

Church Federation and Religious Legislation

# Liberty

A Magazine of Religious Freedom

Devoted to the American Idea of Religious Liberty Exemplified in the Complete Separation of Church and State



UNITED STATES CAPITOL, FRONT VIEW

Among the most inestimable of our blessings is that of liberty to worship our Creator in the way we think most agreeable to His will—a liberty deemed in other countries incompatible with good government, and yet proved by our experience to be its best support.—*Jefferson.*

PRICE, FIVE CENTS



CASTLE IN THE LION'S DEN.

# LIBERTY

*Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof. Lev. 25:10.*

VOL. I

APRIL, 1906

No. 1

## Editorial

### Liberty

IN the contest that is being waged in this country for the preservation of the rights of conscience, the point has been reached where a special organ is again felt to be a necessity in the educational work which aims to bring the people to a right decision upon this question. As such an organ, LIBERTY now makes its appearance.

In former years, when the movement to compel the conscience through religious legislation attained threatening headway in many places, good service was rendered by the *American Sentinel*, afterward the *Sentinel of Christian Liberty*, which was published as the special organ of those who stood for the separation of church and state and the maintenance of Protestant and republican principles of government. A great work was accomplished by the *Sentinel* in the cause of religious freedom at that time. Now, after some years of apparent lull in the conflict, there is a great renewal of activity behind the church-and-state movement, and another crisis is at hand, which will call for active, earnest work with the most effective agencies that can be found.

Such an agency LIBERTY will be, if the purpose of its publication is realized. This journal will be a true exponent and advocate of liberty,—not that liberty which means license, which degrades and enslaves body and mind, not the liberty which means class privilege, or which disregards the rights of the weak and defenseless,—but

the liberty which is God-given, which is the right of all persons by creation,—the liberty for which the martyrs suffered, and by their suffering bequeathed to us,—the liberty which is in harmony with the laws of God and with all just statutes of men.

It will be the mission of this journal to proclaim such liberty throughout the land.

—  
No power but that of love can rightfully compel the conscience.

—  
WHEN religion becomes an affair of law, it ceases to be a matter of love.

—  
No one has a right to bind his theology upon any one's back but his own.

—  
THE early church derived her marvelous power, not from politics, but from Pentecost.

—  
MEN are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely. A government can interfere in discussion only by making it less free than it would otherwise be.—*Macaulay*.

—  
IF all mankind, minus one, were of one opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing the world.—*John Stuart Mill*.

—  
To the question, "Where have you seen the best Sabbath observance?" a San Francisco pastor answers, "Among the Christian people of California." (Mr. Crafts' "Sabbath for Man," p. 95.) But California has no Sunday law. Therefore Sunday laws are not essential to good Sunday observance.

## An Epoch of Freedom

SLOWLY men emerged from the despotism of the Middle Ages into the light of the civil and religious liberty of modern times. Little by little they began to recognize the rights of men, and to see that proscription and persecution are no part of the legitimate business of civil government; that the state can exist and is better off without an established religion, and that the church is better and purer when not allied to the state.

In coming to this light and knowledge, one after another of the Old World powers issued edicts of toleration, which, while not reaching the standard of full and perfect liberty, were, nevertheless, steps toward it. They were better than tyranny. They were promises of better things to come.

The Old World idea of government had been transplanted to the New World, and the evils of enforcing religion by law were seen here as there. Against these evils, and the principles supporting them, noble, courageous, Christian men took their stand.

### *A New Nation*

Finally freedom came into full bloom. In the New World the seeds of civil and religious liberty had taken deep root. From the virgin soil a nation arose in which there was "a church without a pope, and a state without a king." Conscience was placed above the civil power, and the word of God above the authority of the visible church. Its founders declared that all men are "created equal," and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." They declared that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting

the free exercise thereof," and that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust" under the government. The bell of "Liberty" rang out, on which were cast the words: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." A new nation was born, upon whose Great Seal was placed the Latin inscription, "*Novus Ordo Seclorum*," meaning, "A new order of things."

### *Influence of the New Nation*

The spirit of freedom spread. The influence of the example set by the new nation extended far and wide. In every nation men began to call for liberty and to demand their rights,—freedom to hold and express their opinions without fear of molestation, and to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. Old laws restricting the liberties of the people were repealed, or allowed to fall into disuse and become a dead-letter. Persecution died out. Freedom asserted herself, and the rights of man, for once in the world, sat on the throne.



LIBERTY ENLIGHTENING THE WORLD

Such, for over a hundred years, as every one knows, has been the condition of things to a large degree throughout the civilized world. In nearly every nation under heaven the rights of man have been more generally recognized than they had been for ages past, yes, than they had been since the world began. An epoch of freedom indeed! An age of light and liberty!

To reach this point, however, it had cost many hard struggles, and the pouring out of much precious blood. The road to it is strewn with the bodies of brave men, and of the holy martyrs of Jesus, slain for freedom's sake. We who are so blessed as to live in this glorious age,—an age of light and liberty, of open Bibles, free speech, and

free press,—ought not lightly to prize the liberties which we enjoy. They have been purchased at a great price.

#### *Old Principles Retained*

While the principles of civil and religious liberty upon which the government of the United States was founded exerted so powerful an influence throughout the civilized world, there was not a general and complete renunciation of all forms of despotism. Many seemed afraid to step squarely out upon these principles. In various ways there was still a clinging to "the old order of things." While the principles of the Reformation of the sixteenth



LIBERTY BELL.

century demanded the entire separation of church and state, the reformed churches themselves soon united church and state, and made their respective beliefs the established religions of their countries. Even in the United States, as Dr. Philip Schaff observes, "some features of a union of church and state remain in some of the States even to this day." Nearly all have their Sunday laws, and the section in the national Constitution allowing the President ten days in which to sign and return a bill, has, in parenthesis, the words, "Sunday excepted." In this one thing, perhaps, more than in any other, has been retained in this country a feature—the very germ and taproot—of church and state union.

#### *A Backward Move*

And now, in order to give life, form, and effect to these seeds of church-and-state

union thus retained, there is a widespread movement to have the national government commit itself fully to a course of religious legislation, establish religion here by law, and swing this nation back into the "old order of things." The leading Protestant churches of the country are organizing with a view to bringing their united pressure upon the government, in order to secure such legislation as they demand. In this movement there lurks a most dangerous evil. Many connected with it do not see whither the undercurrent is tending, nor what the success of the movement will mean,—what it will mean not only to this country, but to all the world for this nation to repudiate the principles upon which it was founded.

To warn against the dangers here threatened, and to perpetuate in the world as long as possible the glorious principles of liberty, this document has been issued.

W. A. C.

THE complete separation between the proper spheres of religion and the civil government is made evident from the fact that while civil government aims at justice alone, Christianity aims at both justice and mercy. To show mercy to the offender, as Christianity demands, would be quickly fatal to civil government; and to punish the offender without mercy, as civil government demands, would entirely defeat the purpose of the gospel.

Christianity is not opposed to civil government, but is a separate and higher form of government, the one being a government of men, the other the government of God. In Christianity, mercy is not opposed to justice, even in the strictest form, but "mercy rejoiceth against judgment." Justice for the transgression of God's law is secured by the penalty paid by the Son of God on the cross, and mercy is therefore at the same time free to the transgressor.

The government of God is carried on by his own agencies,—his Word, his Son as high priest, his angels, and the Holy Spirit. Only by such agencies could such a government be conducted. Any attempt to commingle Christianity and civil government is therefore contrary to the nature and purpose of each, and can result only in harm.

## The Church Federation Movement

THE leading Protestant religious bodies in the United States to-day, stand committed to the idea of church federation.

Expression was given to this sentiment, in November last, by one of the most noteworthy religious gatherings ever held in this country. In response to a general call issued some months before, three hundred

Brewer of the United States Supreme Court, Judge Grosscup of the United States Circuit Court, and the lieutenant-governor of New York. President Roosevelt sent a letter of endorsement.

The influence of the leading religious bodies of the country, the leading institutions of learning, the leading religious journals, and many of the leaders in politics, is back of this movement. It repre-



INTER-CHURCH FEDERATION CONFERENCE, NEW YORK, NOV. 15-21, 1905

delegates representing thirty-two denominations, assembled in New York City, for a session of several days' continuance, during which an elaborate program relating to the purposes of the movement was carried out. Among those assigned a part in the program, were twenty-five bishops from the different Protestant churches, numerous college presidents and professors, editors of leading Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist journals, and Justices Harlan and

sents a church membership of from eighteen to twenty millions. This is by far the most powerful influence in the nation. No other exists or could be created which could successfully oppose it.

The aim of this movement was set forth at some length in a report of the committee on plans, which was presented at the conference, stating the necessity which was felt for an expression of the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian church.

for mutual counsel and harmonious action on the part of the divided bodies, and a more powerful influence "in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people." But briefly, as expressed in the speeches that were made, the aim of this movement is to set up the kingdom of Christ. Leaders of this movement believe it will fulfil the prophecy of the Apocalypse: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." They believe it will fulfil the petition of the Lord's prayer: "Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven." This belief was voiced throughout the entire conference.

The practical effect of this federation system, as set forth by some speakers, would be to enable all the churches in a State to bring united pressure upon any town or city in that State, to cause it to legislate and enforce laws against whatever might be deemed a social evil, and thus purify the place. The whole State could be purified in the same way, and the union of States by the union of churches, and thus the nation would become a "Christian nation." The system would operate also, it was explained, to prevent the establishment of new churches in a community otherwise than as the federation might provide should be done. The convention is to assemble again in 1908, and every four years thereafter.

While the Catholic Church did not participate in this gathering, the door was left open to them, and desires were expressed that they should join in the movement. It seems probable that a union between Protestants and Catholics on this ground will be an event of the near future. Bishop Vincent, Methodist, in his closing address at the convention, declared there was room in the federation for everybody's individual beliefs. Rev. Dr. Mackay said, as regards the scope of the movement, that he was willing to federate with Brahman or Hindu or anyone, provided only that he be willing to agree to the kingship of Christ, and to work for the betterment of humanity.

#### *A Sign of the Times*

This great gathering is spoken of, and rightly, as a most notable event and sign of the times. The chairman of the confer-

ence spoke of it as being "one of the most notable assemblies of believers in Jesus Christ that has ever been seen;" and a Philadelphia clergyman expressed the belief that it marks "the greatest epoch in the life of Christianity within the past five hundred years." Viewed in the light of its relation to history and to the truths of divine revelation, it must indeed be regarded as an event of the greatest significance for the interests of both church and state, and one whose meaning every person in the country should understand.

#### Responsibilities of Civil Rulers

IN the January number of *McClure's Magazine*, Lincoln Steffens, who has of late exposed a shocking amount of political corruption in civic affairs, writes of the career of the present mayor of one of the Atlantic coast cities, whose motto has been that he would, if elected to office, serve his constituents "faithfully and honestly."

