forced to worship against their will). To compel men to be idle is to put a premium on crime. He showed clearly that the increase of crime on Sundays was not because of liquor, as that could be obtained any day, but because there were more idle men to engage in drunkenness and other crimes. He fully sustained the opening assertion that no State can safely institute a day of idleness.

April 2, 1889

**"About Religious Liberty" *The Daily Inter Ocean* (Chicago) 18, 6
(6,366), p. 8.**

Elder Jones Continues His Lectures Against a Legal Sabbath.
Rome Did Not Persecute the Christians in Olden times.
She Simply Enforced the Laws as They Appeared on the Books.

WHAT LEGISLATION MAY LEAD TO

Elder Jodes [*sic.*] illustrated the necessity for enforcing existing laws, and the hardship and suffering engendered by unwise and illegitimate legislations, last night, in his lecture at the new Central Bible School, Nos. 26 and 28 College place. He said: "In Mark xvi, 15, we have the command to the disciples to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Christ is the author of

freedom. The world never knew true freedom, either religious or civil, until He came. The Romans said to Him: "We were never in bondage to any man, how then, say you, we shall be free?" "Ye are in bondage to sin," Christ said, and it was His message to set men free from the bondage of sin; and in giving them a knowledge of their . . . to draw us away from such an intimate relation to Christ that we lose that liberty. Paul says in Rom. viii, 35, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" This was written to the Romans, who knew all that was implied in it. For His sake He says they were subject to death every hour; they could not tell at what moment they might be cast to wild beasts.

These men were bound to Christ by this principle of love, but long before Christ came into the world there was a Roman law forbidding men to have any strange gods. When the Romans conquered a nation the captives were allowed to maintain their own religion, but it was death and banishment to introduce a new religion. As long as Christians remained with the Jews they were safe comparatively, but when they became a new sect, disturbing men from the old religions, they became rebels. He claimed the God of the Christians as his God, a new one to the Romans, and his commission was to go into all the world and preach this new God. So when they went forth to proclaim this gospel they had to break the law, even when they took the names of Christians, and the rulers had to punish them.

IT WAS NOT PERSECUTION

they were law-breakers, and the law had to be enforced. All the Roman empire saw in Christianity was an uprising against lawful authority, these laws being in existence for many years. But it was not an uprising to subdue good institutions as the Romans thought, but as we now can see, to implant truth and true principles on the earth. It was the Christian mission to tell the Romans that their law was wrong, and that they had no right to pass such laws. They claimed that they had the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. Rome denied it, and this antagonism has been in the world ever since, the effort on one side to force man to worship according to the dictates of men, and the refusal of men to be so controlled. In Rome, Neander says, the highest idea of ethics to a Roman was to keep his house in order and be an humble, obedient citizen of the State. Just as soon then as a Christian announced his allegiance to Christ he exalted Christ above the state, and so became a rebel. To ask Rome to take a second place was to ask her to resign her greatness in the eye of a Roman—to destroy the . . . despised people, and so they enforced the law. The Christians maintained their right to worship as they pleased, and it must not be forgotten that the same issue is before us to-day—to enforce the religious observance of Sunday. There is to be a religious law, and when persons refuse to obey they will be punished—not persecuted—because they will say now, as they did in Rome, it will be simply enforcing the law, and to enforce a law is right.

It has been a problem to students for ages why it was that the very best of emperors should persecute the Christians, and the tyrannical infamous, and

horrible ones did not persecute them. The reason is very simple. The honest, honorable emperors revered the laws and enforced them; the tyrants cared nothing for the laws, and so took no notice of the Christians. There was, as has been said, no real persecution in Rome; it was an enforcement of law, simply. The trouble was this: The government had no right to have such laws on the statute books, states having no jurisdiction over anything of a moral nature, the power vested in government being civil in its nature, moral accountability being due to God alone.

THE LECTURER THEN READ

from numerous authorities to show how at every step the Christian at Rome was forced to shower contempt upon Roman gods or deny his faith in Christ. A Christian could not go even to the wedding or funeral of a relative, because all the ceremonies were in honor of the gods, and so of almost every social custom, and his refusal to join in the ceremonies or games drew the wrath of his neighbors upon him, and complaint would be made to the Governors, and so a Christian did not know at what moment he might be dragged to court and cast to the lions. To a Roman a Christian was not only a rebel, but an atheist, and so to-day any one who refuses to yield to a civil mandate to observe a man-made Sabbath, will be, and even now are, denounced and classed with atheists and infidels. When such laws are written upon our statute books it will be, as it was then, the magistrates will strive to turn the rebels, and will plead earnestly for them to obey, urging that they do not want to punish, and when the Christians will firmly refuse, then the magistrates, many of them, will in their wrath go to the other extreme, and punish with the greatest severity.

