

tending. Its professions are mild, and apparently Christian, but when it shall speak, it will reveal the spirit of the dragon."

Reader! beware of religious laws in secular dress as you would of wolves in sheep's clothing. Not only are they deceptive, but there is persecution in their train. Their character is not changed by the change made in the name through which they are advocated. "Ye shall know them by their fruits." Already persecution is in the land as the result of enforced Sunday laws. Witness cases in Arkansas, Tennessee, Georgia, and Maryland. Again we say, Be not deceived.

## DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

— OF THE —

### INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ.

We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.

We believe in supporting the civil government, and submitting to its authority.

We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.

We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.

We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation by the civil government; that we and our fellow-citizens may enjoy the inestimable blessings of both religious and civil liberty.

## RELIGIOUS LIBERTY LITERATURE

Sunday and the World's Fair, 10c. per 100.

Was Israel a Republic? 10c. per 100.

Shall Religion be Taught in the Public Schools? 20c. per 100.

The True Statesman, 20c. per 100.

Sunday Laws, 20c. per 100.

Religious Legislation, 35c. per 100.

Sunday Laws and Working Men, 35c. per 100.

Congress on Sunday Legislation, 30c. per 100.

Religious Persecution in Tennessee, 75c. per 100.

Arguments on the Breckinridge Sunday Bill, 5c. each.

Civil Government and Religion, 25c. each.

ADDRESS, INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

*See offices on first page of cover.*

## THE COLUMBIAN YEAR

AND

### THE MEANING OF THE FOUR CENTURIES.

*An address delivered by Alonzo T. Jones, on Columbus Day 1892,  
revised to date.*

THE subject announced for to-day's celebration throughout the whole land, as you doubtless are aware, is "The Meaning of the Four Centuries." It is an excellent subject. It is well to know the meaning of any century. It is well to know the meaning of all the centuries. It is excellent for us who are here to-day, to know the meaning of *these* four centuries.

And if we would know indeed the meaning of these four centuries, it is evident that the proper means to discover that would be to consult Him who is the King of all the centuries, and more than that even, the King of eternity. He knows the end from the beginning. He knows the meaning of these four centuries no less than all the others. He has told us some things in regard to these; and the best that any one ever can tell is what he learns from the Lord.

To call your attention to what He has said, I will read first from the fourth chapter of Daniel and the seventeenth verse. This is part of the record that the king of Babylon made in describing a vision that he had had, and what was done in that vision. He was telling what certain ones—



“watchers” and “holy ones”—who came down from heaven said: “This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones: to the intent that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will.” This is repeated in four other places in this book. So it is here five times stated that God rules in the affairs of men, in the kingdom of men, and gives it to whomsoever he will. This is true of this nation as well as of that nation. And he would have us know the meaning of this as well as of that.

There is another place, in Acts 17, that tells us the Lord’s mind upon this subject, to a certain extent: Verses 23 to 26. Speaking of the One who among the Athenians was the “Unknown God,” he says: “Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you. God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshiped with men’s hands, as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation.”

The Lord has determined the bounds of the habitations of the inhabitants of the earth and the times before appointed. And then in the 27th verse he gives the object of this: “*That they should seek the Lord*, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us.” Not “if they might feel after him and *haply* find him;” but if “haply they might feel after him *and find him*.” When they feel after him, there is no “hap” about their finding him. Every person in every nation who feels after God will find him. That is settled.

Then this scripture shows plainly that the object that God has in distributing the nations over the face of the earth is that they should seek and know him; feel after him and find

him, though he is not far from every one. There is another place that tells the same thing, although in other words, and makes it more definite than even this text. Deut. 32:7-9: “Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations; ask thy father, and he will show thee; thy elders, and they will tell thee. When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. For the Lord’s portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance.”

Then the Lord expects that a portion of the inhabitants of the earth will turn to him in response to his love, his calling, and the care and dealing that he has had with them in every nation; and that portion which turns to him becomes his people. When he determined the bounds and the habitations of the people upon the earth, he did it with the idea of Israel and his inheritance, in view. Also when he tells us to remember the years of old and consider the years of many generations, he would have us turn our attention to the centuries.

It is not only true that the Lord has this purpose in view for every nation—that they should feel after him and find him; but it is his purpose for every nation *as long as there remain any there who will seek the Lord*. Gen. 15:13-16: “And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again: *for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full*.”

That land was given to Abram and to his seed; but he could not inhabit it as yet because the iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full. There were among the Amorites at that time



some who feared God, and there were others who might yet turn to the Lord, feel after him and find him; and the Lord would not root up that nation as long as there were any in it who might find him and his blessing. But when they had gone so far away from the Lord as to fill up the cup of their iniquity, so that there were no longer any of them feeling after God that they might find him, then the Lord brought his people into the land and rooted out those who inhabited it, that his people might dwell there.

When any people have gone so far as to seek wholly, not the Lord and his ways, but *their own ways*, then God's purpose is finished with that nation; there is no further use for them on the earth, and they will be swept away. This is but the statement in another form of the principle under discussion, and it is clearly illustrated in the history of the nations.

Turn to Jeremiah 27:1-7. Word was sent to all the nations round about Palestine, telling them: "I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; and the beasts of the field have I given him also to serve him. And all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, till the very time of his land come; and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him."

When that time came, and Babylon reached the height of its glory, they turned away from the Lord. Nebuchadnezzar had sought the Lord and found him, and proclaimed him to all the nations; but his son and his grandson turned away from the Lord. And finally there was that blasphemous feast at which Belshazzar was slain, and the kingdom was taken away and given to the Medes and Persians. Read the full record in the fifth chapter of Daniel.

In the eighth chapter of Daniel we have another state-

ment. Verses 5-9 and 20-23. When is the time that the kingdoms which followed Media and Persia were overthrown?—"When the transgressors are come to the full." Just as the Lord said to Abram concerning the Amorites—when they had filled up the measure of their iniquity.