The title of Mr. Steffens' article is a lesson in itself. It is, "A Servant of God and the People." This recognizes a principle too often overlooked. An officer of the state is, in fact, a servant of God, and is responsible to Him first, and, secondarily, to the people, for the proper discharge of his official duties.

Civil government was ordained of God as a necessity in a world cursed with sin. Its purpose is to protect men in the exercise of their God-given rights and privileges. It is designed to be a terror to evil-doers. Here is the inspired statement for this: "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God: and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment. For rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. And wouldest thou have no fear of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same: for he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil."

The genius of civil government is of God. The people may, under the over-ruling providence of God, select the individual who shall occupy the seat of power; but inasmuch as he is "a minister of God," he is primarily responsible to God for the administration of his office. He is, of course, responsible to the people as one who has been chosen to be, under God, a servant of the people; and he is in duty bound to conserve the interests of all the people. He who attempts to favor a majority of the body politic through whose suffrages he obtained office, at the expense of the minority whose first choice fell upon some other man, is a mere political partizan, and is utterly unworthy of the title of a statesman. He is a spoiler of the people, rather than a ruler of the people.

Sacred history furnishes striking examples of the principles herein set forth. Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, became a universal ruler by the direct providence of God. Through the prophet Jeremiah, Jehovah said: "I have made the earth, the men and the beasts that are upon the face of the earth, by My great power and by My outstretched arm; and I give it unto whom it seemeth right unto Me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, My servant; and the beasts of the field also have I given him to serve him. And all the nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son."

Jehovah called Nebuchadnezzar "My servant." Although Nebuchadnezzar conducted the usual campaigns of conquest against the surrounding nations, yet Jehovah declares that it was He who gave these nations into the hand of the king of Babylon. Jehovah then held Nebuchadnezzar responsible to Himself for the right use of the power placed in his hands.

As God's servant, Nebuchadnezzar was to rule the people wisely in their temporal affairs, leaving God Himself to deal with them in spiritual things. When he attempted to usurp the prerogatives of God by issuing a royal edict governing the object and manner of the people's worship, the Ruler of heaven interfered, and by delivering His worshipers from the burning fiery furnace, he wrought into history the

principle which Jesus of Nazareth afterward enunciated in words, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

When Nebuchadnezzar's heart was lifted up because of his greatness and the extent of his kingdom, and he refused to recognize that he was God's servant, responsible to Him for the conduct of the affairs of the kingdom, those godlike faculties which en-



PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

abled him to rule among men, were taken from him, and he became as a beast of the field. This was done that he might know "that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will."

The same lesson concerning the legitimate sphere of the authority of civil rulers and their responsibility to the King of heaven is taught in the experience of Darius the Mede, who commanded Daniel the prophet to be cast into the den of lions because he prayed to God contrary to the decree of the king. When the earthly king disregarded his responsibility to the heavenly King, he was made to know that the power which ordained civil government was to be reckoned with in the administration of that government.

*Lessons for Succeeding Generations*

These lessons were left on record for the benefit of succeeding generations. They apply with equal force at the present time. Irresponsible power has not been committed to those who occupy positions of authority in the government. The sphere of their authority has been clearly defined by the very Ruler who ordained civil government. In temporal affairs they are supreme, subject always to those principles of right and justice which the God of heaven has established. With spiritual affairs they have nothing whatsoever to do, except that as rulers it is their duty to protect liberty of conscience, and as men, they are under obligation to lead the Christian life the same as are other men. As servants of God they will discharge their official duties by making or administering, in the fear of God, just laws within the legitimate sphere of civil authority, in matters which lie between man and man, and not by attempting to interfere in matters of faith and worship, which lie wholly between man and his God. And for the right discharge of these duties every servant of the people is primarily responsible to Him whose throne is in heaven, and whose kingdom ruleth over all.

The downfall of those kingdoms whose rulers have failed to recognize their responsibility to the King of heaven, is the voice of history to this generation, emphasizing the message of the prophet Daniel to the king of Babylon: "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will." Fortunate will it be for the "minister of God" who heeds this lesson of the ages.

W. W. P.

---

WHERE legal enactment begins, moral suasion ends.

---

YOU may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday.—*Cardinal Gibbons.*

---

THE current notion that Christ and His apostles authoritatively substituted the first day of the week for the seventh is absolutely without any authority in the New Testament.—*Dr. Lyman Abbott.*

*Limits of Civil Authority*

THERE are limits to the authority of the civil power, and these limits should be clearly understood by the people. A republican form of government, as contrasted with an absolute monarchy, implies a limitation to the powers of the government beyond which it can not rightfully go.

Civil government is not the custodian of the souls of the people. Upon all the pages of human history the truth is written plainly that there are two spheres of life within which man moves, with one of which—the higher sphere of conscience and of his relation to God—the civil power can rightfully have nothing to do. Again and again the Almighty has vindicated the course of those who, in order to be true to Him, have refused obedience to unjust mandates from the civil authority. The darkest pages of history are those recording the results of the invasion by the civil power of the realm of conscience. The early history of most of the leading religious denominations of this day was marked by their resistance to the dictates of the civil power outside the sphere of its legitimate authority.

The true sphere of civil government was well defined by the men who founded the American republic. The Declaration of Independence, justifying the separation from Great Britain which led to the founding of this nation, says: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; and 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." This is the principle of government upon which this nation is established.

Governments are instituted among men to preserve the natural, unalienable rights which men have by creation; that is, as individuals; and not to curtail these rights, or to take them away. When civil government invades these rights, it does exactly the opposite of that which it is instituted to do. This is a perverted and illegitimate use of its power.

Legislatures can not create natural

rights, neither can they make right wrong, or wrong right. The law of right and wrong is a law antedating and wholly independent of any legislative enactments. Legislators are bound to shape their legislation by their knowledge of this law of justice which is inherent in the human mind, and their legislation will be excellent in proportion as they approximate to this ideal standard. It is proper to say, therefore, that the province of the legislature is not to create law, but to ascertain and define it. Righteousness is a law, and has been such from the foundation of the world. It is binding upon men everywhere, and at all times. All men are bound, always, to do right.

The question, What is the law? is therefore not the question lying at the foundation of one's duty in any religious or spiritual matter which is brought before him. There is another question lying deeper than this, and that is the question,



INDEPENDENCE HALL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

What is right? Sometimes injustice becomes enthroned in law; but this does not put upon any person an obligation to do morally wrong. He is still bound to do right, still bound by conscience to the higher law of God. This higher law must be obeyed at any cost.

A statute commanding one to commit murder on certain occasions, or to steal, or to swear falsely, would not be binding on anyone, and would not be obeyed; and the reason given for disobedience to it would be that it was unjust. No one would claim that it ought to be obeyed simply because it was "the law;" and what would be true of such a statute would be true of every enactment that is contrary to the law of God. Unjust enactments do not derive any sanc-

tity from being on the statute books. They ought to be repealed, not enforced.

In secular affairs, the principle of majority rule is at the foundation of government; and this is proper and necessary. But in matters of conscience, majority rule has no place. An individual's duty toward God can not be determined by a majority vote. Every individual's relation to God is a direct relation, not sustained through any other individuals or through the government. "Every one of us shall give account of himself to God."

Faith, which is the essence of Christianity, is individual belief of God's word, irrespective of the belief or opinions of any or all other persons. In religion, the majority have always been on the wrong side. It is the majority that throng the broad way leading to destruction, and only the small minority who travel the narrow way leading unto life. Thus the spheres of religion and of civil government must be wholly separate from each other.

Within its legitimate sphere the civil power should have the unhesitating obedience of all persons. Only the higher claims of duty toward God can justify anyone in refusing obedience to the civil ruler. Only a plain conflict with the higher law of God can justify any disobedience to the laws of men. The legitimate realm of the civil power is that of preserving the rights of the people, and within this realm it has the sanction of God. No one can, under a plea of conscientious conviction of duty, be permitted to invade the natural rights of another person. These rights do not conflict, and each one must respect the rights of others.

---

Laws are not designed to enforce rights upon the people, but to protect the people in their rights.

---

COMPULSION in religion only drives men to wickedness and hypocrisy under the cloak of religion.

---

To force people to observe Sunday is not protection of civil rights, but an interference with civil rights.

## A Few National Reform Utterances

"We want state and religion; and we are going to have it."—*Jonathan Edwards, D. D.* In other words, they want a state religion.

"Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measure. So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion."—*Prof. C. A. Blanchard.* And this will mean an established religion.

"Our remedy for all these malefic influences is to have the government simply set up the moral law, and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it."—*Rev. M. A. Gault.* And this means religious persecution.

They desire an amendment to the Constitution that will "place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."—*Art. 2 of their Constitution.* That is, they desire the Christian religion made the "legal" religion of the nation.

"Those who oppose this work now will discover, when the religious amendment is made to the Constitution, that if they do not see fit to fall in with the majority, they must abide the consequences, or seek some more congenial clime."—*Dr. David McAlister.* This is what Rome said after Christianity, so-called, became the established religion of this empire. Justinian told the people that if they did not embrace the established religion, confiscation and other punishments would follow.

"We propose to incorporate in our national Constitution the moral and religious command, 'In it (the Sabbath) thou shalt do no work,' except the works of necessity, and by external force of sheriffs we propose to arrest and punish all violators of this law."—*Rev. M. A. Gault.*

"Let those who will, remember the Sabbath to keep it holy from motives of love and obedience; the remnant must be made to do so through fear of law. We have no option."—*Christian Nation.*

This of course would work hardship to those who did not believe in keeping the

Sabbath enforced by the law; but Dr. McAlister says: "It is better that a few should suffer than that the nation should lose its Sabbath." So Caiaphas, the high priest, thought concerning Christ, when he said that it was expedient "that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not."

These are the sentiments and principles held and being taught by many of the leaders of religious thought to-day.

"Give us good Sunday laws, well enforced by men in local authority, and our churches will be full of worshipers, and our young men and women will be attracted to the divine service. A mighty combination of the churches of the United States could win from Congress, the State legislatures, and municipal councils, all legislation essential to this splendid result."—*Rev. S. V. Leech, D. D.*

This shows that this whole Sunday-law movement is a church movement, and that Sunday laws are desired by the church leaders in order that their churches may be "full of worshipers" and that the people may by this means be "attracted" to the divine service.

"In the Christian decalogue the first day was made the Sabbath by divine appointment. But there is a class of people who will not keep the Christian Sabbath unless they are forced to do so; but that can easily be done. If we would say we will not sell anything to them, we will not buy anything from them, we will not work for them, or hire them to work for us, the thing could be wiped out, and all the world would keep the Christian Sabbath."—*Rev. Dr. Bascom Robins.*

In other words, they propose to boycott all who will not keep the first day of the week as the Sabbath, just as Christ, in Revelation the 13th chapter, said the mark of the beast (the papal power) would be enforced,— "that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark," etc.

