

CHRISTIANITY & Civil Government

With special application to the Image & Mark of the Beast

by Dr. Elliot Douglin



CHRISTIANITY & Civil Government

With special application to the Image & Mark of the Beast

by Dr. Elliot Douglin

Truth for the Final Generation
P.O. Box 725
Bridgetown, Barbados, W.I.
Tel/Fax (246) 421-7297
email: teachingtruth14@yahoo.com

Visit us on the web at <http://www.tffgbarbados.com>

or truthforthefinalgeneration1984.org

Copyright © 2019

Truth For The Final Generation, all rights reserved

THIS BOOK IS NOT FOR SALE

Complete books or requested portions are available in printed or electronic form by writing to the addresses above, by email, or by visiting our website.

Printed in Barbados

Cover design, book design and layout by:

Shammal Jordan

Email: shammaljordan@hotmail.com

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	<i>i</i>
CHAPTER 1	
<i>An Introductory Outline to the Basic Principles</i>	1
CHAPTER 2	
<i>Principles of Love and Freedom</i>	8
CHAPTER 3	
<i>Caesar and God</i>	15
CHAPTER 4	
<i>More on Matthew 22:21</i>	20
CHAPTER 5	
<i>An Advanced Study of Romans 13:1 to 9</i>	26
CHAPTER 6	
<i>The Development of Civil Society from Ancient to Modern Times & the Complexities of Civility</i>	31
CHAPTER 7	
<i>An Outline of the History of the Development of the Constitution of the USA Part 1</i>	38
CHAPTER 8	
<i>An Outline of the History of the Development of the Constitution of the USA Part 2</i>	46
CHAPTER 9	
<i>Opposition to the First Amendment in the Nineteenth Century</i>	55
CHAPTER 10	
<i>A History of the Evolution of Church – State Union and Sunday Legislation in the Fourth Century Part 1 ...</i>	62

CHAPTER 11

A History of the Evolution of Church - State Union and Sunday Legislation in the Fourth Century Part 1..... 69

CHAPTER 12

History of Sunday Laws in the 19th Century Part 1..... 75

CHAPTER 13

History of Sunday Laws in the 19th Century Part 2..... 82

CHAPTER 14

How Nations Rise and Fall Part 1..... 89

CHAPTER 15

How Nations Rise and Fall Part 2 - The Rise and Fall of Rome..... 94

CHAPTER 16

How Nations Rise and Fall Part 3 - The Rise and Fall of the USA..... 103

CHAPTER 17

The End-Time One World Religious-Economic-Political System..... 115

Appendix A..... 129

Appendix B..... 145

Bibliography..... 150

Key to abbreviations of the relevant E.G. White book titles

KEY:	BOOK TITLE
AA:	The Acts of the Apostles
DA:	The Desire of Ages
GC :	The Great Controversy
PK:	Prophets and Kings
RH:	Review & Herald
ST:	Signs of the Time

INTRODUCTION

The freedoms we now enjoy and take for granted, especially in the free democratic nations of Christendom, are becoming increasingly threatened because of a number of various developments now taking place in our ultra-modern world. This present generation is to a large extent ignorant of the history of intolerance in the Dark Ages and also ignorant of the history of the intense struggles involved in the development of the liberties we now enjoy, especially **liberty of conscience** in matters of faith and worship.

These Camp Meeting lectures include a comprehensive study of the history, the law and the theology of the development of the principles of **liberty of conscience**. Starting in the era of the **Protestant Reformation**, continuing through the era of the development of the USA Constitution and ending in the near future, this book seeks to reveal the lessons to be learnt from the past and to apply them to the future.

As global problems increase and intensify, as solutions are sought to such severe problems and as fear and panic take hold of the global psyche, the protestant principles of separation of church and state and liberty of conscience in matters of faith and worship, will be sacrificed upon the altar of popular opinion and, so-called, public morality.

A new Global System is ahead of us. Freedom of conscience will no longer be guaranteed, in fact it will be removed. We are living in the most exciting and at the same time, most perilous era in the modern history of our world. Notwithstanding the global movement for a new world order with union of church and state, there will be a **minority** who will boldly protest against the **removal** of religious freedom. That Protest will usher in a global crisis. The protesters will be subjected to progressively severe persecutory pressure and ultimately will be sentenced to death. This will usher in **the time of trouble such as never was!** (Daniel12:1).

The purpose of this book is to equip you with the knowledge to make the right choices in that time of global crisis.

Chapter 1



An Introductory Outline to the Basic Principles

The first question is: How should the Christian relate to the State?

The second question is: What are the basic Biblical principles involved?

BASIC PRINCIPLES

We shall study these basic principles under three subtitles:

Firstly: The Biblical principle of civil obedience.

Secondly: The Biblical purpose of Government.

Thirdly: The Biblical basis for civil disobedience.

THE BIBLICAL PRINCIPLES OF CIVIL OBEDIENCE

Scripture sources: Romans 13:1-7; 1 Tim. 2:1, 2; 1 Thess. 4:11, 12; Titus 3:1, 2; Jer. 29:7

THE BIBLICAL PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT

We live in a sinful world in which the majority of persons are not believers. (And even among believers may are not clear on the role of Civil Government).

Although the world has been legally bought back by Christ and all persons therefore have physical probationary existence, the world is experientially dominated by Satan's principles of rebellion. Read St. John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; Eph. 2:1, 2 1 John 5:19.

Therefore God has: ordained (Greek: Tasso: which means to allow or put in place for order) civil government to prevent chaos and anarchy.

The Apostle Paul gives us a number of important functions of civil government:

1. To restrain evil. Rom.13:3
2. To protect and support citizens. Rom. 13:3, 4
3. To punish law breakers. Rom 13:4

Modern types of punishment: Capital punishment, prison, fines.

Biblical types of punishment (under divine permission): Capital punishment; criminals working to pay back what was stolen.

Examples of Functions/Purposes of a civil government in Paul's day.

Acts 19: 23-41; Acts 22:24-30; Acts 25

THE BIBLICAL BASIS FOR CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

The Bible in both testaments teaches us clearly that there is exception or limitation to the Divine mandate of civil obedience: Whenever an ordinance or official command or civil law would require that a believer disobeys (his or her conscientious convictions of) the will or word of God, the believer ought to obey God rather than man.

EXAMPLES OF RIGHTEOUS CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

1. The Egyptian Pharaoh once ordered the killing of all Israelite male babies by their Jewish midwives. But the two midwives refused to comply with a civil directive which was against God's law Ex. 1:15-21

2. Daniel and his three companions arrived as exiles in Babylon and were chosen to study in the University of Babylon. The King's dietary directives were not in harmony with God's dietary laws, and they resolutely but politely declined to comply (Daniel 1).
3. Daniel's Three Companions attended a special convocation ordered by Nebuchadnezzar. That was civil obedience. But when King commanded all to bow down to the image, Daniel's 3 companions refused. Dan. 3:16-18, 24-27.
4. Our fourth example is the third occurrence in Daniel and is the well-known account of Daniel in the lion's den. He submitted himself to possible death rather than obey King Darius's decree that sought to prevent him from worshipping the true God (Daniel 6). God honored his faithful servant who behaved with dignity and respect but did not compromise his loyalty to God.
5. The New Testament also contains a noteworthy, memorable example of the proper exception to civil obedience. Read Acts 4:17-21; Acts 5:28, 29.

Remember also that in the exercise of obeying God rather than human government the Christian will do so respectfully, prepared to suffer the consequences, and always reflecting God's character of love.

Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king. Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the forward. 1 Peter 2:17, 18.

The apostle plainly outlined the attitude that believers should sustain toward the civil authorities: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: as free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the

servants of God. Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king.

It is our duty in every case to obey the laws of our land, unless they conflict with the higher law which God spoke with an audible voice from Sinai and afterward engraved on stone with His own finger. . . . The ten precepts of Jehovah are the foundation of all righteous and good laws. Those who love God's commandments will conform to every good law of the land.

We are to recognize human government as an ordinance of divine appointment and teach obedience to it as a sacred duty, within its legitimate sphere. **But when its claims conflict with the claims of God, we must obey God rather than men. God's Word must be recognized as above all human legislation. A "Thus saith the Lord" is not to be set aside for a "Thus saith the church" or a "Thus saith the state." The crown of Christ is to be lifted above the diadems of earthly potentates.**

We are not required to defy authorities. Our words, whether spoken or written, should be carefully considered.

Teach the people to conform in all things to the laws of their state when they can do so without conflicting with the law of God. **{ML 280}**

Now to move on, we need to ask a crucial question:

Who or what is to determine what the word of God or the will of God is?

There are 3 possible suggestions, but as we shall prove, only one is correct.

THREE CANDIDATES FOR THE POSITION

Is it Religion/Church?

Is it the State/Civil government?

Or is it the individual person?

HISTORY

History has shown us that in the past, the prevailing religion / church, acting through the state or civil government, defined the will of God and enforced that definition by civil penalties. The individual conscience was not allowed to have any say in the matter.

THE BIBLE AND INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Carefully read the following texts:

Rev. 22:17; John 3:16, 36; 1 John 5:11, 12; Romans 14: 10-12; Romans 10: 8-13.

INDIVIDUAL CONSCIENCE

Romans 2:15; Rom 9:1; 1Tim. 3:9; 2 Cor. 1:12.

The above principles were most beautifully and succinctly summarized in the famous Protest of the Christian princes of Germany at the Diet of Spire in 1529:

“The principles contained in this celebrated Protest . . . constitute the very essence of Protestantism. Now this Protest opposes two abuses of man in matters of faith: the first is the intrusion of the civil magistrate, and the second the arbitrary authority of the church. Instead of these abuses, Protestantism sets the power of conscience above the magistrate, and the authority of the word of God above the visible church. In the first place, it rejects the civil power in divine things, and says with the prophets and apostles, ‘We must obey God rather than man.’ In presence of the crown of Charles the Fifth, it uplifts the crown of Jesus Christ. But it goes farther: it lays down the principle that all human teaching should be subordinate to the oracles of God.”—Ibid., b. 13, ch. 6. The protesters had moreover affirmed their right to utter freely their convictions of truth. They would not only believe and obey, but teach what the word of God presents, and they denied the right of priest or magistrate to interfere. The Protest of Spire was a solemn witness against religious intolerance, and an assertion of the right of all men to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. **{GC 203, 204}**

The Holy Spirit, through and by the word of God, reveals the truth of God. But the Holy Spirit cannot and does not force the mind or the conscience of the individual. The Holy Spirit works on our minds as fast and as far as we allow Him to. Therefore we, individual persons, determine what we believe by our evaluation of, and acceptance or rejection of, the evidence for or against any particular point of doctrine (and, of course, each individual at any given time claims that he/she has the evidence of the word of God for his/her belief). Moreover, since we are all on probation, God allows us time and opportunity to make up our minds on any and all points of faith.

BIBLE PROOF

Romans Chapter 14. The entire chapter is worth reading but especially for our especially for this study, read verses 5, 12, (13, 14) ; Joshua 24: 15; Isaiah 1: 18 ; Rev. 3 : 20. Let us read Rom 14:5 from the NIV:

One person considers one day more sacred than another; another considers everyday alike. Each of them should be fully convinced in their own mind.

INDIVIDUAL CONSCIENCE

Since each individual is to be fully persuaded or convinced in his/ her own mind, it is the individual conscience, (not the State, not a church), I say again, the individual's conscience that determines what he or she accepts as doctrine, in matters of faith and worship.

In matters of conscience the soul must be left untrammelled. No one is to control another's mind, to judge for another, or to prescribe his duty. God gives to every soul freedom to think, and to follow his own convictions. "Every one of us shall give account of himself to God." No one has a right to merge his own individuality in that of another. In all matters where principle is involved, "let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Romans 14:12, 5. In Christ's kingdom there is no lordly oppression, no compulsion of manner. {DA 550,551}

Therefore no individual person should be forced to accept any doctrine, or be persecuted or be criminally punished by the state, for his / her

conscientious belief(unless, of course that belief violates the fundamental right to life and property of another person).

The law of love being the foundation of the government of God, the happiness of all intelligent beings depends upon their perfect accord with its great principles of righteousness. God desires from all His creatures the service of love--service that springs from an appreciation of His character. He takes no pleasure in a forced obedience; and to all He grants freedom of will, that they may render Him voluntary service. **{PP 34}**

HISTORY

The principle that: “in matters of faith the soul must be left untrammled”, was not known or accepted or practiced by World-ruling Powers or Authorities in ancient times. Those powers were symbolised as beasts of prey in Bible prophecy.

The Protestant Reformation was the first modern Christian Movement (since the Apostolic Church) to rediscover and relay the foundation for the development of the principle of religious tolerance and the assertion of the right all individuals to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

In this book we shall explore that development and how it produced the ideal form of civil government.

Chapter 2



Principles of Love and Freedom

God is Love. 1 John 4: 8.

God is the God of freedom. 2 Cor. 3: 17; John 8: 32, 36; Gal. 5: 1.

God has given His intelligent creatures freedom of choice and powers of reason. He does not predestinate human choices. He does not arbitrarily cause or prevent any set of human activities or accomplishments.

God allows the issues involved in the great controversy on planet Earth to work themselves out in accordance with human choices and the consequences of those choices in harmony with the principles of cause and effect or sowing and reaping.

God's unselfish, self-sacrificing Agape Love in His Holy Spirit; His Wisdom, Truth and Righteousness in His Son, through which His Power works without compelling force, are All being opposed by Satan's selfishness, hatred, falsehood, and unrighteousness with Satanic compelling force.

God, through the plan of redemption in Christ by His Spirit, through His word, works on the hearts and minds of mankind to implant His principles of truth, righteousness and unselfish Love.

Satan is also working on human minds to oppose God's principles. Therefore in the minds of each and all humans the great controversy progresses on to its inevitable climax.

Sinful human depravity, spurred on by Satan produced and produces the most deplorably wicked human behaviour and governments throughout history.

And also throughout history, as persons have responded in part on in whole to God's principles, changes for the betterment of mankind have occurred at all levels of human endeavor, including civil government.

Thus the wicked systems of slavery, racism, unfair treatment of women, coercive religious intolerance, suppression and exploitation of the poor working-class masses and other social injustices and evils have been progressively rectified over the centuries. These changes were especially driven forward by the progressive development and outworking of the biblical principles of the Protestant Reformation which progressively delivered the European civilization from the darkness, intolerance, superstition and conscience compelling socio-religious polity of the dark ages.

I said earlier that God does not arbitrarily intervene in human social / governmental affairs. You may disagree and say that He delivered Daniel from the lions' den, and Paul from prison. But wait; consider the millions of martyrs slain without His intervention. Jeremiah was imprisoned by his own (Jewish) civil government but freed by the Pagan King Nebuchadnezzar! John the Baptist was left alone in prison to be beheaded and Jesus did not intervene. Can you explain these apparent inconsistencies? (They are only apparent.)

THE WESTWARD MARCH OF EMPIRE AND FREEDOM

The world dominating powers of the Old World were all in the East although each successive one, after Persia, was a bit more westward than its predecessor. They were all persecutory and denied, what we would now call, certain inalienable human rights. But under all those oppressive regimes God's people were to be exemplary citizens in civil obedience and in the revealing of His principles of light through the darkness of false religious systems.

Only when those corrupt systems gave a directive or passed a law commanding them to disobey God's principles in matters of faith, worship or His Law, would they be commanded by God's word to obey God rather than human authority and endure the consequences, even if it meant threat of execution! Daniel was such an example.

But the most dangerous world dominating persecutory power of the Old World was the Papacy which killed millions of people for their conscientious beliefs so long as those beliefs was different to Roman Catholic dogma (doctrine). What was even more dangerous than the persecution was the progressive development of multitudinous doctrinal errors such as: changing the Sabbath day from the seventh day to Sunday, the natural immortality of the creature soul, eternal torment, confessionals to priests, the veneration of saints, purgatory, to name the main ones.

The God of freedom and love allowed that power time and scope to parade its power in Europe and the expanding European colonial empire of the Middle Ages. Which expanding empire was initiated by the human desire to explore as epitomized by the Spanish explorer Christopher Columbus. The Spirit of Christ moved upon the hearts of men, yet it took a long time before, eventually, the protestant reformation led by the German Martin Luther rocked the Papacy by revealing its spiritual bankruptcy.

And, another point. A point on sowing and reaping, which allows us to see how God lets things work themselves out. The horrible oppression and persecution perpetrated by the Papacy led the masses to desire relief from such a system and indeed from all religion, and from God, if He were what the Papacy showed Him to be like. Such an uprising took place in France and officially took away the civil power from Papal control.

But even before that, the Papal and Anglican persecution of Protestants led them to desire a church without a Pope and a state without a King, so that they could worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. In other words, it was the God implanted desire for liberty that motivated them. They set their sights on the newly discovered

western world, known as the New World. Puritan Protestants, persecuted and driven from England, after exile in Holland (the Dutch Republic), eventually set sail for North America. There, in the most westward of nations, the development of the protestant principles of liberty would be established, though not without severe struggles, into the most ideal form of civil government known to history. The history of that struggle in America between 1628 and 1798 is an essential study as we face the civil-ecclesiastical perils of the end-time.

SOME MORE IMPORTANT HISTORY

The English Reformers had rejected the false gospel of the Papacy but had still retained many of the forms and much of the ceremonialism of the Roman Catholic Church. Remember that the split between the Roman Catholic church and England occurred in 1534 after the Pope denied King Henry the Eighth's request for a marriage annulment. But other factors eventually led to the establishment of the new church of England among these were personal greed, financial gain and, of course, the impact of the English Reformers.

The Church of England, though rejecting the authority and creed of Rome was still supported by the civil government and also included many of the Roman customs and ceremonies in its liturgy.

Some church members wanted a more thorough reformation and relinquishment of all Papal forms. But the church-state alliance permitted no dissent from the Anglican forms and ceremonial worship. These believers were called Puritans because they insisted on having a pure worship and faith. In the year 1603 the new King of England, James 1, virtually declared ecclesiastical war on the Puritans. They were hunted, persecuted, imprisoned. Eventually, a remnant fled to Holland as religious exiles. Though life was very difficult they clung to God's promises. In their separation from Anglicanism they had covenanted to walk in all the light known or to be made known to them.

THE PILGRIM FATHERS¹

Eventually about 102 exiles decided, under the Spirit's conviction and the desire for liberty, to set sail for the New World. Pastor John Robinson delivered the farewell sermon as they set sail on that long and perilous journey across the Atlantic Ocean to North America.

Their ship, the *Mayflower* after turning back twice before, eventually successfully departed Plymouth England on 6th September 1620 and arrived at, what is now called, Cape Cod, Massachusetts America, on 9th November 1620, after a 66 day voyage.

They were seeking for freedom, but did not yet fully comprehend the great principle of religious liberty. And, as was soon to be seen, the freedom they sacrificed so much to obtain they were not willing to grant to others.

A SERIOUS ERROR

The doctrine that God has committed to the church the right to control the conscience and to define and punish heresy is one of the most deeply rooted of papal errors (GC293). And although the Reformers rejected Rome's creed they, for the most part, still remained infected with her spirit of intolerance.

Massachusetts Bay Colony was established in 1629 with the Puritan church as a kind of state-church. Dissenters were not tolerated. Persecution was the inevitable result. That which they fled from they now sought to inflict on those who did not share their faith. The darkness of the Dark Ages was, in that respect, still lingering. Attendance at the services of the established church was required under a penalty of fine or imprisonment and the civil magistrate punished crime, sin and any dissension from the established faith. The social order was kept "righteous" by compulsion of the conscience.

ROGER WILLIAMS²

Roger Williams was born in England in 1603. He died in America in 1683.

Roger Williams came to the New World on February 5th, 1631, eleven years after the planting of the first Puritan colon, leaving behind the intolerance which continued under King Charles 1 (who succeeded King James the 1st in 1625). He landed at Boston. He was a devout Puritan but, unlike the others, he believed in full religious tolerance and complete separation of church and state. He was also a firm defender of the property rights of the Native American Indians urging that their land should be bought and not simply confiscated. He was a devout searcher for truth and believed that since no one knew all the truth, God (not the church or civil magistrate) must be the sole judge of the human conscience.

American historian Bancroft⁷ wrote that Williams **“was the first person in modern Christendom to establish civil government on the doctrine of liberty of conscience, the equality of opinions before the law.”** Roger Williams declared that it was the duty of the civil magistrate to punish crime, but never to compel the conscience. One of his famous statements was: **“forced worship stinks in God’s nostrils.”**

But his views were considered too radical. (He was constantly embroiled in religious and political controversies throughout his life). He was put on trial in October 1635 and sentenced to banishment from the colonies, and forced to flee into the forest during the very severe winter of that year. Some Native American Indians gave him refuge for some weeks, thereafter he pressed on, eventually reaching Narragansett Bay after a 55 mile journey. In the spring of 1636 he laid the foundation of the first state in modern times that in the fullest sense recognized the right of religious liberty. Historian Martyn wrote that the fundamental principle of William’s colony was **“that every man should have liberty to worship God according to the light of his own conscience.”**

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island founded in 1636 was that first fully free colony described above, and it soon became the asylum of the oppressed. Eventually, through one hundred years of intense struggles, the foundation principles of Rhode Island, civil and religious liberty would become the foundation principles of the entire American Republic.

