

REVIEW AND HERALD EXTRA.

DAILY BULLETIN

— OF THE —

GENERAL CONFERENCE.

VOL. 4.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., SUNDAY, MARCH 15, 1891.

No. 8.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

BY ELDER A. T. JONES.

ABOUT two weeks ago, while speaking upon this subject, I dwelt more particularly upon what religious liberty is. At this time I will mention some of the dangers which threaten religious liberty, — and I don't know but what that will be the subject all the way through, — closing, however, with the present condition of things in this country, as respects the making the image to the beast, and the taking away of all liberty.

We must bear in mind that "religious liberty" is going to become more and more a popular cry, as time goes on. "Religious Liberty" will be a popular cry among those who do not know the first principles of religious liberty. We must understand what these principles are, and be on our guard that we be not deceived by the deceptive cry of "religious liberty" in the mouths of those who do not know what it is.

It was stated in our other talk on this subject that religious liberty is in the gospel of Jesus Christ only. In the breast of every man in this world, there is either religious liberty, or a religious despotism. There is the root of it all. I will just call your attention to the principle that underlies this thought. Jesus Christ says, "If ye believe my words, then are ye my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." That is religious freedom. It is the truth *as it is in Christ*, that makes people free indeed. Whom the Son makes thus free, is free indeed. That is religious liberty, and outside of it there is none. People talk about it, but outside of the truth as it is in Christ, they know nothing about it.

On the other hand, the man who is not made free by the truth as it is in Christ, is a bond-servant, a

slave. "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant [the bond-servant] of sin." Paul says the same thing in other words: "The law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin," — he is a slave, sold into captivity to sin. Thus he is in bondage.

Now mark: every one who is there, sets up a despotism in his own heart. You know that a religious despotism is the enforcement by law, of religious rules and observances upon men. You know also, that the man who is in bondage to sin, passes resolutions and enacts laws by which he proposes to compel himself to do good. He resolves to do better, — he has not done right, and now he passes an act that he will not do it again. He is trying to compel himself, by laws of his own making, to be good. Well, that is despotism, is it not? There is, therefore, a religious despotism in the heart of every man who has not been born again. When he is born again, he is free indeed, made so by the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. He is then set free from these resolutions and laws of his own enacting. He is subject to the law of God, and to the Spirit of God working in him that which is good, both to will and to do of God's good pleasure. He is not in bondage then; he is perfectly free.

Now this despotism in the heart works out in two ways: one of which is monkery. That is, a man passes a law that he will be good. He breaks that law, and then he punishes himself because he broke it. For of what use is a law without a penalty. This, when fully carried out is monkery, penance, a part of "the mystery of iniquity" — the Roman Catholic doctrine exactly. And the first step toward it, contains all there is in it.

Another way in which this despotism is developed is, the man does not punish himself, but men together, in the collective capacity of the State, pass laws to

compel themselves and all others to do the good which as individuals they will not do. Every man who is not made free in Christ, has this law—this despotism—in him, while religious liberty is alone to be found in the truth as it is in Christ.

Now, as to the present subject, Cardinal Gibbons has lately come out in aid of "religious liberty"! Do n't forget it. I will read from the *New York Sun* of March 8:—

Cardinal Gibbons preached to-day on the text, "Jerusalem which is above is free. It is our mother." His topic was "Civil and Religious Liberty." He said, "A man enjoys religious liberty" (mark it now!) "when he possesses the free right to worship God according to the dictates of a *right* conscience."

Do you see it? The conscience must be *right*. Who will keep it right?—Oh, the Catholic Church! That is "religious liberty," is it? You know that that is the despotism of the mystery of iniquity itself. Then do n't you see that we must be careful what we say about religious liberty, and how we take up with those who talk about it. Again I read, and further:—

A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right of worshipping God [not of worshipping whom he pleases and what he pleases, but of worshipping God], according to the dictates of a *right* conscience, and of practicing a form of religion most in accordance with his *duties* to God.

What are his duties to God? Who shall tell? The Catholic Church of course. Do you see it? We need not go further. That is not religious liberty, and you know it. It is despotism.

Now I will read from another author:—

Religious liberty is a natural, fundamental, and inalienable right of every man. It is founded in the sacredness of conscience, which is the voice of God, in man and above the reach and control of human authority. There is a law above all human laws. It is written not on parchment and tables of stone, but on the heart of man by the finger of God. It is that law which commands with the categorical imperative, and which filled the philosopher Kant with ever-growing reverence and awe. "We must obey God more than man." He and he alone is the author and lord of conscience, and no power on earth has a right to interpose itself between them. "Every man stands or falls to his own lord." Liberty of conscience requires liberty of worship as its manifestation. To grant the former and to deny the latter is to imprison conscience and to promote hypocrisy or infidelity. Religion is in its nature voluntary, and ceases to be religion in proportion as it is forced. God wants free worshipers, and no others.

I will read another passage from the same author before I ask any questions:—

Freedom of religion is one of the greatest gifts of God to man, without distinction of race and color. He is the author and lord of conscience, and no power on earth has a right to stand between God and conscience. A violation of this divine law written in the heart is an assault upon the majesty of God and the image of God in man. Granting the freedom of conscience, we must, by logical necessity, also grant the freedom of its manifestation and exercise in public worship. To concede the first and to deny the second, after the manner of despotic governments, is to imprison the conscience.

Now that sounds like religious liberty, doesn't it? It is so,—if he only meant it: but he doesn't mean it. That same writer also advocates Sunday laws, laws against blasphemy, and that the State should teach religion in the public schools. But what does he know about religious liberty? He knows the *name* of it, and *some* of the principles of it,—but what does he know of *it*, in fact?

Another point: Not long ago, in an important teachers' convention, a speech was made, which was sent to the *Sentinel* to be published in the interests of religious liberty. I want to read you a few passages from this speech:—

The State derives its fundamental principles from the *religious* consciousness of man. Both justice and grace ["grace"—mark that!] are active principles in the State!

Yes, the State can save the people; it can dispense the grace of God! So the Blair bill guarantees an eternal good to the man who will keep Sunday—not in a secular way, but in a way that pertains to the world to come.

Further:—

This conviction of the common brotherhood of man . . . reaches down into man's *religious consciousness*, and draws its nourishment from thence. . . . The state consciousness *can never sever* its connection with the *religious consciousness*."

What is that but a union of church and state—a union of the state and religion! Is not that what it is? Therefore, is not that what this speech teaches ought to be? "The divine principles of justice and grace are the foundation ideas of the state as well as of the church."

Then, if they are carried into effect, what is that but a union of church and state? And yet the *Sentinel* has been, and is yet, blamed, to some extent, for not printing that speech in the interest of religious liberty! And why would not the *Sentinel* print it?—The *Sentinel* is not run in the interest of church and state, that's why.

But I read farther:—

The divine principles of justice and grace are the foundation ideas of the state as well as of the church, but the functions of the two [mark it now!], as different forms of institutional life, are as distinct as the *two great branches of a tree*.

Yes, and Crafts says the religious Sabbath and the civil Sabbath are the two arms of the body—the two branches of the tree. That is the doctrine precisely upon which the church and state was founded when Constantine and the bishops made their bargain. The State was to have its place and the church was to have its place; but only as the two branches of a tree or the two arms of the body.