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

embodies the very principle for which these early Christians strived—that man had an inalienable right to worship or not, and in a manner according to his own conscience, yet there is a tide rising in our country trying to overthrow this precious provision of safety, and soon the question will soon come home to each one: Are we to be Christians or not? because soon everyone will have to be a hypocrite or suffer the penalties of the law.

April 3, 1889

"The Rise of the Papal Power" *The Daily Inter Ocean* (Chicago) 18, 7 (6,367), p. 4.

The Combination of Church and State by Constantine in the Fourth Century.

The fourth in the series of lectures on "Religious Legislation," being delivered at the Bible-rooms, No. 28 College place, was given by Elder Jones to the usual

full house last night. The speaker said: I want to call your attention to the making of the Papacy, the root of all the trouble and persecution that has resulted in the making of rebellions from that time to this. Last evening we proved that governments have no right to legislate upon matters of religion. In looking into history we find the last effort paganism attempted to blot out Christianity was in the time of Diocletian. In the time of Constantine, Christianity had become world-wide and its followers so numerous that this emperor, seeing in it the only organization in the world whereby to control the people, and to bring order out of chaos, his successors, way back to Augustus, having but a precarious hold upon his throne, put himself at the head of the church, at the request of the Christian bishops, and then and there began the union of church and state and

THE FOUNDATION OF THE PAPACY

Constantine was simply a paganised political Christian, having assumed authority over the church merely as a political move to strengthen his hold upon the people and secure himself upon the throne. The bishops of the church at . . . they represented Constantine that the church was a united body, and if he would place himself at the head of the church, with its power and the army at his back, he would be invincible. Constantine therefore, in A. D. 319, accepted the offer of the bishops, and the church then, for the first time, was enabled to bring the power of the civil government to enforce its decrees. Dr. Schaff says distinctly that Constantine was only a pagan, and "adopted Christianity only as a superstition, and placed it beside his pagan superstition," and the result was of course a mixture of the two, and that was the religion of that day, and that was the papacy.

The lecturer then read from several authorities to show the condition of the church at that time, showing they were divided into over ninety different denominations, and as each one tried to convince the Emperor it was the strongest, violent meetings and brawlings constantly occurred, and the bishops of each church flattered Constantine with many titles and specious prophecies, so that finally, he, to flatter them in return, declared that the Catholic Church was the head of the world, but this led at once to the calling of council after council to decide which one was

THE TRUE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Creed after creed being introduced, and being either accepted or rejected, made unity impossible, as either way would result in banishment and often death of bishops, and appeals for other councils for reconsideration, and the brawlings and contentions were so severe often that soldiers, always stationed about the council chamber, were called in to quell the disturbances. Many interesting facts were also presented from the writings of Eusebius and others to show the methods of exaltation the bishops used to raise Constantine into a god, each side trading their influence for what could be gained, showing a fearful state of iniquity that finally resulted in the papacy. He then went on to show that the

authors, Eusebius especially, knew Constantine, whom they compared to Christ, was a murderer twenty times over, and a perpetual perjurer. Murdering his own wife, son, and nephew after becoming nominally a Christian, and perjuring himself hourly as policy and humor dictated, yet this is the man who took Sunday from its pagan origin and placed it in the Christian calendar as a day of religious worship for Christians, in opposition to the Sabbath of the Bible, the seventh day a Saturday. The lecturer then read from Neander to show that the object of the bishops in their union with Constantine was to organize a theocracy, or God government upon the earth, in imitation of the theocracy of

THE ISRAEL OF GOD

actually claiming that Constantine was chosen by God for his position exactly as Moses had been, and even went so far as to compare the drowning of the other emperor of Rome, Maxentius—for there were two at the time—as a parallel to the drowning of Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea. Constantine, to follow out the simile, they suppose to cross in safety and to establish a theocracy. In this way did they create the foundation of the Papal power that ruled the world for twelve hundred and sixty years.