PROPHECY WAS ABOUT TO BE FULFILLED

Indeed a beast with 2 horns like a lamb was getting ready to arise on the prophetic/historic land-scape. Rev. 13: 11 was getting ready for its first fulfilment. But much important American history of the struggle for liberty would occur between 1636 and the time ,152 years later, when the rise (as pictured by the prophet) of that second beast of Rev .13 would occur. The lessons to be understood from that period are invaluable for us in this generation who will soon have to face the process of reversal from freedom of worship to “the image of the beast”. These lessons we shall endeavor to look into, God willing.

Chapter 3



Caesar and God³

INTRODUCTION

Thus far in our studies we have examined the basic biblical principles in Lessons 1 and 2, along with the first significant and important historical developments in Religious Liberty in the New World, North America, in seventeenth century (1600's).

In this, the Lesson, we begin the more advanced studies of this very important doctrine which is but an outgrowth of the true Gospel and Character of our Saviour and Lord, Jesus the Christ, and of God the Father. But as we begin our advanced studies we still have to move gradually step by step, in this deep and difficult subject, so as to give everyone time to understand and to assimilate.

Where did Roger Williams get his understanding of complete separation of church and state from? And so much so that he was way ahead of his contemporary fellow Reformers!

Jesus is the Way, the Truth and the Life. John 14: 6.

CAESAR AND GOD³

Let us read Matthew 22: 17 - 22. Now let us read again the key principle enunciated by Jesus in verse 21:

“Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.”

In this principle Jesus has established 3 clear distinctions:

1. Distinction between Caesar and God
2. Distinction between what is Caesar’s and what is God’s
3. Distinction between what we owe to Caesar and what we owe to God.

The term Caesar means the civil government, therefore the duties we owe to the civil government are civil duties ; while the duties we owe to God are moral and religious duties.

RELIGION

Religion may be defined as the recognition of Deity (or deity) as an object of worship, love and obedience ,and /or, as man’s personal relation of faith and obedience to his chosen deity or Deity.

It is therefore evident that religion and religious duties pertain solely to God and since that which is God’s is to be rendered to God and not to Caesar, then according to the words of Jesus ,in Matthew 22:21, the inevitable and only truly logical conclusion is that civil government can never of right have anything to do with religion, that is, with man’s personal relation of faith and obedience to his Deity or deity.

MORALITY.(ECCL.12:13; 1 JOHN3: 4 ; MATT.5:21,22 ; 1JOHN 3:15)

Morality may be **absolutely** defined as conformity to the true moral standard or law of the true God or **religiously** defined as the perceived moral standard of one’s chosen religious faith. Morality is obedience to the moral law of God according to one’s religious faith.

Since morality is conformity to divine law or religious standards, it should be equally plain that morality also pertains solely to God and religion and is a duty owed to God and not to civil government. Sin is transgression of moral law in thought, word and action. Only God can read the thoughts and therefore God is the sole judge of morality. God judges and “punishes” sin/immorality. The civil government judges and punishes incivility or crime.

A DIFFICULT CONCEPT?

Not really. Just give it some thought. If a man hates his fellowman it is sin as judged by God. But the civil government does not, in fact, cannot punish that man. But let that man speak threateningly or act violently to his fellowman and now the civil government can and does punish him not because he has committed sin but because he is uncivil or has behaved criminally.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN CRIME AND SIN.

The civil government declares its civil statutes or laws and judges and punishes incivility or crime. Historically civil statutes have been based on the necessity to safeguard social order and the basic fundamental human rights of life and property.

God declares His moral laws and statutes and judges and punishes immorality or sin within the context of salvation.

It is not the role of the civil government to define morality or sin, that is the religious realm, that belongs to God not to Caesar. Similarly God allows the civil government to define civility and to punish uncivil behaviour. The enforcement of civility is the sphere of the civil government, such belongs to Caesar. God by His Word through His church defines sin and calls human beings to heart obedience to His principles of righteousness in His moral law by faith in Jesus Christ, that is the sphere of religion, of the church.

In other words, civil statutes define crime and deal with crime but not with sin, whereas the divine statutes define sin and deal with sin, but not with crime.

THE PROMOTION OF MORALITY

According to scripture all have sinned, all have made themselves immoral by transgression of God's moral law. And no man can make himself moral by attempting to obey the moral law. The demands of the moral law can never be satisfied by the sinner, and all have sinned. Read Romans 3: 19 to 31.

It is by the righteousness, the morality of Christ alone that men can be made moral. This righteousness of God ,this morality of God is imputed to the believer by faith in Christ, and the Holy Spirit writes the moral law in the believer's heart and mind. Hebrews 10:16. It is by this and this alone that man can ever attain to morality .Therefore it is evident that to God alone pertains the promotion of morality and the work of making men and women moral.

THE CHURCH

Since God is the sole promoter of morality, through what instrumentality does he work to promote morality in the world? Is it the civil government or the church ? According to scripture it is by His church and His church alone. Read 1 Tim.3:15; Matthew 28: 18 – 20; Romans 16: 25 –27. There is no God- acceptable obedience but the obedience of faith, and no God-acceptable morality but the morality of faith. Therefore we have clearly proven that to the church and NOT to the civil government/state, is committed the promotion and conservation of morality in the world! This at once settles the question as to whether the State shall teach morality or religion. The State cannot teach morality or religion. The Spirit of God and the gospel of Christ are both essential to the teaching of morality and neither of these is committed to the State but to the church !

PUNISHMENT OF IMMORALITY

But even though this work of promoting and conserving morality is committed to the church, the prerogative to reward or punish sin or immorality is NOT committed to the church. The church beseeches, entreats, persuades, invites men to be reconciled to God and instructs and trains them in the principles of morality (Rev.22 : 17). The church has

the responsibility by moral suasion and spiritual censures to discipline her membership . But hers it is neither to reward nor punish immorality. Since sin or righteousness springs from the secret counsels of the heart; and as God alone knows the heart, He alone can determine either the merit or the guilt involved in any question of morality.

Therefore it should be clearly understood that to no man or assembly of men or organization of men, belongs any right whatsoever to punish immorality. Whoever attempts it, usurps the prerogative of God. The Spanish Inquisition was the inevitable logic of any claim of any assembly of men to administer civil punishments for immorality or sin. The Papacy, claiming the right to compel men to be moral and to punish them for sin, found it necessary to find out the secrets of men's hearts and therefore applied torture to compel men to make a full confession of the secret counsels of their hearts, hence the Inquisition which we now look back on with feelings of revulsion.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of civil government is civil, not moral. Its functions are to maintain order and to define and punish incivility or crime thus protecting the rights of its citizens to life, privacy, social security and property and certain civil freedoms. Morality and religion belong to God and must be rendered to God not to the State.

But this is more than enough for an introduction to the advanced studies in this area. God bless you.

Chapter 4



More on Matthew 22:21

In our last lesson we presented the evidences from the words of Christ in Matthew 22: 15 to 22 to clearly establish the principle that to civil government pertains that which is civil. The purpose of civil government is civil not moral or spiritual. Its function is to preserve order in society and to allow all its subjects to rest in safety by guarding them against all incivility.

Morality and spirituality belong to God and are to be rendered to God. Civility belongs to the State and must be rendered to the State.

“Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.”

AN IMPORTANT QUESTION

But you may ask: Does not the civil government enforce the commandments of God, which say: Thou shalt not steal; Thou shalt not kill; Thou shalt not bear false witness, etc.? Does not the civil power punish the violation of these commandments of God which are moral? *Answer:* the civil government does not enforce these, nor does it punish their violation, *as commandments of God but as acts of civil disobedience or criminal offences.*

The civil government or State does forbid theft, murder, perjury (and some Nations, especially in past times included adultery), but *not* as commandments of God. From ancient times civil governments that knew nothing about God have forbidden these things for the maintenance of social/ civil order. Remember, the commandments of God deal with the thoughts and intents of the mind and therefore if the State is to enforce those laws as the moral law of God it would have to punish the thoughts and intents of the heart; but this is not within the province of any earthly power, and for any earthly power to attempt such would be to be putting itself in the place of God and usurping His prerogative.

Moreover, any attempt to punish transgression of God's Law would be an attempt to punish sin but sins repented of and removed (apheimi) are not held by God against the repentant person, therefore, justly speaking, the State should not punish the transgressor whom God has forgiven. In addition, the word of God teaches forgiveness to the level of seventy times seven of brother to brother! So if the civil government was to attempt to enforce God's moral law and seek to punish sin, it would have to acquit any law breaker who says he repents or who is forgiven by his fellow! You should be able clearly to see that such a system would be the utter destruction of civil government; and this only demonstrates conclusively that no civil government can ever of right have anything to do with the enforcement of God's moral law, or with defining or punishing sin ; or with making the Bible its code of laws.

GOD'S GOVERNMENT

The true gospel teaches us that all humanity received a legal pardon/ acquittal of all sins of law transgression by the infinite sacrifice of our Substitute and Surety and Saviour Christ Jesus. All men have been bought back by that infinite price, and all men are on probation to make their minds up for or against Christ and His Salvation. Only the Divine Judgment can and will declare who will be saved unto eternal life and who will pass under the second condemnation and be punished for rejecting Christ. And into this Divine Arrangement, *no civil government can ever enter.*

Civil government must deal with civil laws and punish crime. God by His word through His church proclaims the gospel, defines sin, writes His moral law in the heart of believers and will ultimately allow that gospel to judge all mankind. But He has ordained civil government to maintain civil and social order and to define and punish crime and thereby prevent civil and social chaos while human probation lasts.

A T Jones⁴ quoted an expert on this matter in his day, one Professor W T Harris¹⁶ who said:

"....Sin and crime must not be confounded, nor must the same deed be counted as crime and sin by the same authority."

The civil government makes civil laws and punishes incivility, but must not seek to define morality or sin or to punish sin or to make any laws pertaining to faith or worship. The latter belong to God and His church.

Abundant evidence has been presented to show the amazing depth of wisdom in the principle of the word of Christ in Matthew 22: 21. And although that principle is plain, the world and the church have been long in learning and accepting the truth of the lesson He gave. The United States of America is the first and only government in history that has a Constitution based on the principle established by Christ. That Constitution will be one of our later studies.

Civil government ought to deal with civil law and punish crime, but never seek to define or implement morality or to punish sin. The latter belong to God and must be rendered to Him alone. The State should never interfere in matters of faith, worship or the law of God but concern itself with civil laws, punishment of crime and maintaining civil order, economic stability, infrastructural development, and the protection of the rights of its citizens.

The principle laid down by Jesus in Matthew 22: 21 is very clear:

Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's.

In chapter 3 we clearly established that Caesar, being the civil government, the things that are Caesar's are civil matters, civility, civil laws, the definition and punishment of *crime* and the maintenance of civil order. Whereas the things which belong to God are *moral* and *spiritual* and include the *definition* and *judgement* of *sin*. Into the things which belong to God, civil government has no right to control or to make any demands.

We also explained that though certain fundamental civil laws such as those against murder, and theft and perjury are similar to the last six commandments of God's *moral law*, the state enforces these as civil statutes, *not* moral laws and punishes their violation as *criminal* offences and *not* as sins.

We have a classical example of the distinction between *crime* and *sin* in the record of the thief on his cross next to Jesus on His Cross. The thief was being rightfully punished by the civil power for breaking the civil laws against theft and murder, in other words Caesar was punishing him for his *crimes*. At the same time as Caesar was punishing him for those crimes, Jesus forgave him of his *sins*. This clearly illustrates the point made by AT Jones, when he quoted from Prof. WT Harris¹⁶, that:

“...sin and crime must not be confounded, nor must the same deed be counted as crime and sin by the same authority.”

With regards to the thief alongside Jesus, his misdeeds were counted as *crimes* by Caesar and rightfully punished as *such*. But those same misdeeds were counted as *sins* by Jesus and rightfully forgiven as *such* because he accepted Jesus as his Saviour.

Civil government deals with civility and this includes *legislation to regulate* human- human interactions in social, financial, economic and business matters and also civil statutes concerning marriage / human-human binding relationships for the legal and social security of those involved, without *defining morality or sin*. For example, civil government determines the age at which sexual consent can be legally given. Suppose this age be 16 in a particular jurisdiction. If a young lady age 17 gives

consent before marriage it is *not* counted as a crime by the state even though it is counted as *sin* by God. On the other hand if a 14 year old girl gets married, she is below the age of legal consent and her husband could be charged with a *crime*, even though it be not counted as *sin* by God.

We should clearly see that *sin* and *crime* must not be confounded, nor must the *same* deed be counted as *crime* and *sin* by the *same* authority!!

The civil government defines and deals *civil statutes* and with punishing *crime*. God, His Word (and His church in accordance with their understanding of that Word) defines and deals with the *moral law* and with judging *sin by His word*. The civil government *as a government* has no right to tell the church what is moral law or what is sin. And the church *as a church* has no right to tell the government what is or is not a crime. A member of government, *as an individual*, can, as a church member or even if not a church member, discuss morality and sin; but he/she is *not* the government. Similarly a Christian, *as an individual* can have a say in any public discussions on civil statutes and crime; but he or she is *not* the church.

To further illustrate, the government has the civil responsibility for the registration of births and to demand that every person has a birth certificate. Those of us who are older may remember that there was a time when there was a civil certificate called a baptismal certificate dating back to the colonial state – church days when the state church baptized babies by sprinkling. But that was abolished when enlightened minds realized that other denominations did not share such a belief and government had no right to be demanding or asking anything about a matter of faith such as baptism.

From time to time civil legislators review certain civil statutes and determine whether certain acts should or should not remain as crimes. Once upon a time premarital sex would have been considered a crime, the time came when it was decriminalized, but in declaring it not a crime the state was not saying that *it was not sin*. The state has the civil right to no longer consider something as a crime for civil regulatory /privacy reasons but in such cases it is not defining *morality* or *sin, because it has no right to do so*.

Here is another example. Tobacco smoking is not counted as a crime by civil government. But God counts it as sin. Civil government now bans it in public. Smoking other things may be a crime at present, but the civil government may decide to decriminalize such with, of course, certain limitations. There was a time when the use of alcoholic beverages was counted a crime in certain civil jurisdictions, but later on it was decriminalized with certain limitations such as forbidding liquor to be sold to persons under the age of 18. In all these examples the state is dealing with civil regulation and order, not with defining morality or sin.

It is very important to understand these matters which all spring from our Lord's word in Matthew 22: 21. Those who want the government to criminalize or decriminalize a matter, according to what may be called "public morality" do not realize on what ground they are treading. Into the definition of *morality* and *sin* civil government has no right to enter, else it may give in to so called "public morality" (the morality of the majority) on a matter that violates the liberty of conscience of a minority.

Civil government should deal with civility and leave individuals free to choose their morality, spirituality, and worship so long as they behave with civility towards each other. For example, if a man starts up a church in which he gives people poison to drink to prove that God can prevent them from dying, the state will charge him with the crime of attempted murder or of occasioning grievous bodily harm. In such a case the state is dealing with his incivility. He can believe whatever he wants to, but the moment he performs an injurious, uncivil act toward fellow humans, the state has the right to restrain and punish his incivility.

We should now be in a position to move on to have an advanced look at Romans 13 and show how some people incorrectly seek to use that passage.

Chapter 5



An Advanced Study of Romans 13:1 to 9

INTRODUCTION

We are now ready for an advanced study of Romans 13: 1 – 9. Such a study is necessary because those who claim that civil government has the right to act in things pertaining to God quote Romans 13: 1 which says: “The *powers that be are ordained of God.*” They argue that since civil government is *ordained of God* it has the right to enforce or demand things pertaining to God. We must prove clearly that such a conclusion is *incorrect*.

ROMANS 13: 1 – 9; AN EXPOSITION OF MATTHEW 22: 21³

First we shall prove that in Romans 13: 1 - 9 the Apostle Paul gave an *exposition* of the words of Jesus in Matthew 22: 21; “*Render to Caesar the things which are Caesar’s...*” In this command of Jesus to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, there is the clear recognition of the rightfulness of civil government and that civil government has claims upon us that we are duty bound to recognize and to render to civil government. In harmony with this Paul wrote in Romans 13: 1; “*Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers...*” (Even before we go any further it is important to understand that Paul was writing about civil government, the *higher powers*, not the *Highest Power*, but the *powers that be*.)

The Pharisees had asked Jesus: *“is it lawful to give tribute (pay taxes) unto Caesar, or not?”* Jesus answered: *“Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s;”* and Paul wrote in Romans 13: 6, 7: *“For this cause pay ye tribute (taxes) also: for they are God’s ministers, attending continually upon this very thing, Render therefore to all their dues: tribute (taxes) to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.”* It should be clearly seen, then, that Romans 13:1-9 is a divine commentary upon the words of Christ in Matthew 22: 17- 21. Romans 13 refers first to civil government, the higher powers, the powers that be. Next, Paul speaks of rulers as bearing the sword which means the enforcement of the laws of the state and the punishment of crime. Then he commands to render to civil government the things that pertain to civil government: taxes, custom, respect, and honour. **Custom** was a tax imposed by the Romans on certain goods (whether imported, or exported, or otherwise). Custom collectors were called *publicans* and sat at gates where goods were being transported. These gate offices were called **Receipt of Custom**, Mark 2:14. With regards to **honour**, there is written down a biblical example of this in the book of Daniel ,chapter 6 verse 21 where Daniel addressed Darius with the words “ O King live forever”.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ROMANS 13: 8 AND 9

Let us read Romans 13: 8, 9. In verse 9, Paul first refers to the commandments in the **second** table of the law of God. Then Paul added *“and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.”* Why did he say if there be any other commandment it is briefly comprehended in loving your fellow human as yourself? The answer is that he was dealing with man’s inter-relation with his fellow man which is the **province** of civil government. Paul knew fully well that the Ten Commandments give us the **whole** duty of man (Ecclesiastes 12: 13), yet, in Romans 13, in discussing our duty to the civil government, he does **not** mention any of the **four** commandments from the **first** table of God’s Law, the reason being that the **first four commandments**, that is, *the first table of God’s Law*, spell out our duty to God, whereas the last six, the second table of God’s Law, spell out our

duty to our fellow human beings . So this is additional evidence that Paul was giving an inspired exposition on the **first** part of Jesus' statement in Matthew 22: 21: ***Render therefore unto Caesar things which are Caesar's,*** and he, Paul, in Romans 13: 1 – 9, was **not** dealing with what we have to ***render to God.***

It should be clear then that Caesar, civil government, ***cannot rightfully make any demands concerning the first four commandments (the first table of God's Law) which spell out man's duty to God!*** And, we have already proven in Lesson 6, that the civil laws which regulate human-human inter-relations and which forbid murder, theft, perjury and so on, even though they resemble the last six commandments, are **not** enforced as moral laws **but** as civil / criminal statutes by the state. Let us repeat for emphasis that as the ten commandments contain the **whole** duty of man, and as in Romans 13 in Paul's enumeration of the duties men owe to civil government, there is no mention of any of the commandments mentioned in the first table of the Law of God, it follows that none of the duties listed in the first table of the Law of God, do men owe to the civil government. Which means that although civil government is ordained of God, it is **not** ordained of God pertaining to a single duty in any one of the first **four** of the Ten Commandments.

ORDAINED OF GOD

What did Paul mean, in Romans 13: 1, when he wrote that the powers that be are **ordained** of God? First of all, it is important to understand that Paul was not speaking of any particular king or president or prime minister but rather he was speaking about the **principle** or (as AT Jones calls it) **the genius** of civil government in whatever form it exists, in whatever era or geographical location.

Secondly, the Greek word Paul used and which is translated **ordain** is not the same word used for **ordain** in its usual meaning of **ordaining** an elder. In fact the Greek Word used in Romans 13: 1 is **tetagmenoi** derived from the root word: **tasso**, primarily a military word, which means: **to draw up or arrange in order**, or, **to allow for the purpose of order**. **Tasso** is used 8

times in the NT (Matt.28: 16; Luke 7: 8; Acts13: 48; 15: 2; 22: 12; 28: 23; **Romans 13: 1**; 1Cor. 16: 15).It does not mean predestinate, nor does it mean directly decreed by God. It is not an easily understood word therefore it is best to follow AT Jones⁴ line of allowing scripture to show its applications and limitations of usage within the context of civil government.

A CLEAR EXAMPLE

Read Jeremiah chapter 27: 1 to 11. In this scripture it is clearly shown that the Babylonian Empire as a civil imperial power was **ordained of** God, so much so, that in verse 8, God said that the nation which refused to submit to Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, He, God, would punish that nation.

Now let us see whether this power was ordained of God in **things pertaining to God**. In Daniel chapter 3 we have the record that Nebuchadnezzar made a great golden image and set it up in the plain of Dura and ordered all his top-order civil officials to assemble to its dedication. Daniel 3: 1 to 3. They assembled. Then he commanded them all, as representatives of their respective nations, to fall down and worship the golden image upon threat of execution in a fiery furnace (Daniel 3: 5, 6).

In obedience to the king's command all the people bowed down except three Jews, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. These men knew that they and all nations had been made subject to the Babylonian imperial power by Jehovah Himself. It had been prophesied and commanded by Isaiah and Jeremiah. And they also knew that God had said that whosoever did not submit to Nebuchadnezzar would be punished by God. Yet these 3 men, knowing all this, refused to bow down to the image. They were thrown into the furnace made 7 times hotter **and God delivered them!**

Let us now follow a clear line of scriptural logic: **1.** God gave power to the kingdom of Babylon. **2.** God allowed, even commanded His people to be in subjection to that power on pain of punishment. **3.** God defended His people by a wonderful miracle from a certain **kind** of exercise of that power. **4.** God does not contradict Himself. **5.** Therefore it is clearly shown that the **exercise** of that power in **matters** pertaining to God, such

as worship, or a command of the first table of God's Law, was a *wrong* use of the civil imperial power of Babylon. **6.** So although the Babylonian civil imperial power was ordained of God, it was not ordained of God *in matters pertaining to God*, but *only* in civil matters. The 3 Jewish men understood all this. They obeyed the command to assemble as a civil command, but refused to obey the command to worship the image because they understood that such a command *was no longer in the civil realm but was in the realm of things pertaining to God*. They were so civil that they obeyed the command to assemble even though they knew that the occasion was for the dedication of the golden image. It was in the king's right to order his officials to assemble for an official ceremony, but the moment he commanded them to *worship* the image, the line was drawn and they refused to obey in a matter in which civil government *had no right* to be involved or to demand.