Again:—

Essential to good membership in all these institutions, both secular and religious, are intelligence and morality. . . . But the church and the state, our modern thought has declared to be two

separate branchings from that common trunk. . . The one as church undertakes to prevent and cure *sin*. The other as state, undertakes to prevent and cure *crime*. If either should realize the full purpose of its being, the vocation of the other would be gone.

That is to say, If the State should realize the full purpose of its being, the vocation of the church would be gone. Why, yes! If the State is the conservator and the dispenser of the grace of God, of course the vocation of the church would be gone; and if the church should realize the full purpose of its being, the vocation of the State would be gone! Do n't you see, then, that the union of church and state is inherent in this theory? Again:—

But until that Utopia shall be attained, these institutions must work for different immediate ends, and by different methods, toward the one ultimate end common to both, which is *the perfection of man*. . . . It seems to me that the education of the child in the theory and practice of religion is of supreme importance for its own well-being. The American State, recognizing this to be true, relieves the church of all burdens of taxations, and affords it protection free of expense.

The real idea, then, of this speech, is that the State must relieve the church of all burdens of taxation, so as to help teach the people to be religious. What is that but a union of church and state! Further he says:—

The school can do much to point the way to a *spiritual* interpretation of nature and of the world of man, but it cannot perform the functions of the church.

Here is another important part of his argument:—

If the doctrines taught by the church were one and the same, there would be some ground for the demand that the schools should be suffered to teach the cardinal doctrines of the church.

That is, if there was only one denomination in the country, then the State could teach the principles of the church,—then there would be some grounds for teaching it!

Is that true? Would there be any? You know there would not be; for that would be as veritable a union of church and state as ever was.

Here it is again:—

By common consent, the school and the church might join in the effort to perpetuate a common religious belief.

Yet once more I read:—

Nor is it (the State) to teach religion in the sense of religious dogma; but it is to prepare the mind for the study of religious doctrine, and to re-enforce the rational religious teaching of home or church, and so lend a hand in the religious education of the child. A child that leaves the school, bearing with him the spirit of reverence for what is worthy of reverence, is not far from the kingdom of heaven.

There is considerable more to the same purpose in this speech, but that is enough to show you what that man's ideas of religious liberty are. He spoke for "Religious Liberty," and, as I have said, that speech was sent to the *Sentinel* to be published in the interests of religious liberty; but I repeat, the *Sen-*

inel is not run in the interests of church and state; therefore, we could not see our way clear to print it, and we have been blamed for it, but we are willing to bear the blame.

You can see by these things, then, that there is a good deal more to the question of religious liberty than simply talking about religious liberty; and there is just this much more to it, brethren, that, outside of the third angel's message, there is no religious liberty in this world at this time. And this will be more clearly seen the farther we go on. Therefore, if we would know the real principles of religious liberty—know them properly, and hold them all the time—we must get them from the third angel's message; we must get them from God in the way he is giving them to the world at this time, and put them where they belong. We must keep ourselves in such connection with the third angel's message, and with God in it, that we shall be able to know all the time (gathering them from him) and know for ourselves, the principles of religious liberty; and then tell them to those who know them not.

Now there are some people outside of the Seventh-day Adventist church who understand the principles of religious liberty so far as they know them; but they do n't understand them far enough. And it is the purpose of the third angel's message, to hold before the world and everybody in it, the true principles of religious liberty. Then our place, as I have said, must be to receive these principles from the third angel's message; that is, from God. That is the source of all our knowledge upon this subject. Is not this so? We who are here to-day, where did we get our ideas of religious liberty? The truth is that, were it not for the third angel's message, every soul of us would be in favor of religious legislation. Every soul of us, because we are just the kind of people who, without the blessing and influence of the Spirit of God, would be in that very business.

This is plain enough from another consideration. When it is so difficult for God to keep us in the way of right, through the power that he employs through the Spirit of prophecy, and every other means, where would we be if we were left to ourselves? Where would we go, but in the wrong paths? Don't you see, then, that it is to the third angel's message entirely, that we owe every idea that we have of religious liberty?

There is another danger which all of us are liable to fall into, and that is, that when the third angel's message has given us these principles so clearly, we may get puffed up in our minds and say that *we* are the ones who discovered these principles. That is treason against the Almighty. Let God have the praise and the glory for all the light that he has given us. Let no mind be estranged from the third

angel's message and from the people to whom God has given it — and through them, to the world. Let us stand firm in our allegiance to God, and give him the praise for what he has done.

Shall we draw off now, and claim that we have discovered these things, and that other people have them too? If they have, then they have the third angel's message as well as we have. I know they have *some idea* of religious liberty, but I say they don't have it as the truth is in Jesus Christ. God has given it to us as it is in Jesus, and holds it upon our hearts and minds through the Spirit of prophecy, so that we have it in its truth and purity, that we may give it to those who have it not.

Then let us not, having received this light, boast as though we had not received it. "What have we" (I might say in the words of Paul to the Corinthians), "that we have not received?" And if we have received it, why should we glory, as though we had not received it? No, no! Let us glory only in Him who gave it. Let us glory in Christ and the cross of Christ, through which religious liberty has come to us to be spread abroad throughout the world.

I think now, that I will talk of things as they stand to-day. A good many things have occurred since our last General Conference, tending in the direction of the image of the beast. You know of a number of these things (I hope you know them all), but there are some things which I think perhaps all do not know, and some of these I will mention. Of course you know of the Constitutional Amendment, the Sunday bill, the University bill (which will again be introduced in Congress), — you know of these things, but they pertain to only one branch of our government. There are two others, — the Executive and the Judicial.

The Legislative branch is pretty well connected with these movements that are being carried forward; but there is the Judicial, which, in the past year has done more to make the image of the beast, it is safe to say, than all the legislation of Congress in all past years. That is, the Supreme Court of the United States, — I mean, so far as the national power itself is concerned. Of course, in the States, their powers have been sufficient for that all the time. I will refer, for instance, to the Idaho test-oath, the legality of which was passed upon by the Supreme Court last spring, by which they confirmed the legality of it — the righteousness of it. That "test-oath," in the first place, compels a Mormon, or anybody else, if challenged, to take an oath of which the following is the material part: —

I am not a member of any order, organization or association which teaches, advises, counsels, or encourages its members, devotees, or any other person to commit the crime of bigamy or polygamy, or any other crime defined by law as a duty arising or result-

ing from membership in such order, organization, or association or which practices bigamy, polygamy, or plural or celestial marriage as a doctrinal right of such organization; that I do not and will not, publicly or privately, or in any manner whatever, teach, advise, counsel, or encourage any person to commit the crime of bigamy or polygamy, or any other crime defined by law either as a religious duty or otherwise.

If Tennessee had that test-oath without the Mormon part of it, but should put Sunday in there instead, then Tennessee could not only forbid anybody to work on Sunday, but could forbid anybody to teach others not to keep Sunday. This oath compels people to say they will not "publicly or privately teach or advise any person to commit any crime defined by law, either as a religious duty or otherwise." That makes the State supreme in religious as well as civil things. Whatever the State may say is a crime, you must not teach publicly or privately. Any State therefore which declares working on Sunday to be a crime, that State may also prohibit any teaching in public or in private, that to work on Sunday is right.

