

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ISSUE.



VOLUME XVI.

DENVER, COLO., WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 1906.

NUMBER 9.

Echoes from the Field.

Published every two weeks for the
Colorado S. D. A. Conference and Tract Society,
At 1112 So. Eleventh St., Denver, Colo.

MEADE MACGUIRE, - Acting Editor.

SUBSCRIPTION, 25 CTS. PER YEAR.

Entered at Denver Post Office as Second-class
Mail Matter.

Church and State in Ancient Times.

Then Nebuchadnezzar in his rage and fury commanded and said unto them, Now if ye be ready, that at what time ye hear the sound of music, ye fall down and worship the image which I have made; well; but if ye worship not, ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace; and who is that God who shall deliver thee out of my hand?

Shadrach, Mishach, and Abednego, answered and said to the king, O Nebuchadnezzar we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.—Dan. 3:13-17.

Religious Laws of Men.

The following question is asked by the Holy Spirit, and recorded by David in Ps. 94:20. "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, which frameth mischief by a law?" As the throne of iniquity cannot be in heaven, and there can be no place for such a throne other than on this earth, we must conclude that

the throne or place where human laws are made, must be the throne of iniquity. But when does the place where the laws of our country are enacted become the throne of iniquity? Not while just laws are being made which will be a blessing to mankind, but when laws are made that bind the consciences of men; laws that take from man his right to worship God according to his own pleasure or wishes, or not to worship at all, as the case may be.

The following words, from the same great mind, tell us against whom this throne of iniquity makes its laws, and when it becomes such a throne. "They gather themselves together against the soul of the righteous, and condemn the innocent blood." Ps. 94:21. There is no place in all the universe of God where laws are made against the righteous only in this earth. When the law-making powers of earth sit in judgment, making laws that will bind men or interfere with their worship of the true and living God, or that will compel men to worship by law, right then that law-making power becomes the throne of iniquity. The throne of iniquity was set up in Daniel's day, and the law that came from that throne put him in the den of lions, and his three companions in the fiery furnace. Every man who has been thrust behind prison bars for his faith in God, was placed there by laws which came from the throne of iniquity. It is the duty of every true man and woman in this world who has the light and truth of religious liberty to exert every energy in making known to others that their only safety is in the liberty which God alone can give.

"But the Lord is my defense, and my God is the rock of my refuge." Ps. 94:22.

These words of our God are the hope of the righteous.

But let us turn and read what God says will be the end of those who enact the laws that are used against the souls of the righteous. "My God shall bring upon them their own wickedness, yea the Lord our God shall cut them off." Ps. 94:23. But we would have them know the truth of God, and we know of no better way than through our literature. Then let us, dear people, see that our neighbors have the truth for this time placed in their hands.

Yours for service,
G. F. Watson.

The Church and the World.

To Abraham, the father of the faithful, the command came to leave his country, his kindred, and his father's house for a land that God would show him. He obeyed, not knowing whither he went. That land embraced the whole world. Though God had promised to give it to him, yet while he was here he gave him no inheritance in it.

Abraham was God's representative in this world. He was the man with whom God made the everlasting covenant. In order to become an heir of the promise, one must become a child of Abraham. In his dealing with him, God showed him that he wished him to be separate from the world—the State—and not to be entangled in its politics. This was for the instruction of all believers, who are to be blessed with faithful Abraham.

Four hundred years later God delivered his people from Egypt. He chose Moses as their leader. Moses was the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter; he was, therefore, the heir to the greatest

throne of that time. God called him to take charge of his church. Obeying, he refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter. He detached himself from the State of Egypt, renounced his claims to the crown, and attached himself to the church of God. He chose the affliction of God's people rather than enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.

Thus, in the case of Moses, God again definitely taught the separation of Church and State. The National Reformer of today would have accepted the throne of Egypt and renounced the church of God with her afflictions.

The very same principle was taught later on. "Lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." Israel constituted the church of God. It was never in God's plan that his people should form themselves into a State. "So shall we be separated, I and thy people, from all the people that are on the face of the earth."

But Israel soon apostatized. They commenced to serve Baal. Having imbibed the religion of the pagan, they longed for their mode of government. "Make us a king," they demanded, "like all the nations." God gave them what they wanted, with the express declaration that they had rejected him that he should no longer be their king. The step they now took laid the foundation for all their future troubles. Union of Church and State in Israel was the result of disobedience, apostasy, and the rejection of God as their king. Every kindred move, though it be under the name of "Christian Citizenship," "Christian Patriotism," or "National Reform," must of necessity be a child of apostasy.

IN THE SAVIOR'S FOOTSTEPS.