Enough for this lesson. God bless you and enable you to understand this important doctrine of religious liberty as we advance step by step.

Chapter 6



The Development of Civil Society From Ancient to Modern Times and the Complexities of Civility

SOME HISTORY

In very ancient times, just after the Tower of Babel, as people scattered across the earth, some lived a nomadic life, but eventually, most formed societies. Let us consider the sociology of the transition from a nomadic condition, in which individuals were solely responsible for their own protection, to a society. In individualistic nomadism each individual had the right to protect his person and property from any invasion against his person or property. Every other person had the same right; but if that right were to have been personally exercised in all cases by everyone, then, given the selfishness of unregenerate human character, every man's hand would have been against his neighbour. That would have been plain anarchy, and, in such a condition of affairs, society cannot exist.

DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIETY

Now suppose a few hundred of such nomads occupied a certain area in close proximity to each other with no established order, if each one were to individually exercise his rights of self-protection he would have the assurance of only that amount of protection which he alone could have furnished himself which would have been very slight. Therefore all came

together and each surrendered to the whole body that individual right; and in return for that surrender, he received the power of all for his protection. Each, therefore, received the help of all to protect him from invasion of his right to life and property and was several-fold more secure than he would have been without that surrender.

A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE

When societies are formed, each individual surrenders certain rights, and as an equivalent for that surrender, has secured to himself the enjoyment of certain other rights appertaining to his person and property, without the protection of which society cannot exist.

This is the fundamental principle of the civility of human inter-relationships for the establishment and preservation of order in a society, otherwise there would be chaos. This principle of civil government is *ordained* (KJV) of God, better translated *allowed by God to be put in place by society*, for civil order; (Greek root: *tasso*). Romans 13: 1 and Matthew 22:21.

But there is one right that is *not* to be surrendered.

AN INALIENABLE RIGHT

LISTEN TO AT JONES^{3,4}:

“But what condition of things can ever be conceived of – among men – that would justify any man in surrendering his right to believe? What could he receive as an equivalent? When a man surrenders his right to believe he has virtually surrendered his right to think. When he surrenders his right to believe, he surrenders everything, and it is impossible for him to ever receive an equivalent; he has surrendered his very soul! Moreover, eternal life depends upon believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, therefore the man who surrenders his right to believe, surrenders eternal life. Consequently, no man, no association or organization of men, can ever rightly ask of any man a surrender of his right to believe. Every man has the right, so far as organizations of men are concerned, to believe as he pleases; and that right, so long as he is a Protestant, so long

as he is a Christian, yes, so long as he is a man, he can never surrender, and he never will". **AT Jones, Civil Government and Religion, page 38.**

DEFINING "SURRENDER OF FAITH" IN CIVIL MATTERS

This is a challenging task! In order to tackle it satisfactorily we must remember the fundamental principles established so far in our studies.

RECAPPING THE BASIC PRINCIPLES

One very important basic principle is that it is **not** the role of the civil government to *define* morality or sin **but** its role is to *determine and implement civil laws for the regulation of human- human inter-relations, economy, finance, trade, taxation, public health, protection of persons' rights to life and property and privacy; and allowing each the freedom to determine their faith and worship and morality.*

Another Bit of History. During the 1260 year Papal church- state union in Europe, the church caused the civil government to enforce its version of God's Law as civil law and to punish sin and "*heresy*". But although that was the case, vice flourished in the world and in the church while honest seekers for truth were burnt at the stake! Then came the Protestant Reformation with progressive religious liberty and, especially in America, separation of church and state with the state no longer defining sin. And, lo and behold, as the gospel was accepted by free men and women, both the church and the society were more righteous than under church-state union!

Many of the old church-laws remained on the statute books, but enlightened minds over the years have paved the way for their removal. Take, for example, **blasphemy** which is entirely a matter between a soul and God. **Blasphemy**, though a sin, should *never be* a crime at all, and certainly not in an enlightened world! And so it should be for any of the first *four* commandments of God's Law.

CIVILITY

When it comes to the last *six* commandments, they are *not* to be enforced as *morality* but as *civility* with the state determining *how* to regulate human-human inter-relations. There was a time when the heterosexual cohabiting of two consenting unmarried adults was declared to be a crime because it is sin. The time came when the civil government *decriminalized* it. It is still a sin but it is no longer a crime. When the civil government decriminalizes a particular thing, it is not saying that that thing is *not* a sin; it is simply saying that it is *not* a crime. To legalize something is simply saying that the thing is no longer a crime under civil law. Those who want sin punished as crime do not seem to realize that the whole world would have to be a state prison because all have sinned and continue to sin. God has *not* given to Caesar the prerogative of defining or punishing sin. The **church** must continue to define sin, call sin what the bible calls sin and invite individuals to accept Christ and be obedient to His word. The church should never blame the state for promoting sin when it (the state) *decriminalizes* or *legalizes* any particular human behavior, even though that behaviour is a sin, because it is not the role of the state to define sin. Furthermore, each individual is free to accept or reject salvation from sin and free to choose his/her moral behaviour. The sale and use of tobacco and alcohol, as well as gambling, are all regulated by civil law, though sinful they are not defined as crimes by the state.

So long as the state decriminalizes any particular human activity, those who act on behalf of the state, civil servants, ought to extend civil courtesies and civil-instruments to those who apply for such; and to do so is *no* surrender of the civil servant's faith because he is not working for a church or in a private capacity but as an agent of the civil government. But if the civil servant feels uncomfortable he/she can either ask someone else to do it or vacate the post. Many feel that performing a civil duty as a civil servant for decriminalized (though sinful) behaviour is a surrender of faith but they are misguided. For, example, a Christian civil servant who believes that smoking and drinking are sins cannot *rightfully* refuse to give out licenses to sell liquor to those who apply for them according

to civil requirements. Civil government cannot make judgement calls on individual morality but must treat each citizen with dignity and respect. Christians should be exemplary in being courteous, respectful, polite to all; and, as AT Jones points out, see Jesus in every man, this does not mean compromising with sin, but it means Christian tolerance and respect for others' freedom of choice while seeking to win them to Christ by telling them of His Love and the infinite Price He paid for their souls.

The righteousness that exalts a nation is *not* legislated by civil government but proclaimed by the church in the preaching of, and living by, the word of God ; and received by individuals exercising free choice to receive righteousness and live in obedience to God's moral law, Col.1: 26-29. Any call for the state to legislate righteousness is a violation of Jesus' word to: *render to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's*. And those who make such a call know not where it will culminate.

SLAVERY: A CLASSICAL EXAMPLE.

Slavery, in some form or another and to whatever extent, was a common cultural practice of many nations, including Israel, from ancient times. It was legal, meaning it was not a crime, to own slaves; and each Nation or Kingdom had civil laws for the regulation of slavery. But slavery was *immoral* and *sinful*. We know this for sure because it transgressed the principle of loving your fellow human as yourself and of doing to others what you would have them do unto you. In other words slavery was a cultural sin that was *not* a crime in those ancient times, that is, it was legalized with regulatory civil laws in place for its control. Historians tell us that slavery in the time of the Pagan Roman Empire was particularly severe and extremely inhuman. Yet the Apostle Paul told slaves (translated *servants* in the KJV) to be obedient to their masters with fear and trembling, read Eph.6:5 to 8. As the Gospel of Jesus Christ spread throughout the Roman Empire, some slave owners and some slaves became Christians and still remained in the master-slave relationship of slavery which though *not morally right* was a legalized civil statute and therefore not a crime . Paul gave them the same advice, Colossians 3:22-

24; 1Tim.6: 1, 2; Colossians 4: 1. In the New Testament Book, **Philemon**, Paul was pleading with Philemon to forgive and receive again his runaway slave Onesimus. Obviously, at that stage of human cultural development, being a slave or a slave owner was not a surrender of faith. Slavery today is now a crime! It was always *morally* wrong. All this shows how complex these issues are. So to say that because the state legalizes something that is a sin, it will bring down the judgements of God on the world is not correct.

SOCIETAL WELLBEING

Take, for example, prostitution as a case in point as an age-old crime and sin; but for the sake of the health of the community as a whole, a civil government may decriminalize prostitution and regulate it so as to give those involved better medical care and help prevent the spread of STI's without pronouncing moral judgement on those involved. Similarly, when the government gives out condoms in prisons, it is for the limiting of the spread of STI's, like HIV, in the prison population, and religionists should not label it as encouraging sin. Those involved in health care should show no prejudice in dealing with such issues.

DEFINITION

If civil government commands you to *break* any one of the first four commandments or to *worship* against your conviction or to *disobey* (your conviction of) the word of God and you *yield* to the command, well, then, you are *surrendering* your faith. In our last lesson we studied the example of the 3 Jewish young men in Daniel chapter 3. They obeyed the command of the king to attend the official ceremony of the dedication as representative high- level civil officials. But when he commanded them to *transgress* the first 2 commandments of Jehovah's Law, *by bowing down to the image*, they refused and God miraculously delivered them. In his first order to assemble the king was within the realm of things to be rendered to Caesar, but in his second order to bow down to the image, he had intruded into things that belong to God. Obeying the King's first order was *not* a surrender of faith, but obeying his second order *would have been a surrender of their faith*, and so they *refused* to bow down.

DUAL CITIZENSHIP

A Christian is a citizen of God's kingdom of grace and at the same time a citizen of an earthly national civil government. Paul gave the instructions for our *heavenly* citizenship in Colossians 3 and the instructions for our *earthly* citizenship in Romans 13: 1 to 9. Until the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord at His Second Coming, Christians should be exemplary civil citizens, never confusing the *things which belong to God with the things which belong to Caesar*, not blaming the state wrongfully, and being civil-obedient within the realm of *things which belong to Caesar*. And for us preparing for the *image and mark of the beast crisis* we need to understand the intricate and complex issues involved in *rendering to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's*. Let it be said of us as was said of Daniel: "*We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God*" Daniel 6: 5.

Chapter 7



An Outline of the History of the Development of the Constitution of the USA Part I

1. Roger Williams (1603-1684)²

You will remember that we mentioned the liberty-pioneering work of **Roger Williams** in Chapter 2. We saw that he was far in advance of his times. According to historian **Bancroft**, Williams “was the first person in modern Christendom to establish civil government on the doctrine of liberty of conscience”. He believed in full religious tolerance and complete separation of church and state. He understood the principle enunciated by Jesus in Matthew 22: 21 and amplified by the Apostle Paul in Romans 13: 1 to 9. He saw in those passages what no one else in his day saw; complete separation of church and state! In 1636 he founded Rhode Island as the first fully free colony in America and the world! It would be more than a century before the other great movements for civil and religious liberties would be consolidated.

2. Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826)⁵

Jefferson was born in 1743 April 13, in Albemarle County, Virginia. His father died when he was fourteen. He entered law school at eighteen years of age in 1762, and 5 years later, in 1767, he was called to the bar

having mastered English Common Law and having made the subject of **legislation** his special focus. He was brilliant at penetrating analysis and systematic enquiry and became a leading American lawyer. During the years of the revolutionary war (1768 -1775) Jefferson was a member of the famous **Virginia House of Burgesses** for Albemarle County. The war ended in victory for the colonies, and on June 7, 1776, Richard Henry Lee of the Virginia delegation proposed independence; and Congress, after much debate, appointed a five man committee to draw up a **Declaration of Independence** with Thomas Jefferson as Chairman. The others were Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, Robert R. Livingston, and Roger Sherman. The completed document was essentially the brain child of Jefferson, it both *declared* independence and *proclaimed* a philosophy of government, a philosophy which was essentially Jefferson's in content! Here now is the **key** statement of that philosophy of government.

"We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness . That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed" .

The entire document was laid in Congress on July 4, 1776 and was approved by 28 members of the **Continental Congress**. Those 28 Members are known as the **Founding Fathers** of the United States of America. The *Declaration of Independence* contained the *basic* philosophical tenets of the civil and religious liberties of true Republicanism with fifty six signatures affixed thereto.

In September 1776 Jefferson entered the Virginia House of Delegates and embarked upon legislative reforms unprecedented in human history. He drew up almost half of the 126 bills proposed. 80% of the bills were passed into law. By 1786 his bill on the **complete separation** of church and state was at last fully adopted. His legislative skills and amazing work as a civil liberty reformer eventually led to his being elected governor of Virginia in 1779, succeeding Patrick Henry. By 1793, though, he felt politically

discouraged and even vowed never again to accept any office. That notwithstanding, his good friend Madison and others “forced” him to run for the presidency in 1796. He lost to John Adams’s by 68 to 71 electoral votes. He ran for the presidency again in 1800 and this time he defeated Adams and became the **third** president of the USA. His presidency was in a very difficult time when both England and France were hostile to the newly independent Nation. He had to make tough decisions; some were considered bad decisions by his critics. Nonetheless he was zealously and passionately committed to the concepts of natural law, of inviolable rights, of government by consent of the governed and **complete separation** of church and state with full liberty of conscience in matters of faith and worship. His most famous statement on religious liberty was written in 1779 but shelved at that time for lack of support. We quote:

“No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil capacities.”

This Jefferson document was an inspiration to, and much loved by James Madison who later resurrected it and employed it in his great work on the Constitution.

Another famous statement comes down through history as a caution, almost prophetic in its tone, we quote:

The spirit of the times may alter, will alter. Our rulers will become corrupt, our people careless. A single zealot may commence persecution, and better men be his victims. It can never be too often repeated, that the time for fixing every essential right on a legal basis is while our rulers are honest, and ourselves united. From the conclusion of this war we shall be going downhill. It will not be necessary then to resort every moment

to the people for support. They will be forgotten, therefore, and their rights disregarded. They will forget themselves, but in the sole faculty of making money, and will never think of uniting to effect a due respect for their rights. The shackles ,therefore, which shall not be knocked off at the conclusion of this war, will remain on us long, will be made heavier and heavier, till our rights shall revive or expire in a convulsion”
Thomas Jefferson, Notes on Virginia, Query XV11. In American State Papers page 101.

Thomas Jefferson was certainly one of the most important architects of civil and religious liberty in history. He requested that three of his achievements were to be carved on his tombstone; these were his **document on religious liberty**; his **authorship** of the **Declaration of Independence** and his **founding** of the **University of Virginia**. He died, (as did John Adams) on July 4, 1826 on the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. The **Jefferson Memorial** in Washington D.C is a circular colonnaded structure containing choice writings of the great President and a sculpture of him reading a draft of the Declaration.

3. JAMES MADISON (1751- 1836)⁶

Madison was born at Port Conway, Virginia on March 16, 1751. His tertiary education took place at the College of New Jersey, now called Princeton University, from 1769 -1771. He was a sharp debater at University and a skilled writer. In 1776 Madison was elected to the Virginia Constitutional Convention. There he met for the first time Thomas Jefferson and the two began a friendship that was to last for half a century. Madison was appointed to the committee to prepare and to draft a plan of state government. The great **George Mason** of Gunston Hall was chief author. The last section of a sixteen-section **Declaration of Rights** adopted by the House of Burgesses reflected the thoughts of Jefferson and also the influence of Madison’s thinking. It declared: “ **That religion, or the duty we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and**

***conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience* “ AMERICAN ARCHIVES, Fourth Series, Vol.6pp.1561,1562**

In his tenure at the Virginia Constitutional Convention Madison also proposed an amendment to separate church and state in Virginia. He was active in Virginia politics during the period 1777- 1785 and in 1785 he led a successful fight on the floor to enact Jefferson’s Bill for religious freedom, this was a major accomplishment in the development of religious liberty in the USA and the world! Among his political achievements he was a member of Congress and after retiring from Congress in 1797 he expected to live a quiet life. However certain events (the passing of Alien and Sedition Acts in 1798) stirred him into active politics again. Madison was Secretary of State under Jefferson’s Presidency and with Jefferson’s support he won Presidency in 1808 becoming the fourth President of the USA. After an illustrious career, he died on June 28, 1836.

But let us return to his work in religious liberty and on the US Constitution.

Madison along with Mason and Jefferson successfully argued against the establishment of any denomination as a state-church and their clear reasoning galvanized the **dis-establishment of the Anglican Church**. They also successfully argued that no denomination or religion should have a **legal preference** over any other denomination or religion. In other words the USA was not to be made a religious state, whether Christian or otherwise. When a certain Patrick Henry championed a general tax labelled “A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Faith” in 1784, Madison denounced it as “**chiefly obnoxious on account of its dishonorable principle and dangerous tendency**” **Writings of James Madison, Vol.1, pp.130, 131(American State Papers page 99).**

In his famous “A Memorial and Remonstrance” printed and circulated in 1785 he wrote:

“Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects? That the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute three pence only for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?” Ibid., pp.84, 85.

State-church disestablishment had been achieved first in Virginia but other States were slow in following Virginia’s example. The time was ripe for Federal intervention. When the Federal Constitutional Convention adjourned on September 17, 1787, it had produced an impressive document. It guaranteed that there would be no religious test required for holding public office in the new government. But it had no bill of rights and no positive guarantees of church- state separation. Both George Mason and Thomas Jefferson were very disappointed. However as the local states commenced ratification procedures for the Constitution there was launched a move for **a bill of rights** and three states (Virginia, New York, and New Hampshire) also asked for a **declaration of religious liberty**. Guess who was in the thick of things? James Madison, of course! He presented a long list of amendments to the First Congress, meeting in 1789. Number one on the list was a religious liberty amendment which he had drawn up himself. After some fine tuning by his colleagues it was one of seventeen proposals sent to the Senate; twelve of them were eventually sent to the states and ten were ultimately ratified. When the **Bill of Rights** was born in 1791, the wall of separation between church and state became the law of the USA! Let us read Madison’s first amendment: **Amendments to the Constitution, Article 1. “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”**

CONCLUSION

History has clearly shown that *all* persecutory powers or kingdoms or governments, without exception, were church-state or religious-state alliances or unions. Such powers are symbolized as **beasts of prey** in Bible prophecy. The only world government *not* symbolized as a beast of prey but as a harmless herbivore, *a lamb*, is the civil government of USA in Revelation 13 : 11.(Remember Satan got the Jews to crucify Christ through that same evil principle of religious intolerance).

Jesus is the *Lamb* of God. John1:29. And the *government* is upon His shoulders. Isaiah 9: 6. Since the Bible uses the symbol of *a lamb* to represent non-persecutory or *harmless* government, it means that the government of God the Father and His Son, is a *harmless* government, *not* persecutory, that is, God's government *does not* kill those who choose to differ with His principles but Christ lets them go, gives them up to their choice and the consequences of such a choice. This is the *wrath* of the lamb.Rev.6: 16; Romans 1.

In fact Jesus says that He will not even judge those who reject Him, their rejection of His word means that they pass judgement on themselves. John 12: 47-48.

As A T Jones said, the USA constitution is the only civil constitution in the history of the world that allows full liberty of conscience and, if followed, persecutes *no one for their faith* and guarantees complete separation of church (religion) and state. So long as there is **complete separation of church and state** in accordance with Jesus in Matthew 22:21, Satan cannot achieve his objective of persecuting and eliminating God's true people from the earth in his quest for a one world Religious-political-economic system with the enforcement of false worship. Therefore he, Satan, must devise strategies to cause the modern, "enlightened", final generation of mankind to reverse the process of church-state separation and revert to the intolerance of the Dark Ages. One strategy is to cause people to forget the history of persecution in past ages, and the subsequent history of the development of liberty of conscience in USA in the eighteenth and

nineteenth centuries. Another strategy is to cause people to abuse freedom through a lack of self-government and then lead religionists and other authorities to blame freedom for all the evils in society and to argue for restriction of freedoms and for the civil enforcement of Christianity .

Jefferson said that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

And God says that His people are destroyed for lack of knowledge.

My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee... Hosea 4:6, first part

The Third Angel's Message warns against the ***image of the beast***, which means ***the resurgence of church-state persecutory intolerance*** in the end-time by apostate Protestantism. We cannot give that warning without a thorough knowledge of these issues that we are now studying. Moreover we shall see that the doctrine of liberty of conscience is inseparable from the true gospel and the Character of God message.

Chapter 8



An Outline of the History of the Development of the Constitution of the USA Part 2

In our last chapter, we saw that the US Constitution in Article VI says “...*but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States*”. We also saw that Madison’s amendment: **Amendments to the Constitution, Article 1**, says clearly that: “*Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;*”. This first amendment was adopted in 1789, by the first Congress that ever met under the Constitution.