This is sufficient to show the wicked, compulsory, persecuting spirit that is behind the Sunday-law movement. It belongs to the great apostasy from God and His law. It is not Christian. Christ did not persecute.

W. A. C.

---

---

# General Articles

---

## Proposed National Religious Legislation

### Another Sunday Bill Before Congress

W. A. COLCORN

THE friends of religious legislation are again in evidence. On January 5, 1906, the following Sunday bill (H. R. 10510) for the District of Columbia, was introduced in the House of Representatives, by Hon. A. L. Allen, of Maine:—

"A BILL TO FURTHER PROTECT THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK AS A DAY OF REST IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

"Whereas, There has recently been an increase not only of traffic, but also of hard labor on Sunday in the national capital, including the public filling and driving of dirt carts, to the great offense of Christian and humane citizens; and,

"Whereas, The President has been appealed to by philanthropic societies of this city to suppress this Sunday toil ordered by contractors for government work and others, and has regretfully said that there is no law that would enable him to do so; and,

"Whereas, The following bill has been twice approved in previous Congresses by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, therefore

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

every person employed in violation of this Act laid upon the corporation offending.

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

Sunday observance originated in religion; hence all Sunday laws are, in their original intent and purpose, religious. The proposed measure now before Congress, like all Sunday laws from the days of Constantine down, is therefore religious.

Through Sunday legislation church and state were united in the fourth and fifth centuries. Sunday legislation will result in the same evil now.

#### *A District Law an Entering Wedge*

This is only another effort, in a long line of attempts, to get the government of the United States committed to religious legislation. From almost the earliest history of this nation, contrary to one of its fundamental principles, misguided men have sought to fasten religious legislation onto the national government, and thus unite church and state in the United States. The chief means by which they have sought to do this has been through Sunday legislation. As early as 1811, 1829, and 1830, petitions and memorials were sent to Congress, praying for legislation prohibiting the carrying and handling of mails on Sunday.

In 1888 Senator Blair introduced a bill for a very stringent national Sunday law, openly based on grounds directly religious. This applied to the whole nation, and provided a fine of one thousand dollars for its violation. It was rejected in committee, largely because of its religious character.

Since that time certain religious organiza-

tions have been urging Congress to pass a District Sunday law, it being evident that the people were not yet ready for a national Sunday law. In response to this demand, various District Sunday bills, such as the Breckinridge Sunday bill, introduced in 1890, have been placed before Congress from time to time. The idea has been that if a precedent could be established, if Congress could be led to commit itself to the principle of religious legislation through a law requiring Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, it would be comparatively easy to secure a national Sunday law.

gress, with the exception that this one has a preamble,—a rather remarkable and unusual thing in ordinary legislation,—setting forth certain reasons why the proposed law should be enacted. As now prepared, it sounds more like some conference resolution or Sunday-school petition, than a bill to be enacted into law by Congress.

The religious character of the bill is apparent. According to its title, its object is "to protect the first day of the week as a day of rest," or sabbath. Sabbath means rest, or cessation from labor.

Upon its own showing, the bill is designed



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

And a national Sunday law is desired in order to make consistent and effective the state laws,—relics of colonial church-and-state legislation copied from European models.

But all these proposed measures have failed because of their religious character. All have been met on the ground that in this government church and state are separate, the First Amendment to the Constitution declaring that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

#### *The Bill Examined*

This bill is the same as the one (H. R. 4859) that died in the House, March 4, 1905, at the close of the Fifty-eighth Con-

gress to protect the *day*, not the people. It is the "peace and quiet of the *day*" with which it is concerned. Work which upon any other day would be considered perfectly proper, is by it declared to be a "great offense" to "Christian and humane citizens."

Works of "charity or necessity" it graciously permits. But what are works of charity and necessity? Who is to decide? A Sunday excursion for the poor might, by some, be considered a charity; and harvesting to save crops, or labor to provide for a family, by others, a necessity.

Twice, it says, the District Commissioners have approved of the measure, and, in a very adroit manner, represents the President as favoring such legislation,—that he has "regretfully said" there was no law

enabling him to suppress Sunday toil in the District.

It makes honest labor and trade on Sunday a penal offense, but permits the sale of tobacco, cigars, and malt and spirituous liquors under limitations, on that day. A strange inconsistency!

Such legislation has been urged as necessary because certain dealers are "compelled to keep open their places of business on Sunday to compete with those dealers who do not respect that holy day." (Washington *Evening Star*, April 14, 1904.) This at once shows the character and object of the desired legislation. It is religious, and is designed to stop all Sunday competition by compelling non-Sunday-observing dealers to respect the "holy day."

Must the right of men to choose their own religion and their own time to rest and labor be treated as a crime, in order that those who observe Sunday shall have no Sunday competition? It should never be forgotten that a religious monopoly is the most dangerous, the most unreasonable, and the most oppressive of all monopolies.

No one in the District of Columbia is compelled now to labor or keep open any place of business on Sunday. All are free to rest and observe Sunday as a "holy day" if they desire to do so. But if this bill becomes a law, freedom is gone. Then all embraced in its provisions will be compelled to cease from business and trade on Sunday, and to observe the day, whether they desire to do so or not, or be subjected to heavy and repeated fines.

If a man is religious from principle, he will do that which he believes to be right, even though he loses financially by so doing. The religion which is a matter of so little conscience that it needs a governmental prop to support it, can not benefit its possessor, and would certainly be a dangerous thing to embody into civil law.

Moreover, if those who observe Sunday need a law compelling others to observe the day, then, by parity of reasoning, those who observe any other day need a law requiring others to observe that day. And the state can not grant such a law to one class and deny it to another, without enacting class legislation, taking sides in a religious controversy,—the question of which day is the Sabbath,—and making an unjust distinction between its citizens.

But the truth is, no class needs such a

law. Every such law is a selfish, unjust, unchristian thing, and virtually establishes by law the religion of the class represented and favored by it. They may be the majority, it is true; but in religion majorities have no right to rule by law, nor to ask the state to give preference by law to them or to their mode of worship. For the majority to rule in religious matters by the power of the state is all any church ever asked in the palmiest days of religious establishments.

The state can not select and enforce the observance of the day kept by one class without showing partiality to that class, and discriminating against those who observe another day. Chief Justice Terry, of California, gave judgment upon this point in the following language: "The enforced observance of a day held sacred by one of the sects, is a discrimination in favor of that sect, and a violation of the freedom of others." "Considered as a municipal regulation, the legislature has no right to forbid or enjoin the lawful pursuit of a lawful occupation on one day of the week, any more than it can forbid it altogether."—9 Calif., 502.

#### *What the Exemption Implies*

The bill proposes to exempt those who keep "another day," providing they keep it "uniformly," and do not by their labor "interrupt or disturb" those who observe Sunday.

Such an exemption implies that the state has a right to compel all to observe some day; if not one, then another.

It implies that the state has a right to say when men may labor, as well as when they must rest.

It is, moreover, of the nature of toleration. The state selects, establishes, and requires the observance of the first day of the week as the day of rest; but, upon certain conditions, it *permits* men to labor on that day, and to keep another day, the seventh,—the one enjoined in the law of God,—instead. Think of the state *permitting* men to obey God! Think of it saying to a certain class: "You may worship God according to the dictates of your conscience!"

This is simply toleration; and toleration implies an established religion; and an established religion forebodes persecution. From tolerance to intolerance is but a step. The right to *permit* implies the right to

*prohibit*. The permission may be withdrawn.

In this is seen the inherent evil involved in this proposed legislation. It is religious. It invades the realm of conscience, and treats the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience as a concession or privilege granted as a kindness or mercy. It assumes that the state has a right to dictate to men in matters of religion,—to say when and how they shall worship. It is the first step in the making of a religious establishment.

If it is right to exempt one class who do not believe in keeping Sunday, why is it not right to exempt all classes who do not respect the day? This, of course, would nullify the law.

But why is this exemption introduced? Sixteen years ago the first District Sunday bill was introduced into Congress. This likewise contained an exemption for observers of another day. The reason was clearly stated by a representative of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union — Mrs. Catlin. The observers of the seventh day had opposed, as unconstitutional, unchristian, and contrary to the law of God, the Blair Sunday-Rest bill introduced two years before. That contained no exemption. So when the Breckinridge District Sunday bill was introduced, the lady referred to, said: "We have given them an exemption clause, and that, we think, will take the wind out of their sails." It was hoped by this means to check their opposition to Sunday legislation until Congress was committed to it. Foolish indeed would they or any one else be to be deceived as to the real nature of such legislation by such a clause. The founders of this nation held that "the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience, is something which every man may demand as a right, not something for which he must ask as a privilege. To grant to the state the power of toleration is implicitly to grant to it the power of prohibiting;" whereas they denied to it any jurisdiction whatever in the matter of religion.

The wording of the exemption would seem to imply that only observers of the first day were entitled, during their devotions, to protection against interference and disturbance.

Lastly, the exemption is of little value in itself; for it takes very little to "disturb"

some people. A few years ago a woman in New York complained of being disturbed all day one Sunday because her nephew was setting type in a back room up stairs ten blocks away.

From all this it is evident, therefore, that the passage of this bill would be

#### *Needless and Unjust Legislation*

Now all are free; hence this legislation is *unnecessary*. And if it should bring suffering or religious oppression to a single individual, even though demanded by every other person in the District, it would be *unjust*.

It would, moreover, be a new departure; for while, under strong church pressure, Congress has, in two or three instances, conditioned appropriations to certain expositions upon Sunday closing, it has never as yet passed a law *compelling* any one to observe Sunday or any other religious institution.

Shall the people of the District of Columbia be allowed to remain free, or must they be compelled to accept this yoke? No citizen of the District of Columbia has any vote or voice in making the laws by which the District is governed. This, then, is a field most favorable for the commencement of a religious despotism. And right here the International Reform Bureau, the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and other religious organizations have been working for years, seeking to persuade Congress to commit itself in some way to the principle of religious legislation. After some such local and apparently insignificant bill as this is passed, a multitude of others increasingly oppressive, not only for the District, but for the whole nation, will inevitably follow. A mighty impetus would also be given to state Sunday legislation as a result of the example set by the national government, and the way opened for religious despotism to establish itself in this country as it has in past ages in other lands.

This bill applies only to the District of Columbia, and only to certain classes in the District. The first Sunday law, that promulgated by Constantine, March 7, 321 A. D., likewise applied only to cities, and was for certain classes only. But after the union of church and state thus formed, religious tests and religious persecution followed. Liberty was in chains. Then came the world's midnight,—the Dark Ages,—a

time of physical, intellectual, and spiritual bondage, and finally the Inquisition. Do the people of the United States wish to see this history repeated?