April 4, 1889

"Proposed American Theocracy" *The Daily Inter Ocean* (Chicago) 18, 8 (6,368), p. 2.

National Reform Movement to Establish a Theocratical Form of Government.

The fifth of the series of lectures on Religious Legislation, by Elder Jones, was given last night at No. 28 College place, in the chapel of the Bible rooms. The speaker began by reading from Neander the extracts in part, he read the previous evening, to show the agreement entered into between Constantine and the Bishops of the Christian Church, which resulted in the union of church and state. Paul speaks of those in his time in the church, that would speak perverse things to draw away disciples, and also, in another letter, he calls their attention to the wicked one, "the man of sin, the son of perdition," etc., that should exalt himself above God, sitting in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God, "who was to be revealed before the coming of the Savior. Now, whosoever shall sit in the temple claiming to be God, must sit there representing God, and that is what the Pope claims that he is, the vice regent of God upon earth. It is useless to say that

THIS POWER IS FOOLISHNESS

It is the most consummate, complete, and thoroughly organized system of religious despotism ever consummated. The premises of their faith is diligently

implanted in the brain of the child, and the logic of his belief grows with his growth. It is such a unit that it must be accepted entire. If we admit the right to organize a theocracy upon earth, we must go farther, and admit the entire faith of the Papacy, because one slip is logically certain to follow the previous one and lead to the final . . . cils at the head of it must sit there as the representative of God, and God's rule being a rule of morality, whoever represents God on earth must take cognizance of the morality of the ones governed, which include the thoughts as well as the acts. But how is a government to ascertain the thoughts of man? Why by torture, and that brings before us the Inquisition, inaugurated for this very purpose to wring from a person his inmost thoughts that he might be absolved and saved from hell.

Dr. Crafts, lecturer of the National Reform party, who desire to establish a theocracy, says "that the ministers are the successors of the prophets."

WHY DOES HE SAY THAT

Because in olden times, when God's theocracy among the Israelites was in existence, God made known his will among the prophets, and Dr. Crafts wants to make the ministers their successors that their dictum may be accepted as the word of God conveyed through them for the government of the country through the churches. And what would follow them, as a natural consequence? Just what the National reformers say themselves. Establish a National religion, and thus "enforce upon all that come among us the precepts of the Christian religion." If parties refused to be "enforced" what else? What is the natural sequence? Is it not punishment? And if the ministers are the successors of the prophets, and the prophets were the exponents of God, what will be the power and force, or where the limit of the power that will be exercised by them to "enforce" their views upon others? Is it not self-evident that the result will be another inquisition?

The lecturer then read from the same authority to show how the bishops in the fourth century managed so that they could get the power of the civil government to enforce their decrees, which was the promulgation of a Sunday law.

THEY ESTABLISHED A THEOCRACY

and to get control of civil authority they induced the Emperor Constantine to pass laws enforcing rest upon Sunday. "What do we see to-day in our country? A party trying to establish a theocracy and to enforce its decrees by combining the power of the civil government with that of the church, through the enactment of a National Sunday law that will compel men to rest, or come under penalties established by the government. Is it wise to let this movement go on? To wait until it has acquired this power to persecute? Must not the natural sequence follow if they are permitted to take the first step? Must not persecution follow as a matter of course?

The speaker then went on to show that government had no right to establish such laws: that the Sunday movement of the fourth century was a religious one,

and legislation on morality, over which God alone has authority. Hence the plea of the present movement that it is a civil Sunday that is wanted is fallacious, there being no such thing as a civil Sabbath. He then proved that the Sunday is a pagan institution, being the venerable day of the sun taken by a pagan emperor and forced upon the Christians of the fourth century in opposition to

THE SABBATH OF JEHOVAH

The Sunday to-day is just as much a pagan institution as it ever was. Man can not make a holy day. God alone is holy, and it must be a holy being to make a day holy. Therefore, man's calling a day holy never can make it so. It is just as much blasphemy to-day to call it the Sabbath as it was in the fourth century, for it is ignoring and heaping contempt upon the seventh day which is the Sabbath of God.

April 5, 1889

**"Legalized Christianity in America" *The Daily Inter Ocean* (Chicago)
18, 9 (6,369), p. 7.**

Elder Jones Cites Dr. Schaff on Legalized Christianity in the Fourth Century.