In 1796 in a treaty made with Tripoli and signed by President Washington, the US Government declared (Article II) that: “*the Government of the USA is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion.*”²⁰

LISTEN NOW TO AT JONES:

“It was not out of disrespect to religion or Christianity that these clauses were placed in the Constitution, and that one was inserted in that treaty. On the contrary, it was **entirely on account of their respect for religion, and the Christian religion in particular, as being beyond the province of civil government, pertaining solely to the conscience, and resting entirely between the individual and God.** It was because of this that

this nation was constitutionally established according to the principle of Christ, demanding of men only that they render to Caesar that which is Caesar's, **and leaving them entirely free to render to God that which is God's, if they choose, as they choose, and when they choose;** or as expressed by Washington himself, in reply to an address upon the subject of religious legislation:-

'Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen, is accountable to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience ' Pres. Washington. AT JONES: CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION Pages 24 to 27

Amendments to the Constitution, Article XIV, commonly called the Fourteenth Amendment, was added to the USA Constitution in 1868. It reads thus:

'No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.'

This Fourteenth Amendment was added so as to ensure that laws of individual States uphold the USA Constitution, especially the First Amendment to the Constitution.

AMERICAN HISTORIAN GEORGE BANCROFT

George Bancroft, one of the greatest American Historians, was born on Oct.3, 1800. He entered Harvard College at age 13 and graduated at age 17. He then proceeded to Germany where he eventually completed his doctorate. He was a brilliant and keen student of history, theology, languages and political science. He was the author of the first major history of the United States, and in fact wrote many books. He died on January17, 1891, aged 90. He was inducted into the Hall of Fame of Great Americans. In one of his great works: ***History of the Formation of***

the USA Constitution, he wrote this beautiful historical tribute to this principle of liberty of conscience.

“In the earliest States known to history, government and religion were one and indivisible. Each state had its special deity, and often these protectors, one after another, might be overthrown in battle never to rise again. The Peloponnesian War grew out of a strife about an Oracle. Rome, as it sometimes adopted into citizenship those whom it vanquished, introduced in like manner, and with good logic for that day, the worship of their gods. No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual, till a Voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity, **by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Caesar only that which is Caesar's.** The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men. No sooner was this religion adopted by the chief of the Roman Empire, than it was shorn of its character of universality and enthralled by an unholy connection with an unholy State; and so it continued till the new nation, - the least defiled with the barren scoffings of the eighteenth century, the most general believer in Christianity of any people of that age, the chief heir of the Reformation in its purest forms, when it came to establish a government for the United States, refused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by a corporate body, or having a headship in a monarch or State.

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

eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power.”
George Bancroft in *History of the Formation of the American Constitution*, last chapter.

THE VOICE IN JUDEA

Jesus *both taught and lived* the principle He enunciated in Matt.22:21; John 18:36.

“The government under which Jesus lived was corrupt and oppressive; on every hand were crying abuses,—extortion, intolerance, and grinding cruelty. Yet the Saviour attempted no civil reforms. He attacked no national abuses, nor condemned the national enemies. He did not interfere with the authority or administration of those in power. He who was our example kept aloof from earthly governments. Not because He was indifferent to the woes of men, but because the remedy did not lie in merely human and external measures. To be efficient, the cure must reach men individually, and must regenerate the heart.”

Not by the decisions of courts or councils or legislative assemblies, not by the patronage of worldly great men, is the kingdom of Christ established, but by the implanting of Christ's nature in humanity through the work of the Holy Spirit. “As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” John 1:12, 13. Here is the only power that can work the uplifting of mankind. And the human agency for the accomplishment of this work is the teaching and practicing of the word of God.”

“Now, as in Christ's day, the work of God's kingdom lies not with those who are clamoring for recognition and support by earthly rulers and human laws, but with those who are declaring to the people in His name those spiritual truths that will work in the receivers the experience of Paul: “I am crucified

with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Galatians 2:20. Then they will labor as did Paul for the benefit of men. He said, "Now then 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." 2 Corinthians 5:20." {DA 510}

Thus the Constitution of the United States as it is, stands as the sole monument of all history representing the principle which Christ established for earthly government. And under it, in liberty, civil and religious, in enlightenment, and in progress, the USA has deservedly stood as the beacon-light of the world, for two centuries.

THE GENIUS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT

The First Amendment has two clauses addressing religious liberty:

1. The **Establishment Clause**: "Congress shall make no law respecting an *establishment of religion*; and 2. The **Free Exercise Clause**: "... Or *prohibiting the free exercise* thereof ... ".

THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE

Any activity or law of the government which establishes a religious practice or sponsors a religion or religious belief or practice or tradition, or favours one religion above others violates the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment.

The USA Supreme Court laid down a three-prong test in 1971 to determine whether a particular government action constitutes an establishment of religion. (The *Case of Lemon vs Kurtzman*; Ref. 310 US 296.)

- (i) Does the activity have a secular (non-religious) purpose?
- (ii) Does the activity primarily advance or inhibit religion?
- (iii) Does the activity constitute excessive government involvement with religion?

For example, if government gives a public holiday for rest and recreation there is no violation of the First Amendment. But if government insists that the individual should not do any kind of work or play on that day for religious reasons, or if government insists that people should worship on that day, the Establishment Clause has been violated.

THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE

This clause protects the right of the individual to believe, teach and practice his religion according to his own convictions.

HOW THE TWO CLAUSES FUNCTION TOGETHER

To show how the two clauses operate, let us look at the following examples:

- a) If government were to require everyone to attend a particular church, that would be a violation of the **Establishment Clause**. If government were to prohibit people from attending a particular church, that would be a violation of **Free Exercise Clause**.
- b) If government were to require everyone to keep a particular day as the Christian Sabbath or Lord's Day, that would be a violation of the **Establishment Clause**. If government were to prohibit anyone from keeping a particular day as a special day of worship, that would be a violation of the **Free Exercise Clause**.

It should be clear, then, that any call to make any government /state a religious or Christian government /state, is a call to violate the principle enunciated by Christ in Matthew 22:21, and is in fact *anti-Christian*. Similarly any call for the government to enforce any kind of worship or to enforce the Ten Commandments as the moral code for society through civil law, is also a call to violate the principle of Christ in Matthew 22: 21 and is also, in fact, *anti-Christian!*

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THE "WALL OF SEPARATION" BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE

The term "**wall of separation**" is a commonly used term and is subject to misuse if not clearly understood. It was first coined by Thomas Jefferson, it is not explicitly written down in the First Amendment.

The First Amendment was not intended to abolish religious principles or religious thinking in public life. Nor was it intended to prohibit a politician's individual use of religious principles in his public life.

When James Madison was asked what he meant when he first offered the First Amendment in its original form to Congress in 1789, this was his answer:

“...that Congress should not establish a religion and enforce the legal observance of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to their conscience.”

This then is the true meaning of the “wall of separation“, not that the government should be anti- religious, but that it should ***not enforce*** any religious doctrine or practice ***by law*** or ***compel*** any citizen to obey any religious duty he ***does not conscientiously believe***.

Therefore, as we have stated in a previous lesson, when a government allows liberty of conscience it is acting in harmony with New Testament Christianity. But when it does not allow liberty of conscience and, instead, enforces or prohibits any religion, thereby violating the consciences of those of a different persuasion, it is an anti-Christian government. The basis for this conclusion is the principle enunciated by Christ: ***“Render therefore to Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s.”***

IT DOES NOT MEAN A GODLESS STATE

Some people may think or suggest that the term ‘wall of separation’ between church and state means the establishment of a godless state.

NO. IT DOES NOT MEAN THAT!

It simply means that the state allows everyone the freedom to practice one’s religion without compelling anyone to practice a religion which one does not believe in. The state should not oppose religion or show hostility to religion. It should allow the freedom and security for each citizen to practice his conscientious beliefs.

There are some who would want government to establish an atheistic or completely secular state by opposing or banning all religion, but this would also be a violation of the Constitutional principles of liberty of conscience. In the case of *Abington Township vs Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963), the US Supreme Court declared that:

“...the state may not establish ‘a religion of secularism’ in the sense of affirmatively opposing or showing hostility to religion, thus ‘preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe’.”

In summary, then, the term ‘wall of separation between church and state’ when correctly understood is a wonderful principle of religious liberty, and is completely in harmony with the principle of our Saviour in Matthew 22:21.

James Madison expressed it succinctly and clearly when he said:

“Religion and government will both exist in greater purity, the less they are mixed.”

PROTESTANTISM AND REPUBLICANISM

The USA Constitution sets forth a non- monarchical government, of the people, by the consent of the people, for the people. It guarantees the right of its citizens to elect the government of their choice through free, fair and open elections. It also guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly and freedom of peaceful protest. These are the *fundamental liberties* of genuine democratic *republicanism*, the freest and best form of civil government.

In addition the USA Constitution guarantees *religious liberty*, or liberty of conscience, in matters of **faith, worship and religious duty**. It leaves the matters of *defining* the *law* of God, and *defining sin* to the *individual conscience*, as pertaining solely to God and not to the civil government, thereby setting forth the important principles of *separation* of church and state. **These are the fundamental, inalienable principles of true Protestantism.**

Adventist pioneer, **J N Andrews**¹⁷ was the first American Bible student to see all of the above symbolized in the first part of Revelation 13: 11:

“And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb....”

Andrews reasoned that the major world Empires and kingdoms down through history have been mentioned in the Bible either in bible prophecy or bible history and especially so when they made a **significant** impact, one way or another, on the progress of God’s truth and God’s church. He concluded that the development of civil and religious liberties in the USA was significant enough to merit a place in end-time bible prophecy. And so he searched and studied diligently. He knew that the **first** or leopard-bodied beast in Rev.13:1 to 10 represented the Papacy from 538 to 1798 AD and he recognized that all previous kingdoms were symbolized as beasts of **prey** indicating their persecutory nature. So he was immediately struck with the **difference** in symbolism of the beast brought to view in Rev 13: 11, first part. Andrews reasoned: “A beast having horns like a **lamb**? That must be significant. It must mean a different kind of governmental system previously unknown in world history” He was the first to interpret the two horns as Republicanism and Protestantism, with the lamb’s body representing the benign, gentle and liberty-loving nature of its Constitution.

A truly protestant government guarantees full religious freedom and upholds the rule of civil law impartially applied to all citizens. The moment a civil government enforces religion or religious duty by law it has changed from **lamb-like to dragon-like (or persecutory) nature**.

The USA is still in its lamb-like phase. It will change to its dragon-like phase in the not too distant future. How? and Why? The answers will occupy us in the lessons ahead.

CHAPTER 9



Opposition to the First Amendment in the Nineteenth Century

One hundred years had not even yet passed since the First Amendment was added to the US Constitution in 1789, when, in the late 1800's (1884 to 1888), there developed a concerted effort to make and to declare America a **Christian state** by legislation. Interestingly enough, the two major planks chosen as identifiable markers of the proposed church-state union were compulsory Christian education in Public schools and legislation of a National Sunday law to enforce Sunday sacredness and worship. The aims were ostensibly noble and the reasoning sounded sweetly logical, so much so, that it took solid counter-reasoning from history and scripture to defeat that proposal to make the USA a Christian state.

The organizations at the forefront back then were the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the National Reform Association, the Lord's Day Alliance and the Sunday-law Association :- all protestant Christian organizations. Their aim was to make America a Christian Nation by legislative enforcement of Christianity upon the population. They did not seem to understand or to believe that in the very act of enforcing religious beliefs and practices by the civil law they would be rejecting the essential principles of Protestantism.

Let us look at some of the strident views that were published at that time:-

“Give all men to understand that this is a Christian nation, and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain by all means our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution. Enforce upon all, who come among us the laws of Christian morality.” **The Christian Statesman, Oct.2, 1884.**

“Our remedy for all these maleficent 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.” **M.A Gault, National Reform Association.1884.**

E .B Graham, a vice-president of the National Reform Association in an address delivered at York, Nebraska and reported in the Christian Statesman of May21,1885, said:-

“We might add in all justice, If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild ,desolate land, and in the name of the devil, and, For the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas ; and then if they can stand it, stay there till they die.”

The above were but a few of the many calls, spoken and written, in the late nineteenth century for making America a Christian state and inscribing Christianity in the USA Constitution. The main reasons for those calls to make America a church-state union at that time are listed below:-

1. The rapid development of atheistic ideology spurred on by, what was then, the new ‘Theory of Organic Evolution’ which rejected the Biblical account of creation by God.
2. The rise of materialistic secularism and a decline in church attendance even among professed believers.

3. Increasing crime and lawlessness

4. The increase in the number of Christian sects with beliefs differing from what was considered 'main-stream' or orthodox Christianity.

Those developments were seen as threats to Christianity, morality and social stability. And it was felt that 'orthodox' Christianity could not be left up merely to individual free choice, but, in order to be effective, had to be enforced by civil law. A national Sunday law, enforcing Sunday sacredness, was seen as mark of Christian statehood, while inscribing mainstream Christianity into the Constitution would eliminate sectarianism. Such was the thinking of those so-called Protestant Groups that wanted a Christian state in the 1880's. In fact, one Jonathan Edwards D.D., the most militant in his opposition to Atheism, said in 1873:-

"Let us repeat, atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They cannot dwell together on the same continent."

He went on to say:-

"We want State and religion, and we are going to have it...the religion of Jesus Christ. The Christian oath and Christian morality shall have in this land 'an undeniable legal basis'. When he was warned that deists, Jews, and Sabbath keeping Christians would be hurt by such legislation, he lumped them all together as in the same class as the atheist! (Imagine that!?)."

THE BLAIR SUNDAY LAW BILL

In May, 1888, Senator Henry W. Blair introduced a resolution and a bill to the US Congress. The bill (May 21, 1888) was for the enforcement of a National Sunday Law. The Resolution (May 25, 1888) proposed an Amendment to the USA Constitution respecting establishment of religion.

Can you, dear reader, grasp the terrible significance of that resolution and that bill? How could any American protestant Christian, in that era of less than a hundred years after the addition of the First Amendment, seek to alter a Constitution that was in perfect harmony with Matthew 22: 21?

Listen again to what they either forgot or rejected:-

“The Framers of the Constitution recognized the eternal principle that man's relation to God is above human legislation and his conscience inalienable. Reasoning was not necessary to establish this truth; we are conscious of it in our own bosoms. It is this consciousness which, in defiance of human laws, has sustained so many martyrs in tortures and flames. They felt that their duty to God was superior to human enactments, and that man could exercise no authority over their consciences. It is an inborn principle which nothing can eradicate.” **Congressional Documents (USA) No. 200, Document No. 271.**

A T JONES' DEFENSE OF THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION⁸

AT Jones, a history professor, Seventh Day Adventist theologian and Reformer requested, and was granted, permission to represent Seventh Day Adventists at the Congressional debate of the Blair Sunday law bill. Jones spoke for 90 minutes and was interrupted 169 times by the chairman alone, but he patiently persevered in his rebuttal of the Blair Sunday law bill. Time and space would not allow us to cover his entire speech but we shall look at some of the key points of his presentation. Here is one **solid point**, from Jones, to start with:-

“To enforce upon men the laws of Christian morality, is nothing else than an attempt to compel them to be Christian, and does in fact compel them to be hypocrites. It will be seen at once that this will be but to invade the rights of conscience.....”

Jones gave an exposition of Matt.22:21 and also of Romans 13: 1 to 9 (as we have studied it in earlier lessons) and explained that all matters pertaining to the first four of the Ten Commandments belong to God and must be rendered only to God and not to Caesar or *through* Caesar to God. Just as Jesus had asked the Pharisees to show him the coin and then asked whose name and superscription was on, so Jones asked whose Name and Superscription was on the Sabbath and pointed out that it was the Sabbath

of the Lord Our God, and belongs therefore to God. Therefore, he said, render to God the things that are God's! Jones especially emphasized that though '*ordained*' of God (KJV), civil government was *not* ordained of God in matters *pertaining* to God but only in *civil* matters. As we explained in Chapter 3.

Jones also pointed out that if there was a proposed Saturday law he would also oppose it, and just as vehemently as he opposed the Sunday law! He asked: "if SDA's were a majority and wanted to enforce the seventh day Sabbath, Saturday, would it be right to force you to keep Saturday against your belief?" This was a penetrating question to all assembled! There could be only one genuine *American* answer! **NO**.

So Blair tried a new tactic; he asked: "If Caesar is society and the Sabbath is required for the good of Society, does not God require us to establish the Sabbath for the good of Society and if Society makes a law, would it not be binding?" Jones line of reasoning to answer that question was that the Sabbath is only good for any man, and therefore for any society of men, when it is kept by one's free choice springing from love to God; and not by the force of civil legislation. Forced obedience is not acceptable to God and can receive no blessing or good from God.

Blair then came from another angle. He said that those who keep Sunday claim that those who work on Sundays disturb their work and worship.

A T Jones became more strident in dealing with this question. Jones said that it was a blatantly false claim, because if it was true, then those who work on Saturdays disturb the rest and worship of seventh day Sabbath keepers but, yet, claim that they do not disturb them. So if Saturday workers (who were in the majority) don't disturb Saturday Sabbath keepers, how could Sunday workers (who were in the minority) disturb Sunday keepers? It could not be a valid reason for enforcing Sunday rest!

Jones went on to explain that to enforce **rest**, (that is *no work legally allowed*), on Sundays (or any day) was to compel men to be idle, interfere with their right to earn a living, and in fact, would cause an increase in

criminal activity. Jones backed up this statement with statistical evidence from the Courts.

To get around that point, Blair brought up the subject of Israel as a Theocracy, and said that, under the Theocracy, Sabbath rest was enforced by law with the death penalty attached. Jones pointed out that Jesus in His statement to render to God what was God's and to Caesar what is Caesar's had clearly shown that the Theocracy had ended. In the genuine full Theocracy God, as King and Judge, was in control of the government of Israel at all levels. But Israel departed step by step from God's ways and eventually through apostasy was conquered by Babylon and then, later, by Rome, thereby and therefore practically ending the theocracy even before it was officially ended by their terminal announcement at the Cross, when they shouted out "*We have no king but Caesar.*" *John 19:15*. Jones further reiterated that the USA Constitution and Government were by no means theocratic. In other words America was *not* a Theocracy.

In an attempt to soften Jones' point, Blair mentioned the then existing laws, in many nations, against **blasphemy**. A T Jones showed quite clearly that **blasphemy** was entirely a matter between the individual's soul and God, similar to the first four commandments, and into that realm civil government has no right to intervene. Whichever definition of **blasphemy** the state accepts would be but to prefer one religion over the other religion which has a different definition.

JONES' CONCLUDING REMARKS⁸

" Thus it is clearly demonstrated that Senator Blair's proposed Constitutional amendment, if adopted, will only open the way to the establishment of a religious despotism in this dear land, and that this is the very use those who are most in favor of it intend to make of it. And to favor that amendment is to favor a religious despotism."

Jones' defense of religious liberty and separation of church and state was not only successful but highly significant because he had not long before, along with Waggoner, given the message of righteousness by faith to the

General Conference of SDA'S. A message which, if it had been accepted, could have, and would have, ushered in the final 'loud cry' of Rev.18: 1 to 4 in an amazingly short time.

NO NEW THING UNDER THE SUN

- *"The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun." Ecclesiastes 1:9:*

According to Solomon's principle, history repeats itself. Church-state Sunday legislation was instituted a long time ago by the Bishops of Rome through Emperor Constantine. True USA Protestantism rejected church- state union, but in the end - time false Protestantism will again revive Church-state Sunday legislation and precipitate the world's final religious- political crisis. So we need to go back in history to learn how the first church- state Sunday legislation developed, then we shall be better able to understand how it will be reinstated by modern false American Protestantism.

Chapter 10



History of the Evolution of Church - State Union and Sunday Legislation in the Fourth Century

Part I

SOURCES OF SUCH HISTORY

Two great German-educated historians, **August Neander** and **Philip Schaff** have left on record, for the whole world, thorough works of the history of the Christian religion and the church from the first century right through to the Reformation and even to the development of American Protestant freedoms.

Johann August Wilhelm Neander⁹ (Jan.17, 1789 – July 14, 1850), was a German theologian and church historian. He was born at **Gottingen** as David Mendel. His father was a Jew. His mother divorced his useless father and moved to Hamburg with the very young David who at age 17 converted to Christianity, was baptized on 25th Feb.1806, and changed his name from David Mendel to Johann August **Neander**. He went to **Halle** to study Divinity. At **Halle** the young Neander had as his lecturer Prof. Friedrich Schleiermacher whose teaching inspired the young brilliant student to learn well and to be analytical in his thinking. The War of the Coalition forced him to return to Gottingen where he successfully pursued advanced studies in **theology** under the venerable Prof. G J Planck. It was at this point in time that **Neander seemed to**

have realized that the original investigation of Christian history was to form the great work of his life. Upon completion of his university studies he returned to Hamburg, and passed his examination for the Christian ministry. However after about eighteen months he decided upon an academic career which began at **Heidelberg, and by 1812 was appointed Professor.** As he started to research and publish, others came to recognize his analytical genius fairly quickly and realized that a world- class church historian was in the making! Neander's in-depth and scholarly research led to the publication of many papers and booklets. Meanwhile and meantime he was working on his great and monumental work entitled:- **GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH by Dr. August Neander.** The first volume, covering the first three centuries, appeared in 1825. Other volumes followed at intervals, the fifth was published in 1842 and a sixth volume was published in 1852 after Neander's death (edited by C F T Schneider).

The several volumes were translated by Prof. Joseph Torrey and the English version came to be called *Torrey's Neander.*

A T Jones loved the German language and was intrigued by German Scholarship. He diligently studied **Neander's** history of the Christian religion and the church, and frequently quoted therefrom as one of the most authentic sources available.