Again in Dan. 11:1, 2, and 10:20, we read the words of the angel: "Also I, in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him. And now will I show thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all, and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia." "Then said he, Knowest thou wherefore I come unto thee? and now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia: and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come."

This angel was there with Daniel in the third year of Cyrus. Dan. 10:1. Cyrus was the successor of Darius the Mede, and the angel had stood with Darius to strengthen him; and to Cyrus he had said, "I will open to you the two-leaved gates, and the gates shall not be shut." Isa. 45:1-5. But the angel now says, I will return to the prince of Persia, and I will stay there a certain length of time, and when I am gone forth, then the prince of Grecia shall come. When the angel went forth and stood no longer by the Persian ruler as he had stood by Darius the Mede and Cyrus the Persian, then that nation was really left to its own devices, so that when the prince of Grecia came against it, all he had to do was to move onward. And it is a mystery even to this day that that monarch of the Persians, who contended with Alexander the Great, should do the things that he did do—things that would really be ridiculous in any commander; things that the veriest tyro in soldiery would know ought not to be done. But the secret of it was, that when the angel had gone forth from Persia, he went to the nation that was coming against Persia; the power and guid-



ance of God were transferred from Persia to Grecia; and the power of Persia perished, and that of Grecia succeeded to its place in the world and in the grand purpose of the Lord.

When the Amorites had filled up the measure of their iniquity, their place was given to Israel, the people of God. When Israel, following the way of the heathen, filled also the cup of iniquity, God brought up the kingdom of Babylon, and took all away. When Babylon had filled up the cup of its iniquity, the power was transferred to Persia. And when the angel was turned away by the wickedness of the Persians, then the prince of Grecia comes in and sweeps it away.

And how long was the power of Grecia to continue? When was it to be broken?—"When the transgressors were come to the full." That nation stands until it has filled up the measure of its iniquity, and then the power is transferred to another kingdom. That power to which it was transferred was the Roman, as we learn from Dan. II:14. "And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south; also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision; but they shall fall." This nation is pointed out as a nation of robbers—the children of robbers, as says the margin of the text.

These are the ones to whom the kingdom is now given, and what for?—"The children of robbers shall exalt themselves to establish the vision." When this nation comes upon the scene, then there enters that which establishes the vision, that which is one great object of the vision, the one chief landmark in the line of vision which God has given through the prophets for all time.

By this mere sketch there is seen the secret of God's purpose with the nations. He presides in the kingdoms of men and giveth them to whomsoever he will. Why?—That they should seek him if haply they might feel after him and find him; and as long as any one remains in the nation that will

seek him, that nation will stand. But when all fail to do this, then it will be given to another people that they may seek him.

It is the truth that there is no principle announced in the Scriptures concerning either men as individuals or men as grouped in nations, that will not be illustrated in the life of individuals or of nations. There is no principle in the Scriptures that has been announced in vain for the children of men.

Every principle of God, announced for the salvation of the individual, will be illustrated in the life of individuals in every nation. So that in the grand consummation there will be those out of every nation, kindred, tongue, and people who will be brought there through the power of the salvation and the light of God that is in the world. Rev. 7: 9, 10.

Now it is true that nations, as such, are not saved in the kingdom of God. But there are principles which God has announced for the good and the guidance of nations in this world, the place of their existence. This is as true of nations in their sphere as it is true of individuals in their sphere. And the principles which God has announced for nations will be illustrated before all the nations, as certainly as the principles for individuals will be illustrated before all individuals.

#### THE DIVINE PRINCIPLE FOR GOVERNMENTS.

There is one principle which God has established for the nations which was referred to before, but which, when Christ came, was announced in its fullness. That principle is *the total separation of religion and the State*. Jesus in more than one place separated religion—the realm of God—entirely from the State—the realm of man. In one place: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." In another place, "My kingdom is not of this world." In still another, when one desired him to judge between him and his brother in the matter of an inheritance: "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?" And



again: "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." Consequently our Lord refuses to condemn any man for not believing in him. He judges no man for his refusal to believe in him. So when Christ established the principle that no one can be judged by any one but God for not believing in him, he left all interference with anybody's belief—all interference with anybody's worship or failure to worship, entirely out of the province or jurisdiction of men in any way whatever.

This is the divine principle that the Lord has established for governments and nations. If that principle had not been announced in the Bible, God could have saved individuals, and his salvation could have been illustrated in the individual; but here is a principle announced for nations, and as salvation for the individual is to be illustrated in the individual before all the world, so this principle for governments will be illustrated before all the nations of the world. *And that is the purpose and the meaning of these four centuries.* The meaning of these four centuries is that this principle should be made manifest to all the earth—this divine principle that a man's faith, his religion, pertains to himself alone, and not to any other individual, nation, government, or set of men. That divine principle and the illustration of it, the setting of it before all the nations of the earth, is the meaning of these four centuries.

This can be seen by a glance at what has been done. When the gospel first went forth,—the everlasting gospel to be preached to every nation and to every creature,—it went forth under just such a state of things as is directly opposed to this divine principle. Every man was compelled to be religious just as the Roman state said; and the state itself absorbed the individual with all his individuality.

Yet the disciples of Christ preached everywhere in all that empire the principle that with religion or men's worship

no government can of right have anything to do. The Roman empire would not admit the principle, and opposed it with all the might of that mightiest government of all former times. But the principle is divine and could not be quenched.

And in spite of that mightiest government on earth, this divine principle prevailed, and was at last admitted in official utterances even by that imperial government. But mark, that principle was not definitely established *as a principle of the government*. By force of circumstances and of the divine principle, it was admitted that every one should worship as he pleased. It was only a question of time, however, when it would have become a recognized principle of the government if it had been maintained in its integrity. But just then there were ambitious bishops and political priests, professing Christianity, who seized upon the government, established the new religion as a part of the government, and used the state to an extent in matters of religion, which man had never before attempted, in carrying on for twelve hundred dreary years, the cruel despotism of the papacy.