The sixth in the series of lectures on the union of church and state was given at the Bible-rooms, No. 28 College place, last night by Elder Jones, the rooms being crowded to their utmost capacity. The speaker began by saying: "Last night I read from several authorities to show how Constantine gave gifts to the heathen in order to induce them to become Christians, and how by exempting cities from taxation, and by donations converted whole districts so that such a demoralizing influence crept into the churches [*sic.*] that the members, who were practically half pagan and half Christian, abandoned themselves to all species of worldliness and licentious, corrupting folly, turning to their religion only in sudden danger, sickness, or near approach to death, when they took refuge in baptism. Then, as ever, when religion is professed simply for worldly interests, it resulted in hypocrisy. To legislate to force a religion upon the people is to raise up a nation of hypocrites, which will be simply ruin sooner or later. To establish a religion by law is to establish a papacy. If it be a Methodist faith it will be

A METHODIST PAPACY

So of any other form of faith, or if a national religion be established, it will be a National papacy, and, further, a religious despotism is certain to come from it. The speaker read also from Dr. Schaff, to show the effect of such legislation. In his words it would result in this: "The church became fashionable. When a religion becomes fashionable, it loses all the good it ever has. Nationalize a religion and you corrupt and degrade it. To Christianize people is to create a

nation of hypocrites; worldly professors, to whom real piety will be unpopular. Dr. Schaff sets forth in strong language the gaudy apparel, luxury, and prodigality indulged in by the Christians of the fourth century, and afterwards from Milman's Christianity, and then contrasted their extravagance, with the prevalence of the same follies of to-day. Schaff then shows that the genuine Christians were reproached by those Christian worldlings with "being righteous overmuch," and also that the main effort among those nominal Christians was to obtain a church office, because all taxation was removed from such, the result being that many who were the least competent of proper became church officers, some bishops, who were continually engaged in contentions for supremacy, each one holding his

OFFICE FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

So, the speaker said, it will be in our country when ministers, as politicians, devote their time to political wire-pulling, which will be a natural result of legislation on religious matters. Men will be made ministers because they are popular, and as a result they will have to play into the hands of those who elected them, and instead of preaching righteousness to the people they will preach only smooth things which will please their hearers. Further, as the majority will rule, worldly and wicked men will be made ministers and their wire-pulling will eventually be to obtain higher positions, so that men will enter the ministry solely, in some instances, to obtain preferment in large cities like New York, Chicago, etc., where the chief ministers may become the ruling power. Again, the speaker read from the same author to show that many were made bishops because they were so wicked and in order to prevent them harming the church through their power and influence. He also read from Bowers' History of the Popes to show the bloody strife that resulted from the efforts of the bishops to exalt themselves, and to obtain wealth by legacies, donations, and gifts from the people, their extortions and intrigues becoming finally so scandalous that Constantine passed a law forbidding the clergy and church clerks receiving legacies or

GIFTS OF ANY KIND

The whole of the extracts read showed that more wickedness was carried on, in an aggravated form, under a Christian garb than had ever been known under paganism. Therefore, it is plain that, as history repeats itself, if our Nation will compel the people to become hypocrites, Christianity will degenerate until at last it will become so corrupt that our Nation will be swept from the earth exactly as Rome was before us.

April 7, 1889

"Religious Legislation" *The Sunday Inter Ocean* (Chicago) 18, 14, p. 5.

The W. C. T. U. and National Reform Association in Close Union.
Miss Willard's Address Criticised— Efforts to Establish a Theocracy.
Misleading Tracts Issued, and Names Doubled Upon Petitions.

TRYING TO ESTABLISH A PAPACY

Friday night Elder Jones again presented the subject of religious legislation with the object of uniting the church with the State, at the chapel of the Bible rooms, No. 28 College place. In opening, the speaker called attention to all he had presented that had occurred in the past which resulted in the creation of a theocracy, and also the formation of the Papacy, and presented the parallel now being attempted in our own country. He called attention to the fact that in the start they had an imperial religion, which changed in form with every change of emperors, until the Bishop of Rome assumed the office of Pope and ruled exclusively. Then followed, of course, the attempt to enforce the established religion, because they reasoned if we are a Christian nation it will be setting a bad example if it does not respect the institutions of the church. So they began to force the people who composed the nation to outwardly, at least, show themselves Christians.