PHILIP SCHAFF¹⁰, JAN1, 1819 - OCT20, 1893

Philip Schaff was a Swiss born, German educated Protestant Theologian and ecclesiastical historian who spent most of his adult life in the USA.

Born in *Chur*, Switzerland and educated in Stuttgart, Germany, he attended the universities of Tübingen, Halle and Berlin. He was influenced by many great German Scholars including, and especially by, **Neander.** After completing his Bachelor's in Divinity in 1841 and having passed examinations for Professorship, he traveled through Italy and Sicily. In 1843 he was called to be professor of Church History and Biblical Literature in the German Reformed Theological Seminary in Pennsylvania USA.

His two most accomplished works were Schaff's *History of The Apostolic Church*, (in German in 1851 and in English in 1853); and *History of The Christian Church*, a 7 volume masterpiece, 1858-1892. The latter resembled Neander's work, though less biographical and less philosophical. Schaff became professor at Union Theological Seminary, New York, in 1870. He also served as president of the committee that translated the American Standard Version of the Bible.

Schaff was also one of AT Jones favourite sources of church history.

APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY

The Apostolic Church (AD 31 to AD 100) followed the teaching and example of Christ in remaining *separate* from the state while it *rendered* to the state (Caesar) what belonged to the state and *rendered* to God what belonged to God, *without* confusing or mixing the two. In other words, the Apostolic Church obeyed Matthew 22: 21; Romans 13:1 – 9; James 4:4; 1 John 2: 15 – 17; John 18: 36; and 2Cor.11:2.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY

The Apostle Paul had a fear: *“But I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity which is in Christ.”* 2 Cor.11: 3. And he told the Thessalonians that something called the “*mystery of iniquity*” (KJV) was already beginning to develop in that Apostolic era. 2 Thess. 2: 7.

Furthermore Jesus reproved Ephesus about the loss of their first love for Him. Rev.2: 4.

Persecution kept the early church relatively pure but as Paganism converted to Christianity, the *mystery of Iniquity* developed quite rapidly into an apostate Christianity.

THE DECLINE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Rome had started out as a Republic with the overthrow of its traditional monarchy in 509BC . This Republican phase ended in 27 BC with the establishment of the Roman Empire. You will remember that Rome

reached world dominance in 168BC. In the republican phase, although there was an oligarchy, citizens were for the most part hard -working, honest, and practiced economy and thrift. In other words individual self-government was at an acceptable standard. But as Rome progressively conquered the world, great wealth and slaves poured into the state and these resulted in luxury, ease and increasing love of money, materialism, pleasure and entertainment . Slavery also brought its attendant problems causing unemployment and unrest among the working classes. Therefore as Rome's wealth and world dominance increased, there was a progressive decline in individual self-government producing power struggles in the ruling clans and increasing crime and lawlessness in the masses. Whenever individual self-government fails ,it becomes more and more difficult for civil government to control society and under such circumstances the state looks for help elsewhere. Such were the circumstances at the time when Constantine became Emperor.

ANALYSIS OF THE SPIRITUAL PATHOLOGY OF THE MYSTERY OF INIQUITY

The church was to remain a faithful wife to her husband Christ Jesus, but when she lost her first love for Him, she also lost His *mind*, and therefore lost her *meek* and *lowly heart* which she had when she had been learning of Him ,see Matthew 11: 28-30. So instead of remaining *meek* and *humble*, the apostate Christianity became *proud* and *self-assertive* and desired worldly power, while depending less and less on the word and Spirit of God, and more and more on human philosophical reasoning. Having left her first Husband she now found, in the state, another husband. At the same time she also forsook Christ's principle of the separation between the things of Caesar and the things of God, and sought to bring the Old Testament Israelite Theocracy into the New Testament Church. This *false theocratic theory* led progressively to marriage between church and state. This marriage was facilitated *firstly* by the desire of the church leadership to obtain the power of the state to further their own ends, and *secondly* by the desire of the state leadership (initially and especially **Constantine**) to obtain the favour of the church to further his own political ambitions. In other words the combination of apostasy in the church and a decline in

the ability of civil government to control society led to the development of church-state union. **This is very significant, as these same problems in our day will lead to the end-time protestant church-state union which will precipitate the world's final crisis.**

The great church historians, **Neander** and **Schaff**, in their brilliant research into church history and in their incisive analysis, have both left on record an account of the above evolution of the marriage of church and state which eventually produced the Papal church- state persecutory beast of the Dark Ages (Rev.13:1-10); and which will again be used by Satan in the end-time through false Protestantism, the last persecutory beast of Bible prophecy,(Rev.13:11-18).

Listen to Neander!

“ There had in fact arisen in the church a false theocratical theory, originating not in the essence of the gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments, whichbrought along with it an unchristian opposition of the Spiritual to the secular power, and which might easily result in the formation of a sacerdotal State, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way.....This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and.....the bishops made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and by their determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims" Torrey's Translation of Neander: General History of Christianity and the Church (Boston,1852) page 132.

In addition, Constantine worked unceasingly to stabilize the disintegrating Roman Empire by his efforts to reconcile Christians and pagans and to suppress paganism while favouring Christianity. In fact **Eusebius** wrote that Constantine's first act on behalf of the Christians was his **Edict of Tolerance, A.D 313** which granted”*to Christians, and to all, the free choice to follow that mode of worship which they may wish.*” **Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, Book 10.**

But as soon as religious liberty had been given to the Bishops of Rome, they, through their *theocratic theory* sought to control the whole Empire and to make all people Christians through the power of the state.

Neander pointed out that such efforts by Constantine were: “**not so much for the cause of God, as for the gratification of his own ambition and love of power.**” (Ibid.)

Constantine accepted the *theocratic* theory of the Church Bishops and saw in that theory a wonderful opportunity for the political reformation and stabilization of the weakening Roman Empire.

Philip Schaff wrote that Constantine was;

“the first representative of the imposing idea of a Christian theocracy, or of that system of policy which assumes all subjects to be Christians, connects civil and religious rights, and regards church and state as the two arms of one and the same divine government on earth....Christianity appeared to him, as it proved, in fact, the only efficient power for the political reformation of the empire, from which the ancient spirit of Rome was fast departing.” Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 5th Edition, (Revised), Vol.3, pages 15, 16.

The evolution of a church-state Christian Theocracy was the first of two manifestations of the *Mystery of Iniquity*. The second manifestation evolved even more insidiously than the first. We are talking about the evolution of Sunday sacredness.

THE VENERABLE DAY OF THE SUN

In his quest for additional devices of unity, Constantine carefully studied the significance attached to the first day of the week by both Christian and pagan sectors of the Empire. Many Christians had for some time attached the *Lord's Day* label to the first day of the week with the claim that it was a celebration of Christ's resurrection although there was no scriptural evidence that Christ had given such a command. Many pagans, including the Mithraists worshiped the sun as a God. Sun worship was a

pagan practice from very ancient times and even ancient Judaism had been contaminated by it. According to Historian, Philip Schaff Constantine found it politically expedient, therefore, to please these two diverse segments of his Empire by honouring the *venerable day of the sun* by a governmental edict in which he *combined* the celebration of the sun-god, Apollo, and Christ, the true Sun of Righteousness, into one, by promoting and recommending Sunday (Dies Solis) to his subjects. According to **Neander** and another historian, **A P Stanley**, it was Constantine's mode of harmonising the Christian and Pagan elements of the Empire under one common institution to promote unity.

History shows us quite clearly that church-state union and Sunday-sacredness developed together as the apostate Christianity gained progressive control of the weakening Roman Empire. As Paganism was conquered outwardly, it conquered the Christianity inwardly by incorporating and uniting itself with the new doctrines of apostate Christianity. This is symbolized in Revelation Chapter 2: 12 to 17 as the **Pergamos** era of church history, the era of compromise (313 to 508 and unto 538 AD). It is also symbolized as the **Black Horse** of the Third Seal in Rev.6: 5, 6. Constantine, in concert with the Bishops of Rome, played a key role in the early development of that Pergamos era when many pagan errors were incorporated into the popular but apostate Christianity. Two of those errors: Sunday sacredness and the natural immortality of the human soul will continue to deceive millions right up to the final crisis. They will be united with calls for the enforcement of Christianity by the state to save the world from progressively worsening conditions, but in fact will lead to global ruin. We must be prepared for that coming final conflict!

Chapter 11



History of the Evolution of Church - State Union and Sunday Legislation in the Fourth Century

Part 2

BY AT JONES FROM 'THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE' (1895)¹⁹

Introduction

A T Jones relied heavily on the great church historians especially **Neander** and **Schaff**, in his analysis of how and why fourth century Sunday-legislation was firmly established in the Christianized Roman Empire in his book: **The Rights of the People, published in 1895.**

OUTLINE:

Stages of the development of Sunday laws.

- **AD 321 Constantine's Sunday law-**
- **AD 386 civil transaction of any kind strictly forbidden**
- **AD 425- law enacted to compel all to worship on Sunday**
- **AD 538- papacy gains power, and persecution & death pronounced on the righteous.**

FIRST SUNDAY LAW-AD321

“On the venerable day of the sun let the magistrates and people living in towns rest, and let all workshops be closed. Nevertheless, in the country,

those engaged in the cultivation of land may freely and lawfully work, because it often happens that mother day is not so well fitted for sowing grain and planting vines; lest by neglect of the best time the bounty provided by Heaven should be lost. Given the seventh day of March, Crispus and Constantine being consuls, both for the second time.” [A. D. 321.]

This was not the very first Sunday law that they secured; the first one has not survived. But though it has not survived, the reason for it has. Sozomen says that it was “that the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purposes of devotion.” And this statement of Sozomen’s is endorsed by Neander (“Church History,” Vol. II. p. 298). This reason given by Sozomen reveals the secret of the legislation; it shows that it was in behalf of the church, and to please the church.

By reading the above edict, it is seen that they started out quite moderately. They did not stop all work; only judges, townspeople, and mechanics were required to rest, while people in the country might freely and lawfully work.

SECOND PHASE- NO CIVIL TRANSACTION OF ANY KIND ON SUNDAY- AD386

This Sunday law of a. d. 321 continued until 386, when: “Those older changes effected by the Emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced, and, in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden. Whoever transgressed was to be considered, in fact, as guilty of sacrilege.”-Neander, Id., p. 300.

THIRD PHASE - AD 425, CITIZENS COMPELLED TO WORSHIP ON SUNDAY

CARTHAGE CONVENTION AND PETITION OF 401AD

Then as the people were not allowed to do any manner of work, they would play, and, as the natural consequence, the circuses and the theaters throughout the empire were crowded every Sunday. But the object of the law, from the first one that was issued, was that the day might be used for the purposes of devotion, and the people might go to church. Consequently, that this object might be met, there was another step to take, and it was

taken. At a church convention held at Carthage in 401, the bishops passed a resolution to send up a petition to the emperor, requesting:

“That the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday, and from feast days, to some other days of the week.”-Id.

And the reason given in support of the petition was: “The people congregate more to the circus than to the church.”-Id., notes 5.

In the circuses and the theaters large numbers of men were employed, among whom many were church members. But, rather than to give up their jobs, they would work on Sunday. The bishops complained that these were compelled to work; they pronounced it persecution, and asked for a law to protect those persons from such “persecution.” The church had become filled with a mass of people, many unconverted, who cared vastly more for worldly interests and pleasures than they did for religion. And as the government was now a government of God, it was considered proper that the civil power should be used to cause all to show respect for God, whether or not they had any respect for him.

425 AD PETITION ACCEPTED AND THE LAW ENACTED

“Church teachers . . . were in truth often forced to complain that in such competitions the theater was vastly more frequented than the church.”-Id.

And the church could not then stand competition; she wanted a monopoly. And she got it.

This petition of the Carthage convention could not be granted at once, but in 425 the desired law was secured; and to this also there was attached the reason that was given for the first Sunday law that ever was made, namely: “In order that the devotion of the faithful might be free from all disturbance.”-Id., p. 301.

JUSTIFICATION OF THE THIRD PHASE- LEADS TO 4TH PHASE- DEATH DECREE

It must constantly be borne in mind, however, that the only way in which “the devotion of the faithful” was “disturbed” by these things was that,

when the circus or the theater was open at the same time that the church was open, the “faithful” would go to the circus or the theater instead of to church, and, therefore, their “devotion” was “disturbed.” And of course the only way in which the “devotion” of such “faithful” ones could be freed from all disturbance, was to close the circuses and the theaters at church time.

In the logic of this theocratical scheme, there was one more step to be taken. It came about in this way: First, the church had all work on Sunday forbidden, in order that the people might attend to things, divine. But the people went to the circus and the theater instead of to church. Then the church had laws enacted closing the circuses and the theaters, in order that the people might attend to things divine. But even then the people would not be devoted, nor attend to things divine, for they had no real religion. The next step to be taken, therefore, in the logic of the situation, was to compel them to be devoted – to compel them to attend to things divine. This was the next step logically to be taken, and it was taken. The theocratical bishops were equal to the occasion. They were ready with a theory that exactly met the demands of the case, and the great Catholic Church father and Catholic saint, Augustine, was the father of this Catholic saintly theory. He wrote:

“It is indeed better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment, or by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not, therefore, be neglected. Many must often be brought back to their Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain to the highest grade of religious development.”-Schaff's Church History, Vol. II, sec. 27.

OF THIS THEORY NEANDER'S REMARKS:

“It was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded which . . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition.”-Church History, p. 217.

FOURTH PHASE -AD 538- DEATH DECREE AND PESECUTION

In the sixth century the papacy had become firmly established. Its seat of power was fixed in the imperial city, and the bishop of Rome was declared to be the head over the entire church. Paganism had given place to the papacy. The dragon had given to the beast “his power, and his seat, and great authority.” Revelation 13:2. And now began the 1260 years of papal oppression foretold in the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation. Daniel 7:25; Revelation 13:5-7.

Christians were forced to choose either to yield their integrity and accept the papal ceremonies and worship, or to wear away their lives in dungeons or suffer death by the rack, the fagot, or the headsman's ax. Now were fulfilled the words of Jesus: “Ye shall be betrayed both by parents, and brethren, and kinsfolks, and friends; and some of you shall they cause to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for My name's sake.” Luke 21:16, 17. Persecution opened upon the faithful with greater fury than ever before, and the world became a vast battlefield. For hundreds of years the church of Christ found refuge in seclusion and obscurity. Thus says the prophet: “The woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and three-score days.” Revelation 12:6. **{GC 54.2}**

During the early centuries of Papal supremacy a variety of strategies including bribes, false miracles and severe civil punishments and the death penalty, were employed to concretize Sunday sacredness and compulsory Sunday worship in Europe until the masses were compulsorily brain-washed into the Sunday Sabbath while the seventh-day Sabbath of the Bible was eradicated from their socio-ecclesiastical psyche. Hence the European Nations and their colonies became inextricably embedded in the religious-socio-economic polity of Sunday rest and Sunday sacredness. In truth and in fact the dragon deceived the whole world.

During the Final Crisis the end-time remnant, having a clear understanding of such history, will expose traditional long- standing error, in the love of God, under the power of the Latter Rain of the Holy Spirit. And thousands of Sunday-keeping Christians will, at last, be delivered from deep-seated deception.

Chapter 12



History of Sunday Laws in the 19th Century Part I

A.T. JONES IN RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE (1895) PAGES 224 -234

ARGUMENTS USED IN FAVOR OF SUNDAY LEGISLATION IN THE MID-1800'S

At Elgin, Illinois, November 8, 1887, there was held a Sunday-law convention, which was but the first in a series of events that ended only with the congressional recognition and establishment of Sunday as the national “Christian sabbath.” The doctrines and acts of this convention are, therefore, proper evidence in this inquiry.

This convention was “called by the members of the Elgin Association of Congregational Ministers and Churches, to consider the prevalent desecration of the sabbath, and its remedy.” It was well attended by prominent ministers. In that convention the following resolutions were passed:

“Resolved, That we recognize the Sabbath as an institution of God, revealed in nature and the Bible, and of perpetual obligation on all men; and also as a civil and American institution, bound up in vital and historical connection with the origin and foundation of our government, the growth of our polity, and necessary to be maintained in order for the preservation and integrity of our national system, and, therefore, as having a sacred claim on all patriotic American citizens.”

“Resolved, That we look with shame and sorrow on the non-observance of the sabbath by many Christian people, in that the custom prevails with them of purchasing sabbath newspapers, engaging in, and patronizing sabbath business and travel, and in many instances giving themselves to pleasure and self-indulgence, setting aside by neglect and indifference the great duties and privileges which God’s day brings them.”

That is a fact. They ought to be ashamed of it. But what do they do to rectify the matter? Do they resolve to preach the gospel better, to be more faithful themselves in bringing up the consciences of the people, by showing them their duty in regard to these things? Oh, no. They resolved to do this:

“Resolved, That: we give our votes and support to those candidates or political officers who will pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the civil sabbath.”

In a Sunday-law mass meeting held in Hamilton Hall, Oakland, Cal., in January, 1887, “Rev.” Dr. Briggs, of Napa, Cal., said to the State:

“You relegate moral instruction to the church, and then let all go as they please on Sunday, so that we cannot get at them.”

And so they want the State to corral all the people on Sunday, that the preachers may get at them. That is what they wanted in the fourth century. They got it at last. The Sunday railway train must also be stopped, and for the same reason. In the Elgin convention Dr. Everts said:

“The Sunday train is another great evil. They cannot afford to run a train unless they get a great many passengers, and so break up a great many congregations. The Sunday railroad trains are hurrying their passengers fast on to perdition. What an outrage that, the railroad, that great civilizer, should destroy the Christian Sabbath!”

THEOCRATIC THEORY

“The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union,(local, State, national, and world- wide), has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose,

one undying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be this world's king; yea, verily, this world's king in its realm of cause and effect, king of its courts, its camps, its commerce, king of its colleges and cloisters, king of its customs and its constitutions. . . . The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics. . . .

We pray heaven to give them [the old parties] no rest . . . until they shall . . . swear an oath of allegiance to Christ in politics, and march in one great army up to the polls to worship God.”-President’s Annual Address in Convention, Nashville, 1887.

Their idea has ever been to turn this republic into a “kingdom of God.” In the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, 1872, Prof. J. R. W. Sloane, D.D., said:

“Every government by equitable laws is a government of God. A republic thus governed is of Him, through the people, and is as truly and really a theocracy as the commonwealth of Israel.”

The Sunday-law Association also holds much the same theory. In the Elgin Sunday-law convention, Dr. Mandeville, of Chicago, said: “The merchants of Tyre insisted upon selling goods near the temple on the Sabbath, and Nehemiah compelled the officers of the law to do their duty, and stop it.

O we can compel the officers of the law to do their duty.”

Now Nehemiah was ruling there in a true theocracy, a government of God; the law of God was the law of the land, and God’s will was made known by the written word and by the prophets. Therefore if Dr. Mandeville’s argument is of any force at all, it is so only upon the claim of the establishment of a *theocracy*. With this idea the view of Mr. Crafts agrees precisely, and Mr. Crafts was general secretary for the National Sunday-law Union, in their national campaign for national recognition of the Sunday. He claims, as expressed in his own words, that:

“The preachers are the successors of the prophets.”-Christian Statesman, July 5, 1888.

Now put these things together. The government of Israel was a theocracy; the will of God was made known to the ruler by prophets; the ruler compelled the officers of the law to prevent the ungodly from selling goods on the Sabbath. This government is to be made a theocracy; the preachers are the successors of the prophets; and they are to compel the officers of the law to prevent all selling of goods and all manner of work on Sunday. This shows conclusively that these preachers intend to take the supremacy into their hands, officially declare the will of God, and compel all men to conform to it. This is why they must needs attack the Declaration of Independence, and declare that “governments do **not** derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.” This deduction is made a certainty by the words of Professor Blanchard in the Elgin convention:

“In this work we are undertaking for the Sabbath, we are the representatives of God.”

WERE THEY WILLING TO PERSECUTE IF IT WERE NECESSARY?

When they shall have stopped all Sunday work, and all Sunday papers, and all Sunday trains, in order that the people may go to church and attend to things divine, suppose that then the people fail to go to church or attend to things divine, will the religio-political managers stop there? Having done all this that the people may be devoted, will they suffer their good intentions to be frustrated, or their good offices to be despised? Will not these now take the next logical step, the step that was taken in the fourth century, and compel men to attend to things divine? If not, why not? Having taken all the steps but this, will they not take this? Of course they will. Human nature is the same now as it was in the fourth century. Politics is the same now as it was then. And as for religious bigotry, it knows no centuries; it knows no such thing as progress or enlightenment; it is ever the same. And in its control of civil power, the cruel results are also ever the same.

But we are not left merely to this inquiry, nor yet to the argument, for an answer to the question; we have their own words. At a National Reform W. C. T. U. convention held at Lakeside, Ohio, in 1887, the following question was asked:-

“Will not the National Reform movement result in persecution against those who on some points believe differently from the majority, even as the recognition of the Christian religion by the Roman power resulted in grievous persecution against true Christians?”

Answer, by Dr. McAllister:-

“Now notice the fallacy here. The recognition of the Roman Catholic religion by the State, made that State a persecuting power. Why? Because the Roman Catholic religion is a persecuting religion. If true Christianity is a persecuting religion, then the acknowledgment of our principles by the State will make the State a persecutor. But if the true Christian religion is a religion of liberty, a religion that regards the rights of all, then the acknowledgment of those principles by the State will make the State the guardian of all men, and the State will be no persecutor. True religion never persecutes.”