Finally came Protestantism announcing anew the principle to all the world that every man should worship as he pleased, and that religion should be separate from earthly government. Yet in not a single Protestant nation was the principle illustrated.

The principle was announced by Protestantism, but the nations, and the governments of the nations, held on in the same old way, with the newly announced principle. Consequently Lutheranism fell into a union of Church and State; Calvinism, claiming to be Protestantism, also established a union of Church and State. Puritanism, although claiming to be Protestantism, tried to establish a union of Church and State in England, and could not, and came over to New England and did it.

So, although this divine principle was announced by original Christianity and again by genuine Protestantism,



the principle was never established or recognized *as a governmental principle* till the rise of *this splendid nation*, the outgrowth of that splendid day when Columbus sighted land, four hundred years ago to-day. When this nation established its government, it announced this principle and proclaimed "A New Order of Things." The United States government not only announced to all the world a new order of things, but pledged itself forever to the new order of things, by placing on the national seal that declaration, "A New Order of Things," and "God has Favored the Undertaking." Of course God has favored the undertaking.

Now this nation—the one of all the nations the most glorious, is the one that has been acknowledged as the enlightenment of all the nations, the one that has reached the highest place in the shortest time, of all that have ever been upon the earth. It is ahead of all the nations of the earth. Where on the earth then could there possibly be a better place to illustrate that principle announced by Jesus Christ for all nations, than right here? And this is the meaning of the four centuries.

The meaning of these four centuries is that in this government, in this nation, there should be established and illustrated before all the world this divine principle which was enunciated for the benefit of the world. *And this purpose has been met.*

#### THE AMERICAN PRINCIPLE IS THE DIVINE PRINCIPLE.

When this government was formed, it was with the express intent that there should be exemplified here this divine principle, and that therefore in this nation there should be a total separation between the government and religion, that the State should not have anything to do in any way whatever with what any man believed or with any man's worship or refusal to worship. This was done with the expressed purpose and with the direct intent of its being an illustration of

that divine principle; for it was distinctly announced that the government was so established because Christ had proclaimed the principle.

Jefferson, Madison, and their noble fellow-workers for religious as well as civil freedom in this new nation, truthfully said:—

"Almighty God hath created the mind free;" and 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 both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do;" and "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."

Further they said:—

"We hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth that religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence. The religion then of every man, must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. We maintain, therefore, that in matters of religion no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society, and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance."

And again:—

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

Again:—

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



And yet again : —

“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.”

And therefore says Bancroft : —

“Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, *the new nation* dared to set the example of accepting, in its relations to God, *the principle first divinely ordained of God in Judea*. It left the management of temporal things to temporal power; but the American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the Federal government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite Spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power.”

This is why the United States Constitution was made to declare that, “No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States;” that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;” and why the supreme law was made to say that “the government of the United States is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion.”

Consequently upon this theater alone has been displayed the working of that principle which is for the enlightenment of all nations upon the earth. This principle has been illustrated here and nowhere else on earth. By this government alone it has been declared in the principles of the government; in our national documents; in the supreme law of the land; and in that mystic symbol of legal government, the Great Seal of the United States, pledging the government and all that it is, to this “new order of things.”

It is easy to see that there was no other place on the earth where this divine principle could be so well and so advantageously established and announced for the enlightenment of all the earth. Until this nation was established, all the nations of the world were not known. And of the

nations that had been known, though known ever since the announcement of this principle by our Lord, no one was recognized by the others as an example that they could look to as of much importance. Not one of them possessed an influence that affected all the others. Each nation considered itself the most enlightened, the best, the farthest advanced. But when this nation came up, and established the divine principle for governments here set forth, by which the mind of man was untrammelled in every way, in the nature of things this nation outstripped all the others. And having thus reached the highest place in the shortest time of any nation that ever existed, all the other nations were compelled to admit that this was the brightest example upon the earth.

And the one thing above all others that compelled the attention of the other nations of the earth, was its position and character in this very matter of the divine principle of the separation of religion and the State. Whatever else from this nation may have affected others, it was always, and rightly traced back for its origin to this divine principle. And as in the wisdom of God this principle was established here for the enlightenment of all the world, so in the order of God, this purpose has been accomplished. Especially has this been so with respect to the nations of Europe, where, both by the papacy, and by false Protestantism, the papal — the satanic — principle had been so thoroughly established and so long practiced. Says Dr. Philip Schaff, than whom no one has had better facilities or opportunity for understanding this point : —

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

“The successful working of the principle of religious freedom in the United States has stimulated this progress without any *official* interference. All the advocates of the voluntary principle [in the support of churches and



religion] and of a separation of Church and State in Europe, point to the example of this country as their strongest practical argument."

So irresistible indeed has been this influence that all the nations have been, by it, to a greater or less extent, drawn away from the principles of the papacy and therein from the papacy itself. So certainly is this so that even Spain, the home of the Inquisition, has been led to grant toleration.

And thus stood this great question and this splendid government, in the sublime illustration of that divine principle for governments, until *this very anniversary year*, this *four-hundredth* year, when lo! *all is reversed*.