*Religious Liberty Has Made this Nation Great*

If this nation is great for one reason more than for any other, it is that its founders stood for religious liberty. Note the following:

GEORGE WASHINGTON: "Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious



GEORGE WASHINGTON

faith, and should be protected in worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

THOMAS JEFFERSON: "Almighty God hath created the mind free. All attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who, being Lord, both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercion on either, as was in His almighty power to do."

JAMES MADISON: "Religion is not in the purview of human government. Religion is essentially distinct from government and exempt from its cognizance. A connection between them is injurious to both."

U. S. GRANT: "Leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the church, and the private school supported entirely by private contributions.

*"Keep the State and the Church Forever Separate"*

The historian, John Clark Ridpath, has well said: "Proscription has no part or lot



JAMES MADISON

in the modern government of the world. The stake, the gibbet, and the rack, thumb-screws, swords, and pillory have no place



THOMAS JEFFERSON

among the machinery of civilization. Nature is diversified. So are human faculties, beliefs, and practises. Essential freedom is the right to differ, and that right must be sacredly respected."

The following from a Senate report, in 1829, on petitions for Sunday legislation, is eminently pertinent just now: "The proper object of government is to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their civil as well as their religious rights, and not to determine for any whether they shall esteem one day above another, or esteem all days alike holy. What other nations call religious tolerance we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which government can not deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotic power may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them."

Furthermore, Sunday legislation is not only contrary to the Constitution and principles of this government, but both the legislation and the keeping of the day itself as the Sabbath are in direct conflict with that law which is above all human law, the law of God, which plainly declares that "the seventh day [not the first] is the Sabbath

well said: "When religion is good it will take care of itself; when it is not able to take care of itself, and God does not see fit to take care of it, so that it has to appeal



JOHN WESLEY

to civil power for support, it is evidence in my opinion that its cause is a bad one."

#### *Testimony of Eminent Men*

JOHN WESLEY said: "Let every one enjoy the full and free liberty of thinking for himself. If you can not reason or persuade a man into the truth, never attempt to force a man into it."

DR. ADAM CLARKE wrote: "No other kind of constraint [than prayers, counsels, and entreaties] is ever recommended in the gospel of Christ. Every other kind of compulsion is anti-Christian, can be submitted to only by cowards and knaves, and can produce nothing but hypocrites. The church which tolerates, encourages, and practises persecution, under the pretense of concern for the purity of the faith, and zeal for the glory of God, is not the church of Christ, and no man can be of such a church without endangering his salvation."

DR. ALBERT BARNES taught: "If we can have a Sabbath, maintained by a healthful, popular sentiment, *rather than by human laws*, Christianity is safe in this land, and our country is safe. If not, the Sabbath, and religion, and liberty will die together."

SPURGEON said: "I am ashamed of some Christians because they have so much de-



BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

of the Lord thy God." Ex. 20:8-11. Because the majority keep the first day as the Sabbath is no evidence that it is the Sabbath, or that all should be compelled to keep it. In religion, the majority have generally been wrong. Benjamin Franklin

pendence on Parliament and the law of the land. Much good may Parliament ever do to true religion, except by mistake! As to getting the law of the land to touch our religion, we earnestly cry, 'Hands off! leave us alone!' Your Sunday bills and all other forms of act-of-Parliament religion seem to me to be all wrong. Give us a fair field and no favor, and our faith has no cause to fear. Christ wants no help from Cæsar."

From every standpoint, therefore, from



C. H. SPURGEON

which the question may be viewed, Sunday legislation is wrong.

Jesus, the Author of Christianity, taught the separation of church and state. He said: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's: and unto God the things that are God's." The Sabbath belongs to God, and therefore is not to be rendered to Cæsar. When on trial before Pontius Pilate, Christ declared:

*"My Kingdom Is Not of this World"*

He taught liberty. "Whosoever will, let him come." "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."

We therefore hold that no religious day

should be enforced by law, whether the first or the seventh; that any measure tending directly or indirectly to enforce religion will work injury not only to the state, but most of all to religion itself. Liberty, absolute and eternal, is the gift of God. In religion let there be no compulsion, no persecution.

In his letter to the Jews, of Nov. 16, 1905, President Roosevelt said: "I feel very strongly that if any people are oppressed anywhere, the wrong inevitably reacts in the end on those who oppress them; for it is an immutable law in the spiritual world that no one can wrong others and yet in the end himself escape unhurt."

In the name, therefore, of those noble men who sought to build this nation free, who risked their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to give liberty to the people of this country; in the name of Christianity itself; in the name of Jesus Christ, who died to set us free now and eternally, we protest against this and all other religious legislation by Congress. And we invite all Christians and all liberty-loving people everywhere to join us in this protest.

Sign the petition against this proposed religious legislation.

## Do Workingmen Need Sunday Laws?

"AMONG other printed questions to which I have collected numerous answers, was this one: 'Do you know of any instance where a Christian's refusal to do Sunday work or Sunday trading has resulted in his financial ruin?' Of the two hundred answers from persons representing all trades and professions, *not one is affirmative*. . . . I have never known a case, nor can I find one in any quarter of the globe where even beggary, much less starvation, has resulted from courageous and conscientious fidelity to the Sabbath. Even in India, where most of the business community is heathen, missionaries testify that loyalty to the Sabbath in the end brings no worldly loss. On the other hand, incidents have come to me by the score, of those who have gained, even in their worldly prosperity, by daring to do right in the matter of Sunday work."—*W. F. Crafts, in "Sabbath for Man," p. 428.*

All this talk, then, about laboring men needing Sunday laws to "protect" them and to keep them from "coming to want" in case they choose to keep Sunday, is without foundation. What men need in religion is "courageous and conscientious fidelity" to what they believe to be truth and duty, rather than laws taking away all opportunities for exercising faith and trust in God.

## Practical Results of the Church Federation Movement

K. C. RUSSELL

No movement inaugurated during recent years is probably of greater significance than the Inter-Church Federation Movement. It is one which can not fail to be attended with tremendous consequences, and, if followed to its logical outcome, will terminate in results which ought to cause every thoughtful person to shudder in advance.

The outcome of this federation movement has been plainly outlined in the "sure word of prophecy." History also illustrates, by similar movements, its meaning.

Concerning its importance, the chairman of the Inter-Church Federation Conference, recently held in New York City, said: "This is one of the most notable assemblies of believers in Jesus Christ that has ever been seen. John Calvin wrote to Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, and declared he would cross any sea to make such a union effective. The dream of the great reformer and the great archbishop has met with realization in these latter days."

### *A Bible Prohibition of Confederacy*

"Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid." Isa. 8:12. It is evident, from the context of this passage, that God's professed people inaugurated this federation movement against which He warned them, because they had departed from Him, and "refused the waters of Shiloh that go softly," and "vexed His Holy Spirit."

The rejection of the Holy Spirit lies at the foundation of every church federation which has blighted the prosperity of the church during her history. The only union the true church has ever sought is a union

with Jesus Christ, the great Head of the church; and when such a union has been maintained, mighty power has attended it. As evidence of this, one has but to revert to apostolic times, when the Church went forth "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners."

Years ago much power attended revival efforts, conducted by such men as Professor Finney, President of Oberlin College, and later, by Mr. Moody and others. These old-time revivals were attended with a harvest of souls; but they are largely now things of the past. Many ministers deplore the absence of spiritual power which prevails to such an alarming extent at the present time. Realizing keenly the weakness and lack of spiritual life which characterized the once spirit-filled church with a power which brought conviction to sin-sick souls, churchmen are seeking for some remedy by which the church may regain her former power.

The means by which this restoration of former power is sought, is a gigantic church federation movement, through which the church may secure the power of the state to institute moral reforms and enforce her decrees. To many, at first thought, this may seem an innocent, harmless, and desirable thing. For this reason we desire to submit a few of the inevitable practical results of such a union.

One of the results of this movement was outlined by a prominent delegate at the conference, as follows:

"I trust that one of the practical results of this conference will be the organization of a force that lawbreakers and lawmakers will respect and heed when great questions of morals are involved. Our gospel is the fulfilment of the law. It is our province, in the name of our Supreme King, and seeking the good of mankind, to ask rulers to respect the code of our kingdom. Rulers may ignore sects, but they will respect the church. This federation will compel an audience, and it will speak with power if it will put aside its differences and make its agreement its argument."

When the end has been attained for which they have been seeking, we will have a parallel to that which existed in the fourth century, when the bishops of Rome were united in compelling the Emperor Constantine and others to yield to their demands concerning the settlement of "grave

moral questions," among which was chiefly the enforcement of Sunday observance by law.

#### *A Church Trust*

Another result of the evil principles underlying this proposed Federation will be a veritable church union, or trust; and the same tactics will doubtless be employed by it as are common to other unions. Freedom to preach the gospel will be denied. Any denomination not conforming to the creed, rules, and regulations of this religious trust, will be regarded as an unlawful rival. This was indicated by one speaker at the recent conference, who said:

"No community in which any denomination has any legitimate claim, should be entered by any other denomination through its official agencies without conference with the denomination or denominations having said claims. A feeble church should be revived, if possible, rather than a new one established to become its rival."

This is an age of unions and confederacies. Every department of the commercial world is being bound together. The power which is being wielded by these unions in securing their desired ends has exerted an influence which the church, in its worldly condition, has been unable to resist. On this point a prominent speaker at the recent Inter-Church Federation Conference said: "The two words which express the principles that rule to-day in the business world are co-operation and economy. Apply these two thoughts to the work of the church. Our sects and denominations have often been sources of rivalry and competition, and they have left the church as a whole weakened and shorn of its power. We have not presented a united front against a common enemy, but have too often fired into one another's camps. . . . Co-operation through a closer federation is the need of the hour."

It will readily be seen from this proposal that any denomination which does not belong to the union, would at once be considered a "rival," or, in a more characteristic term familiar to all unions, a "scab." This would at once arouse endless animosities and controversies between the union and the sects which are not connected with the federation, or union. Such a course would result only in the federated

churches bringing pressure to bear upon those who refuse to yield to their demands, which would be nothing short of religious persecution. Again it will be seen that the only safe union for the church, the only true union, is a union with Christ.

#### *A Remarkable Forecast*

In a sermon, in the year 1846, Charles Beecher declared:

"The ministry of the evangelical Protestant denominations is not only formed all the way up under a tremendous pressure of merely human fear, but they live, and move, and breathe in a state of things radically corrupt, and appealing every hour to every baser element of their nature to hush up the truth, and bow the knee to the power of apostasy. Was not this the way things went with Rome? Are we not living her life over again? And what do we see just ahead?—Another general council! A world's convention! evangelical alliance, and universal creed!"

When this state of things shall have been reached, then, in the effort to secure complete uniformity, it will be only a step to the resort to force.