Christ, the seed of Abraham, said, "My Kingdom is not of this world." The only way to enter that kingdom is to be born again. The kingdoms of this world are of the world. Christ was offered them and their glory, by the prince of this world, but he refused to accept them. If Christ refused, how can his followers accept them? This was done to divert his mind from his true mission, which was to save the world. Satan makes the same offer to the church today in the time of her espousal, when she is preparing to meet her bridegroom, and for the same purpose.

The second Adam steadfastly resisted the solicitations of the enemy, but the second Eve, his intended bride, has time and again allowed herself to be entrapped. At the Council of Nicea, A. D. 325, when they saw Constantine, seated

on a golden throne in their midst, some cried, "What gain to our cause that now we have a Christian emperor who will throw over us the shield of his protection and defend the orthodox faith with the sword." Thus blinded by the glory of the world, forgetting her relation to her crucified and risen Savior, she accepted the dowries of kings, married the world, and became a harlot. "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity to God? Whosoever therefore will be the friend of the world, is the enemy of God." When the church is clamoring to unite with the State and control the civil power, it is plain as the noonday sun that she has lost her purity and innocence, broken her vows to the Lord, and become enamored with the world.

The tender, prophetic warning of Paul has not been heeded in her case: "For I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy: for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." The mind of the church has always been corrupted when she has dabbled in politics. Christ knew that and therefore he declared, "Render unto Cæsar, that which is Cæsars, and to God that which is God's." Thus the great leader of the church, once and forever, separated the Church and the State.

We are called upon to walk as Christ did. Did Christ take any part in politics? Did he try to get control of the State in order to further his cause? Did he organize "Law and Order Leagues?" Did he, in disguise, go from saloon to gambling den, and drink and gamble, in order to entrap his victims, as some of our National Reformers are doing today? There were plenty of opportunities for him to do so, for the government under which he lived was corrupt in the extreme; but his kingdom was not of this world, nor was it to be brought about by such means. Let the church follow its leader, for as Christ was in this world, so ought we to be. S. F. Svensson.

What is Religious Liberty?

The plan of salvation, the eternal truths of God's Word, are set out clearly and positively in the Bible; so clearly that he who runs may read. These truths are a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death, and he who created man has the power to enforce obedience to these truths; yet he has not done so. He has given to every man and woman the right and privilege to choose for him-

self what he would, and what he would not do; and he does not quarrel with any one about the choice that is made, whether he accepts the truth and lives, or whether he follows error and finds only death as the result.

If, in our church relationship, we could be content to be as God in this matter what a wonderful change would come into our churches! What a spirit of brotherly love it would beget in our hearts, what sweet peace and what lack of friction in our gatherings together to worship him who is Peace and Love.

If all would follow the instruction given by Elder W. C. White, in his recent talks to us, concerning the use of the Testimonies what a world of difference and difficulty among us would be removed. Neither the truths of the Testimonies, nor of the Bible should ever be used as a club. God gave them in love, and they can be effectively used only as they are used in love.

Because he knew so well the Pharisaism that is in every human heart, God has told us not to judge one another. Is it not strange that we cannot understand that "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin?" Individual knowledge of God's will for us, supplemented by individual faith in the revelation of that will to us for our highest and best good leads us to render the only service to him which can possibly be acceptable, because it is intelligent. Because my brother believes a thing to be right for him, and therefore insists that it is right for me in just the way in which he sees it, is my individual relation to God made the better by an outward compliance to my brother's opinions when I do not see the divine Word of God in it?

To this people God has given his last message of warning and mercy for the world, and they are exponents and loyal supporters of the true principles of religious liberty between the Church and the State, between Cæsar and the Government of God; and yet among us is often manifested the desire to bring others into submission to the judgment of another concerning matters of diet, of dress, of social duties and many other things. How blind and Pharisaical we become when we lose sight of God's eternal principles of liberty, and desire to bring our brethren and sisters into subjection to that which we believe and know to be right. When we do this we place ourselves above God, and do a work which he would never do.

If we could only learn the lesson which the Savior taught Peter just before his

ECHOES FROM THE FIELD.

crucifixion what a glorious truth would be ours, and how it would bind hearts together in Christian fellowship.

Jesus had been asking Peter to "feed his sheep," and to "follow him," when Peter looked about and saw John. He immediately felt burdened about John's duties to the Master, so he asked, "Lord, and what shall this man do?" From the question one would think Peter lived in our day. Listen to the Savior's answer, for it is spoken to us as well: "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? FOLLOW THOU ME." Here is the same thought expressed in another way: "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth." Why is it that we, who believe so firmly in the principle of non-interference in matters civil and religious, are so slow to live them out in church relationship?

I once heard a brother, who was asked to read a paper on religious liberty, use the occasion to call attention to faults in members of his church, in matters of dress, social duties, and other things in which they differed from him.