#### THE SUBVERSION OF THE DIVINE, THE AMERICAN, PRINCIPLE.

On the 29th day of February, this very year, 1892, this four-hundredth anniversary year; in spite of the Declaration of Independence, in spite of the supreme law as subscribed by George Washington, in spite of the plain declarations of the United States Constitution, and in defiance of the whole history of the making of that Constitution in this respect, the Supreme Court of the United States unanimously declared, in an official decision, that "this is a religious people," and that "this is a Christian nation," and above all, that *this is the meaning of the Constitution!* Nor was this done inadvertently or in a mere passing remark. It was done in a plain proposition extensively considered and supported (?) in argument (?) by many "historical" proofs (?).<sup>1</sup>

Then no sooner was this done than a religious combination, which had been working for twenty-nine years to secure this very thing for the very purpose for which they now used it, took that decision and went before Congress, and upon that authority demanded that Congress should officially decide, and by statute declare, that Sunday is the Christian Sabbath, and require its recognition and observance as such, by the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday. This plea,

<sup>1</sup>See Decision and Review, in Religious Liberty Library, No. 8.

that religious combination backed up with the following threatening "petition":—

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

As this religious combination was composed of the National Reform Association, which includes "all the evangelical churches of the country;" the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which includes at least the women of the same; the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, which includes also the young people of the same; and the American Sabbath Union, which includes not only the evangelical churches but also the Catholic Church; as all this represented a good many votes; as politicians dearly love votes; and as loss of these votes was threatened if Congress did not do the bidding of this combination; Congress surrendered, decided, and acted, accordingly; the President duly signed the act of Congress; and thus in this four-hundredth anniversary year the government of the United States, in all its branches—legislative, judiciary, and executive—was turned away from the divine principle upon which it was founded; was committed to religious legislation for religion's sake; the new order of things to which the government was forever pledged was completely reversed, and the old order of things was recognized and revived in this land.

That it may be seen how certainly this was done, let us look at the proceedings in Congress as they stand in the official *Record*, July 10 and 12, 1892:—

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

*Mr. Quay*.—On page 122, line 13, after the word "act," I move to insert:—

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



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

*The Vice-President.*—The part indicated will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:—

“Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy: six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it.”

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

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

The words “Sabbath day,” simply mean that it is a rest day, and it may be Saturday or Sunday, and it would be subject to the discretion of those who will manage this Exposition, whether they should close the Exposition on the last day of the week, in conformity with that observance which is made by the Israelites and the Seventh-day Baptists, or should close it on the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath. It certainly seems to me that this amendment should be adopted by the senator from Pennsylvania, and, if he proposes to close this Exposition, that it should be closed on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday. . . .

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

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

*The Vice-President.*—The senator from Pennsylvania accepts the modification in part, but not in whole. . . .

*Mr. Harris.*—Let the amendment of the senator from Pennsylvania, as modified, be reported.

*The Vice-President.*—It will be again reported.

*The Chief Clerk.*—On page 122, line 13, after the word “act” it is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee, by inserting:—

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

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

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

1. The divine law was officially and in its very words, adopted as containing the “reasons” and forming the basis of the legislation. In other words, the legislation proposed only to enforce the divine law as quoted from the Book. This would have been wholly wrong and presumptuous in itself, even though it had stopped with that.

2. Yet those to whom the legislation was directed and who were expected to execute its provisions, were not allowed to read and construe the divine law for themselves; and this for the very reason that there was a possibility that they



might take the divine word as it reads and as it was actually quoted in the official proceedings, and shut the Exposition on the day plainly specified in the divine word, which was cited as the basis and authority for the action taken.

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

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

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

What then was the intent of the Lawgiver when the Sabbath commandment was given? Did the Lawgiver declare, or show in any way, his intention?—He did. He declared in plain words that the *seventh* day is the one intended to be observed. Nor did he leave them to decide for themselves which day *they* would have for the Sabbath. He did not leave it to the people to interpret his law for themselves, nor to interpret it at all. By three special acts every week, kept up continuously for forty years, the Lord showed his intent in the law. The people were fed on the manna in their forty years' wanderings between Egypt and Canaan. But on the seventh day of the week no manna ever fell. On the sixth day of the week there was a double portion; and that which was gathered on the sixth day would keep over the seventh day, which it could not be made to do on any other day of the week. By this means the Lawgiver signified his intent upon the subject of the day mentioned in the law quoted by

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

Another established rule is this:—

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

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

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

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



the week, commonly called Sunday," they will be too late to find the Sabbath there, for the Lord says that *then* it is "*past*."

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

"And they returned and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them. And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. And they entered in and found not the body of Jesus." Luke 23:56 and 24:1-3.

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

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

"A court or legislature which should allow a change of public sentiment to influence it in giving to a written constitution a construction not

warranted by the intention of its founders, would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty."

The theologians gave to the Sabbath commandment a construction which was not in any sense warranted by the intention of the Author of the commandment. They then went to Congress and demanded with threats that it allow itself to be influenced, by these theological sentiments and political threats, to give to the written Constitution of the government of the living God a construction which is not in any sense warranted by the intention of the founder of that Constitution. And our national Legislature did allow this sentiment to influence it into doing that very thing. Such a thing done to a human Constitution, an earthly statute, being justly chargeable to reckless disregard of official oath and public duty, what must be chargeable against such an action with reference to the divine Constitution and the heavenly law? The national Legislature — the Congress of the United States — has allowed the churches to draw it into the commission of an act with reference to the Constitution and laws of the living God, which if done only with the laws of men would be reckless disregard of official oath and public duty. And both Congress and the churches are without excuse in the doing of it.

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



deciding that an observance established and required by the State, and which it calls the Lord's, is the Lord's indeed, although the Lord plainly declares the contrary.

#### CONGRESSIONAL ASSUMPTION OF INFALLIBILITY.

Now any man or set of men, who assumes the office of interpreter of the Scripture, *in that very assumption* sets up the claim of infallibility. The Congress of the United States has presumed to interpret for the people of the United States that part of the Scripture which commands the observance of the Sabbath. This portion of Scripture was quoted bodily. A senator in his official capacity as such did take it upon himself to declare what the words Sabbath day "mean;" that the Sabbath day "may be" one day or another; and that it *is* "the first day of the week commonly called Sunday." This interpretation was adopted by the Senate as a whole and was confirmed by the House, not only as it came from the Senate, but also by a separate vote — 131 to 36 — that Sunday is the Sabbath and — 149 to 11 — that the seventh day is not the Sabbath.