The following striking paragraphs from a work entitled, "The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan" show how another, with remarkable foresight, outlined this federation movement years ago:

"There has been for years, in churches of the Protestant faith, a strong and growing sentiment in favor of a union based upon common points of doctrine. To secure such a union, the discussion of subjects upon which all were not agreed—however important they might be from a Bible standpoint—must necessarily be waived."

"When the leading churches of the United States, uniting upon such points of doctrine as are held by them in common, shall influence the state to enforce their decrees and to sustain their institutions, then Protestant America will have formed an image of the Roman hierarchy, and the infliction of civil penalties upon dissenters will inevitably result."

Should not every minister and lawmaker in the land protest against this scheme that can only result in the establishment of a complete union of church and state in this country, with all its attendant evils?

## The Church's Need Greatest To-day

A. G. DANIELLS

"TAKE heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood."

These words of the apostle Paul define who constitute the church of God. It is composed of all those in every nation who have by faith accepted Christ, been washed from their sins, and "purchased with His own blood." These believers are "members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." The true head of this mystic body is not some vicar on earth, but our divine Lord himself. He is the "head of the church," the "Saviour of the body." From Him, the invisible Head come all the life and power which have ever been manifested in His true church.

To His body, the church militant, He has committed a mighty work. With His work on earth finished, and standing but a step from His Father's throne, He commissioned His church to go into all the world and teach every nation, kindred, and tongue. To the entire world, perishing in sin, they were to carry the everlasting gospel. How could this be done? With the commission is the power. "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth . . . and, lo, I am with you always, even until the end of the world."

They had been eye witnesses of His power. They had seen Him heal the sick, and still with a word the stormy elements. They had seen sin-stricken souls, whom Satan had chained to his chariot, delivered; and some who had passed under the dominion of death, come forth from the prison house of the enemy, clothed with the bloom of health and youthful vigor.

And now He assures them that with all the power in the universe at His disposal, He will be with His struggling

church till the end of time, as its divine Leader. Endowed with this heavenly commission the church began its work. They began at Jerusalem, with a dead church, filled with bigoted Pharisees, Sadducees, and hypocrites, and trusting in lifeless forms and ceremonies.

But a mighty power was seen. Superstitions and traditions of men were swept away. Priests and rulers were powerless to stay the onward march of the gospel. A very brief pe-



CHURCH AT ALEXANDRIA, VA., WHERE  
WASHINGTON ATTENDED

riod after Pentecost they were forced to confess that Jerusalem was filled with the apostles' doctrine. The ramparts of the enemy were stormed, and the strongholds of sin captured. The Roman Empire, the mightiest incarnation of power which had ever appeared on the earth, held sway over all the world. But this iron monarchy was powerless before the humble fishermen, who, clothed with divine power, and led by the One who commands the armies of heaven, "went forth and preached the word everywhere."

The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to the believer. The agency through which this power is communicated to the church is that of the Holy Spirit. In the "upper room," before leaving His disciples, Jesus promised them a helper. As He looked out into the world, darkened with sin,—a wilderness in which His disciples were to go forth like sheep among wolves,—He well understood that more than the power born of a human confederacy would be needed to meet the organized forces of the principalities and powers of wicked spirits. To comfort them, He said, "And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever." He was leaving them, and returning to His Father; but He promised to send them "another," a personal representative and successor, to take His place in His church on earth, till time would end. He promised that He would not leave them orphans. Just as a father, dying, says to his children, "I am going to leave you; but another will come and take my place, who will remain with you forever." O, what a promise!

And on the day of Pentecost, in burning power the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead, came and took His official position in the church. The Book of Acts contains the history of the church immediately following the baptism of the Holy Spirit. This book might well be named the "Acts of the Holy Spirit." It records what was wrought by the church under the leadership of the Holy Spirit. The temporal power of earthly kingdoms gave way before the spiritual power of the church; sinners were converted; and, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners," the church went forth "conquering and to conquer." They made no appeal to Cæsar (the state) for aid; but everywhere they were opposed by the power of the state: yet they triumphed gloriously. They sought no union or federation in order to secure power and wax great; for they were already endowed by the Head of the church with a power infinitely greater than the power of all the combined kingdoms of this world. The only union the church sought was the union with Christ through the Holy Spirit. It is only when the church has lost the power of God, when her grasp on the "sword of the Spirit" has been paralyzed by sin, when

her accumulated iniquity has divorced her from Christ, the real Head of the church, that she seeks, through federations, to lay hold of the sword of Cæsar, and by this means endeavors to accomplish that which can be done only through the power of the Holy Spirit.

It is with sadness that we see the professed church of Christ to-day seeking for power by appealing to the state for help. It indicates a moral degeneracy; it denotes an alarming loss of spiritual strength. It is a sad spectacle, indeed, when a woman turns from her lawful husband, and asks help from strangers. It is equally sad to see the church turning from her professed Spouse, and seeking help from the state.

Power to convert sinners will never be obtained by federation. Every such union, or combine, will be wholly abortive. The Holy Spirit is the only agency which can change the sinful, deceitful heart of man. The only power which can stay the incoming tide of wickedness, which is sweeping over the land, threatening to carry everything to ruin, and before which the professed church of God stands helpless, is the third person of the Godhead, the Holy Spirit. This is the church's greatest need to-day. Instead of federating, and sending petitions to Congress for help to stem the prevailing flood of iniquity, the church should seek unity with Christ, and send its petitions to the throne of God, and with strong crying and tears, and repentance and confession of sin, seek for an outpouring of the Holy Spirit. When professed Christians confederate as they should with the powerful agencies above, they will have no need of forming worldly and artificial federations to gain control of worldly power. Ezra said, "I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way." The crimson blush of shame should likewise mantle the cheeks of every Christian to-day as he witnesses the efforts being made by the professed church of Jesus Christ everywhere to secure, by human legislation, help to do the work given it to do. It is a flag which it is hanging from its masthead as a signal of distress and weakness. Instead of turning to the broken cisterns of earth, let the church seek the living stream of the Holy Spirit, and a pentecostal baptism of power from on high.

## The Civil Sabbath

G. B. THOMPSON

THE promoters of Sunday laws have much to say about the "civil Sabbath." But this term is both confusing and misleading, for there is no such thing as a "civil Sabbath." The term itself is contradictory. As well might one speak of a civil prayer, a civil baptism, or a civil communion. The Fourth of July, Washington's Birthday, and Memorial Day, are civil institutions. But are those who are asking for Sunday laws willing that the "civil Sabbath" should be treated as are these civil holidays? If not, why not? Why make a distinction between one civil institution and another? Why permit labor and amusements on the Fourth of July, and prohibit them on Sunday, if both are civil institutions?

The Sabbath is not a civil but a religious institution. It rests on a divine precept. Its observance is a duty which man owes to his Creator, and its desecration is a spiritual and not a civil offense; a sin and not a crime. But a spiritual offense can never rightfully be punished by civil laws, and any attempt to do so necessitates a union of church and state. All the dreary history of the terrible inquisition and the Dark Ages, in which savages were made to shudder at the name of Christianity, was only the result of the church seeking to mete out punishment for religious offenses by the power of the state.

In civil offenses, such as fraud, burglary, arson, or assault, the extent of the crime can be measured, and the damage made good by a pecuniary consideration; but not so in religious matters. Sabbath breaking is a sin against God, and can never be atoned for by fine or imprisonment. It is a spiritual offense, which can be purged only by the blood of Christ applied to the heart by faith.

But the Sabbath command is only one of the precepts of the Bible. Why single out "Sabbath observance" as a subject for legislation, and neglect other things which the Bible commands? For instance, the Bible tells us that the "tenth shall be holy unto the Lord." This is as plain as the command respecting the Sabbath. But would those favoring a compulsory Sunday law favor a law compelling all to give a tenth of their income for religious pur-

poses? Quite a protest would doubtless be raised concerning the impropriety of such a law. But why should Congress be asked to pass a law requiring a person to give one seventh of his time for worship, any more than to give one tenth of his income for religious purposes? One is no more out of place than the other.

Then there is the Lord's Supper, an ordinance established by the Saviour himself. Why not petition the honorable and respected members of Congress to enact a law requiring at stated intervals every citizen in the District of Columbia—the agnostic, the Jew, the blasphemer, the Christian—to assemble and partake of these sacred emblems? O, says one, it would be sacrilegious for this holy ordinance to be enforced upon everybody! Indeed, but is it not equally sacrilegious to attempt to force upon everybody, by law, the observance of the Sabbath?

Again, take baptism. The Saviour commanded this ordinance also. But are those seeking for laws to make compulsory the observance of the "Lord's Day" in favor of a law compelling all to be baptized? Why seek to enforce the Lord's Day any more than the Lord's baptism, or the Lord's Supper? Why would it not be as proper to legislate upon the one as the other. If it is right to compel individuals to observe a Sabbath, regardless of their convictions, it is equally proper to compel them to be baptized. It may be urged that all are not agreed as to the "mode" of baptism. Very true. Neither are all agreed as to the proper day to be observed. Shall Congress be asked to settle which day is the Sabbath, and determine how it shall be observed? The right of judgment as to which day is the Sabbath, and the manner of its observance, belongs to the individual, not to the state. Every citizen should decide when and how he shall worship, untrammelled by any legal enactments or requirements. Manifestly the true sphere of the state is to deal with civil questions, and not to settle religious controversies. Are the Baptists willing to adopt sprinkling at the dictation of the state? Are the communicants of the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and other churches, prepared to adopt immersion as the proper mode of baptism, by vote of the members of Congress?

Then, there is the Lord's Prayer. It

certainly is right to pray. Everybody ought to pray. The Master told us to pray always. Then why does not the National Reform Bureau petition Congress for a law compelling every citizen in the District of Columbia to say the Lord's Prayer once a day, or once a week? Why enforce the "Lord's Day," and neglect the Lord's Prayer? But how much piety would there be in saying this beautiful prayer under such circumstances? Just the same amount as there would be in keeping the Lord's Day under like circumstances.

The recent bill introduced into Congress (H. R. 10510) by Representative Allen, of Maine, states that it is a bill to "protect the first day of the week as a day of rest." But a Sabbath of divine appointment needs no human protection. And no special legislation is needed to maintain civility on the first day of the week. The laws which guarantee police protection on other days of the week, do the same on Sunday. Mid-week prayer meetings are held, and revivalists conduct services day and night, and the labor performed around them is not considered or complained of as a disturbance. Funeral services are held daily in churches, where, in brokenness of spirit, friends weep around the bier of the dead, and the pastor speaks words of consolation, and no one is disturbed by the ordinary routine of business going on. Clubs and lodges meet during the week, and conduct their forms and ceremonies, and say nothing about being disturbed or molested. The Jews who worship in their synagogues on Saturday, and the Seventh-day Baptists, and Seventh-day Adventists, who meet in their various places of worship on the seventh day, are not disturbed by the labor performed while they worship. Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, and others, who consider certain services appropriate to Christmas, Good Friday, Ascension Day, Lent, many Saints' Days, and the like, conduct their worship upon these days undisturbed. No laws are asked compelling others to be idle on these days while they worship. Why then this continual clamor for laws demanding cessation of labor on Sunday? Why is labor perfectly proper on all these other days and occasions mentioned, but so objectionable and such a disturbance if performed on Sunday that those who perform it must be fined and imprisoned? It is as clear as a sunbeam that

it is the supposedly religious character of the day that is the thing in question, and it is this that Congress is being asked to protect. And it was this same wicked union of church and state which engulfed the world in the gloom of the Dark Ages for a thousand dreary years. Let the people beware lest the clock of liberty and progress be turned back, and the smoldering embers of a religious tyranny be fanned again into a flame.