Any State may disfranchise every person who teaches in public or in private that it is right to work on Sunday, or that it is wrong to keep Sunday. In other words: As matters stand to-day throughout this Union where there are Sunday laws, every Seventh-day Adventist, every Seventh-day Baptist, and every Jew, may be disfranchised unless he will agree to stop all such teaching either publicly or privately — "privately," bear mind, would prohibit us from teaching our own children. And from it there would be no appeal, because this decision of the Supreme Court has established the rightfulness of the doctrine, and by it has made every State in this Union supreme in religious as well as civil matters.

But there is another point which concerns us not less than this, and which goes much farther toward the making of the image to the beast; that is, the decision by which the Mormon church property was confiscated.

In 1862 Congress passed a law declaring that no church corporation in any Territory should hold more than \$50,000 worth of real estate. The Mormon church was a corporation, and by donations, investments, etc., in the year 1887 had accumulated real estate to the amount of about \$2,000,000, and personal property to about \$1,000,000. This was a violation of the law, which limits the amount to \$50,000. Therefore their charter was annulled. What became of the money? By every principle of justice and right, and every principle of the United States Government, it should have gone back to those who gave the money. But it didn't do that: it went to the United States Government, as the *father of the people*.

There are a few preliminary remarks to be made here. One of them is, that out of such people as made the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, the image of the beast never could have been made in this world. There had to be an entire change of principle. Mark this: The Declaration of Independence says:—

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, *deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed*; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, *it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.*

This statement that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that it is the right of the people to alter or abolish, to make or unmake, the government, is a declaration that the government is but the creature of the governed; that the State is the creature of the people; that the people themselves are supreme, and the source of all the powers of government. It is the doctrine that the people are capable of governing themselves, and were so at that time. They chose to govern themselves, and therefore established a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. And as long as that principle and that spirit should prevail in the United States, so long there would be religious liberty, and so long the image of the beast would not be made.

But when men lose the power to govern themselves, then everything is reversed. Instead of the people being the father of the government, the government becomes the father of the people. The people become children; they are incapable of doing for themselves, and the government has to do for them. They say, "I can't make enough money, the government must give me some. The government must feed me, and give money to pay my mortgages, etc."

That is the argument of Socialists, Farmers' Alliances, Nationalists, and of the United States Supreme Court. The argument of the Supreme Court that the government is the father of the people, and ought to take this money of the Mormons, and use it for the interests of the people. And just as soon as that doctrine shall be applied by the States, they can take the money of the Seventh-day Adventists under the same decision, as soon as the issue is reached. Therefore the foundation for making an image to the beast is fully laid, and only awaits the issue. That is how the matter stands to-day.

The arguments of the Supreme Court, in rendering this decision, justifies that principle. I have here

the official decision of the Court, and will read the last paragraph. And mark as I read, that it is a doctrine of the Supreme Court of the United States, that Congress or a State, can annul a charter whether that charter has been violated or not, if it chooses to do so, as the father of the people, in the interests of the people as its children:—

It was not necessary to resort to the condition imposed by the act of 1862, limiting the amount of real estate which any corporation or association for religious or charitable purposes was authorized to acquire or hold; although it is apparent from the findings of the court that this condition was violated by the corporation before the passage of the act of 1887. *Congress, for good and sufficient reasons of its own, independent of that limitation, and of any violation of it, had a full and perfect right to repeal its charter and abrogate its corporate existence, which of course depended upon its charter.*

Then, just as soon as the doctrines of the Seventh-day Adventists have reached the right point— as soon as the nation has made Sunday the great day to be observed, and the doctrines of the Seventh-day Adventists become antagonistic to that in the eyes of the nation, then the nation can repeal all charters under its jurisdiction whether they have been violated or not. And the States applying the doctrine can do the same thing with all the charters which they may have granted, whether violated or not. This is in one word the doctrine of Absolutism in the State.

We cannot depend upon our State machinery. We cannot depend even upon our right to vote against these things. For there is another trick: Only the other day somebody sent me a clipping (and I am glad of it), which contained a statement by the *New York Press*, that in Rhode Island in a certain district, there are a good many Seventh-day Baptists, who, generally speaking, are Republicans and vote the Republican ticket. Those who had the management of politics appointed the election *on the Sabbath*, so that these Sabbath-keeping Republicans would be shut out— virtually disfranchised— and the Democratic candidate elected, and it was done! The Republican nominee seeing how matters were arranged, simply withdrew from the canvass, thereby refusing to sanction such a trick.

So you see we cannot depend upon the State, we cannot depend upon the nation, we cannot depend even upon our right to vote, for elections can be appointed to be held on the Sabbath, thus disfranchising Seventh-day Adventists as well as Seventh-day Baptists. Brethren, our dependence is on God only, and the quicker we find this out, and the more firmly we hold to it, the better it will be for us and for all the people of this world.

Now I read the argument of the court justifying the confiscation of this property:—

When a business corporation, instituted for the purpose of gain or private interest, is dissolved, the modern doctrine is that its

property, after the payment of its debts, equitably belongs to its stockholders. [That is all straight enough.] But this doctrine has never been extended to public corporations. As to this, the ancient and established rule prevails.

Why do they not take the *modern* rule in this case? They take the modern rule for private corporations,—why can't they take the "modern rule for public corporations? Oh, that wouldn't take the money of the Mormon church; that wouldn't confiscate their property.

As to this, the ancient and established rule prevails, viz., that when a corporation is dissolved, its personal property, like that of a man dying without heirs, becomes subject to the disposal of the sovereign authority.

That is all well enough,—but who is the "sovereign authority" in this country? The Constitution says it is the people. The Declaration of Independence says it is the people. But the Supreme Court of the United States says it is *the Legislature!* Then we come to the doctrine that Congress is absolute, and government by the people is gone! I read again:—

The principles of the law of charity [that is, the principles upon which they have confiscated this property], are not confined to any particular people. They are found imbedded in the civil law of Rome.

Yes; and Rome was paternal altogether. The emperor was the father of the people. He fed them, and gave them money, and whatever else they pleased; and he took from them what *he* pleased. Now I come directly to the principle upon which this decision is based:—

The manner in which the due administration and application of charitable estates is secured, depends upon the judicial institutions and machinery of the particular government to which they are subject.

That is all well enough. But see now what kind of government they make of the United States:—

In England, the court of chancery is the ordinary tribunal to which this class of cases is delegated, and there are comparatively few which it is not competent to administer. . . . There are some cases, however, which are beyond its jurisdiction; as where, by statute, a gift to certain uses is declared void, and the property goes to the king.

But there is no king in this government. Ah! but the Supreme Court makes one. The decision goes right on thus:—

In such cases the king as *parens patriæ*—parent of the country or father of the people—under his sign manual, disposes of the fund to such uses, analogous to those intended, as seems to him expedient and wise.

Now see the contradiction here. Let me read the former passage again:—

The manner in which the due administration and application of charitable estates is secured, depends upon the judicial institutions and machinery of the particular government to which they are subject.