There is indeed a fallacy here; but it is not in the question; it is in the answer. That which made the Roman State a persecuting power, says the doctor, was its recognition of the Catholic religion, “which is a persecuting religion”. But the Roman Catholic religion is not the only persecuting religion that has been in the world. Presbyterianism persecuted while John Calvin ruled in Geneva; it persecuted while the Covenanters ruled in Scotland; it persecuted while it held the power in England. Congregationalism persecuted while it had the power in New England. Episcopalianism persecuted in England and in Virginia. Every religion that has been allied with the civil power, or that has controlled the civil power, has been a persecuting religion; and such will always be the case.

In A.D. 556 Pope Pelagius called upon Narses to compel certain parties to obey the pope’s command. Narses refused, on the ground that it would be persecution. The pope answered Narses’ objection with this argument:

“Be not alarmed at the idle talk of some, crying out against persecution, and reproaching the church, as if she delighted in cruelty, when she punishes evil with wholesome severities, or procures the salvation of souls. He alone persecutes who forces to evil. But to restrain men from doing evil, or to punish those who have done it, is not persecution, or cruelty, but love of mankind.”-Bower’s History of the Popes, Pelagius, A. D. 556.

Compare this with Dr. McAllister’s answer, and find any difference in principle between them if you can. There is no difference. The arguments are identical. It is the essential spirit of the Papacy which is displayed in both, and in that of Pope Pelagius no more than in that of Dr. McAllister.

“There is a law in the State of Arkansas enforcing Sunday observance upon the people, and the result has been that many good persons have not only been imprisoned, but have lost their property, and even their lives.”

Answer, by Dr. McAllister:

“It is better that a few should suffer than that the whole nation should lose its sabbath.”

This argument is identical with that by which the Pharisees in Christ’s day justified themselves in killing him. It was said:

“It is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.” John 11:50.

And then says the record:

“Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death.” Verse 53

CONCLUSION

These same arguments will be used again in the near future to convince the masses, first in USA, and then the rest of Christendom, to demand, from the Civil Government, a Sunday Law. The seventh-day Sabbath-keeping people of God must understand the subtle malignity of such arguments and be prepared to show that they are false according to Jesus

in Matthew 22: 21. It will not merely be a matter of arguing which day is the true sabbath, but, just as importantly, to prove clearly that in such matters of faith and worship the civil government has no right to intrude. And, furthermore, that in asking the civil government to enforce *any* day of worship by civil law, Protestantism would have completely apostatized from true protestant principles.

We must be prepared intellectually and spiritually for that coming crisis.

Chapter 13



History of Sunday Laws in the 19th Century Part 2

INTRODUCTION

Way back in 1829, there was a proposal to ban the transportation of mail on Sundays in USA as part of a plan to enforce Sunday sacredness by civil law. A Committee, and especially its two leading men, Johnson and Powell, prepared a report to rebut the proposal. Their arguments were unanswerable. Here now is the Report as reprinted by the US Library of Congress, with a brief preamble by the Library.

Transportation of the mail on the Sabbath: in the SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 19, 1829 PREAMBLE¹¹

To the lovers of civil and religious liberty the following report comes like the freshness of the morning dew, distilling vigour and hope around, although the deep laid designs of Priestcraft, like the deadly Upas, are fastening on our land. Yet there is a hope that such sentiments will eradicate every remain of impious attempts at supremacy—and the names of Johnson and Powell be handed down to posterity as the champions of equal rights.

Mr. Johnson, of Kentucky, made the following report:

The Committee to whom was referred the several petitions on the subject of mails on the Sabbath or the first day of the week,

REPORT:

That some respite is required from the ordinary vocations of life, is an established principle, sanctioned by the usages of all nations, whether Christian or Pagan. One day in seven has also been determined upon as the proportion of time; and in conformity with the wishes of the great majority of citizens of this country, the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, has been set apart to that object. The principle has received the sanction of the national legislature, so far as to admit a suspension of all public business on that day, except in cases of absolute necessity, or of great public utility. This principle, the committee would not wish to disturb. If kept within its legitimate sphere of action, no injury can result from its observance. It should, however, be kept in mind, that the proper object of government is, to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their religious, as well as civil rights; and not to determine for any whether they shall esteem one day above another, or esteem all days alike holy.

We are aware, that a variety of sentiment, exists among the good citizens of this nation, on the subject of the Sabbath day; and our government is designed for the protection of one, as much as for another. The Jews, who in this country, are as free as Christians, and entitled to the same protection from the laws, derive their obligation to keep the Sabbath day from the 4th commandment of their decalogue, and in conformity with that injunction, pay religious homage to the seventh day of the week, which we call Saturday. One denomination of Christians among us, justly celebrated for their piety, and certainly as good citizens as any other class, agree with the Jews in the moral obligation of the Sabbath, and observe the same day. There are also many Christians among us, who derive their obligation to observe the Sabbath from the decalogue, but regard the Jewish Sabbath as abrogated. From the examples of the apostles of Christ, they have chosen the first day of the week, instead of that day set apart in the decalogue, for their religious devotions. These have generally regarded the observance

of the day as a devotional exercise, and would not more readily enforce it upon others, than they would enforce secret prayer or meditations. Urging the fact, that neither the Lord nor his disciples, though often censured by their accusers for a violation of the Sabbath, ever enjoined its observance, they regard it as a subject on which every person should be fully persuaded in his own mind, and not coerce others to act upon his persuasion. Many Christians again differ from these, professing to derive their obligation to observe the Sabbath from the 4th commandment of the Jewish decalogue, and bring the example of the Apostles, who appear to have held their public meetings for worship on the first day of the week, as authority for so far changing the decalogue, as to substitute that day for the seventh.—The Jewish government was a theocracy, which enforced religious observances; and though the committee would hope that no portion of the citizens of our country could willingly introduce a system of religious coercion in our civil institutions, the example of other nations should admonish us to watch carefully against its earliest indication.

With these different religious views, the committee are of opinion that congress cannot interfere.—It is not the legitimate province of the legislature to determine what religion is true, or what false. Our government is a civil, and not a religious institution. Our constitution recognizes in every person, the right to choose his own religion, and to enjoy it freely, without molestation. Whatever may be the religious sentiments of citizens, and however variant, they are alike entitled to protection from the government, so long as they do not invade the rights of others.

The transportation of the mail on the first day of the week, it is believed, does not interfere with the rights of conscience. The petitioners for its discontinuance appear to be actuated from a religious zeal, which may be commendable if confined to its proper sphere; but they assume a position better suited to an ecclesiastical than to a civil institution. They appear in many instances, to lay it down as an axiom, that the practice is a violation of the law of God.—Should Congress, in their legislative capacity, adopt the sentiment, it would establish the principle, that the legislature is a

proper tribunal to determine what are the laws of God. It would involve a legislative decision in a religious controversy; and on a point in which good citizens may honestly differ in opinion, without disturbing the peace of society, or endangering its liberties. If this principle is once introduced, it will be impossible to define its bounds. Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered, but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God. To prevent a similar train of evils in this country, the Constitution has wisely withheld from our government the power of defining the Divine Law. It is a right reserved to each citizen, and while he respects the equal rights of others, he cannot be held amenable to any human tribunal for his conclusions.

Extensive religious combinations, to effect a political object, are, in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous. This first effort of the kind, calls for the establishment of a principle, which, in the opinion of the committee, would lay the foundation for dangerous innovations upon the spirit of the Constitution, and upon the religious rights of the citizens. If admitted, it may be justly apprehended, that the future measures of government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence. All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it, and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequence.

Under the present regulations of the Post Office Department, the rights of conscience are not invaded. Every agent enters voluntarily, and it is presumed conscientiously, into the discharge of his duties, without intermeddling with the conscience of another. Post Offices are so regulated, as that but a small proportion of the first day of the week is required to be occupied in official business. In the transportation of the mail on that day, no one agent is employed many hours. Religious persons enter into the business without violating their own consciences, or imposing any restraints upon others. Passengers in the mail stages are free to rest during the first day of the week, or to pursue their journeys at their own pleasure. While the

mail is transported on Saturday, the Jew and the Sabbatarian may abstain from any agency in carrying it, from conscientious scruples. While it is transported on the first day of the week, another class may abstain, from the same religious scruples. The obligation of government is the same to both of these classes; and the committee can discover no principle on which the claims of one should be more respected than those of the other, unless it should be admitted that the consciences of the minority are less sacred than those of the majority.

It is the opinion of the committee, that the subject should be regarded simply as a question of expediency, irrespective of its religious bearing. In this light, it has hitherto been considered. Congress has never legislated upon the subject. It rests, as it ever has done, in the legal discretion of the Post-master General, under the repeated refusals of Congress to discontinue the Sabbath mails. His knowledge and judgment in all the concerns of that department will not be questioned. His intense labours and assiduity have resulted in the highest improvement of every branch of his department. It is practised only on the great leading mail routes, and such others as are necessary to maintain their connections. To prevent this, would, in the opinion of the committee, be productive of immense injury, both in its commercial, political, and in its moral bearings.

The various departments of government require, frequently in peace, always in war, the speediest intercourse with the remotest parts of the country; and one important object of the mail establishment is, to furnish the greatest and most economical facilities for such intercourse. The delay of the mails one day in seven, would require the employment of special expresses, at great expense, and sometimes with great uncertainty.

The commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests of our country are so intimately connected, as to require a constant and the most expeditious correspondence betwixt all our seaports, and betwixt them and the most interior settlements. The delay of the mails during Sunday, would give occasion to the employment of private expresses, to such an amount, that probably ten riders would be employed where one

mail stage is now running on that day; thus diverting the revenue of that department into another channel, and sinking the establishment into a state of pusillanimity incompatible with the dignity of the government of which it is a department.

Passengers in the mail stages, if the mails are not permitted to proceed on Sunday, will be expected to spend that day at a tavern upon the road, generally under circumstances not friendly to devotion, and at an expense which many are but poorly able to encounter. To obviate these difficulties, many will employ extra carriages for their conveyance, and become the bearers of correspondence, as more expeditious than the mail. The stage proprietors will themselves often furnish the travellers with those means of conveyance, so that the effect will ultimately be only to stop the mail, while the vehicle which conveys it will continue, and its passengers become the special messengers for conveying a considerable portion of what would otherwise constitute the contents of the mail.

Nor can the committee discover where the system could consistently end. If the observance of a holyday become incorporated in our institutions, shall we not forbid the movement of an army; prohibit an assault in time of war, and lay an injunction upon our naval officers to lie in the wind while upon the ocean on that day? Consistency would seem to require it. Nor is it certain that we should stop here. If the principle is once established, that religion or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum. We shall, if consistent, provide for the erection of edifices for the worship of the Creator, and for the support of christian ministers, if we believe such measures will promote the interests of Christianity. It is the settled conviction of the committee, that the only method of avoiding these consequences, with their attendant train of evils, is to adhere strictly to the spirit of the Constitution, which regards the general government in no other light than that of a civil institution, wholly destitute of religious authority.

What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small.

Despotic power may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them. Let the national legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid for that usurpation of the Divine prerogative in this country, which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the world. Our Constitution recognizes no other power than that of persuasion, for enforcing religious observances. Let the professors of Christianity recommend their religion by deeds of benevolence—by Christian meekness—by lives of temperance and holiness, Let them combine their efforts to instruct the ignorant—to relieve the widow and the orphan—to promulgate to the world the gospel of their Savior, recommending its precepts by their habitual example: government will find its legitimate object in protecting them. It cannot oppose them, and they will not need its aid. Their moral influence will then do infinitely more to advance the true interests of religion, than any measures which they may call on Congress to enact.

The petitioners do not complain of any infringement upon their own rights. They enjoy all that Christians ought to ask at the hand of any government—protection from all molestation in the exercise of their religious sentiments.

Resolved, that the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

Chapter 14



How Nations Rise and Fall Part I

BASIC PRINCIPLES

Prophecy has traced, and history has witnessed, the rise and fall of the world's great empires (and also of nations of lesser power). Long before any of those nations became world conquering powers, certain basic human successful behavioural principles were seen to be at work. The people were industrious, and practiced thrift and economy, spending more time on what was constructive and less time on what was non-productive. They, to a reasonable extent, subordinated their individual ambitions to the overall progress of the nation. Moreover adherence to their civil laws was a dominant feature and they tried to live up to whatever was their standard of social justice. In other words, there was an acceptable level of individual self-government, individual temperance and wise national civil government among the population. This is not to say that there were no disorderly elements or crime or lawlessness, but these were all kept well below the critical level because of good self-government and the enforcement of civil law by wise civil government.

However, as the particular nation became more and more powerful and conquered other nations, wealth poured in and with wealth there

was increasing pride, arrogance, luxury, ease, love of entertainment and pleasure-seeking with resultant intemperance, vice and dissipation. The conquered peoples with their cultures also poured in. This brought in the very elements of decay which led to the defeat of those nations. The net result was an insidious deterioration in individual self-government and individual temperance which produced, gradually at first and more rapidly later on, a decline in national power. Such a nation having climbed to the pinnacle of world dominion began the downhill fall to defeat without even knowing it.

God also allowed those nations to come into contact with His truth and character. Their acceptance or rejection of His righteousness determined their destiny because acceptance of God's Wisdom/Righteousness produces the highest level of genuine self-government whereas rejection produces the lowest level of self-government and resultant dissipation.

All of the great Empires of Prophecy would have started out with their people, on average, practicing good self-government, self-control and temperance and therefore good civility with progressively increasing national military, socioeconomic and political growth and strength. But when an Empire reached the top, the seeds of poor self-government, pride, arrogance, and increasing incivility would be weakening the Empire and precipitating its decline. Moreover the rejection of the true God and His principles of freedom and righteousness accelerated the fall.

CONDEMNATION, GUILT AND RESULTANT RUIN

In Matthew 11: 20 to 24 Jesus explained that the degree of condemnation is directly proportional to the amount (quantity and quality) of light rejected!

The Apostle Paul expanded on Jesus's words in Romans 2: 4 to 11, by explaining that the degree of hard-heartedness determines the amount of wrath. But the degree of hard-heartedness is caused by the amount of light rejected (=riches of God's goodness, forbearance, and longsuffering despised).

BABYLON'S FALL (DANIEL CHAPTER 5; ISAIAH 47: 1 TO 15)

Babylon reached the pinnacle of world **dominance** by 604BC under the great leadership of Nabopolassar and his son and successor Nebuchadnezzar.

Babylon, through Daniel and his Jewish companions, was exposed to much Divine light; enough to have led to the conversion of its most famous king, Nebuchadnezzar!

"The once proud monarch had become a humble child of God; the tyrannical, overbearing ruler, a wise and compassionate king. He who had defied and blasphemed the God of heaven, now acknowledged the power of the Most High and earnestly sought to promote the fear of Jehovah and the happiness of his subjects. Under the rebuke of Him who is King of kings and Lord of lords, Nebuchadnezzar had learned at last the lesson which all rulers need to learn--that true greatness consists in true goodness. He acknowledged Jehovah as the living God, saying, "I Nebuchadnezzar praise and extol and honor the King of heaven, all whose works are truth, and His ways judgment: and those that walk in pride He is able to abase."

God's purpose that the greatest kingdom in the world should show forth His praise was now fulfilled. This public proclamation, in which Nebuchadnezzar acknowledged the mercy and goodness and authority of God, was the last act of his life recorded in sacred history." {PK 521.2 -3}

But his grandson Belshazzar rejected that light and also rejected Daniel's wonderful example of individual self-government.

"Toward the close of Daniel's life great changes were taking place in the land to which, over threescore years before, he and his Hebrew companions had been carried captive. Nebuchadnezzar, "the terrible of the nations" (Ezekiel 28:7), had died, and Babylon, "the praise of the whole earth" (Jeremiah 51:41), had passed under the unwise rule of his successors, and gradual but sure dissolution was resulting.

Through the folly and weakness of Belshazzar, the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar, proud Babylon was soon to fall. Admitted in his youth to a share in kingly authority, Belshazzar gloried in his power and lifted up his heart against the God of heaven. Many had been his opportunities to know the divine will and to understand his responsibility of rendering obedience thereto. He had known of his grandfather's banishment, by the decree of God, from the society of men; and he was familiar with Nebuchadnezzar's conversion and miraculous restoration. But Belshazzar allowed the love of pleasure and self-glorification to efface the lessons that he should never have forgotten. He wasted the opportunities graciously granted him, and neglected to use the means within his reach for becoming more fully acquainted with truth. That which Nebuchadnezzar had finally gained at the cost of untold suffering and humiliation, Belshazzar passed by with indifference.

It was not long before reverses came. Babylon was besieged by Cyrus, nephew of Darius the Mede, and commanding general of the combined armies of the Medes and Persians. But within the seemingly impregnable fortress, with its massive walls and its gates of brass, protected by the river Euphrates, and stocked with provision in abundance, the voluptuous monarch felt safe and passed his time in mirth and revelry.

In his pride and arrogance, with a reckless feeling of security Belshazzar "made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand." All the attractions that wealth and power could command, added splendor to the scene. Beautiful women with their enchantments were among the guests in attendance at the royal banquet. Men of genius and education were there. Princes and statesmen drank wine like water and reveled under its maddening influence." {PK 522, 523}

The disastrous result was that, while the city was submerged in wild partying and alcoholic debauchery with Belshazzar, as an individual, exhibiting blasphemous contempt of the Israel's God, Persian General Cyrus entered through the famous brass gates with the guards too drunk to notice! Babylon fell in one night after 70 years at the top of world dominance.

“Every nation that has come upon the stage of action has been permitted to occupy its place on the earth, that the fact might be determined whether it would fulfill the purposes of the Watcher and the Holy One. Prophecy has traced the rise and progress of the world's great empires--Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. With each of these, as with the nations of less power, history has repeated itself. Each has had its period of test; each has failed, its glory faded, its power departed.” {PK 535.1}

Chapter 15



The Rise and Fall of Nations

Part 2:

The Rise and Fall of Rome

THE EARLY REPUBLICAN YEARS OF ROME¹²

Long before Rome (pagan) had reached the pinnacle of world dominance it had been progressively developing and growing in every aspect of nationhood: socially, economically, civilly, militarily, and technologically. Underpinning such growth was a very good level of individual self-government, strict temperance and self-control, coupled with excellent civil government both of which were conducive to creativity, innovation, national development, social stability and military might. In its earliest days Rome was ruled by kings, from around 759BC to 509BC. But the people (especially the two main classes of Patricians and Plebeians) demanded representation in government. The two main classes continued the struggle for equal rights.

The Roman Republic was the era of classical Roman civilization beginning with the overthrow of the Roman monarchy in 509 BC and ending in 27 BC with the establishment of the Roman Empire. Politically there were magistracies overseen by a Senate. The top magistrates were the two Consuls. Though there were elections each year the Republic was not at first a democracy but an oligarchy, with the wealthy Patricians holding power.

Gradually, the Patricians lost power. The principles of republicanism were struggling for birth until at last the government rested in the hands of the people. AT Jones comments thus:

“As a natural consequence, the government of Rome, being a government of the people, was the freest and the best human government of all ancient times, so long as they maintained the principle of self-government, even only on a human basis. But as soon as they failed in the government of themselves, so soon the (republican) Roman government failed; because, of all forms of government, that form known as the government of the people or republican form, depends most vitally upon the integrity of the individual in governing himself.” **THE HISTORY OF GOVERNMENT, page 38**

The Republican years were characterized by almost perpetual warfare, but the Republic nonetheless demonstrated amazing resilience and always managed to overcome its losses however catastrophic and took complete control of the Italian Peninsula. Strict temperance and proper self-government enabled the population to quickly recover from the ravages of war.

Of the many wars there were three that deserve special mention; these were against Carthage, Rome’s greatest enemy. After two defeats, Rome won in 202 BC and thereby became the dominant power in the Mediterranean world. Thereafter Rome continued its conquests with notoriously brutal military might and cruelty, and on the way to the pinnacle of world dominance she conquered the Seleucid Empire and Egypt and by 168 BC became the fourth world ruling Empire of Daniel’s prophecies. Rome ruled the then known world until 476AD and was known as the iron-monarchy. **Ridpath** wrote that the ‘Romans conquered, took what they could and then took the remainder’. The conquered inhabitants of Corsica and Sardinia were sold in the slave markets of Rome, and so numerous were those slaves that **Livy** wrote that “Sardinians for sale” became a proverbial expression for anything cheap. A detailed history of Rome would be beyond our scope in this series of lectures, but such history is complex and intriguing to say the least.

ONE OF THE GREATEST EMPIRES¹³

The Roman Empire was, from a merely worldly view point, one of the greatest Empires and influential civilizations of all time. It made an important and significant impact in the shaping of the world's history. Here is a list of the 17 greatest inventions of ancient Rome:

1. Roman Numerals
2. Modern plumbing and sanitation management
3. The use of **arches** to build great structures
4. Air-conditioning: allowing hot air to circulate around the building through hollow spaces in columns.
5. The famous Roman **Aqueducts**: channels created to carry water from downhill streams to large holding areas for public supply. Gravity was the energy used.
6. The making of **surgical tools!** Caesarean Section was actually devised by the Romans .
7. Developing **concrete** to strengthen buildings.
8. **Roads** that withstood the test of time.
9. **The Papyrus Codex** ordered by Julius Caesar.
10. **Roman Law** (and registration for the payment of taxes by all citizens) which formed the basis of much of our western civil legal system.
11. **Equitable Social Welfare**: better living standards for all citizens.