Enforced idleness never tends to civility. An idle brain is the devil's workshop. To close up all places of business, stop all work, forbid proper recreation on Sunday, and thus remove the restraints which are imposed upon society by the six days of labor, and turn out a large population of both old and young with nothing to do, exposes them to temptation and vice rather than shields them from it. It tends to unsettle established habits of virtue, and turn the day into a time of dissipation and disorder instead of order and quietness. Idleness, with its attendant evils, does far more to make people uncivil and prepare them for the penitentiary and the gallows, than honest labor. It is in the interest of morality and religion, and that the day may not be turned into a curse through compulsory idleness, and the ship of state wrecked on the rocks of a union with the church by seeking to protect and foster some form of religion, that we call attention to these things, and earnestly protest against all Sunday laws, or governmental interference in religious matters.

THE hold which the Catholic Church had acquired upon the French nation through the long-standing union of church and state, based upon the Concordat, is being demonstrated by unpleasant events. The state some time ago began taking an inventory of Catholic Church property, and now the church has taken an attitude of open resistance to the state, and in some places has placed her own armed guard about the church buildings, with orders to resist the government troops. Opposition by the church to the state program for carrying into effect the separation from the church led recently to the embarrassment of the government by the overthrow of the Rouvier ministry, and the church, emboldened by this success, has become more bold and defiant than before.

## The Sphere of the Gospel Minister

W. A. SPICER

"PREACH the Word!" That is the order from Heaven. "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His Kingdom; Preach the Word."

And what a power there is in this Word. The Gospel is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," and "this is the Word which by the Gospel is preached unto you." The ministry of the Word is the ministry of the very power and might of the God of Heaven for the salvation of sinners.

Not the combined forces of all the governments of earth could set one soul free from the bondage of sin, nor plant renewing grace in one sinful heart. In this realm only the power of God — creative power — can avail. All the church organizations of the world, allied with all the kingdoms of this world, could never force faith into any man's heart. Just one thing will do it — "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." To preach that all-powerful, faith-creating word of salvation is the office and commission of the Christian minister.

"The weapons of our warfare are not carnal," said the apostle Paul, chiefest of preachers. It is when men forget the nature of Christ's kingdom, or lose their hold upon the power of the living God, that they turn to carnal weapons, and seek to advance the cause of religion by human legislation. The Reformation of the sixteenth century brought soul liberty and light and life to mankind just in proportion as it uncompromisingly held to the platform laid down by Luther, when he said, "It is by the Word that we must fight. . . . I am unwilling to employ force against the superstitious or the unbelieving. Let him who believes approach; let him who believes not stand aloof — none ought to be constrained. Liberty is of the essence of faith."

This does not leave the Gospel minister defenseless in the world. He has pledged to him all the power of the kingdom which he represents: "We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."

As the ambassador of a kingdom of righteousness which accepts only the service that springs from the heart, the Gospel minister can never righteously ally himself with any movement on earth that seeks by constraint of human force to compel religious observances. The true principle was thus stated by Dr. R. S. MacArthur, in his declaration of the historic Baptist position: —

"The Baptist doctrine that a man could be made a Christian only by the free action of his own spiritual nature left the civil magistrate nothing to do [with religious observances]. . . . They saw that while a man might by force be brought to baptism or the Lord's Supper, he could not by force be brought to believe. Others might abstain from persecution because their pity was



"PREACH THE WORD"

stronger than their creed, but Baptists refrained from attempting to force men to become Christians because their fundamental principle was that it was impossible to do this."

This is an echo of that voice that cried in Judea, "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink." The invitation breathes through all the Gospel story. "Whosoever will, let him come." Directly opposed to this Gospel was the spirit of the Dark Ages, when "the branding tool and the bloody whip" was "the summons to Christian fellowship." Then weakness and ruin came upon the church. Against every tendency toward substituting the power of the state and coercive legislation for the power of God in religious observances, the Gospel pulpit must ever protest.

That was a striking rebuke administered by a young Russian exile in Chicago, when effort was being made by his church to secure legislation to promote the interests of Sunday observance. Rising from his place, and speaking in broken English, he said: —

"I am from Russia, the land of intolerance; the land of a union of church and state. I have seen the scars on the wrists of the missionaries whom you sent to my country,—scars made by chains placed on them by Russia's union of church and state. I joined the Baptist church in Russia because it trusted in God, not in the state. And now I come to America and enter my beloved Baptist church, and hear you petitioning Congress for a law to bind



MARTIN LUTHER

chains on the wrists of your fellowmen. In the name of God, send your petitions to the throne of God, and not to the Congress of the United States."

Yes, in our own time, there is need of calling the pulpit to stand loyal and true to the Great Commission: "All power is given unto Me. . . . Go ye therefore."

### The Proper Tribunal

IN settling religious controversies appeal should be made to the Word of God, not to human councils, courts, and laws of men. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8:20.

### The Sabbath Not a Proper Subject for Legislation

J. S. WASHBURN

"THE seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," not of the state. The highest authority in the universe has, once for all, legislated on the matter of the weekly rest day.

"God is a Spirit," and His law is "spiritual." The rest of the Sabbath of the Lord must, therefore, be a spiritual rest. Only those who are spiritual, in other words, only those who are free from sin, can properly keep the Sabbath. And only the Spirit of God, received through faith in Christ, can free a man from sin, and enable him to keep the spiritual Sabbath of the Lord. Hence, for any man or any human government to attempt to legislate on the matter of the weekly rest day, is an assumption of that power and authority which belongs to God and to the work of His Spirit. It is an attempt to do that which, in the very nature of things, is impossible. "The carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

Human legislation can secure only an outward obedience. It can not reach the heart. Hence, earthly, human government, can, in the very nature of things, deal only with that which is outward; and even then, rightfully, only with that which pertains to the relationship between man and man. It can compel civility under civil penalties. It can not properly deal in any way whatsoever with the relation of man to his Maker.

An outward observance of even those religious forms that are right, while the heart is full of evil, is but the whitening of the sepulcher that is "full of dead men's bones and all manner of uncleanness." Open wickedness is better than hypocrisy. The greatest calamity that can come to the humble, spiritual church of Christ is for it to be popularized, and filled up with those who are satisfied with a legal, outward service, who are simply obeying the human, and not the divine, law. Baptism, the Lord's supper, the true Sabbath, or any spiritual ordinance of God, could not suffer a more terrible blow than to be legally enforced by the state.

Christians, who, in obedience to the law of God, and following the example of Christ, observe the seventh day as the

Sabbath, would protest against the making of a law for the compulsory observance of that day. Even the church has no right to enforce Sabbath observance by fines, imprisonment or civil penalties. Only under a true theocracy, or a government of God, like that of Israel in Old Testament times, could any religious law be rightfully enforced. The United States is not a theocracy. This government is "for and *by the people*." There is no true theocracy on earth to-day.

In religious matters men are responsible to God only. The Sabbath, being in its nature wholly religious, is therefore beyond the rightful sphere of civil government. The founders of this nation recognized this fact, when they declared that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The true Sabbath neither needs nor asks for any human law to enforce its observance. For authority it has the law of the eternal God, and the example of Jesus. This is sufficient. It is only a substitute for the true Sabbath that needs, or that demands, the prop of human legislation. There being neither law nor example in either the Old or the New Testament for the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, as the Sabbath, or Lord's day, its only support or authority is human. To perpetuate its existence it therefore needs and demands human legislation.

The true Sabbath has been sacredly enshrined in the heart of those precepts, spoken from Sinai, that are in their very nature unchangeable and everlasting. It is the keystone, the seal, of the law of God. The seventh-day Sabbath was made by Christ at creation, and kept by Him, and by His followers after His crucifixion, and will be observed by the redeemed in the new earth. Isa. 66:22, 23.

Speaking of His people, the children of Israel, the Lord says: "I gave them my Sabbaths to be a sign between Me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Ezek. 20:12. The true Sabbath is a sign or seal between God and His own faithful, obedient children. The holy prophet clearly points out that anti-Christian power which was to attempt to change the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, in the following scripture: "He shall speak great

words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws." Dan. 7:25. But no earthly power can come between God and His people, and attempt to take away the true Sabbath and substitute a rival sabbath,—the sign or mark of Antichrist,—in its stead, without fulfilling the terrible prophecy that speaks of the enforcement of the mark of apostasy and rebellion, and of the ruin of the world that follows. See Rev. 13:16, 17; 14:9-20. There is infinitely more evil in this matter of Sunday legislation than many have dreamed.

Commanded by God amidst the thunders of Sinai, engraven by the finger of the Almighty in the adamantine rock, and placed in the heart of those precepts which are the basis of the throne of the infinite Creator, Ruler, Lawgiver, and Judge, is the Sabbath law, unchanged and everlasting. Firm as the pillars of His throne, and as enduring as the life of its Author, is this sign, this seal, of the living God. With this, no human legislation has any right to tamper.

"If the Lord be God, follow Him." When human governments make laws conflicting with the law of God, then those who are loyal to God will answer, with the Apostles, "We ought to obey God rather than men." The question involved is not simply that of a day, as some erroneously suppose, but the question, Whom shall we obey? Back of the rival day is a rival power.

---

THE Sunday laws upon the statute-books of the States are dead letters; they are not enforced, and Sunday observance is not in a single State or city secured by the Sunday law. Occasionally the officials, under the prodding of a certain religious element in the community, enforce the law for a few weeks, but public sentiment soon turns against it because of the religious animosity which always shows itself in connection with such attempts, and then the law again becomes a dead letter. This is the record of every attempt that is made to put these old-time blue-laws on a level with other and proper acts of legislation. So far as the effect of such a law upon Sunday is concerned, it should be noted that Sunday is just as well observed in the District of Columbia, where there is no Sunday law, as it is in any other part of the country.

## What Are Works of Charity and Necessity?

G. B. THOMPSON

THE Sunday bill recently introduced into Congress, like those which have preceded it, makes provision for works of "charity or necessity."