First they find this Mormon corporation and property under a Republican form of government. Then they go to England—a government which has a king—for their law, and make the principle of a kingly government the rule in this country where the people are the government, and every individual is a king!

Therefore in this country when a corporation whether public or private is dissolved, the money must return to the people who gave it; because here there is no king, and aside from the people there is nothing that corresponds to a king. And even *in* the people all that corresponds to a king is in the individual; for each individual himself is a sovereign,—a king, in his own right. This is American doctrine; but it is utterly subverted by this decision of the Supreme Court, and the doctrine of a kingly government is established in its stead.

The Court then proceeds to quote a number of decisions, Roman, Spanish, and English, to sustain the principles which it has adopted from Rome and England. Of course such decisions can be found, and any quantity desired; because such only was the nature of those governments. Those governments were the reverse of our own.

I have not time to dwell upon all these instances, but they show what the theory is which they seek to establish. These authorities are all cited for the purpose of showing that—

The authority thus exercised, arises in part from the ordinary power of the court of chancery over trust, and in part from the right of the government or sovereign as *parens patriæ*. . . . If it should be conceded that a case like the present transcends the ordinary jurisdiction of the court of chancery, and requires for its determination the interposition of the *parens patriæ* of the State, it may then be contended that, in this country, there is no royal person to act as *parens patriæ*, and to give direction for the application of charities which cannot be administered by the court. It is true we have no such chief magistrate. But here the legislature is the *parens patriæ*.

The legislature is the father of the people. Therefore by this decision the principle of absolutism in government is established, and government by the people is swept away. When that stage has been reached on the part of the government, how long will it take to make the image of the heast? The court proceeds thus:—

Unless restrained by constitutional limitations, the legislature possesses all the powers in this regard which the sovereign possesses in England

Now hear how they prove this:—

Chief Justice Marshall, in the Dartmouth College case, says "the duties, as well as powers of government, devolve upon the people."

That is true enough; but the Court makes these powers devolve upon *the Legislature*, and leaves the people out.

Now to show that the strictures which I have made on this decision are supported by respectable authority, I will read what the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court has said on the same subject. The Chief Justice, Justice Lamar, and Justice Field dissented from the opinion of the court. The Chief Justice writing the dissenting opinion, and the other two Justices concurring. These are the words of the Chief Justice :—

In my opinion, Congress is restrained, not merely by the limitations expressed in the Constitution, but also by the absence of any grant of power, express or implied, in that instrument. And no such power as that involved in the act of Congress under consideration is conferred by the Constitution, nor is any clause pointed out as its legitimate source. *I regard it of vital consequence, that absolute power should never be conceded as belonging, under our system of government, to any one of its departments.* The legislative power of Congress is delegated and not inherent, and is therefore limited.

I agree that the power to make needful rules and regulations for the Territories necessarily comprehends the power to suppress crime; and it is immaterial even though that crime assumes the form of a religious belief or creed. Congress has the power to extirpate polygamy in any of the Territories, by the enactment of a criminal code directed to that end; *but it is not authorized* under the cover of that power to *seize and confiscate the property of persons*, individuals, or corporations, without office found, because they may have been guilty of criminal practices.

The doctrine of *cy-pres* is one of construction, and not of administration. By it a fund devoted to a particular charity is applied to a cognate purpose, and if the purpose for which this property was accumulated was such as has been depicted, it cannot be brought within the rule of application to a purpose as nearly as possible resembling that denounced. *Nor is there here any counterpart in Congressional power to the exercise of the royal prerogative in the disposition of a charity.* If this property was accumulated for purposes declared illegal, that does not justify its *arbitrary disposition* by judicial legislation. In my judgment, its diversion under this act of Congress is in contravention of specific limitations in the Constitution; unauthorized, expressly or by implication, by any of its provisions; and *in disregard of the fundamental principle* that the legislative power of the United States as exercised by the agents of the people of the republic is delegated and not inherent.

Then, you see that the powers of our government, so far as the law can make it, are gone! Congress is supreme; it is absolute; it is the father of the people,—and how opportune for the Farmers' Alliance and similar organizations to come in and say, "The government is our father, and our father must give us some money; our crops are poor,—you must lend us money on our wheat, and help us so that we can have our own way. You are our father,—why shouldn't you help your children!"

I have stated that Rome was a paternal government, the emperor being the father of the people. Before the emperor came, the people lost the power of governing themselves, and they depended on the State for what they wanted. Some of them had not much land, and they said to the rich, "We have not land enough, and you have more than you need. Now divide up,"—and it was done! But it was

not land that they wanted. It was money that they wanted, and they could n't get money out of the land without work.

When the commissioners divided the land, some of the people got good pieces of land, and some got land that was not so good. Then there was enmity and strife, and the commissioners became unpopular, and the distribution of land was checked. But the greatest trouble arose when it was found that in most cases, it was not land that the people wanted, but money. And, though the land was virtually given them, and was well improved, they could not get money out of it without work. It had to be personal work too; for to hire slaves was contrary to the law by which they had received the land, and no freeman would work for a slave's wages.

Some could not compete with others in their business, and the only alternative was, to do the best they could in working the land. Money came only by hard labor. Many wished themselves back in the busy and hustling town,—and they did go back. They sold their land and went back into the city, and then they would sell their votes. Then the land would be divided among them again, and then, by their extravagance and laziness, their land would go from them again, and they would go back into the city and sell their votes.

Then dividing the land became an old story. What next? Why, "the government must support us without the land!" The government established granaries and sold the grain at a few cents a bushel, and a man could sell his vote for money enough to buy grain to last him a good while! Soon out of this came an imperial power. The Emperor then became the father of the people. When they wanted the money, they got it. I will read you two instances of that :—

Augustus, as often as large sums of money came into his possession by means of *confiscation* [do you see it?], would lend it free of interest for a fixed term, to such as could give security for double of what was borrowed.

Senator Stanford has not gone quite as far as that. His bill proposes to loan money—not free of interest—but at 2 per cent for thirty years. Then, perhaps, like the Central Pacific Railroad Company, they may get it extended to a hundred on a second mortgage. Senator Stanford knows how this works.

Now as long as the Roman Empire was making conquests, and gathering wealth from every people, and bringing money into the State treasury, the emperor had money to give to his own subjects; but when the conquests ceased, then where was the money to come from? Government cannot make money—unless it makes it out of paper. If it makes it out of paper, then the more paper that goes into circulation, the less it is worth; and when your

money is gone, you can't get more without paying for it! Then what? Why, here is the way the emperor Tiberius managed it:—

After the example of Augustus, and to satisfy the clamors of the people, he loaned money without interest for three years, to all who wanted to borrow.

That was good, wasn't it? Isn't that precisely what the Farmers' Alliance asks the government to do to-day? And why? Oh, "The government has become the father of the people, and we want our father to help us along." Why can't they be manly, and work their way through as our fathers did who made the Declaration of Independence? Why can't they cultivate that spirit of manly self-dependence that will keep a man above State charity, so that he will not become a public pauper, asking the State to help him along and feed him? But that is just where the people are going, and when that point is reached,—mark it,—government by the people is gone. The power of the people is merged in the government, and the people are reduced to a state of dependence upon the government. And the Supreme Court is preparing to keep them there! But where did Tiberius get the money?