THEY BEGAN VERY QUIETLY

and modestly at first, just as the theocratical movers are doing now. They asked in A. D. 321 only that the courts and trades people should quit work, but years after they asked more and more; first, that theaters and places of amusements be closed, and, finally, that every one be compelled not only to rest, but attend divine worship. Now, the speaker said, the very same movement is taking place in our midst. At first in California, the petitions were modest, but at present a cry is going up from every State in the Union for more Sunday legislation. Every State nearly has a Sunday law, and this winter the reformers petitioned Congress to establish a National Sunday to be in harmony with the States. Now what is their theory? Why an effort to establish the Christian religion as a National religion, and have its principles taught in the public schools? They claim that the government is an atheistic government and deny allegiance to it until such time as it recognizes Christianity, then, they said, it will be a true theocracy of God, and entitled to allegiance. Is not this a repetition of the action of the bishops of the fourth century?

BETWEEN THE NATIONAL REFORM

Association and the Women's Christian Temperance Union there is a close association. In 1885 Miss Willard suggested the adoption of a new department

for the furtherance of Sunday observance, to co-operate with the National Reform Association, and it was done, and Miss Bateman made President of it, who was admitted to the National Reform Association as a Vice President. A vast amount of literature on the subject of Sunday observance was distributed by the W. C. T. U., and special prayers have been requested among the churches, for the success of the National Reform Association. Mr. M. A. Gault, who is president of this latter, says that the W. C. T. U. is the best of all organizations for the promulgation of these doctrines; in fact, he advises leaving all that kind of work to them and the Prohibition party. Now what does the W. C. T. U. propose? In September they sent out a pamphlet upon the subject of our National sins. At the end of it they say, "A true theocracy is yet to come and the enthronement of Christ in law and law-makers; hence I pray devoutly as a Christian patriot for the ballot in the hands of women, and rejoice that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union has so long championed this cause." The speaker read also from

MISS WILLARD'S ADDRESS

at the Pittsburg convention as follows: "The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, National, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be this world's King, yea, verily, this world's King." The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics, but the Savior himself said, "My Kingdom is not of this world," and no candid man can fail to decide which is right, the Savior or the W. C. T. U. The speaker said: "I am not finding fault with this association, but with its leaders. Let them remain within their proper field, and I heartily indorse them, but when Miss Willard attempts to embroil them in an attempt to enforce religion as a civil law, I oppose them persistently. In their last convention at New York they said "that Christ must be the king and the Bible the code of civil law." What will be the result? The wicked saloon men, for instance, will misquote and misuse the Bible in defense of their business; in short, the pearls being thrown before the swine, the latter will turn and fend the throwers. The speaker then went on to show that when the National reform movement started, twenty-five years ago they took the position that Congress had no right to legislate on religious subjects, but when it was suggested last year that government be

ASKED TO PASS A SUNDAY LAW

they came right to the front to its support. What does this prove? That these men are willing and ready to take advantage of unconstitutional measure to obtain their ends. If then they are willing to break down the constitutional safeguards, what will become of our boasted liberty?

A large number of extracts from records and speeches from the W. C. T. U. and National Reform Association was introduced to show that the aim of the two is to establish a theocracy, and that each was pledged to vote for men only

who would promise to labor for Sunday legislation. Now, said Elder Jones, what happened in the fourth century from just such an attempt? Did not the Church fill up with the very worst characters, who entered the body of Christians for political power, and what will be the result among us? Can we expect to be more favored? Not at all. All the evils that resulted then will follow in our country, and the end will be an increase of wickedness and iniquity and the establishment of a papacy. Now, when the church establishes a monopoly of religion, let all Americans ask themselves, Who will deliver us from it should it become, as it must, oppressive and despotic? There will be no relief.

A MISLEADING TRACT

Last evening Elder Jones continued his talk on religious legislation to a large congregation. "The subject," the speaker said, "was to be the methods used to obtain a Sunday law, but since that announcement I have received some papers from a mis-called 'American Sabbath Union.' In a printed circular, among the lot, is one that classes the opponents of Sunday legislation, Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh Day Baptists, with infidels and saloon-keepers. It also charges Elder Jones with saying that the present Sunday movement is a Catholic one, but this is in error. The tract asserts that Elder Jones also admitted, before the Educational Committee of Congress, that the government had a right to enforce Sunday laws. It is sufficient to say these are entirely untrue." Elder Jones then read from another tract extracts that are claimed to be his utterances, and which in a garbled form are italicized, he said, he presumed to falsify his position. At considerable length the speaker showed the alteration in his argument that had been attempted, and presented his true position, but as THE INTER OCEAN has published it in full, and as the proceedings before the committee are printed in pamphlet form and can be obtained by anyone interested, from the Senator of his district, the argument upon the misrepresentations, is omitted.