These words cast an almost impenetrable cloud of obscurity over the meaning and application of the bill. Who is able to

seeking to settle that which no human mind can accurately determine for another.

What is the word "charity" intended to cover? Is it relieving pain, helping those in trouble, and doing kindly acts? If so, these can be made to cover a multitude of things which Sunday-law advocates do not sanction. It might be a commendable act of charity to chop wood on Sunday for a sick person, or to take a team and haul a ton of coal to a widow. Would this excuse

the man from arrest who chopped the wood or hauled the coal? To provide a free excursion into the country on Sunday, for the poor from the congested, unhealthy portions of a city, would be a charitable act. But would the men who are employed to run the train be liable to fine or imprisonment? Or should some philanthropic person charter a steamer and take some orphan children on Sunday down the river for an outing, would this excuse the captain and engineer from arrest for Sunday work?

Then whose "necessity" is meant in the bill? Is it the one who works, or the one for whom the labor is performed? A farmer may decide that, in order to get his crop planted in time, it is necessary for him to work on Sunday. Or in harvesting the same, he may think it necessary, in order to save his crop from destruction, that he not only work himself, but employ others on that day. Who is to determine this; the farmer, the judge, or the jury? It may not seem necessary to a contractor to push his work on Sunday; but it may seem imperative to the one for whom the work is being done. Or it may seem to the men working on the job, that it is necessary, in order to provide for their families, for them to work seven days in the week. Who is to

be the one to invade the privacy of the home, and settle these questions? Shall it be left with the individual, with representatives of the National Reform Bureau, or with the courts?

One man may conclude on a hot Sunday that it is a "necessity" for him to have some "refreshments." But there are thousands who live year after year without any refreshing drink, except water. It may



LAFAYETTE MONUMENT, WASHINGTON, D. C.

determine whether a certain deed is an act of "charity," or a "necessity"? In its truest sense charity is an act of religion, a thing of the heart; and no court, except the tribunal of the universal Judge, can determine the motives of the human soul. Courts have been cast upon a sea of uncertainty, and foundered in their vain efforts to find a harbor, and have become entangled in hopeless contradictions, in

not be necessary for a man to be shaved or have his hair cut on Sunday, but the barber may know that in order to properly provide for his family it is necessary for him to shave his customers on that day. Again the delivering of ice to the rich, who have ways of keeping it over Sunday, may not be a necessity, but to the poor, sweltering in the congested tenements of the cities, the case may be far different. Whose necessity shall be considered, the rich or the poor? Who is prepared to swear that it is absolutely necessary for a man to get up on Sunday morning, or to eat a meal. It is convenient, of course; but this is not the question. If only acts of actual necessity are to be permitted by the promoters of Sunday laws, where shall the line be drawn?

It is needless to add more. Enough has been said to call attention to the fact that this clause which is introduced into nearly all Sunday bills is merely a subterfuge to extricate men from the difficulties in which they are involved when once the state enters a field upon which it has no right. Concerning the intricate questions involved, no human mind can discriminate, and the vain jangling which would be necessary in order to find the way out of the labyrinth of confusion concerning this matter is but a sample of the sea of endless controversy upon which the state embarks when once it enters the realm of religion.

## The Extent of Sunday Laws in the United States, and Some of Their Evil Effects

K. C. RUSSELL

THE question of Sunday legislation is assuming gigantic proportions in this country. Every State in the Union, except California and Idaho, and the Territory of Arizona, has a Sunday law, and in many of these there are demands for even more rigid laws than they now possess. Not only are Sunday laws found here, but in almost every other country throughout the world. This question is one concerning which none can escape responsibility; all must take their stand for or against these laws.

The advocates of Sunday legislation have said and written so much concerning the necessity of such laws as being in the in-

terests of morality, that many have become blinded and deceived as to the evil effects of such legislation.

It will be found, by considering their effects upon every phase of society, that Sunday laws are a terrible menace to city, state, and nation; and it is high time that their evil results were pointed out, that all may understand their true nature.

Sunday laws produce hypocrites, because they compel a person to outwardly appear religious when he is not.

Sunday laws infringe upon the rights of conscience, because they enter the realm of religion, which is the realm of conscience.

Sunday laws are a species of class legislation; because they favor one class of religionists at the expense of others.

Sunday laws are favorite tools for the work of inquisitors. They encourage one class of citizens to spy out the liberties of another class who do not believe in observing the day as they do.

Sunday laws are the cause of upright and honest Christian people being compelled to appear before courts as criminals for exercising their God-given right to work six days and rest on the seventh.

Sunday laws are productive of immorality, because they make idleness compulsory. On this point, Dr. W. W. Evert, a prominent Baptist clergyman, in "The Sabbath, Its Defense," says: "It were better no Sabbath were given to the poor than that they should spend it in dissipation. Uninterrupted toil is not so debasing to the body, mind, estate, or character."

Sunday laws violate the golden rule, which says, "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Those who ask others to observe a day which they do not regard as sacred, would not wish to be compelled to observe a day which they do not believe to be sacred.

Sunday laws are a prolific source of religious persecution, as is evidenced by the fact that from 1885 to 1896, as the result of their enforcement, over one hundred Seventh-day Adventists in the United States, and about thirty in foreign countries, were prosecuted in fifteen States, for quiet work performed on the first day of the week, resulting in fines and costs amounting to \$2,269.69, and imprisonments totaling 1,438 days, and 455 days served in chain gangs.

Sunday laws are resulting in turning the state and nation backward to medieval times. The States which have fined and imprisoned those who observe the seventh day, have even been stigmatized as "backward States," by Mr. W. F. Crafts, a champion of Sunday legislation, in an article published in the *Washington Post*, of April 3, 1905. Should the principles of the National Reformers be carried out by all the States, they would all become "backward States."

It is evident from the foregoing, that Sunday laws tend only to evil, and should therefore be repealed.

## Sunday Legislation Traced to Its Source

C. S. LONGACRE

### *Significant Acknowledgments*

IN a book just published by the National Reform Association, entitled, "Sabbath Laws in the United States," by R. C. Wylie, D. D., a prominent worker in the Association, every Sunday law in every State in the Union is quoted, and is traced back to the Sunday laws of the colonies; these laws are traced back to the Act of Charles II, of England; from England, Sunday laws are traced back through the divisions of the Roman empire; and from these divisions, they are traced to the edict of Constantine, issued in the year 321 A. D., which the work styles "the first Sunday law."

The first page of the book says: "At the time of the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, the law known as the Twentieth, Charles II, Chapter VII, enacted in 1676, was the Sabbath law in force in all the American colonies. In legal circles it is regarded as the immediate historical antecedent of all our present Sabbath legislation." After quoting the Sunday law of Charles II, the author says: "This, with a few supplementary sections, is still the Sabbath law of England," and "in a few of our States, Sabbath laws are still modeled after the Act of Charles II."

Continuing, the author says: "Legislation for the protection of the first day of the week as a day of rest may be traced back, through the history of the various nations into which the Roman empire was divided, to the edict of Constantine, issued

in the year 321 A. D., which is often called the first 'Sunday law.'"

This is simply a plain statement of the historical facts respecting Sunday laws. They originated with Constantine in the fourth century of the Christian era, and come down to us as relics of a union of church and state under pagan, papal, and Protestant rulers.

"One very important point of difference is to be noted, however," says Mr. Wylie, "between English and American legislation, and legislation in Continental Europe. In the latter there is but seldom any reference to a divine warrant for Sabbath laws, while Sabbath laws in England, especially from the Reformation period, and in America from the planting of the first colonies, have been based upon the law of God. From this it follows that in our country no other day than the first day of the week is regarded as possessing a sacred character. We have a few holidays, but no other holy day than the Lord's day. It follows likewise that the day thus recognized among us as holy and protected by law from desecration is a vastly different thing from a continental Sunday."

This sounds very different from the "civil sabbath" talk sometimes indulged in by advocates of Sunday legislation. Sunday is here plainly called a "holy day," and, through Sunday laws, this "holy day," it is asserted, is "protected by law from desecration."

But note the admission here made. The ancient Sunday laws, after which our present Sunday laws "are still modeled," were lacking because they were not, like our modern Sunday laws, "based on the law of God," and seldom made "any reference to a divine warrant." Why wonder at this difference, when the first Sunday law was made by a pagan ruler, for his pagan and half-pagan subjects, to do homage to "the venerable day of the sun," dedicated to the sun-god, whom he then worshiped? Both the makers of the first Sunday laws, and the church bishops who demanded them, knew full well that there was no divine warrant for either the Sunday institution or for Sunday legislation. And no amount of modern legislation can supply this warrant. The best the friends of either can do is to clothe the wolf in sheep's clothing; but he is a wolf still. Neither a first-day sabbath nor a first-day sabbath law can.

with any propriety or show of reason, be based on the law of God which requires the observance of the seventh day.

#### *The Spirit of Intolerance Revealed*

The remarks of the author regarding the clauses in various State Sunday laws which exempt those who keep the seventh day, reveal the true spirit of religious intolerance that is back of this whole Sunday-law movement.

The exemption clause in the Sunday law of the State of Maine reads thus: "No person conscientiously believing that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as the Sabbath, and actually refraining from secular business and labor on that day, is liable to said penalties for doing such business on the first day of the week, if he does not disturb other persons." — *Sec. 28.*

But note Mr. Wylie's comment on this. He says: "The law of this State is deserving of high praise. The exception, however, in favor of those who observe Saturday goes too far in allowing them to do business as well as to labor on the Lord's day."

Concerning the Sunday laws of Michigan and their exemption, he says: "With the exception of the liberty allowed to Saturday-keepers both to labor and to transact business on the Sabbath [Sunday], this law is of superior excellence."

Referring to the Sunday law of Connecticut, he says: "The law of this State is defective in permitting those who observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath to engage in both business and labor on the Lord's day. In other respects it is an excellent statute."

Similar remarks are made concerning other exemption clauses.

We do not quote these because we are in favor of Sunday laws with exemptions; but to show the real spirit that actuates the so-called "Reformers" and advocates of Sunday legislation.

This is still more clearly shown from the following regarding the Arkansas Sunday law: "In 1886 the Supreme Court of Arkansas, in *Seales versus State*, upheld the constitutionality of the law whether or not it excepts from its operation, either wholly or in part, those who keep another day. The court said: 'The law which imposes the penalty operates upon all

alike.'" In other words, all, irrespective of conscientious convictions or religious belief or practise, must bow to the Sunday decree of the State. Note the "Reformers" approval of this law: "There are few States whose Sabbath laws deserve more praise and less criticism than that of Arkansas."

In a map of the United States published in the book, the States having the strongest Sunday laws are represented in white; those having laws "weakened by numerous exceptions," are shaded; while the two States and one Territory having no Sunday law, are printed in black.