He first compelled all money-lenders to advance two-thirds of their capital on land; and the debtors to pay off at once the same proportion of their debts.

But this was not enough to supply all the money that was wanted. What then?

This was found insufficient to meet all the demands, and he loaned from the public treasury about \$5,000,000. In order to obtain money to meet this and other demands upon the parental purse, he turned his mind to sheer robbery. It is certain that Cneius Lentulus, the augur, a man of vast estate, was so terrified by his threats and importunities, that he was obliged to make him his heir. . . . Several persons, likewise of the first distinction in Gaul, Spain, Syria, and Greece, had their estates confiscated upon such despicably trifling and shameless pretensions, that against some of them no other charge was preferred than that they held large sums of ready money as part of their property.—*The Two Republics*, pp. 88, 89, 90.

That is how they got money then,—and so it is now. Farmers want money. They see there is gold and silver in the treasury, and they say the government must let the people have it. But when the money is gone,—then what? Why, "make greenbacks and send them forth." But the government cannot issue a promise to pay, unless it has something to pay with, without lessening the value of its paper; and the farmers would then say of it, "this is n't worth anything,—we want real money. Jay Gould and many others have real money piled up. We want a share,—and they must divide up." Brother Loughborough told you, a short time since, in explaining the prophecies, how the treasure which has been heaped together will yet have to be disgorged.

Brethren, the elements are working to-day in fulfillment of these prophecies, and God's message to his people instructs us to put our money where Farmers' Alliances and similar organizations cannot get it; that we should put it in a secure place; that we should lay it up where thieves cannot break through and steal; and where the violators of liberty cannot get at it. And this message is not only to Seventh-day Adventists, but to all the people, that they may become Seventh-day Adventists. It is to go to all that they may have the light, and put their money where it will be safe.

Why, brethren, everything is going to pieces everything is going to pieces, *but the third angel's message*. That is binding the people together. That is making us one, and is sealing us unto God. And oh, let no mind be estranged from it,—from the integrity of it! Let every mind be held fast to the truth of it, asking God for the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of it, that we may know just what to do at this time; that we may take these things and consider them and see what all things are coming to. God has told us what is coming, and what our duty is. And oh, that we may listen to his message, and heed while we listen!

GENERAL CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS.

TENTH MEETING.

NOTWITHSTANDING that the weather was inclement, a large number of visitors were in attendance at the opening of the tenth meeting at 10:30 A. M., Friday. Prayer was offered by Elder R. A. Underwood.

No committees being ready to report, the Chair called up the report of the Committee on Resolutions (BULLETIN, page 92). After a motion had been made to adopt, the entire report was read by the secretary.

On the request of a number of the delegates that this report should not be acted upon till after the report of religious liberty had been presented to the Conference, the report under consideration was made the special order for Wednesday, March 18, at 10:30 A. M.

There being no further business before the Conference, it was decided to hear the report of religious liberty work, and omit the afternoon session of the Conference.

REPORT OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY WORK FOR THE YEAR 1890.

BY C. ELDRIDGE.

IN reporting the labor of the Association for the past year, we shall say very little of the time immediately following the last annual meeting, as that

time was largely consumed in laying plans and making preparations for the campaign of the winter.

In order that the members of the Association everywhere might be aroused to a sense of duty, an eight-page paper was prepared, setting forth the situation of affairs, and recommending plans to be followed during the campaign that was just opening. Copies of this paper were sent to every part of the United States.

On the evening of December 25, the Secretary of the Association (Prof. W. H. Mc Kee) and J. O. Corliss left Battle Creek for Washington, D. C., to begin an active campaign in that city, against religious legislation. They had not long to wait after their arrival, before avenues of labor were presented. On the sixth of January, Mr. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, presented in the House his famous Sunday bill for the District of Columbia. The representatives of the Association thereupon set on foot plans for a mass-meeting, at which features of the bill could be discussed by both its supporters and its opponents.

In order to produce the greatest possible interest in the meeting, invitation postal cards, 800 in number, were sent to the lawyers and ministers of the city, and to the prominent members of the W. C. T. U. Circulars were also printed and scattered largely, and the efficient force of workers granted for the occasion, made house-to-house visits, and distributed 30,000 copies of the *American Sentinel*, besides a large quantity of appropriate reading-matter. A popular lawyer was asked to preside, which he consented to do, and a most enthusiastic meeting was held. This meeting did very much to introduce the Association to the people of that city, because of the favorable reports of the gathering which were published in the daily papers.

Immediately following this meeting, the American Sabbath Union held a convention for the purpose of encouraging sentiment in favor of the Breckinridge Sunday bill. But the representatives of the National Religious Liberty Association were on hand, and did most effective work in the dissemination of truth, which resulted in largely neutralizing the desired effect of the efforts of the supporters of the Sunday bill.

Immediately after this convention, the National Religious Liberty workers made another house-to-house canvass, carrying petitions against Sunday legislation, and secured about 8,000 signatures, which were exhibited, February 18, at a hearing before the committee having charge of the Breckinridge bill. Upon this occasion, a great victory was scored in behalf of the principles of the Association. The secretary of the association prepared a very able paper, setting forth the unconstitutionality of religious legislation, and the evil effects which have always fol-

lowed in its train, which paper was submitted to the committee upon that occasion.

In support of the Breckinridge bill, there appeared Dr. Elliott, of "Abiding Sabbath" fame; another Dr. Elliott, pastor of the Episcopal church of Washington, D. C.; W. F. Crafts, field secretary of the American Sabbath Union; and Mrs. Catlin, secretary of the W. C. T. U. in Washington, D. C. Against the bill appeared the editor of the *American Sentinel*, the secretary and the corresponding secretary of the Association. Very strong efforts were made by the supporters of the bill to belittle the influence of the representatives of this Association, which failed in every instance, and their efforts only seemed to lower themselves and their cause in the estimation of the committee. After the hearing, members of the Congressional Committee grasped the hands of the representatives of this Association, and congratulated them on the strength of their position.

In the meantime, a request was sent to the members of the Association throughout the United States, to correspond with the members of Congress sent from their respective districts, and thereby learn their standing upon the Blair Sunday-rest bill and the Educational Amendment. In this way, it was readily ascertained on whom the Association could depend, in case of attempted religious legislation. Such correspondence also opened the way for the members of the Association to place appropriate reading-matter in the hands of the various members of Congress, whether favorable to religious legislation or otherwise.

During the time this correspondence was going forward, petitions were being forwarded in large quantities from every part of the United States to Washington, and about the middle of March these, representing 250,000 signatures against religious legislation, were presented in both Houses of Congress.

The efforts thus put forth at the National Capitol were productive of great good. Those who listened to the arguments against the Breckinridge Sunday-rest bill afterward declared themselves unreservedly against such measures; and, as the result, the bill itself died in the hands of the committee. This bill, meeting with no favor in the Lower House, had the effect of putting a quietus upon the Blair bills at the other end of the Capitol; hence nothing more was done toward pushing these measures during the entire session of Congress, and in a little time all talk concerning them had ceased.