Now where is the difference between this assumption by the Congress of the United States and that of the pope of Rome? The pope of Rome assumes the prerogative of interpreter of the Scriptures for the people of the whole world; the Congress of the United States assumes the prerogative of interpreter of Scripture for the people of the United States. Where is the difference between the assumption of this Congressional pope and that of the Roman pope? — There is none at all, unless, perhaps, it be in the *extent* of the claim — the Roman pope claiming to be interpreter for all the world and the Congressional pope only for the United States. Yet it is not certain that there is even this difference. The Congressional pope interpreted the Scriptures for the World's Fair, and was expecting at the time that all the world would be represented at the Fair, and would accept, and conform to

this interpretation. So that, instead of there being any real difference, it is rather another illustration of the difficulty that always attaches to any effort to measure the relative claims of rival popes.

And this is precisely what the makers of this government saw would be done as certainly as the government had anything to do with religion in any way. And therefore they said: "*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.*"

Congress did decide a question of preference between sects that profess the Christian faith. The Seventh-day Baptists are a Christian sect. They accept the commandment of God as the Lord wrote it with his own hand. The Seventh-day Adventists are a Christian sect who likewise accept the commandment of God as he wrote it. These two sects therefore observe the seventh day as the Sabbath because the commandment of the Lord says that this day is the Sabbath. These two sects actively advocate everywhere that the observance of the seventh day is the only true Sabbath observance. There are many other sects that profess the Christian faith that observe the first day of the week as the Sabbath. These on their part, insist that the observance of "the first day of the week commonly called Sunday" is the only true Sabbath observance. They further insist, many of them at least, that this is what the fourth commandment "means."

Now here are various sects professing the Christian faith. Among them there is, and for a long time has been, a live and persistent controversy as to the meaning of certain scriptures and as to what is the proper way to observe the commandment of God. One portion insists that the scripture means just what it says, and that to observe it *as it says* is the only right observance. The others insist that this commandment "means" differently from what it says, and therefore they interpret it to "mean" the first day of the week, and



insist that to observe it *according to its interpretation* is the only right observance.

Here was a controversy between sects professing the Christian faith, and it was deepening every day. Those who say that the first day of the week should be observed, have for a long time been urging Congress to take their side of the controversy, to decide that their interpretation of the scripture is correct, and fix that interpretation in the law, so that they would have the aid of the law and the power of the government on their side in the discussion.

By the threatening "petition" before cited, they succeeded in getting Congress to enter upon this ground and take notice of the subject of controversy. In considering the subject, Congress did quote bodily the Sabbath commandment. Congress did say what the words Sabbath day "mean." Congress did say that the Sabbath day "may be Saturday or Sunday" the seventh day or the first day. Congress did cite the two ways of "observance" of the Sabbath — "the last day of the week" and "the first day of the week," and did distinctly name one sect professing the Christian faith — "the Seventh-day Baptists" — as representing the observance of "the last day of the week" as the Sabbath, in contradistinction to those sects which observe "the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath." And Congress did definitely and intentionally decide the question of preference in favor of those sects which say that the first day of the week is the Sabbath, for the express purpose of preventing "those who will manage this Exposition" from closing the Exposition "on the last day of the week *in conformity with the observance which is made by the Israelites and the Seventh-day Baptists.*"

And this not because those who manage the Exposition would voluntarily choose to close it on the last day of the week, but *because*, as the proposition first read, Congress had fixed in the law that the Exposition should be closed "on

the Sabbath day," and had quoted the Sabbath commandment as giving "the reasons for" this act. Having decided that the Exposition should be closed "on the Sabbath day," and having quoted the word of God that "the seventh day is the Sabbath," as containing "the reasons" for this, it was plain enough that the only thing the managers could do, if they were going to obey the law at all, would be to close the Exposition on the last day of the week. But lo! this would be "in conformity with that observance which is made by the Israelites and the Seventh-day Baptists." Therefore Congress must, *and did*, interpret the commandment of God to *mean* "the first day of the week commonly called Sunday," so as to be in conformity with that observance which is made by those sects who observe "the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath."

Thus Congress did, in completest measure, the very thing that those who made the government said never could be done "without erecting a claim to infallibility." And as it is certain that anybody who sets himself, or itself up as an interpreter of the Scriptures thereby assumes and asserts the prerogative of infallibility; and as it is certain that Congress has done this very thing for the people of the United States; it now becomes a question to be decided by every person in the United States, each one for himself, whether *Congress is right or whether the word of God is right*. It is for each one to decide whether the Lord is able to speak for himself, or whether he must needs have the Congress of the United States set itself up as his official and authoritative mouthpiece; whether each one for himself is capable of finding out for himself what the word of the Lord means, or whether the Congress of the United States shall stand between the individual and God to insure to the individual the true and infallible meaning of the word of God; and whether the Lord is able to say what he means, or whether it is essential that he must have the Congress of the United States to examine, interpret,



and construe what *he says* in order that what he *means* may surely reach the people of the United States.

To the decision of these questions, every person in the United States is now shut up, each one for himself. To accept as correct the decision which Congress has made, is to admit that Congress is competent to decide for the people what the meaning of the word of God is. To admit this is to admit the infallibility of Congress; and to admit the infallibility of Congress IS TO ADMIT THE INFALLIBILITY OF ROME *just as soon as Rome can secure a controlling or a deciding influence in Congress.*

And this is just what the makers of our government fore-saw, as certainly as the government touched religious questions; and therefore they said:—

“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.*”

To lead back to the church of Rome is the inevitable result of any such step, and will be the sure result of this step which has thus been taken by the Congress of the United States. This step was taken, this act was done, and this interpretation of the scripture was made, at the dictation and under the threats of the professed Protestant churches of the United States, aided by the Catholic Church, in this controversy between Protestant sects, as to which day is the true Sabbath. Those who keep Sunday demanded that Congress should decide in their favor and fix in the law of the land their interpretation of the Sabbath commandment. Congress yielded to their demand. And now they have declared that this “settles the Sabbath question.” They were able to make their influence felt in Congress in a sufficient degree to accomplish their will in this matter; and having accomplished their purpose, they now declare that that question is “settled.”