In some of our churches there are disgruntled persons who periodically arraign the members, and particularly the officers, for their sins and wickedness as they appear to them, thus keeping the church in a continual upheaval and confusion. They evidently believe that God has chosen them to make trouble in the church whenever the opinions of others differ from their own. If it is not possible to convert such ones, so that the church may be permitted to do its sacred work in peace, they should be set outside, where God has said the "accuser of the brethren" should be. Do we understand the principles of religious liberty? "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? FOLLOW THOU ME."

Bertie L. Herrell.

Liberty.

Liberty, as defined by Webster, is freedom, permission, privilege. This being true, religious liberty must be freedom untrammelled; permission without hindrance; privilege beyond the dictation of society in any form. This is so broad that it must include both the State and the church.

This being true, every person has a right, so far as man is concerned, to be religious or not, as he may choose. It must mean that each person who wishes to be religious may choose what their religion shall be, either christian or pagan. It must mean that each one may render

just such a service as they believe their God will accept.

All persons will agree to the above, and then, with but few exceptions, deny their consent to this right by the things they do. It is a fact that a person has a right to keep a day in honor of his Creator, recognizing the fact that he rested after his finished work of creation in six days.

It is a fact just as specific that all persons who desire to do so have the liberty to refrain from keeping the seventh day in honor of the Creator, and they have a right to keep the first day of the week, or to keep no day at all if they elect to do so.

Then if all persons have this right, why do so many stultify their acknowledged position by asking laws from various sources to *compel* people to keep a day? Surely none can plead that majorities have a right to decide what religion is right. None of us would be willing to consent to such reasoning if we were in a foreign country where the religion was entirely foreign to what we believed to be right. Is not every person's conviction just as sacred in the United States as in a foreign country? Surely it is.

On the rights of life and personal liberty Spencer says: "Every man has freedom to do all that he wills, provided that he infringes not the freedom of any other man." In harmony with the above Thomas Jefferson declared, "Our legislators are not sufficiently apprised of the rightful limits of their power; that their true office is to declare and enforce our natural rights and duties, and to take none of them from us." "When the laws have declared and enforced all this, they have fulfilled all their functions, and the idea is quite unfounded that on entering society, we give up any natural right."

The Lord teaches this same liberty. Take the case of Cain and Abel. The Lord talked with Cain and knew he was wrong. The only reproof he offered was, "If you do well, your service will be accepted; if not, sin lieth at the door." Cain tried to persuade Abel to worship as he did, and because he would not, Cain killed Abel. This is a positive testimony that all who would compel a religious rite of any kind are wrong, for no one who is a true worshiper ever compelled others to worship. True worship is inspired by love. Then to love the things God commands is to voluntarily do them. To love the commands of the Holy Spirit is to receive a spiritual mind. To reject the word of the Holy Spirit is to have a carnal mind.

It is written that we should love one another, not as Cain, who was of that wicked one and slew his brother. And why? Because his own works were evil and his brother's righteous. 1 John 3:11, 12. "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets." Matt. 7:12. This is the fullness of liberty. Watson Ziegler.

Exemption Clauses.

The Scripture says, "Every man shall give an account of himself to God." This accounting is between God and the man, solely. God enacts all his own laws, and attends to their enforcement. No man was ever delegated to make laws for God, or, upon his own part, to execute the laws he has made.

When a man or a company of men attempt, without duly appointed authority, to enforce some civil statute, it is called anarchy, and such a company is called a mob. Such men have, by their act, assumed to be the government, and have declared themselves better able to regulate its affairs than is the government itself. This is rebellion: an usurpation of authority, and the law holds them accountable as law breakers.

This is exactly the status, with regard to the government of God, of those who take upon themselves the management of other men's religious affairs. It is but one step from the attempted enforcement of God's laws, to the making of laws for him. This is the crowning act of man's presumption.

To tolerate, is to permit the doing of that which you have the right to forbid: to suffer another to trespass upon your privileges. God is no respecter of persons. He never issued an edict of toleration.

Edicts of toleration led by a short and direct course to the inquisition chamber and the stake. First, man presumed to possess rights which even the Son of God did not attempt to exercise when he was on earth. He established those rights (?) by man-made laws and practice. He set up a standard of right and then, for reasons of policy, and to gain certain ends, he violated his conscience and permitted men to ignore or go contrary to the standard he had set up. When it no longer served his purpose to tolerate it, he forbade it. Those who had enjoyed the immunity of the toleration, now gave hypocritical obedience to what they believed to be wrong, or they were persecuted, and dragged to torture and to death.

Exemption clauses are the modern

edicts of toleration. They are conceived by the same spirit of presumption and self-exaltation, and are designed, not to secure liberty or conserve the rights of those they effect, but to serve the purpose of those who grant them. Because of the opposition of those who stand for liberty of conscience and the truth of God, exemption clauses are attached to such bills as the "Allen Sunday Rest Bill." This is a mere subterfuge to assist in the passage of the bill, and when it is no longer needed, it can be repealed. If men have the right to pass religious laws, if they can attach to them exemption clauses, they may repeal the clause and force obedience to the original law. Let us reiterate that God never gave such rights, and those who assume to possess them are breaking the very code of laws they are striving to enforce, and some day they will have to give an account.