IT MAY BE SAID

however, that Dr. Lewis, of the Seventh Day Baptists, did admit the right of Government to enact Sunday law, but the argument of Elder Jones was from beginning to end opposed to Governments legislating upon religious subjects for any purpose whatever. The speaker then took up his argument before the committee in detail, to refute the assertion that "he admitted the righteousness of Sunday rest laws," and showed how by a combination of sentences, the tract made him admit such a thing. "But," said the speaker, "I will write the gentleman an open letter defining my position." He then called attention to the proof he had previously presented from the Rev. Cook, Dr. Elliott, and others that the Sabbath is a divine institution, and is of no effect if enforced from any other than a religious stand-point, to show the inconsistency of the position of the writer of the tract in his argument for a civil Sabbath. In reference to the assertion of the National Reform Association claiming that 7,200,000 Catholics signed the petition to Congress in favor of Sunday legislation, basing their assertion on the fact that

Cardinal Gibbons wrote a letter favoring a Sunday law, he said, "Cardinal Gibbons has written a letter to Elder Lindsay, of Baltimore, stating, in substance, that he wrote for himself alone,

HAVING NO AUTHORITY OR WISH

to try to pledge or bind any one else, and the letter will appear in full in the next issue of the *American Sentinel*." He then went on to show that whole churches were placed on the rolls of signatures by the vote of a few that might be present at a meeting, hundreds of names being added to the list without their voice in the matter, the bona fide signatures being but a few hundred, instead of fourteen millions as claimed. Further, he called attention to the fact the petitioners claim all the signatures are those of adult residents "21 years of age," or over, while the whole body of American Catholics of all ages was taken, babies, children, and youths—and so of churches everywhere. "O," said he, as Miss Bateham says, "signatures are most valuable, but endorsements count up the fastest." Endorsements in a church take all the church, and Cardinal Gibbons' endorsement takes all the Catholic population." When it came to the presentation of the petitions to Congress, another petition from Illinois was also presented signed by a hundred ministers in favor of such legislation, and Senator Blair presented a synopsis of the main petition and admitted that there were only 407 signatures, the balance being "indorsements."

THE MINISTERS WHO SIGNED

the special petitions had already signed the principal one, and formed a part of the 407 actual signatures, and the petition of the W. C. T. U. was already included in the main one, so "doubling up" the signatures from beginning to end. Practically the 14,000,000 of people claimed to be desirous of Sunday legislation were represented by 407 individuals only. The speaker then read at considerable length from the report of the Columbus, Ohio, convention of National Reformers, and from the arguments of Dr. Herrick Johnson, Dr. Sutherland, and others before the Senate committee, to show that even the supporters for the movement for Sunday legislation admit and claim the divine origin of the Sabbath. In closing he said he would take up the argument at length to-night.

April 8, 1889

**"The True Sabbath Day" *The Daily Inter Ocean* (Chicago) 18, 15
(6,372), p. 4.**

Efforts Made by the National Reformers to Change the Day and Their Reasons.

The lectures on religious legislation which have been given nightly at No. 28 College place by Elder A. T. Jones were continued last night, the closing one to

be given to-night. The speaker began by saying that the Sabbath is fast becoming a subject of legislation and of civil law, and when it is made so, questions will arise both of interpretation and law. The Sabbath is not a civil institution and can not be made so, hence, if legislation is decided upon, it must become a matter of interpretation by the courts, and as Senator Blair's bill calls the Sunday "the Lord's day," it will be necessary for the courts to go to the Bible to ascertain why it is called this, and the courts will begin to interpret Scripture for you and I; but no court, or set of men, have any right to interpret the word of God for any man.

Article 2 of the constitution of the American Sabbath Union endorses the Sabbath found in . . . Sabbath from desecration." Herrick Johnson claims also that "it is useless to put the Sabbath on a basis of expediency.