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

What can these Protestants answer?—Not a word. Their mouths will be completely stopped. And just then they will find out how completely they have sold themselves into the hands of Rome, in the doing of this which they have already done. If they had sold only themselves into the power of Rome, it would be bad enough; but they have sold all the rest of us, they have sold the whole nation. They have done that which will as certainly lead us back to Rome as that a controversy shall arise between Catholics and themselves.

Nor is such a controversy a far-off thing. It is at hand



in more shapes than one. One point is already raised. It came about in this way: In 1885, by a scheme of the Catholic Church, the Catholic Church and about fourteen professed Protestant churches secured donations of money from the treasury of the United States to aid them in carrying on their missionary work among the Indians. And at the very first move the Catholic Church obtained more money than all the Protestants put together—the Catholics \$118,343, and all the others together only \$109,916. The second year the Catholics got \$194,635, while all the others got but \$168,579; the third year the Catholic Church got \$221,169, while all the others got only \$155,095; the fourth year the Catholic Church got \$347,672, while all the others together got but \$183,000; the fifth year the Catholic Church got \$356,967, while all the others got only \$204,993; and the sixth year the Catholic Church got \$400,000, while all the Protestants together got but the same, \$204,993. Thus starting almost even, in only six years the Catholic Church succeeded in increasing her portion of the public money to almost double that of all the others together—and this while the others were increasing theirs all the time too.

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

year before; and when the bill went to the Senate she went there too, and got \$12,000 more added, making \$44,000 which she secured that year in addition to her share for the year before, *and this in spite of the administration*, and in spite of the "protests" of all the Protestant churches engaged in the matter. For, as soon as these churches learned that the Catholic Church was getting all this increase while they were getting no increase, they all began to "protest" against it. But their protest amounted to nothing, because they were taking money from the public treasury at the same time, and they protested only because she was getting *more* than they were. But they kept up their "protest" and succeeded in reducing the appropriations to themselves to the amount of \$48,647, and to the Catholic Church to the amount of only \$31,432, so that for the present year, 1892, the Catholic Church got \$369,535, while all the others together got only \$156,346—the Catholic Church is now getting *more* than two dollars, to one dollar paid to the Protestants.

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

First, when they declare it wrong to make appropriations of public money to churches, the Catholic Church can reply: "You yourselves took public money in direct appropria-



tions for from six to eight years straight ahead. If it is wrong, why did you do it? We all began it at the same time. If you have since found out that it is wrong, it does not follow that *I* should acknowledge it to be wrong. Even if you do think it wrong, *I* am not obliged to accept your view. I do not think it wrong. The Catholic Church says that it is right that the State should support the Church." And what answer can the Protestants make?—Just none at all.

Again, the Catholic Church can argue thus: "The Supreme Court of the United States has unanimously declared that 'this is a Christian nation.' As the starting point and leading proof of this, the court has cited 'the commission to Christopher Columbus,' prior to his sail westward, from 'Ferdinand and Isabella, by the grace of God, King and Queen of Castile,' etc., which recites that 'it is hoped by God's assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be discovered.' Now the religion intended to be propagated by Ferdinand and Isabella was the Catholic religion. The religion which Columbus revered and which he hoped to be the instrument of spreading abroad, was the Catholic religion, and that alone. Therefore, as this royal document is adduced as evidence that this is a 'religious people' and 'a Christian nation;' as the only religion contemplated or considered in connection with the document or its purposes was the Catholic religion; as all but Catholics are heretics and not Christians; it follows that the religion of this nation is the Catholic religion, and that this is a *Catholic* Christian nation. It is therefore perfectly proper and right that the Catholic Church should be supported, and the Catholic religion propagated, *under national authority and from the national funds.*"

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

The fathers of this Republic told them long ago that "the same authority that could establish Christianity in ex-

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

They cannot deny that such an argument by the Catholics upon the Supreme Court decision would be strictly logical. Neither can they call in question the rightfulness of the decision itself, for the reason that they themselves have already used that decision to their own advantage in influencing Congress to recognize Sunday as the Christian Sabbath, and to fix in the law their interpretation of the word of God. Having used this decision, and claimed it as certainly right, to their own advantage, and to sustain and fix in the law their own views in matters of religion; they have forever cut themselves off from calling in question either the decision or the use of it, when it is employed to their disadvantage, and to fix in the law Rome's views in matters of religion.

Thus completely, in this four-hundredth anniversary year, and by professed Protestants, has this nation been sold into the hands of Rome. Thus completely has the new order of things been reversed and the old order of things restored,

#### AND, ROME KNOWS IT.

Not only does Rome know it, but she is already making use of it to restore her power in Europe and over all mankind. While these things were being done here by professed Protestants, Rome was closely watching all the time. And in a letter from the Vatican to the New York *Sun*, July 11, 1892,



by an official correspondent, she announced her program and her purpose concerning the United States, in the following startlingly significant words. "The letter is entitled, "The Papacy and Nationality ; Pope Leo and the United States :"—

"In his [Pope Leo's] view, the United States has reached the period when it becomes necessary to bring about the fusion of all the heterogeneous elements in one homogeneous and indissoluble nation. . . . It is for this reason that the pope wants the Catholics to prove themselves the most enlightened and most devoted workers for national unity and political assimilation. . . . America feels the need of this work of internal fusion. . . . What the Church has done in the past for others, she will do for the United States. . . . That is the reason the Holy See encourages the American clergy to guard jealously the solidarity, and to labor for the fusion of all the foreign and heterogeneous elements into one vast national family. . . .

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

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

With sorrow Rome has seen all the nations steadily drawn away from her by the bright example of the separation of Church and State and complete religious liberty in the United States government, assured in the national Constitution, the supreme law, and the fundamental principles of the nation.