From all this it is plain to be seen how, if church and state are united here, the prophecy of Rev. 13:11-18 will meet its fulfilment in this country, and how those who "fear God and keep his commandments" will be put under the ban of merciless measures. In the utterances here quoted are revealed the dragon voice against those who refuse to worship an apostate power, and receive its mark. Let all beware of the spirit behind Sunday legislation.

## Lessons from History

W. A. COLCORD

EVERY fifty years, according to divine command, Israel was to "proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." Lev. 25:10. They failed to do this, and became proud, selfish, and oppressive; therefore God said to them: "Ye have not hearkened unto me, in proclaiming liberty, every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor: behold, I proclaim a liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine; and I will make you to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth." Jer. 34:17. From this we may learn that God loves liberty and hates oppression, and that he will punish those who oppress their fellow men.

God's law forbids making and bowing down to images. Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, made a great image, and commanded all to bow down and worship it. Three Hebrews refused, for which they were cast into the fiery furnace. But God miraculously delivered them, thus demonstrating that civil rulers have no right to

make any law that is contrary to the law of God, and that when they do so, men have a right to disregard such laws, and to obey the higher law of God. Earthly rulers are not the highest rulers. "There be higher than they." Eccl. 5:8.

In His Word, God says: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." Darius, king of Persia, made a decree that for thirty days no one should pray to any god or man save himself. Three times a day, ninety times in all, Daniel disregarded this law and prayed to the God of heaven. He was cast into the den of lions; but God sent His angel and protected him from harm. From this we may learn that no earthly power has a right to come between another soul and God; that when it does, it usurps the place and power of God, and persecution inevitably follows.

Christ commissioned His apostles to go and preach in all the world the good tidings of salvation through His name, beginning at Jerusalem. They did as commanded; but the Jewish authorities objected, and cast them into prison. But an angel of the Lord opened the prison doors, and said to the apostles: "Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life." They obeyed. Again the authorities arrested them, and asked, "Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name?" "Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 5:29.

Like many to-day, the emperor Diocletian held that religion must form the basis of any permanent system of government. To save the empire from ruin, therefore, he called for a general revival of the pagan worship. The Christians refused to take part in this revival. Being but a small minority of the population, only one twelfth, Diocletian thought they should yield their peculiar faith, and unite in worship with the masses. But they thought otherwise; whereupon, urged by the fanatical Galerius, and particularly by the priests of the pagan cult, who saw that their influence was being undermined through the spread of the new

religion, Diocletian began a most bitter persecution against the Christians, which lasted for ten years, from 303-313 A. D., foretold by Christ in Rev. 2:10. But neither the revival of the state-established and state-enforced religion nor the persecution saved the empire. It fell. Modern church-and-state reformers would do well to study this lesson. The religion that will save men and nations from ruin can not be established or enforced by law. It is the religion established in the heart by faith which works by love and purifies the soul.

After referring to the Sunday laws of 321, 386, and 425 A. D., Neander, the historian, says: "In this way the church received help from the state for the further-



" TO THE LAW AND TO THE TESTIMONY "

ance of her ends." In other words, in this way church and state were united in the fourth and fifth centuries. What united church and state then will unite them again. The friends of Sunday legislation would do well to study this lesson also.

The first Sunday law forbade labor on the part of certain classes in the towns and cities only; the second law prohibited all work on Sunday; and the third forbade all plays and shows on this day, in order that the churches might have no competition; and still later Sunday laws, not only on the Continent and in England, but in some of the American colonies as well, required church attendance under fine, whipping, and even the death penalty.

These are lessons which should be most carefully studied just now.

RELIGION ceases to be religion in proportion as it is forced.

---

---

# News and Notes

---

---

POSTMASTER-GENERAL CORTELYOU has prohibited the use of the government frank for the purpose of mailing without cost copies of "Patriotic Studies," a book issued by the "Christian lobby" bureau at Washington, conducted by Rev. W. F. Crafts.

THE Pennsylvania Sunday law is being invoked to stop the running of Sunday trains in that State. March 1 seven B. & O. engineers and conductors at Uniontown were fined four dollars and costs each by Justice Boyle, and warrants were prepared for eleven other trainmen.

MR. EDWIN M. WHITE, a cranberry-bog owner, of Cape Cod, Mass., has been prosecuted on a charge of doing unnecessary Sunday work in connection with the harvesting of his cranberry crop. In a bill of exceptions filed by Mr. White he pointed out that times, customs, and ideas had changed since colonial days when the blue-laws flourished, but the court replied that while his statement was true, the Sunday law still remained on the statute-books and must be enforced. Mr. White also claimed exemption on the ground of necessity, the Sunday work being done to save his crop from spoiling. The court declared that the law was to be construed in harmony with the religious ideas of the times in which it was framed, and that it was meant to secure the proper observance of the "Lord's day" according to the practise of those times, and must be so observed to-day. The court in its argument made no pretense of enforcing a "civil sabbath," and made no claim that the law was not purely a religious one, but proceeded as if the enforcement of religious laws by the civil courts were a perfectly proper thing and in harmony with the principles of this republic. It ruled that the defendant was not exempt on the ground of necessity, and fined him for having profaned the "Lord's day."

ONCE more Congress is being asked to tread upon the forbidden ground of religious controversy, in the matter of granting an appropriation to the Jamestown Exposition, to be held in commemoration of

the three hundredth anniversary of the settlement of Virginia. We see it stated that a bill is before the House Committee of Industrial Arts and Expositions that calls for an appropriation of \$2,100,000 for this purpose. In a notice which is going the rounds of the religious press an appeal is made to "all citizens who believe in Sabbath rest, now greatly imperiled on every hand," to "send letters or telegrams to their own congressman and both senators," or to "secure petitions of churches or other bodies, to be sent in care of the appropriate congressman and one of the senators, addressed to the House and the Senate," requesting that the appropriation be made conditional upon Sunday closing of the exposition. It would be a good idea if some counter communications on the subject were sent to Congress just now by the friends of religious freedom.

Do exemption clauses exempt? In Pennsylvania recently it was held that the exemption for seventh-day observers did not apply because they began their day at sundown and not at midnight. And now from Minnesota comes another answer to the question, also in the negative. The Minnesota Sunday law contains a specific exemption for observers of the seventh day, but the following press paragraph tells how much effect this fact had on the court in the decision of a case: "St. Paul, Jan. 13. — An opinion of the municipal court of Minneapolis holding that the Sunday closing law is equally applicable to Jew and Gentile has been upheld by the Minnesota Supreme Court. The case was that of the State of Minnesota versus M. A. Weiss who was arrested and convicted on the charge of selling groceries on Sunday contrary to the Sunday closing law. Weiss, who is a Hebrew, alleged that this law is unconstitutional, the constitution providing that no preference shall be given by any law to any religion. His sabbath is Saturday. The Supreme Court did not sustain this view, however, but announced the doctrine that the 'Sunday law is justified as a sanitary measure and as a legitimate exercise of police power.'"

# LIBERTY

WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL, 1906

L. A. SMITH - - - - - *Editor*  
 W. A. COLCORD }  
 W. W. PRESCOTT } - - *Associate Editors*

Subscription Price - - 25 cents per year  
 To Foreign Countries - 50 " " "

Published Quarterly by

REVIEW & HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN.  
 TAKOMA PARK STATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Application made for entry as second-class matter, at the post-office at Washington, D. C., under the act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

THE trouble which France is now having to complete the severance of her union with the church, ought to be a warning to every other nation against being drawn into such an alliance.

THE favorable response that has been made to the announcement heralding the appearance of this magazine, shows that a place was waiting for it in the field of religious liberty work. The people evidently feel that it meets a demand of the times. Subscriptions have been coming in quite rapidly, and a highly useful career for LIBERTY seems assured from the start.

"OVERCOME evil with good," is a divinely given rule of procedure for those who are contending on the side of good. Overcome darkness with light. It is the only effective way. In the contest with ignorance, bigotry, and intolerance the best victories will be gained by calling attention to the brightness and beauty of the principles of religious freedom, and not by simply trying to make people see the darkness and ugliness of religious intolerance. Let light and darkness, beauty and ugliness, be put side by side, and the people will soon see the contrast, and make their choice between them.

"STRAWS show which way the wind is blowing." We desire to be kept as fully as possible in touch with public sentiment throughout the country regarding the prin-

ciples of religious freedom, and will appreciate any "straws" that may be gathered up in any place and forwarded to us. The real spirit that is behind a movement is sometimes more clearly revealed by some apparently trivial incident than by a set of resolutions put forth by its leaders at a public meeting.

SINCE this issue of LIBERTY began to be made ready for the press, two more Sunday bills have been introduced into Congress making four such bills that have been presented in the House, with one in the Senate, during the present session. The same activity in behalf of Sunday legislation is being shown at some of the State legislatures. The present activity in seeking to throw legal restraints around freedom in the practise of Sabbath observance, has never been surpassed, if it has been equaled, in any previous time since the existing Sabbath controversy began. Such facts very plainly show the necessity for renewed activity on the part of the friends of religious freedom in this country.

THE liberty for which this magazine stands is not that reckless sentiment called liberty by a certain class who have cut loose from the restraints of law, and desire to be guided only by their own fancy. This magazine will never offer any apology for the crimes committed by persons of this sort. We advocate liberty no more strongly than we advocate law. Liberty and law belong together; the two are inseparable. One of the chief reasons why so much now needs to be said and done in behalf of liberty, is that we are living in an era of lawlessness. Lawlessness means disregard by one or by many of the rights and interests of others. It means the oppression of the weak by the strong. Just in proportion as the spirit of lawlessness gains the ascendancy in any place, the liberty of the people is put in jeopardy. The divine law or moral code is called the "perfect law of liberty." If that law were perfectly obeyed, there would be perfect liberty. In contending for liberty we shall not forget to call attention to the exalted character of this highest law.

General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists

Washington, D. C. May 22, 1905.

To His Excellency President Roosevelt:-

*The world's Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists is now in session, at Takoma Park, in this city. From this body we have the honor of being a deputation chosen to extend to you the greetings of our people.*

*While our Saviour is the King of kings and Lord of lords, still, as Christians, we recognize that Civil Government is of Divine ordinance; and, while, in accordance with His command, we render to God the things that are God's, we also, according to the same command, cheerfully "render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's." As Protestants, we believe in the American idea of Civil Government. The principles upon which this national government was founded are our principles. We therefore honor the names of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln, and others of your predecessors who stood for the great principles of Civil and Religious Liberty, and approve your own position on the side of the rights of the people.*

*We wish you long life, and success in all that makes for the glory of God and for the peace and prosperity of this nation and of the world.*

THE above is a facsimile copy of an engrossed address from the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists to President Roosevelt, to which were attached the names of forty delegates, who, on the date named, waited on the President, and presented the address to him.



GODDESS OF LIBERTY SURMOUNT  
ING CAPITOL DOME