Hear the Saviour say, "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." "As thou has sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." It is man's blessed and sacred privilege to preach the gospel of liberty and salvation, and to leave the enactment and execution of God's laws to the all-wise Ruler of the Universe.

Willard W. Hills.

The National Reform Political Organization.

The following editorial, from the *Wichita Daily Eagle*, upon the occasion of the last meeting of the National Reformers in that city, is straight to the point. It is much to be regretted that there are not more editors who have so clear a view of truth:

"Some people may make this mistake of supposing that the National Reform Association, now holding conference in this city, is the church, because it is largely composed of church members and holds its meetings in the churches. It is the object of this organization to shape national politics, and that makes it a political organization.

"We often hear it remarked that the church should have nothing to do with politics. As a matter of fact the church does not have anything to do with politics. Church members as citizens have a right to, and do, go into politics, but they cannot take the church with them. It is often remarked that the Chinese live on the opposite side of the earth from the Americans, and that the two people are

as far apart as people can get on this earth. The church and the state are farther apart than the Chinese and the Americans. They are as far apart as heaven and hell.

"The church is the ultimate of the love of God for the human race, and the ultimate of human government is the policeman with his club, or the army and navy with their big guns, all instruments of war, and General Sherman was conceded to be not far wrong when he said "War is hell." Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and then he explained that if his kingdom was of this world his servants would fight like the soldiers of the state. When the hypocritical Pharisees attempted to entangle him by inducing him to say that it was not lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar, he told them to render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's. What does that mean, except as a citizen to obey the laws of the state, and as a living spirit to obey Christ and his church? The duty to one seldom conflicts with the duty to the other on account of their distance apart.

"Members of the churches, and even the ministers, as citizens, have a perfect right to form a political party for the purpose of securing the enactment of certain laws and to secure their enforcement, but they must not claim their party is the church of Christ. Their political party, by whatever name it is called, must stand on its own merits by the side of other political parties. If it is better than the other political parties it ought to win at the elections. It must not, however, be forgotten that the people are the jury and they will render the verdict as to its merits. The priest may speak as one having authority in spiritual matters, but his authority does not extend to the state. Like any other politician, he must convince the people that the policy of government he proposes is the better policy, otherwise they will not, and should not, accept his theories.

"Whether any laws of the state can aid the church in the conversion of the world is a debatable question. It is claimed that the primitive church made its most miraculous growth at the most corrupt time in the whole history of the Roman empire, and nobody will claim that the state rendered the church any aid when its membership numbered few. There is a question whether the later Christian rulers of Rome ever really aided the church, but there is no doubt that the church did a good deal

for the rulers by making them better men.

"One of the objects of this party is said to be to get God in the constitution. It certainly could not hurt the constitution, and it might have no more effect than placing the name of the Creator on the side of a horn. In this country the people are the government, and the way to get God in the government is to get him into the hearts of the people. It should not be forgotten, however, that kings claim to rule by divine right and that the people of this country repudiated that doctrine and declare that the consent of the people is the highest authority in government. 'There is but one God, and Mohammed is his prophet,' may be a fine thing in politics for the fellows who are conceded to be the vice-regents of Mohammed, but bad for the people who are governed."

Five Sunday rest bills have been introduced in this session of congress.

"The moral and religious education of the people is one of the great problems of the hour." This problem cannot be solved by the legislature or the public school, but only through the preaching of the gospel.

"We are made and governed by the ideals we cherish. Without moral vigor wealth counts for nothing, resources for nothing. Rome built great highways, and founded splendid cities, while her civilization was declining."—Gov. Folk.

"The National Reform Association has been formed to maintain and promote the influence of Christianity in the American government. In the discharge of this trust it has labored to maintain our Sabbath laws." God's commission to man was to observe the Sabbath of Jehovah, not to make or maintain Sabbath laws of their own.

The *Christian Statesman* says, editorially, "There are great, positive evils in the church of God. Christian(?) men and Christian(?) ministers bow at Christian(?) altars under agreement to exclude the name of Jesus from their prayers. Christian(?) men are to be found in all political iniquities which are being uncovered in all our cities and in every State. The great corporations, whose injustices and dishonesties are awakening such wide condemnation and calling for new and stringent legislation are, in no small part, composed of Christian(?) men."

In view of this situation, would it not be well to forego further attempts at civic righteousness, until the church has become Christian in fact and not in name? We might ask how a church which keeps clean with such difficulty can serve as an arbiter of National purity?