Seeing this, she knew that if she would recover her loss, and regain her influence over the nations, she must draw this nation into her toils. If she could succeed in this, and get the divine principle of this nation subverted and its influence reversed, she knew that the influence of this nation would be as strong to draw the nations back to her as it had been to draw them away from her. And so it has been with the most greedy satisfaction that she has seen the professed Protestant churches in the United States, steadily playing into her hands by their amazing blindness in calling for the legal recognition of religion and the legal enforcement of religious observances. And when at last she saw "the Christian religion" legally recognized, and this nation plainly declared to be "a Christian nation" by the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, and supported in argument by that court, by the citation of Catholic documents; and when she saw the professed Protestant churches joining hands with herself, and by threats requiring Congress to recognize and fix in the national legislation her own chief, sacred day, the very sign of her authority—when she saw all this, and knew that it gave her her longed-for opportunity and advantage, she instantly grasped it with all her might; at once publicly announced to the people of the United States and the world her scheme and her purpose for the United States and for the world; and followed this up immediately by sending over Archbishop Satolli and establishing him here as "permanent apostolic delegate"—his personal representative—to carry out by his immediate and active presence, the scheme and purpose of Leo XIII as announced.

And this is exactly what Satolli is here for. It has been so announced in print, more than once, since he came over. And there is not the least doubt that "what the Church has done for other nations in the past she will now do for the United States." She has been the continuous curse and the final ruin of nations in the past. And she will be that now to the United States, and to the other nations, by the restoration



of her power which she gains through the subversion of the divine principle of the government of the United States. *And the chief hand in it all will have been that of the apostate Protestants of the United States, who have sold this nation into Rome's ruinous hands.*

Irreparable ruin will be the sure result. This we know, not only from the history and nature of things, but also because God has announced it. When her purpose of gathering back the nations and the kingdoms into illicit connection with herself is accomplished, she glorifies herself and lives deliciously, and the kings of the earth commit fornication and live deliciously with her; and she exultantly "saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire; for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." Rev. 18: 7-9.

#### THE MEANING OF THE CENTURIES.

Nevertheless we have found the meaning of the four centuries. The meaning of the four centuries has been made plain. And now when, in the face of all this, the order is reversed, and this nation is turned back again into the evil tide of the old order of things, how much greater the guilt than that of all the nations before it! How much greater the guilt, and how appropriate the scriptures which tell what will result to the nation which has done it!

And now as the meaning of the four centuries has been made plain before the face of all people, and as this meaning has been not only ignored but reversed, there still lingers that for which God has set every nation in its place—that men should seek him if haply they might feel after him and find him.

We have found in all the other nations, that as long as there were any remaining who would seek the Lord, feel

after him and find him, so long the nation would stand. But when all turned away from the Lord, and none would seek him and feel after him that they might find him, then nothing more could be done for them, and they had to be swept away. This was true of all the ancient nations and even of the Roman nation itself. Rome continued until under the evil influence of the papacy it became so corrupt that there was no longer any hope for it; and then, by the barbarians of the North, it was swept from the earth no less completely than were all before it.

The meaning of *these* four centuries being that God might show to all the earth the principle which he has established for all nations; this meaning having been made plain; and men here free and untrammelled to seek the Lord, and worship him; then if the time should come when the people of this land should refuse to seek the Lord, refuse to feel after him and find him, in the very nature of things the time would be near when it must be cut off.

What, then, has been set before our eyes this present 400th anniversary year? Among the people in this land who profess to be the people of God there has been a religious controversy discussed, a religious contest carried on. One side of the question has felt the need of more power than they had to lead the people to accept their idea of the question. What did they do to obtain that power? Did they seek God for it? Did they feel after him that they might find him?—No. From one end of the land to the other they sought the Congress of the United States. They felt after that—and found it too. But in doing that, they had to turn away from seeking the Lord that they might find him. Why did they not send up their petitions to the Lord to come to the rescue of the Sunday institution—their side of this religious controversy? One great reason is, of course, that the Lord has not said anything in favor of that side of the subject, so they could not send up their petitions to him with any prospect of success.



But this is not the reason why they sought the Congress of the United States, and found it. They did that for the reason that attaches to every proceeding of this kind. It can be seen at a glance. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation unto *every one that believeth*. Rom. 1: 16. This people acknowledged the need of power that they did not have. The power of God is a gift to every one *that believes*. Then when they sought to earthly government for power, did they not thereby testify that they had lost the power that belongs to the gospel? And did they not therefore confess that their belief of the gospel is a thing of the past? They lacked faith; and having no faith how could they receive the power that belongs to faith? And having no power from God to *persuade men*, the only power they could get was the power of the government to *compel men*. And that is the reason they sought not God, but the government of the United States, and found it.

When, instead of fulfilling the purpose which God had in view in this nation that the people should seek the Lord, they seek after earthly power, and get hold of that, and begin to sway that, *even against the plain commandment of the Lord*, then what can be the outcome? What can possibly be the outcome? Only that which has come upon every nation that has followed this course before!

Yet though they refuse to seek after him and find him, the Lord would linger and still wait to call after those who might feel after him and find him. And when these are brought to him, there remains nothing but the destruction of the mass of evil and corruption that remains. So now that the churches of this nation have turned from the Lord and sought after the government of the United States and found it, there goes forth the call, "Come out of her, my people." "From such turn away." Rev. 14: 6, 7; 2 Tim. 3: 1-5. God sends forth a special call to his people now to seek after him and find him. He sends a special message to all his

who are there, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins and that ye receive not of her plagues." When this has been accomplished, what will be the end? Just as before, God will bring forth a people that will sweep away the hypocrisy, the iniquity, and the sin that lie hidden beneath this apostasy. *When the transgressors have again come to the full*, God will bring forth a people to sweep away this mass of iniquity just as he has done in the cases of the other nations.