12. The Julian Calendar.
13. The use of apartments.
14. A “**postal**” service: messages carried to all parts of the Empire by messengers on horseback or chariots.
15. The **Corvus**: a boarding device to connect to enemy ships so that Roman soldiers could enter.
16. **Grid- based orderly** layouts for roads and paths.
17. Advancements in military warfare such as the **testudo** (the tortoise approach) and siege warfare.

THE SEEDS OF THE FALL

Military conquests brought into the center of the Empire vast amounts of wealth and caused an increase in pride, arrogance, luxury, leisure (idleness) and the development of a variety of entertainments. Individual self-government gradually declined. The love of money produced an all absorbing desire to get rich, famous and powerful. Corruption, *intemperance and declining self-control* increased at all levels of society. There were increasing power struggles in the top echelons of society and an increase in crime and lawlessness among certain sectors of the masses. The latter was aggravated by the influx of slaves from the conquered nations which led to increasing unemployment of Roman citizens and inevitable unrest. The Empire was gradually weakening from within, because of *intemperance* and declining self- control, but held together by strong civil law enforcement and increasing taxation.

It also became more and more challenging to maintain, feed and equip such very large armies as the Romans needed for defense at home and aggression abroad. Nevertheless

Rome still remained the mighty **fourth iron kingdom** of Daniel chapter 2, even though the iron was beginning to **rust**.

As the Republic lost its power, a corporation composed of Caesar, Pompey and Crassus; called the *triumvirate*, took the reins of power. Crassus controlled the money, Pompey had the army and Caesar was the master mind. It was during the rule of the first triumvirate that Rome took control of Palestine and entered Egypt a second time. Pompey was slain while crossing by boat and Julius Caesar shortly after entered Alexandria and espoused the cause of the famous Cleopatra. Julius Caesar suffered an untimely death in BC44.

Triumvirate government collapsed. Lapidus, one of the second triumvirate died, Anthony after being enamored by Cleopatra and entrapped by Egyptian darkness committed suicide and only Octavius was left. He became Emperor Caesar Augustus, imperialism became fully established . Caesar Augustus was Emperor at the time of the birth of Christ (BC 4) and imperial Rome was at the zenith of its world dominance though gradually weakening from within.

ROME AND RELIGION

Rome was pagan through and through and incorporated all the various forms of paganism, of the conquered pagan nations, into a pantheon of polytheistic pagan ritualism. Nonetheless Rome's favourite false gods were Jupiter and the Sun. Sun worship on the day of the Sun (*dies solis*) was prevalent.

In Rome, religion was made the servant of the state, the State was supreme.

Jewish religion did not make the kind of impact that it could have because of their prejudice and bigotry (what Paul called *the middle wall of partition*) but the Romans allowed the Jews to practice their religion (although there was some degree of persecution), and some Romans even converted to Judaism. However, in AD 70, and thereafter, Rome turned against Judaism with increasing persecution of Jews and Christians.

ROME AND CHRISTIANITY

The redemptive work of the Messiah (BC 4 to AD 31) took place in Judea under Roman Imperial rule. The Good News of His miracles and message

of God's **Love** and **kingdom** spread far and wide. Yet the Romans ratified the Jewish rejection of the Messiah and also allowed the Jewish persecution of the early Christians in the Ephesus era: 31 to 100 AD.

During the Smyrna era: 100 to 313 AD, direct Roman persecution of Christianity was most severe and cruel, reaching its peak between 303 and 313AD (Rev 2: 10).

The true Christianity placed the requirements of God above and beyond the requirements of the state. Though the early Christians were exemplary citizens in obedience to Roman civil law, they would not submit their faith or worship to state control or even recognize any pagan god. This was the main reason for the intense Roman hatred and persecution of Christians.

While Rome was rejecting and persecuting the true Christianity, a gradual apostasy was developing among Christians and when persecution ceased, apostasy developed more rapidly during the Pergamos era: 313 to 538 AD when there was the mysterious infiltration of Christianity by paganism producing false doctrines that would eventually be called *orthodox* Christianity. These false doctrines included the natural immortality of the creature soul, eternal torment, the soul's consciousness in death, and Sunday sacredness. But one of the most dangerous errors was a *false theocratic theory* developed by the bishops of Rome to make the civil government an instrument of coercion under the control of the church to force Christianity upon all citizens against their free choice.

THE FALL OF ROME¹⁴

As we saw in an earlier chapter, as the Roman Empire weakened in the fourth century, Barbarian attacks from the outside became more threatening. Constantine, who "converted" to Christianity, saw a church-state union as the best way to hold together the disintegrating Empire, while the Bishops of the apostate Christianity saw, in the state, the power they needed to control the masses in Spiritual matters and to make all citizens Christian by civil legislation.

An important lesson is seen here: Whenever individual self-government fails, it becomes increasingly difficult for civil government to maintain civility, and such a government looks for help from religion; and an apostate religion gladly grasps the power of the state for the furtherance of her own designs. This is Satan's strategy for world control.

Pagan Rome became Christian Rome, but the brand of Christianity was *apostate*. Notwithstanding Constantine's efforts, the empire eventually collapsed both from within and from external Barbarian attacks, and became divided, by 476 AD, into the ten divisions foretold in Daniel's prophecies. In fact the Christianization of Western Rome actually contributed to its collapse by reason of its religious intolerance triggering retaliation from pagan groups.

Many people ask why the Roman Empire ended, but according to the historian Gibbon¹⁸, the question should be how did it last so long. Gibbon wrote:

“ The decline of Rome was the natural and inevitable effect of immoderate greatness.....The story of its ruin (downfall) is simple and obvious; and instead of inquiring why the Roman Empire was destroyed, we would rather be surprised that it had subsisted so long” Gibbon, in **History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.**

The fall of the Western Empire is a great lesson of *cause* and *effect*: Because the Roman legions evacuated Britannia in AD 406, the Anglo-Saxons moved into Britannia. The Huns pushed other groups westward into Roman territory and so Aleric and the Visigoths sacked Rome in AD 410, and also the Vandals invaded Spain and North Africa and sacked Rome in 455AD. By 476AD the Western Empire was dissolved. By 508 paganism was vanquished and by 538 the Papacy became fully dominant and in control of all the Western European kingdoms which came out of the dissolved Western Roman Empire. The Eastern Roman Empire (later called the Byzantine Empire) survived for another thousand years.

This was mainly because an acceptable level of self-government continued in the nations of the Eastern Empire and the luxury and intemperance of the West was avoided.

Republican Rome and **Imperial Rome** ended in ruin through a departure from the principles of individual self-government, which departure resulted in intemperance and national weakening. Of all forms of government, the Republican form is the freest and therefore depends most heavily upon the integrity of individual self-government. When individual self-government declines it becomes increasingly difficult for civil government to maintain civility and socio-economic stability.

A weakening Empire, whose **peoples** had rejected the true Christianity, now as a **civil government** accepted a *false* Christianity and enforced it on its citizens. But that did not save it from ruin; it actually accelerated its collapse. The vast empire of Rome crumbled to pieces, and from its ruins rose that mighty power, the Roman Catholic Church which recognized only one form of government, that is, government wholly by the church, ecclesiastical government. Individual self-government and freedom of thought and faith were not allowed. In the Middle Ages the Papacy exercised absolute control over the consciences of men, and over the civil governments of Europe. The priests of that church maintained their ascendancy by keeping the people in ignorance of the scriptures. The Papacy claimed infallibility and claimed to be God's vice-gerent on earth. She allowed no dissent from her dogmas and as she increased in power, the darkness of Europe increased in intensity. Papal leaders exercised power without limit, and practiced vice without restraint. During the centuries of Papal supremacy Europe made no progress in learning, arts, or civilization. A moral and intellectual paralysis had fallen upon Christendom.

Then came the Protestant Reformation which was met with unimaginably inhuman persecution. Over 50 million Christians were killed by the Papacy. Freedom of thought and speech, especially in matters of faith and worship, was **not** allowed by the Roman Catholic Church, but the Reformers, though terribly persecuted, maintained their God-given right

to study the scriptures and form their own conclusions and hold their own faith. The Protest reached its zenith at the **Diet of Spires** in 1529 when the principles of liberty of conscience were firmly concretized and espoused.

This was the beginning of the long and difficult process of liberating the people from the tyranny of the Dark Ages and eventually led to the rise of American republicanism as the freest form of government in history.

Chapter 16



The Rise and Fall of Nations

Part 3:

The Rise and Fall of the USA

BRIEF HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE

The principles of liberty of conscience enshrined in the USA constitution, and the constitutions of the democratic nations of Christendom, are the outgrowth of the principles enunciated in the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century. Historian Jean-Henri Merle d' Aubigne is our historical source.

Jean-Henri Merle d'Aubigne¹⁵ (16 August 1794-21Oct.1872) was a Swiss Protestant minister and historian of the Reformation. He was born at *Eaux Vives*, near Geneva. His father's ancestry was French. After his early education in Geneva, he traveled to Germany in 1817 to further his education at Berlin University. There he remained for 8 months and during his course of study was inspired by some great minds including (guess who?) the great Johann August Wilhelm **Neander!** His famous work of history was *Histoire de la Reformation—History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*. The first part of that work earned him a foremost place among modern French ecclesiastical historians and was translated into most European languages. He frequently visited the **UK** and even received honours from the city of Edinburgh. He died suddenly on Oct.21, 1872, at the age of 78.

In his *History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*, book 13 chap.6, page 451, d' Aubigne wrote:

“The principles contained in this celebrated Protest of the 19th April 1529, constitute the very essence of Protestantism. Now this protest opposes two abuses of man in matters of faith: the first is the intrusion of the civil magistrate, and the second is the arbitrary authority of the church. Instead of these abuses, Protestantism sets the power of the conscience above the magistrate, and the authority of the word of God above the visible church. In the first place, it rejects the civil power in divine things, and says with the prophets and apostles, ‘We must obey God rather than man.’ In presence of the crown of Charles the Fifth, it uplifts the crown of Jesus Christ. But it goes farther; it lays down the principle that all human teaching should be subordinate to the oracles of God. “

Notwithstanding that wonderful protest, persecution continued; and even in England the Church of England persecuted the Puritans. Eventually, as we saw in earlier chapters, many were driven across the ocean to America. But, as we have already shown in earlier chapters the early Protestant European colonists to America did not fully understand the extent or significance of these principles. They therefore established state churches and adopted the regulation of permitting only church members to vote.

The regulation adopted by the early colonists, of permitting only members of the church to vote or to hold office in the civil government, led to most pernicious results. This measure had been accepted as a means of preserving the purity of the state, but it resulted in the corruption of the church. A profession of religion being the condition of suffrage and office holding, many, actuated solely by motives of worldly policy, united with the church without a change of heart. Thus the churches came to consist, to a considerable extent, of unconverted persons; and even in the ministry were those who not only held errors of doctrine, but who were ignorant of the renewing power of the Holy Spirit. Thus again was

demonstrated the evil results, so often witnessed in the history of the church from the days of Constantine to the present, of attempting to build up the church by the aid of the state, of appealing to the secular power in support of the gospel of Him who declared: "My kingdom is not of this world." John 18:36. The union of the church with the state, be the degree ever so slight, while it may appear to bring the world nearer to the church, does in reality but bring the church nearer to the world. {GC 297.1}

Then came Roger Williams² who, according to the great nineteenth century American historian George Bancroft⁷: **“was the first person in modern Christendom to establish civil government on the doctrine of liberty of conscience, the equality of opinions before the law”** *History of USA Part One Chap 15, para 16*. His little State Rhode Island, increased and prospered until its foundation principles – civil and religious liberty— became the cornerstones of the American Republic. Great advocates for liberty of conscience and separation of church and state such as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, George Mason and others, built upon the Roger William’s foundation until at last the edifice of liberty was completely constructed. Republicanism and Protestantism became the fundamental principles of the new Nation and these principles became the secret of its power and prosperity. The development of USA republicanism was a **repudiation** of kings and all the principles of kingship, and also, a **repudiation** of popery and all the principles of the Papacy. Complete separation of church and state with the State established as a government of self-governing people: a government of the people by the people and for the people. A government separated and held by the Constitution entirely apart from the church, or any recognition of the church, or religion. The churches were left free to organize and govern themselves, and conduct their own affairs as they might choose without any help or interference by the State. The State would conduct all matters of civility and never intrude into religion or the realm of faith or the conscience or defining the law of God; and this out of respect for things divine and the sacredness of the human conscience. Indeed a state without a king and religion without a pope.

LIFE IN EARLY USA

In that grand old document which our forefathers set forth as their bill of rights--the Declaration of Independence--they declared: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." And the Constitution guarantees, in the most explicit terms, the inviolability of conscience: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

"The framers of the Constitution recognized the eternal principle that man's relation with his God is above human legislation, and his rights of conscience inalienable. Reasoning was not necessary to establish this truth; we are conscious of it in our own bosoms. It is this consciousness which, in defiance of human laws, has sustained so many martyrs in tortures and flames. They felt that their duty to God was superior to human enactments, and that man could exercise no authority over their consciences. It is an inborn principle which nothing can eradicate."--Congressional documents (U.S.A.), serial No. 200, document No. 271. **{GC 295.3}**

As the tidings spread through the countries of Europe, of a land where every man might enjoy the fruit of his own labor and obey the convictions of his own conscience, thousands flocked to the shores of the New World. Colonies rapidly multiplied. "Massachusetts, by special law, offered free welcome and aid, at the public cost, to Christians of any nationality who might flee beyond the Atlantic 'to escape from wars or famine, or the oppression of their persecutors.' Thus the fugitive and the downtrodden were, by statute, made the guests of the commonwealth."--Martyn, vol. 5, p. 417. In twenty years from the first landing at Plymouth, as many thousand Pilgrims were settled in New England.

To secure the object which they sought, "they were content to earn a bare subsistence by a life of frugality and toil. They asked nothing from the soil but the reasonable returns of their own labor. No golden vision threw a deceitful halo around their path. . . . They were content with the slow but steady progress of their social polity. They patiently endured the privations of the wilderness, watering the tree of liberty with their tears, and with the sweat of their brow, till it took deep root in the land."

The Bible was held as the foundation of faith, the source of wisdom, and the charter of liberty. Its principles were diligently taught in the home, in the school, and in the church, and its fruits were manifest in thrift, intelligence, purity, and temperance. One might be for years a dweller in the Puritan settlement, "and not see a drunkard, or hear an oath, or meet a beggar."--Bancroft, pt. 1, ch. 19, par. 25. It was demonstrated that the principles of the Bible are the surest safeguards of national greatness. The feeble and isolated colonies grew to a confederation of powerful states, and the world marked with wonder the peace and prosperity of "a church without a pope, and a state without a king." **G C 295, 296**

Individual Christianity, individual self-government, thrift, industry, and temperance, honesty and civility and subjection to the rule of equitable civil laws, were the hallmark of the early American Christian population. Complete separation of church and state kept both pure, while freedom to think and speak and believe, enhanced learning and creativity and productivity.

It is critically important to understand that of all the forms of government, Republicanism: government of the people, by the people, for the people; which is the freest form of government, is the one form that, in order not to fail, depends absolutely on its citizens practicing good individual self-government, civil obedience, honesty, temperance, thrift, industry and economy. If its citizens would maintain such good self-government, and church and state remain separate, guaranteeing liberty of conscience, the USA would remain the leading nation in the world.

THE EARLIEST DEPARTURES FROM INDIVIDUAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE USA

But continually increasing numbers were attracted to the shores of America, actuated by motives widely different from those of the first Pilgrims. Though the primitive faith and purity exerted a widespread and molding power, yet its influence became less and less as the numbers increased of those who sought only worldly advantage. **GC 296-297**

And by the time of the preaching of the nearness of the Second Advent in the early to mid-nineteenth century, there was an even greater deterioration.

But as the spirit of humility and devotion in the church had given place to pride and formalism, love for Christ and faith in His coming had grown cold. Absorbed in worldliness and pleasure seeking, the professed people of God were blinded to the Saviour's instructions concerning the signs of His appearing. The doctrine of the second advent had been neglected; the scriptures relating to it were obscured by misinterpretation, until it was, to a great extent, ignored and forgotten. Especially was this the case in the churches of America. The freedom and comfort enjoyed by all classes of society, the ambitious desire for wealth and luxury, begetting an absorbing devotion to money-making, the eager rush for popularity and power, which seemed to be within the reach of all, led men to center their interests and hopes on the things of this life, and to put far in the future that solemn day when the present order of things should pass away. **GC 309.1**

MORE CHANGES IN THE LATE- EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

In the late 1800's American society became more secular and materialistic with love of money and luxury progressively eroding its love of religion. Crime and lawlessness were also increasing. The then new theory of organic Evolution was giving impetus to atheism and attracting many minds away from Christianity. These developments induced a number of

prominent protestant Christian organizations in the USA to lobby the government to enforce Christianity and Sunday sacredness by civil law in order to halt the deterioration in Christian morals and civility. (We studied this in Chapter 14). A T Jones led the rebuttals against those church-state proposals and the famous 1888 Blair Sunday-law bill was defeated.

1961 SUNDAY LAW CASES

Even in the enlightenment of the 1960's and with the First Amendment of the US Constitution, there continued to be the prosecution of free and good citizens on the matter of a day of worship

Again in 1961 Sunday-law cases became prominent. USA Supreme Court Justice **William O. Douglas** dissented from the majority in the 1961 Sunday -law cases. He successfully argued that the Sunday “blue laws” before the Court constituted a violation of both the *establishment Clause* and the *free exercise* clause of the **First Amendment** of the US Constitution. (See Appendix A)

MODERN USA

Ever since the Second World War, the USA has been a world leader in the amazing scientific, medical, military, educational, economic and technological advances of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Computer-internet technology has transformed the world at all levels. As a result of these amazing technological advances the world has become a very complex place especially so in matters of communication, trade, commerce and finance. Such tremendous and complex advancement in science and technology in a free society, of necessity, requires appropriately high standards of individual integrity and individual self-government, self-control and compliance with those civil statutes established to regulate such matters. But on the contrary, the USA has experienced a progressive increase in all types of crime and lawlessness and especially in *organized crime*, “*white-collar*” *crime*, and *the trafficking* of illegal drugs. Criminals are capable of breaching any security system and can counterfeit almost any thing; as a result, fraud and corruption exist in all strata of society. In

other words the unprecedented advancement in all branches of education, science and technology has been matched by an unprecedented increase in crime and lawlessness indicative of a dangerous deterioration in individual self-government.

When an increasing number of individuals in any free society cease to exercise good self-government and self-control, it becomes progressively more difficult for civil government to maintain law and order. This results in a steady increase in the amount of fear and, even, of panic in the society.

A CASE IN POINT

In the USA guns are quite freely available. For a free society to be safe when guns are freely available to the population requires an appropriately high level of individual self-government and individual self-control with mutual respect for life and for law and order. The mass-shootings in the USA are indicative of the decline in individual self-government and self-control, when this happens in a free society it becomes increasingly difficult for civil government to maintain law and order, or to prevent such massive loss of life.

TERRORISM

During the last four decades there has been an unprecedented increase in terrorism. Suicide-bombings of large gatherings of people and mass-shootings have characterized this type of international terrorism which continues to strike fear to the hearts of the populations of the free nations of Christendom.

FEAR AND PANIC

When a nation is driven to fear and panic, it becomes increasingly susceptible to deception by sweet-sounding but flawed logic, and becomes liable to make perilously wrong decisions in trying to solve the problems confronting the nation.

THE ABUSE OF FREEDOM

This present ultra-modern twenty-first century generation of mankind is a generation that has enjoyed the greatest degree of freedom in the history of the modern world; and is also the generation that has abused freedom the most, and which has forgotten the history of the severe struggles endured and the high price paid, in blood, to win the freedoms we now take for granted. This is doubly perilous. Out of such circumstances will evolve the idea that *freedom* is to blame; and the argument which will follow is that *restriction* of freedom is the only viable strategy to solve the problem of the **abuse** of freedom.

DECLINING MORAL STANDARDS

The collapse of traditional morality, coupled with increasing crime and lawlessness with corruption at all levels of society has already begun, and will continue, to induce a response from the Protestant churches of America. In this response we shall hear of increasing calls for church and state to work together for the improvement in the moral tone of society and to stem the rising tide of crime and lawlessness. The civil government will be more and more willing to consider such proposals especially as the level of fear and panic increases.

NATURAL AND MAN -MADE DISASTERS

The geophysical environment of our planet is becoming progressively more unstable. Contributing to this instability is the increasing amounts of certain gases in the atmosphere caused by burning of the so-called fossil-fuels done mainly by the rich industrialized countries led by the USA. Global warming will continue to produce atmospheric instability which triggers the development of dangerous storms, tornadoes and flooding in many countries. In addition, earthquakes and tsunamis remain unpredictable perils which in recent times have caused massive loss of life and property and will continue to do so in the future.

PEOPLE WANT SOLUTIONS TO THESE SERIOUS PROBLEMS

As morality declines, and crime, violence and terrorism increase; and also as natural and man-made disasters escalate, Church leaders and members in the USA will argue that the Nation's departure from Christianity is the root cause of the unparalleled decadence and corruption. Especially will the Protestant churches call for a National return to God in order to stem the rising tide of vice, crime and corruption and to bring back the blessings of God to America?

Now, true Christianity, by precept and example, proclaims the Gospel of Christ and His righteousness while leaving the individual conscience *free* to choose to believe and accept, or not to believe if that's the individual's choice. Genuine Christianity accepts the free gift of Christ's righteousness which produces self-government, self-control, and Christian morality based on obedience of the moral principles in God's word and empowered by the Holy Spirit, by abiding in Christ.