The representatives of the Association attended the convention of the "National Reformers" held in Washington in the beginning of April, but the effective work previously done in that city by the Asso-

ciation, had so satisfied the people upon the subject of religious legislation, that there was not the first ripple of enthusiasm manifested at this convention.

Mr. Corliss, having been engaged to act as Corresponding Secretary of the Association, was then recalled to headquarters, and the Secretary was left in Washington to watch the course of events there, where he has remained until the present time. The Corresponding Secretary visited the States of Ohio and Indiana in the interests of the Association, remaining one week in each State. He then spent one month in the principal cities of New Hampshire, lecturing in most cases to good audiences. All of these lectures were favorably reported in the leading papers of the State.

During the year, about fifty different articles have been sent out from the central office, to be published in all the States of the Union. Most of these have appeared in about 500 of the principal papers of the Union, and have been the means of educating, to some extent, a large number of people in the principles of the Association.

One prominent line of work which has occupied the attention of the association during the entire year, has been in the interest of what is now widely known as the King case, in Tennessee. During the annual meeting of 1889, word was received that Mr. King had been arrested, and was soon to have a trial in the circuit court of his county. Col. T. E. Richardson, an eminent lawyer of Obion county, was engaged, and argued the case, which was decided adversely, subjecting Mr. King to a fine of \$75 and costs. The case was then appealed to the Supreme Court, by order of the Association, and the judges affirmed the decision of the court below.

At this juncture, it was decided, if possible, to take this case to the Supreme Court of the United States, and test the constitutionality of the Sunday law under which he was convicted. For this purpose, an eminent lawyer of Detroit, Mich., Hon. Don M. Dickinson, formerly postmaster-general under President Cleveland, was retained as associate counsel in the case. Upon refusal to pay his fine, under advice of counsel, Mr. King was placed in jail. His case was then appealed to the United States District Court, on a writ of *habeas corpus*, which was granted, admitting Mr. King to bail, pending the appeal. The case was tried in January last, before Judge Hammond, who has not yet handed down his decision, though it may now be expected any day, as he told Mr. King's counsel that he would give it to the world some time in March.

This is the present status of the case, but should an adverse decision be rendered, the Association expects to push the matter to a final decision in the Court

of last resort. The case has all along excited much comment in the principal papers of the country, and its result is awaited with much interest in every part of the land. One paper (the *Kalamazoo Gazette*, Nov. 21, 1890) in speaking of the case, says: "Our sympathies are with Mr. King, for the reason that there is not a word in the Bible authorizing the first day of the week to be held sacred, while the command is imperative that the seventh day (Saturday) shall be a day of rest." This shows the nature of the work which the Association has been doing, through its defense of this noted case in Tennessee.

During the discussion of the site of the World's Fair in Chicago, the question of opening the Exposition on Sunday has been agitating religious circles throughout the country, but especially the clergy of Chicago. The association, deeming this an excellent opportunity to do good work in behalf of true principles, sent the assistant secretary, about the first of October last, to that city to engage in the work there. They also associated with him Mr. Allen Moon, of Minnesota. The work done there, through these representatives of the association, has been most highly gratifying to the Executive Committee. They succeeded in interesting the editors of a number of the dailies on the subject, until one of the papers (the *Evening Post*) opened a department in which every one who wished, could vote his preference on the subject of the Sunday closing of the Fair.

A circular letter was then sent to the leading workers of the association in the various States, urging them to subscribe for that paper for one month, which would give them an opportunity, as readers of the paper, to write short articles in behalf of religious liberty. This plan was very successful, and in looking over the articles in that department, it was found that the majority of them were written by members of the National Religious Liberty Association.

Our workers in Chicago also formed the acquaintance with some of the ministers of the city, and were granted permission to attend their ministers' meetings, where these questions were discussed; and when one was assigned the duty of preparing a paper for the next meeting, our workers took occasion at different times, to suggest to the essayist that if desired, they would provide him reading-matter upon the subject which would assist him in preparing his essay. These offers were thankfully accepted, and our workers had the privilege of hearing the essayists read papers which were simply reproductions of what they had read from the pages of National Religious Liberty literature.

During the campaign, a mass-meeting was advertised in behalf of Sunday legislation, which was to

convene in the "Auditorium" in Chicago, a hall capable of seating 10,000 persons. The Association sent its President and Corresponding Secretary to attend that meeting. The night of the appointment was dark and stormy; at times the rain fell in torrents. An admission fee of twenty-five cents was charged, yet more than 7,000 persons were congregated there on that occasion. The representatives of the Association there saw a new feature in the work of those who favor religious legislation.

The meeting was not taken up with dry speeches, but consisted of short, pointed speeches by representative men, interspersed with most excellent music, both vocal and instrumental, recitals by elocutionists, etc. The ministers *themselves*, who spoke, seemed also to know how to tickle the fancy of the audience; for while their speeches were very earnest in behalf of Sunday legislation, they had a humorous vein that kept the people in a delightful frame of mind. The exercises, all together, were of such a character that, doubtless, if an expression upon the question of a Sunday law had been taken, there would have been few dissenting votes in that large audience. It was the most gigantic movement in behalf of religious legislation that the country has witnessed during the year's campaign.

Mr. Crafts has been constantly at work in his line, during the year, but so far has failed to make any very great impression in favor of his cause. His work has been largely in the Western States, but the representatives of the Association in those parts, have been constantly on the watch, and he has not been able, in a single instance, so far as we have learned, to fill an appointment without having to meet the influence created by the circulation of the literature of the National Religious Liberty Association. In Iowa, especially, a noble work was done in this direction. The example of the members of the Association in that State is worthy of commendation and imitation.

Mr. Crafts also gave out a number of appointments for the State of Arkansas. The members of the association in that State, though not very numerous, immediately set to work to counteract his influence, and applied to the Executive Committee for literature to circulate. Not having time to order an edition of the *American Sentinel*, and knowing that a paper of some sort prepared especially for the occasion would meet the demands of the case better than literature in tract form, the committee immediately made up a four-page paper, entitled, *Religious Liberty*, which contained the gist of the arguments at the hearing on the Breckinridge Sunday-rest bill, with some account of the practical workings of the Sunday laws, and in twenty-four hours after the order was received, had 10,000 copies of this paper on the way

to Arkansas. Plates of this paper were preserved; and at various times, as they have been needed, copies have been issued to the number of 35,000.

In the early part of November, the Legislature of Vermont convened, and was only fairly organized when a most obnoxious Sunday bill was presented. The Vice President of that State was on hand, however, and requested the committee having the bill in charge to grant him the privilege of appearing in opposition to the measure. At the appointed time he went before the committee, and candidly and carefully set before them the principles of Religious Liberty, showing them the evil that would surely follow if such a bill should become a law; and he had the satisfaction of seeing the measure reported adversely to the Legislature. This also was a commendable work, and one for which the officers of that State received the hearty commendation of the Executive Committee.

Early in the year, the members of the Association in Battle Creek assumed the responsibility of sending the Association literature into the fields destitute of sufficient force for a vigorous prosecution of the work. They have done nobly in this direction, having sent 700 copies of the *American Sentinel* to the single State of Arkansas, for about six months. They have also written hundreds of letters to those to whom papers have been sent. They have, in addition to this, sent out thousands of pages of leaflets treating upon Religious Liberty.