But where will the people come from to sweep this away? When the Lord wished to find a people to sweep away the iniquity of the Amorites, he sent to a far country, even to Egypt, and brought forth the children of Israel. When Israel followed the course of the nations that were cast out before it, he called up Babylon, and left the land utterly desolate. When he desired to find a people to sweep away the iniquity of Babylon, he brought a people from a far country to accomplish his great purpose, even the Medes and Persians. When they became so corrupt that the angel of the Lord could no longer stay, he brought again a people from a far country, even the Grecians, and swept away this evil combination. When among these the transgressors were come to the full, again he brought from a far country a strange people, even the Romans, and swept away the corrupt power of the Grecians. And when under the corrupting influence of the union of Church and State the Roman empire had filled up the measure of her iniquity, the barbarians of the North swept over her in floods and left not a trace behind.

But where is he going to find a people to sweep away the corruption and hypocrisy that will surely be brought in with this return to the old order of things? Here is the answer:—

"Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain; let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand; a day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains:



a great people and a strong; *there hath not been ever the like*, neither shall be any more after it, even to the years of many generations. A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth; the land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and nothing shall escape them. The appearance of them is as the appearance of horses; and as horsemen, so shall they run. Like the noise of chariots on the tops of mountains shall they leap, like the noise of a flame of fire that devoureth the stubble, as a strong people set in battle array. Before their face the people shall be much pained: all faces shall gather blackness. They shall run like mighty men; they shall climb the wall like men of war; and they shall march every one on his ways, and they shall not break their ranks. Neither shall one thrust another; they shall walk every one in his path: and *when they fall upon the sword, they shall not be wounded*. They shall run to and fro in the city; they shall run upon the wall, they shall climb up upon the houses; they shall enter in at the windows like a thief. The earth shall quake before them; the heavens shall tremble; the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. And the Lord shall utter his voice before his army: for his camp is very great: for he is strong that executeth his word: for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible; and who can abide it?" Joel 2: 1-11.

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great. And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the

mark of the beast, and them that worshiped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh." Rev. 19: 11-21.

That is where the people will come from, and these are the people, even the armies of heaven. There is no longer a new people on earth that God can get to sweep away the hypocrisy, the sin, that this wickedness will bring about through this order of things. All the nations have been discovered; all the countries have been reached; the earth has been compassed; and, mark, just as this nation, in exemplifying that divine principle for governments has been the enlightenment of all the nations of the earth, so having reversed that principle, gone back into the old order of things, and united Church and State, and thus given over the civil power to be used in religious things, the evil example in this will curse all the nations of the earth. The influence that this nation has exerted in conveying to all the world the enlightenment of this divine principle, will be exerted just as much the other way when that principle is reversed. Just as certainly as the opposite of this principle when exerted by Roman power in the interests of the papacy resulted in the ruin of the Roman empire, just so certainly this reversal of this same principle by this nation will result in the ruin of this nation. But this ruin will not be confined to this nation alone. As its influence is world-wide, so also will the ruin be world-wide. And the armies of heaven will sweep away this world-wide corruption, at the coming of the Lord. And behold it is near and hasteth greatly.

O that the meaning of the four centuries was continued! O that this people, who, professing to know God, professing to know his gospel, had considered the meaning of these four centuries and sent up their petitions to the Lord instead of to the government of the United States!



O that this people had known the meaning of the four centuries and what it meant for the nations of the world, and had sought the Lord and found the power of God; that from this nation to the world might have gone the power of God, and the blessing that God would have been, manifested through them in gathering the nations to the heavenly rest!

But alas! alas! instead of this they have gone away from the Lord, and have become the instruments to gather the nations to the battle of the great day of God Almighty.

But the meaning of the four centuries has been made plain. The divine principle has been illustrated before them and all the world. And when they turn their backs upon it, none are to blame but themselves.

And now, from this nation also, there goes forth again as at the first the "everlasting gospel to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people," just as it went forth to the nations, kindreds, tongues, and peoples that were then upon the earth. Calling them to "fear God and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come; and worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea and the fountains of waters." Rev. 14:6, 7. And as that everlasting gospel now goes forth again, it goes as at the first, as that which it is—"the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." "Christ in you the hope of glory." Col. 1:25. The gospel being the power of God, and the power of God being preached for what it is, it will go in such a way that all the nations will know it is the gospel, the everlasting gospel itself. It will go in such a way that they will not query whether it is the gospel or not. They may not believe it, they may not yield to it, but they will know that the power is there. They will know that it is what the Scriptures say that the gospel is, the power of God unto salvation, and Christ in men the hope of glory.

## THE LIMITS OF CIVIL AUTHORITY

FROM THE STANDPOINT OF NATURAL RIGHT  
AND DIVINE OBLIGATION.

THERE seems to be in this country at the present time an urgent need of a better understanding by the public, upon the subject of the boundaries of the domain of popular government; for there are indications of an ignorance upon this point which cannot fail to be attended with grave wrongs to individuals and evils to the State. The principle that "the majority must rule," is the correct one, but is not of universal application. There is danger that it may be extended altogether too far; for it must be evident to all, that the majority cannot prescribe rules for the minority in everything, no matter how small that minority may be. If it can, there is no such thing as individual rights, for that which is subject to the will of a majority is not a right. A right is something which, in its very nature, is inherent in the one possessing it, independent of the will of all other persons. Otherwise it would be but a mere privilege, such as a superior might grant to an inferior, and take away again at his pleasure; and the saying would be true that "might makes right." But it is one of the fundamental principles of our government, that "all men are created equal." It is not the prerogative of any one to be lord over any other, to prescribe rules by which he must live. They are equal in this, that all have an *equal* right to think and act as suits their inclinations. But this right is limited by the fact that all are equal, which forbids each to do anything that would encroach upon the rights of his neighbor. For that which would interfere with the rights of