THE ANCHORAGE

is in the fact that it is a divine institution. God wants us to keep all the Sabbath, not merely rest, while Mr. Shepard of the New York *Mail and . . .*, claims that "the demand for this legislation rests solely on its divine origin." This is enough, the speaker said, to show that these parties appeal to the fourth commandment for their authority, but now let us appeal to it and see what it says. No work can be done on that day, the seventh day, the very law that these men say we must turn our backs upon. Now, how can they apply it to Sunday, the first day? I read from Judge Cooley's digest: "What a court has to do it to declare the law as written, and the meaning is fixed when it is adopted and is not changed when a decision is to be rendered under it." Now, did God intend the first day of the week to be kept when he made it? Read the sixteenth chapter of Exodus and you will find that no manna fell on the seventh day, and the Lord kept this up for forty years. Could the children of Israel keep the first day, then, if they tried? No; the manna would not keep over night any time, but on the sixth day they gathered a double quantity, which sufficed for two days, and nothing fell on the seventh, so that by three special miracles God pointed out for forty years the day he wished them to keep.

GOD THEN INTERPRETED THE LAW

when He gave it, and in a way, that showed them the day he meant them to keep, and according to law itself, then no other day can be kept under this commandment. I will show . . . changed the Sabbath to Sunday, and he answered "that there was a meeting after the resurrection on the first day of the week," and afterward admitted that three or four of these meetings is all the authority for the change. Thus, we see, he undermines this . . . principle of Judge Cooley, and this undermines every safeguard we have in law. These few meetings, Mr. Johnson claims, is sufficient to overrule all the interpretations of God. Judge Cooley says that a court which would allow public sentiment to cause them to swerve from the original interpretation of the law is guilty of

reckless disregard of official office and public duty. Now, if it is so of civil law, what is it toward God, in attempting to do

THE SAME WITH GOD'S LAW?

Judge Cooley also says that "in all written law the intent of the law given is the one to be enforced." What was God's intent in the fourth commandment? That the seventh day should be kept. Some claim the people chose the seventh day then, and after the resurrection changed it to the first, but read that sixteenth chapter of Exodus again and you will see that God commanded it, the people having no choice in the matter. Further, when the Savior came he kept the same day and enforced its observance, never intimating or preparing for a change of any kind. In the trial of Andrew Johnson the decision was that "when a law is plain there is no room for constructions, and the meaning must be enforced—the meaning that appears upon the face of the instrument—that is the one alone we are at liberty to enforce." It is obedience God wants, not construction or interpretation; and if those men would go to work to obey and teach the people to do so, the people under their charge would . . . The speaker then read at length from legal . . . construction is to be put upon the language of a statute, and then called attention to the simplicity of the words and plainness of the meaning of the fourth commandment.

THE ONLY QUESTION WHATEVER

that we have to find out under that law is what day is the seventh, and it tells us which one it is—the seventh is a circle of seven—following six days of labor of God. Now, then, see how unnatural and forced it is to say that the commandment means "one day in seven." They say so in order to put into its place any day they please. They make it indefinite to get rid of the seventh day, and then whirl about and make it definite to get in the first day. If we admit that God made the commandment indefinite, He made it so intentionally, and if so, no man has a right to make it definite, and when they try to do so they put themselves above God and usurp authority they never had. If Christ is "Lord of the Sabbath" and the "seventh day is the Sabbath," then the son of Man is Lord of the seventh day, and if so, John being in the spirit on "the Lord's day," then John was in the spirit on the seventh day. This conclusion can not be changed, because the first two statements can not be denied. But further, what was the reason God made the seventh day the Sabbath? Because God made the heavens and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh day, and we are to keep that day because God blessed it and made it holy. Now can not we prove our right to keep it from every ruling of law I have read?

THE SABBATH IS A SIGN

between God and man to draw men to himself as their Creator, and that reason is just as firmly established to-day as when first given. But these would-be

legislators change the day and change the reason for the commandment, yet that commandment was given before men sinned, and would remain even if man had never sinned. Further it is not possible for God to change it. The commandment is based upon facts, and it will never cease to be a fact, and God Himself can never change that fact. God can not remain the Creator and substitute one of His work days and call it His rest day. So the power that is trying to do what God can not is that form of power that seeks to exalt itself above God, and that is a papacy.