In the early part of November, the corresponding secretary, by vote of the Executive Committee, attended the Congress of the American Secular Union, which was held in Portsmouth, Ohio, and, on invitation, spoke to them, presenting to them the methods of operation of the National Religious Liberty Association, and showing the work which they are doing in every part of the land. A favorable impression was evidently made at that meeting, as quite a number expressed themselves pleased with the methods of operation set forth, saying that they were far ahead of anything that their "union" had ever conceived. About the same time, A. T. Jones, a member of the Executive Committee, spoke before a branch of the same "union," in Portland, Oregon, with good effect.

During the year, the Association has published a series of leaflets and pamphlets, fifteen in number, aggregating 122 pages, large editions of which have been printed. One leaflet, "Sunday and the World's Fair," had reached 600,000 copies in less than six weeks from its first appearance. Several of the others have had editions of over 100,000 copies, and the greater part of all of them have been put into circulation.

AMOUNT OF LITERATURE CIRCULATED.

No. of pages of tracts and pamphlets.....	4,060,646
“ <i>American Sentinels</i>	40,075
“ petition blanks.....	29,159
“ Manuals.....	10,707
“ Reasons for Signing the Petition.....	143,162
“ the paper entitled, <i>Religious Liberty</i>	35,000

Brother A. F. Ballenger reported the work done in Chicago. He said, when he arrived in Chicago to engage in the religious liberty work, he did not know what to do; but soon hearing that the subject of the Bible in the public schools was to be discussed in a certain church, he went to the minister and had a talk with him. At the beginning of the conversation, the minister favored the reading of the Bible in the public schools; upon leaving him, he said the objections presented had weight; and the next day's paper contained an article from him opposing the reading of the Bible in the public schools.

The question was next taken up by the Methodist ministers' meeting. Brother Ballenger said he assisted a member who opposed it, by furnishing him facts and quotations. The result was a victory in favor of religious liberty.

To illustrate the possibilities of newspaper work, the following incident was narrated: When the newspapers recorded an account of the trial of Brother King, in January last, he went to the Chicago *Herald* office, with a copy of a paper containing the account of the trial, and asked the editor to send out the reporter to interview several parties whose position on the case he had previously learned. As a result, the next Sunday's issue of the *Herald* contained a two-column interview with the persons whose names he had given. The positions taken were those which he had explained to the editor they would take, — a part defending the cruel prosecution, and the other part denouncing it. In this way fully fifty thousand people had an opportunity of reading the narrow and bigoted ideas of the Sunday legislationists, and the broad and charitable views taken by other persons of prominence and influence.

He said that many other instances of equal interest might be related, but for lack of time would not do so. His work he said has been done largely by proxy. Here he introduced his cousin, Rev. Geo. W. Ballenger, pastor of the First Evangelical Church of South Chicago, who has been engaged in religious liberty work, by way of lecturing in different places in northern Illinois, under the auspices of the N. R. L. Association. Following is a synopsis of his address:—

REV. GEORGE W. BALLENGER.

I have been acquainted more or less with the Adventist people from my childhood, having relatives

who were members of your church. I remember early in my experience that it was predicted that the time was coming in the history of this nation when this peculiar people would be persecuted because of their faith. I laughed at the idea that such a thing could ever happen in this free land. Time has brought it to pass. As I have seen these things coming, I have been convinced that on this point this people were right.

A short time ago my attention was especially called to this subject, and I read and studied pretty much all of the Religious Liberty literature, and looked up some of the prophecies. I became so much interested that I prepared an address for my people on the subject, which was well received by them. Then at the request of the N. R. L. A., I went out into the field to deliver a few addresses in localities where I had been acquainted in the early years of my ministry.

The first appointment was at Rock Grove. At the close of the address, the pastor of the church spoke enthusiastically in favor of the principles of religious liberty, and told his people that he had been furnished with material for three or four discourses. A lawyer in the audience came forward and asked if this was not in the interests of the Seventh-day Adventists. I replied that they would get as much out of it as anyone, I thought, and that they were citizens and needed protection as well as others.

From here I went to Winslow, having sent an announcement on ahead through the pastors of two churches there. About half an hour before the time appointed, one of the pastors came to me, saying it was strange that I should be lecturing in the interests of the N. R. L. Association, and not under the auspices of my own church. I replied that so far as my church was concerned, I stood in the same relation to it that I always had. He then charged me with speaking in the interests of the Seventh-day Adventists. I said I was speaking in the interests of truth. He said that no Adventist could stand on his platform, unless he would accept his principles. I replied that my platform was the Bible, and if the Adventists can stand on that, I will give them plenty of room, and will not try to crowd them off of it. He said the sentiment was against me, and that the people did not want to hear the lecture. I said it was too late to change the appointment to a hall, and that I believed it was Bible truth that I had, and truth for the present time, that the people needed to hear.

I asked the Lord to help me, and to the glory of his name I was helped. I went in the interests of truth, and believed that the truth was more to me than the sentiments of men, and that it would triumph above public opinion. The church was well filled,

and the people were warm in their approval of the lecture. I was convinced afterward that there was not a sentiment against me.

I next went to Cedarville, where revival meetings were being held. The pastor feared that this subject might hurt his meetings, and requested that it should not be introduced. Next I visited a church six miles from this place, where protracted meetings were also being held. The minister wanted to know if what I had was Bible truth. I said it was. "Well, fire away," he said, "and if the truth kills anyone, the sooner they are dead the better." The result of the lecture was an added interest in their revival effort.

I then visited Rock City and Davis, and at the latter place, especially, a good impression was made in favor of the truth. The two ministers present said they wanted to become better informed on the question.

In Sheridan there was much opposition. One of my brethren in the ministry said he would have every man in our Conference on my shoulders for this. He said I was working for the Adventists. Finally the use of the church was granted, but he would not attend the lecture. Thus everywhere the great difficulty is to first overcome the prejudice in the minds of the people.

In conclusion, I want to say, dear brethren, that I used to think the Adventist people were a bigoted people, and were severe critics, without mercy. But I have studied your grievances until I can say I have learned to love this people. I am interested in the National Religious Liberty Association, not because I love the people who gave it birth, but because I love the truth, and want to give the people meat in due season. And, under the blessing of God, I want to go on speaking in opposition to the union of church and state wherever I can, and with all the powers I have.

Prof. W. H. McKee, of Washington, D. C., was called on, and gave a very interesting report of the work done in Washington during the past eighteen months. The attention of congressmen, lawyers, doctors, ministers, and many other prominent citizens of the District of Columbia, has been called to the principles of religious liberty; and in nearly every case, those who give the subject candid consideration, decide against a union of church and state, and everything tending in that direction.

The many articles that have appeared from time to time in the leading newspapers, have created a sentiment throughout the country, in favor of religious liberty. Some of the members of Congress who have had the most to do with these religious measures have failed to be re-elected.

In the course of his report he gave a list of the bills introduced in the last two terms of Congress, which had distinct religious features in them. No less than twelve or fifteen such bills have been introduced.

BIBLE STUDY.

LETTER TO THE ROMANS.—NO. 7.

BY ELDER E. J. WAGGONER.

CHAPTER five contains a partial enumeration of the blessings which are fruits of such a faith as that portrayed in chapter four. It shows the Christian development of the life of any one who has the faith of Abraham. Two words form the keynote of the chapter—MUCH MORE. If you have the glory, the patience, or the Christian experience spoken of in this, or any other chapter, know that God has them in store, and is willing to give much more, for he "is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think."

"Therefore being justified by faith," that is, being made conformable to the law by faith, "we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." The only way that man can be made conformable to the law, and live free from condemnation is by having faith in the promises of God. In Christ there is no unrighteousness, therefore there is nothing but righteousness. By believing on Christ, the Christian has the righteousness of Christ.

But does not James say that there must be works, or the faith is of no avail? It is true that faith is made perfect by works. Jas. 2:22. But it is by faith and faith alone that men are justified. The very text which speaks of Abraham's being justified by faith, states that the works were only the outgrowth of underlying faith, and that by this work the scripture was fulfilled which says: "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." Works are the outgrowth of faith. "It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." We give ourselves into the hands of Christ. He comes and *takes up his abode* with us. We are as clay in the hands of the potter; but it is Christ who does all the good works, and to him belongs all the glory.

"We have peace with God." What is peace? It is not a feeling, but a fact. Many think that they must experience a "certain feeling" which they will know is the "peace of God." But they have never had the peace of God, and therefore cannot know what kind of feeling it ought to be. Satan might give a certain happy feeling, and if the Christian had

only the feeling to go by, he would be deceived. The Lord does not deal in feelings, but in facts. Peace is the opposite of war, strife, emulation. We are either at peace with God or else at war. If at war, it is because we are carrying on rebellion.

How do men fight God? By following sinful practices. Any one knowingly indulging in one sinful practice is warring against God. God is a God of peace. Christ left his peace with his followers. "Let the peace of God rule in your hearts." Between God and his dear Son in heaven there is a "counsel of peace." They counsel for the peace of man. There is only one condition on which man can have that peace—unconditional surrender, surrender all to God, and then there is peace in the heart, no matter what the feeling may be.

"Great peace have they which love thy law: and nothing shall offend them." "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea." What rich comfort in these words! Jesus Christ is "the same, yesterday, and to-day, and forever." So his peace is likened to the continual flowing of the river, and the never-ceasing roll of the ocean wave; therefore it matters not what the feeling is, for if all sins have been confessed, God is faithful and just to forgive them; and we are at peace with him. The condition of peace is the condition of being justified by faith.

"By whom [Christ] also we have access by faith into this grace [unmerited forgiveness and favor] in which we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Righteousness can be wrought in men day by day by the same power by which Isaac was born of parents who were practically dead. When people once gain this experience, the next thing they will be constrained to rejoice in the hope of the coming of the Lord.

How often do we look forward to the coming of the Lord with fear? If we do not rejoice in the Lord in the present life, we have no hope that we will rejoice in him in a life to come. Why should Christians "rejoice in hope of the glory of God?" Because they are at peace with him. Seventh-day Adventists are bidden "when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." We praise him that he is coming soon, it is one of the most glorious and cheering assurances we have.

We live in the present, not in the future. Read 1 Pet. 1:5-9. Salvation belongs to us to-day just as much as it will when in the kingdom of God. No one but ourselves can deprive us of it. Says Peter, "Receiving [present time] the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls." Our present salvation is our only hope of a future salvation. "Kept by the

power of God" is the expression used by Peter, and it denotes precisely the same condition—"being justified by faith"—in the fifth chapter of Romans.

The same power that will make men immortal in the life to come, justifies them—makes them conformable to the law—by being in harmony with it, every day. Says Paul in the letter to the Philippians, chapter three, and verse twenty-one: "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself?"

In Eph. 3:16, Paul in an inspired prayer prays that they might be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man, according to "the riches of his glory." The grace of God is equal to the glory of God. God's throne is a throne of glory, and the grace wherein we stand is backed by the glory of God.

"We glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience." Some say that tribulation worketh *impatience*. This is not true. If a man is not justified by faith, tribulation will develop the impatience that is in him. How is it, then, that tribulation worketh patience? Let these texts answer: "Casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you." 1 Pet. 5:7. "Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and he shall sustain thee." Ps. 55:22. "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Matt. 11:28.

He takes the heavy loads away. What is that burden? Anything that worries or vexes us. It matters not whether it be a small thing—a little trial—or a great one. Cast it on the Lord. We rejoice in tribulation because we have Christ with us, and we cast all the burden on him. He is able to bear them. He has already borne them for all the world, so we cannot add to his burden.

How do we get rid of the burdens? Give them to Christ, and then say, "He has them." And he has them whether you feel any different or not. Then you will experience the truth of the words, "I will give you rest." It is rest even though the physical pain still racks the body. For Christ bears that tribulation, and you are lifted up above all pain.

How did the martyrs go to the rack and the stake with songs of joy on their lips? Was that mere bravado? No, Christ bore their burden, and in him they had peace. Out of a full heart they sang their praise to him. Thus they were happy and joyous, and scarcely noticed the pain while the flames crept around them. We will have to "pass through great tribulation." It may be the lash on the naked flesh, or it may be the thumb-screw. Human nature shrinks from such torture. In Christ we can bear

it. Gain an experience in him now, and in the trying time he will not forsake you. He can bear that great burden as well as a small one.

Christ will be ours then as well as now, and the life we live will be in him. No man in this world will be able to stand in that time unless he has previously learned the lesson of faith. Now is the time, while the lesson may be learned under easy circumstances. Great as will be the tribulation of that time we will pass through it with rejoicing. That rejoicing must be learned now.

"Let patience have her perfect work that ye may be perfect, wanting nothing." Patience shows us to be perfect men.

"Patience worketh experience." It is a Christian, experience that is referred to. "Experience" signifies that men who have it, have been proved and tried. They have laid hold upon God and proved him.

Experience, or the fact that we daily prove God, develops hope,—hope in God. If God is proven every day, then every day there is hope. That is, we have reason to expect the things we desire. We have present salvation, therefore we glory in the hope of an eternal salvation. This is indeed a chapter of hope and rejoicing.

SABBATH SERVICES.

FRIDAY evening, March 13, Elder Loughborough spoke upon the subject of "Early Experiences." The discourse was one of much interest, and will appear in a future number of the BULLETIN.

Sabbath forenoon, Elder Smith spoke on "The Spirit of Prophecy, and Our Relation to It," presenting in a clear and lucid manner the scriptural testimony upon the subject, and the reasons why this, with the other gifts set by God in the church, is needed and should continue to the end. This will also appear in the BULLETIN in the future.

In the afternoon Sister White addressed a large and attentive audience, presenting many practical thoughts and timely warnings. She showed that it was not enough to be pleased merely with the gospel, but that we want to know that Christ is our personal Saviour—that it is well with our soul. The importance of having a faith that works, works by love,—love not simply to God but to our fellow-men,—was also emphasized. We should be missionaries, but the work should begin with our own souls. Everyone who touches sacred things should himself be in touch with the throne of God.