But it will be argued, by an increasing number of religious leaders, that the American experiment of freedom has back-fired, that unrestricted freedom has contributed to the unbridled evil in the great Nation and has allowed the unprecedented acceptance of "new" and *perverted* moral definitions that have corrupted the family and Nation and brought down the "**judgements**" of God on the USA and the world. It will also be argued that to leave such serious matters entirely up to *individual free choice* would not work.

APOSTATE PROTESTANTISM

And so the point will be reached, and the time will come, when the liberties guaranteed under the **First Amendment** of the US Constitution will not only be questioned but will be repudiated! The popular evangelical and so-called mainstream protestant Churches will repudiate the fundamental principle of *liberty of conscience* and call for a union of church and state and for the legislation of Christianity *in order to make America a Christian Nation* and in order to *save* the Nation from complete moral collapse and resultant destruction. Civil authorities and political parties will eventually

be persuaded that this is the only viable strategy to halt the downward spiral of National corruption and evil.

The Mark of “Christian” Statehood

History repeats itself, so we say, and so we know, but yet we never learn!!

The early years of American history before (and even after) the development of its wonderful Constitution were marked by strict Sunday (Blue) Laws by which Sunday sacredness and Sunday worship were enforced by civil law, and people (including Christians of a different persuasion) were imprisoned and even executed for violation of the Sunday “Sabbath “ laws.

Notwithstanding such history and the great Constitution of the USA, there will be the call by the popular protestant Church leaders and membership for the enforcement of Sunday sacredness and Sunday worship by civil law. Trade Unions, Social Workers, Family-life experts, will support the call for a **cessation** of work and sports on Sundays. The various reasons given will be that compulsory Sunday rest will lead to **improvement in family life, better productivity in the work place, and increased capacity to cope with stress.**

The USA will be made a Christian Nation by enforcing Christian values and the Christian Sunday-Rest upon all citizens. Those of a different Christian and bible-based belief will ultimately be subject to civil penalties and the death penalty. **Sunday will be made the mark of American Christian Statehood.**

America will have apostatized from Republicanism and Protestantism by rejecting its Constitution and allowing the civil enforcement of faith and worship. But rather than saving the Nation this will precipitate history’s greatest crisis; ***National Apostasy will end in National ruin.***

The last and greatest Nation on earth will fall bringing the whole world to destruction.

In our next and last chapter we shall study how Bible Prophecy has written down all of this since the days of Daniel and the Apostle John and how

Satan intends to establish a *one-world-system* of total control of the human conscience by the *compelling power* of the *union* of church and state.

Chapter 17



The End-Time One World Religious-Economic-Political System

First let us recap the Biblical proof for *liberty of conscience* and *separation of church and state*.

LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE

Read carefully the following texts: 1 John 4:8; 2Cor. 3:17; John 8: 32, 36; Revelation 22: 17; Joshua: 24: 15; Romans 14: 5; Acts 5: 29.

The law of love being the foundation of the government of God, the happiness of all intelligent beings depends upon their perfect accord with its great principles of righteousness. God desires from all His creatures the service of love-service that springs from an appreciation of His character. He takes no pleasure in a forced obedience; and to all He grants freedom of will, that they may render Him voluntary service. **PP 35**

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Read carefully the following texts: Matthew 22: 21; John 18: 36; Romans 13: 1 to 9 compared with Daniel Chapter 3. Acts 5: 26 to 29

The principle for which the disciples stood so fearlessly when, in answer to the command not to speak any more in the

name of Jesus, they declared, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye," is the same that the adherents of the gospel struggled to maintain in the days of the Reformation. When in 1529 the German princes assembled at the Diet of Spire, there was presented the emperor's decree restricting religious liberty, and prohibiting all further dissemination of the reformed doctrines. It seemed that the hope of the world was about to be crushed out. Would the princes accept the decree? Should the light of the gospel be shut out from the multitudes still in darkness? Mighty issues for the world were at stake. Those who had accepted the reformed faith met together, and their unanimous decision was, "Let us reject this decree. In matters of conscience the majority has no power."--Merle d'Aubigne, **History of the Reformation, b. 13, ch. 5.**

This principle we in our day are firmly to maintain. The banner of truth and religious liberty held aloft by the founders of the gospel church and by God's witnesses during the centuries that have passed since then, has, in this last conflict, been committed to our hands. The responsibility for this great gift rests with those whom God has blessed with a knowledge of His word. We are to receive this word as supreme authority. We are to recognize human government as an ordinance of divine appointment, and teach obedience to it as a sacred duty, within its legitimate sphere. But when its claims conflict with the claims of God, we must obey God rather than men. God's word must be recognized as above all human legislation. A "Thus saith the Lord" is not to be set aside for a "Thus saith the church" or a "Thus saith the state." The crown of Christ is to be lifted above the diadems of earthly potentates.

We are not required to defy authorities. Our words, whether spoken or written, should be carefully considered, lest we place ourselves on record as uttering that which would make us appear antagonistic to law and order. We are not to say or do anything that would unnecessarily close up our way.

We are to go forward in Christ's name, advocating the truths committed to us. If we are forbidden by men to do this work, then we may say, as did the apostles, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." **AA 68-69**

THE BIBLE PREDICTS END-TIME RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

Read the words of Jesus in John 16: 1- 3.

In this passage of scripture Jesus makes it abundantly clear that to persecute and, or, kill anyone for their faith reveals *ignorance* of God and His Son.

Read what the Apostle Paul wrote in 2 Timothy 3: 12!

The book of Revelation predicts *end-time religious intolerance* in chapter 13: 11 to 18. In fact verse 15 indicates that those who *refuse to worship the image of the beast* will be sentenced to death while verse 17 indicates that *economic activity* will be tied to compliance with, and membership of, the *image and mark of the beast system*.

Many of the leading democratic nations of Christendom no longer employ the death-penalty; and have even legalized same sex unions as a demonstration of allowing freedom of the individual conscience in matters of private sexual morality. So the question is how and why will these same nations reach the point of *enforcing* a particular kind of *worship* by civil law; and re-enacting the *death penalty* as punishment for those who refuse to *participate* in that *worship*? This will be a *most radical* turn-around from the **First Amendment to the American Constitution**, and the Constitutions of the Western-style democratic nations.

The problems facing our present world are massive and severe, with many of them being apparently insurmountable. Global economic problems, global geophysical problems, crime and lawlessness spiraling out of control, international terrorism, drug trafficking, human trafficking, an increasing world population with increasing need for food, water and shelter, increasing environmental pollution, and the list goes on. Experts

and ordinary citizens will be **persuaded** or frightened or forced into believing that a new world order, which is more equitable and in which certain freedoms are given up in order to reduce crime, corruption, and lawlessness, **will be absolutely necessary to halt the downward global spiral . Religious leaders will declare that church and state must unite and enforce Christian morality by civil law in order to bring back the blessings of God to the Earth.** And, as has happened before, it will be proposed that Sunday sacredness be enforced by civil law as the *mark of Christian-statehood!*

All sectors of civil society and all the popular, traditional churches will unite in one massive endeavor to rescue mankind, and planet earth, from impending doom.

THE IMAGE AND MARK OF THE BEAST VERSUS THE SEAL OF GOD

To the apostle John on the isle of Patmos were opened scenes of deep and thrilling interest in the experience of the church. Subjects of intense interest and vast importance were presented to him in figures and symbols, that the people of God might become intelligent concerning the perils and conflicts before them. The history of the Christian world to the very close of time was revealed to John. With great clearness he saw the position, dangers, conflicts, and final deliverance of the people of God. He records the closing message which is to ripen the harvest of earth, either as sheaves for the heavenly garner, or as fagots for the fires of the last day.

In vision John beheld the trials which God's people would endure for the truth's sake. He saw their unyielding firmness in obeying the commandments of God, in the face of the oppressive powers that sought to force them into disobedience, and he saw their final triumph over the beast and his image.

Under the symbols of a great red dragon, a leopard-like beast, and a beast with lamblike horns, the earthly governments which would especially engage in trampling upon God's

law and persecuting His people, were presented to John. The war is carried on till the close of time. The people of God, symbolized by a holy woman and her children, were represented as greatly in the minority. In the last days only a remnant still existed. Of these John speaks as they "which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."

Through paganism, and then through the Papacy, Satan exerted his power for many centuries in an effort to blot from the earth God's faithful witnesses. Pagans and papists were actuated by the same dragon spirit. They differed only in that the Papacy, making a pretense of serving God, was the more dangerous and cruel foe. Through the agency of Romanism, Satan took the world captive. The professed church of God was swept into the ranks of this delusion, and for more than a thousand years the people of God suffered under the dragon's ire. And when the Papacy, robbed of its strength, was forced to desist from persecution, John beheld a new power coming up to echo the dragon's voice, and carry forward the same cruel and blasphemous work. This power, the last that is to wage war against the church and the law of God, was symbolized by a beast with lamblike horns. The beasts preceding it had risen from the sea, but this came up out of the earth, representing the peaceful rise of the nation which is symbolized. The "two horns like a lamb" well represent the character of the United States Government, as expressed in its two fundamental principles, Republicanism and Protestantism. These principles are the secret of our power and prosperity as a nation. Those who first found an asylum on the shores of America rejoiced that they had reached a country free from the arrogant claims of popery and the tyranny of kingly rule. They determined to establish a government upon the broad foundation of civil and religious liberty.

But the stern tracing of the prophetic pencil reveals a change in this peaceful scene. The beast with lamblike horns speaks

with the voice of a dragon, and "exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him." Prophecy declares that he will say to them that dwell on the earth that they should make an image to the beast, and that "he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." Thus Protestantism follows in the steps of the Papacy.

It is at this time that the third angel is seen flying in the midst of heaven, proclaiming: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation." "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." In marked contrast to the world stands the little company who will not swerve from their allegiance to God. These are they of whom Isaiah speaks as repairing the breach which had been made in the law of God, they who are building the old waste places, raising up the foundation of many generations.

The most solemn warning and the most awful threatening ever addressed to mortals is that contained in the third angel's message. The sin that calls down the wrath of God unmixed with mercy must be of the most heinous character. Is the world to be left in darkness as to the nature of this sin?-- Most assuredly not. God does not deal thus with His creatures. His wrath is never visited upon sins of ignorance. Before His judgments are brought upon the earth, the light in regard to this sin must be presented to the world, that man may know why these judgments are to be inflicted, and may have opportunity to escape them.

The message containing this warning is the last to be proclaimed before the revelation of the Son of man. The signs

which He Himself has given declare His coming to be near at hand. For well-nigh forty years has the message of the third angel been sounding. In the issue of the great contest two parties are developed, those who “worship the beast and his image,” and receive his mark, and those who receive “the seal of the living God,” who have the Father’s name written in their foreheads. This is not a visible mark. The time has come when all who have an interest in their soul’s salvation should earnestly and solemnly inquire, What is the seal of God? and what is the mark of the beast? How can we avoid receiving it?

The seal of God, the token or sign of His authority, is found in the fourth commandment. This is the only precept of the Decalogue that points to God as the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and clearly distinguishes the true God from all false gods. Throughout the Scriptures the fact of God’s creative power is cited as proof that He is above all heathen deities.

The Sabbath enjoined by the fourth commandment was instituted to commemorate the work of creation, thus to keep the minds of men ever directed to the true and living God. Had the Sabbath always been kept, there would never have been an idolater, an atheist, or an infidel. The sacred observance of God’s holy day would have led the minds of men to their Creator. The things of nature would have brought Him to their remembrance, and they would have borne witness to His power and His love. The Sabbath of the fourth commandment is the seal of the living God. It points to God as the Creator, and is the sign of His rightful authority over the beings He has made.

What, then, is the mark of the beast, if it is not the spurious sabbath which the world has accepted in the place of the true?

The prophetic declaration that the Papacy was to exalt itself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped, has been strikingly fulfilled in the changing of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. Wherever the papal

Sabbath is honored in preference to the Sabbath of God, there the man of sin is exalted above the Creator of heaven and earth.

Those who assert that Christ changed the Sabbath are directly contradicting His own words. In His Sermon on the Mount He declared: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever, therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

Roman Catholics acknowledge that the change in the Sabbath was made by their church, and they cite this very change as evidence of the supreme authority of this church. They declare that by observing the first day of the week as the Sabbath, Protestants are recognizing her power to legislate in divine things. The Roman Church has not relinquished her claim to infallibility, and when the world and the Protestant churches accept the spurious sabbath of her creating, they virtually acknowledge her claim. They may cite the authority of the apostles and fathers in defense of this change, but the fallacy of their reasoning is easily discerned. The papist is sharp enough to see that Protestants are deceiving themselves, willingly closing their eyes to the facts in the case. As the Sunday institution gains favor, he rejoices, feeling assured that it will eventually bring the whole Protestant world under the banner of Rome. **ST November 1, 1899**

The change of the Sabbath is a sign or mark of the authority of the Romish Church. Those who, understanding the claims of the fourth commandment, choose to observe the false sabbath in the place of the true, are thereby paying homage to that power by which alone it is commanded. The mark of

the beast is the papal sabbath, which has been accepted by the world in the place of the day of God's appointment.

There are true Christians in every church, not excepting the Roman Catholic communion. None are condemned until they have had the light and have seen the obligation of the fourth commandment. But when the decree shall go forth enforcing the counterfeit sabbath, and the loud cry of "the third angel" shall warn men against the worship of the beast and his image, the line will be clearly drawn between the false and the true. Then those who still continue in transgression will receive the mark of the beast.

With rapid steps we are approaching this period. When Protestant churches shall unite with the secular power in sustaining a false religion, for opposing which their ancestors endured the fiercest persecution, then will the papal Sabbath be enforced by the combined authority of church and State. There will be a national apostasy, which will end only in national ruin.

Marvelous in her shrewdness and cunning is the Roman Catholic Church. She presents a fair front to the world, covering with apologies her record of horrible cruelties, and declaring that her spirit of persecution no longer exists. But she is the same as in the days of the Reformation, when men of God stood up at the peril of their lives to expose her iniquity; the same as when she assumed the power to control kings and princes, and claimed the prerogatives of God. She may clothe herself in Christlike garments, the better to carry forward her purposes; but she still retains the venom of the serpent, and her principles are exerting their influence in legislative halls, in churches, and in the hearts of men. Her spirit is no less cruel and despotic now than when it crushed out human liberty, and slew the saints of the Most High.

By compromises and concessions, Protestants have tampered with and patronized popery, giving her vantage-ground which papists themselves are surprised to see and fail to understand. The Protestant world needs to be aroused to resist the advances of this most dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty.

When the State shall enforce the decrees and sustain the institutions of the church, then will Protestant America have formed an image of the Papacy. Then the true church will be assailed by persecution as were God's people in ancient times. Almost every century furnishes instances of what human hearts, controlled by rage and malice, can do under a plea of serving God by protecting the rights of the church and State. The Protestant churches that have followed in the steps of Rome by forming alliances with worldly powers have manifested a similar desire to restrict liberty of conscience. How many non-conformist ministers have suffered under the power of the Church of England! Persecution always follows a restriction of religious liberty on the part of secular governments.

It is urged by many that the intellectual and moral darkness prevailing during the middle ages favored the spread of dogma, superstition, and the oppression of popery, and that the general diffusion of knowledge, and the well-nigh universal acceptance of the principles of religious liberty, forbid a revival of superstition and tyranny. It is true that great light, intellectual, moral, and religious, is shining upon this generation. Since 1844 light from the heaven of heavens has beamed from the open door of the temple of God. But it is to be remembered that the greater the light bestowed, the greater the delusion and darkness of those who reject the Word of God and accept fables, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men.

Satan will excite the indignation of apostate Christendom against the humble remnant who conscientiously refuse to accept false customs and traditions. Blinded by the prince of darkness, popular religionists will see only as he sees, and feel as he feels. They will determine as he determines, and oppress as he has oppressed. Liberty of conscience, which has cost so great a sacrifice, will no longer be respected. The church and the world will unite, and the world will lend to the church power to crush out the right of the people to worship God according to His Word.

The decree which is to go forth against the people of God in the near future is in some respects similar to that issued by Ahasuerus against the Jews in the time of Esther. The Persian edict sprang from the malice of Haman against Mordecai. Not that Mordecai had done Haman harm, but he had refused to flatter his vanity by showing him the reverence which is due only to God. The king's decision against the Jews was secured under false pretenses. Satan instigated this scheme in order to rid the earth of those who preserved a knowledge of the true God. But his plots were defeated by a counter-power that reigns among the children of men. Angels who excel in strength were commissioned to protect the people of God, and the plots of their adversaries returned upon their own heads.

History repeats itself. The same masterful mind that plotted against the faithful in ages past is now at work to gain control of the Protestant churches, that through them he may condemn and put to death all who will not worship the idol sabbath. We have not to battle with man, as it may appear. We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. But if the people of God will put their trust in Him, and by faith rely upon His power, the devices of Satan will be defeated in our time as signally as in the days of Mordecai.

The decree is to go forth that all who will not receive the mark of the beast shall neither buy nor sell, and, finally, that they shall be put to death. But the saints of God do not receive this mark. The prophet of Patmos beheld those that had gotten the victory over the beast and over his image and over his mark and over the number of his name, standing on the sea of glass, having the harps of God, and singing the song of Moses and the Lamb.

To every soul will come the searching test, Shall I obey God rather than men? The decisive hour is even now at hand. Satan is putting forth his utmost efforts in the rage of a last despairing struggle against Christ and His followers. False teachers are employing every device possible to stimulate the hardened sinner in his rebellious daring, to confirm the questioning, the doubting, the unbelieving, and, by misrepresentation and falsehood, to deceive, if it were possible, the very elect. Who are prepared to stand firmly under the banner on which is inscribed, "The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus"?

Christ never purchased peace and friendship by compromise with evil. Tho His heart overflowed with love toward the human race, He could not be indulgent to their sins. Because He loved men and women, He was a stern reprover of their vices. His life of suffering, the humiliation to which He was subjected by a perverse nation, show His followers that there must be no sacrifice of principle. God's tried people must maintain watchfulness, with fervent prayer, lest, in their eagerness to prevent discord, they surrender truth, and thus dishonor the God of truth. Peace is too dearly obtained if purchased by the smallest concession to Satan's agencies. The least surrender of principle entangles us in the snare of the enemy.

Paul writes to the Romans, "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men." But there is a point beyond which it is impossible to maintain union and harmony without

the sacrifice of principle. Separation then becomes an absolute duty. The laws of nations should be respected when they do not conflict with the laws of God. But when there is collision between them, every true disciple of Christ will say, as did the apostle Peter when commanded to speak no more in the name of Jesus, "We ought to obey God rather than men."

ST November 8, 1899

Appendix A

United States Supreme Court
366 U.S. 420



MCGOWAN v. MARYLAND

Mr. Justice DOUGLAS, dissenting.

The question is not whether one day out of seven can be imposed by a State as a day of rest. The question is not whether Sunday can by force of custom and habit be retained as a day of rest. The question is whether a State can impose criminal sanctions on those who, unlike the Christian majority that makes up our society, worship on a different day or do not share the religious scruples of the majority.

If the 'free exercise' of religion were subject to reasonable regulations, as it is under some constitutions, or if all laws 'respecting the establishment of religion' were not proscribed, I could understand how rational men, representing a predominantly Christian civilization, might think these Sunday laws did not unreasonably interfere with anyone's free exercise of religion and took no step toward a burdensome establishment of any religion.

But that is not the premise from which we start, as there is agreement that the fact that a State, and not the Federal Government, has promulgated these Sunday laws does not change the scope of the power asserted. For the classic view is that the First Amendment should be applied to the States with the same firmness as it is enforced against the Federal Government. See *Lovell v. City of Griffin*, 303 U.S. 444, 450, 58 S.Ct. 666, 668, 82

L.Ed. 949; *Minersville School District v. Gobitis*, 310 U.S. 586, 593, 60 S.Ct. 1010, 1012, 84 L.Ed. 1375; *Murdock v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105, 108, 63 S.Ct. 870, 872, 87 L.Ed. 1292; *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 639, 63 S.Ct. 1178, 1186, 87 L.Ed. 1628; *Staub v. City of Baxley*, 355 U.S. 313, 321, 78 S.Ct. 277, 281, 2 L.Ed.2d 302; *Talley v. State of California*, 362 U.S. 60, 80 S.Ct. 536, 4 L.Ed.2d 559. The most explicit statement perhaps was in *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, supra, 319 U.S. 639, 63 S.Ct. 1186.

'In weighing arguments of the parties it is important to distinguish between the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment as an instrument for transmitting the principles of the First Amendment and those cases in which it is applied for its own sake. The test of legislation which collides with the Fourteenth Amendment, because it also collides with the principles of the First, is much more definite than the test when only the Fourteenth is involved. Much of the vagueness of the due process clause disappears when the specific prohibitions of the First become its standard. The right of a State to regulate, for example, a public utility may well include, so far as the due process test is concerned, power to impose all of the restrictions which a legislature may have a 'rational basis' for adopting. But freedoms of speech and of press, of assembly, and of worship may not be infringed on such slender grounds. They are susceptible of restriction only to prevent grave and immediate danger to interests which the State may lawfully protect. It is important to note that while it is the Fourteenth Amendment which bears directly upon the State it is the more specific limiting principles of the First Amendment that finally govern this case.'

With that as my starting point I do not see how a State can make protesting citizens refrain from doing innocent acts on Sunday because the doing of those acts offends sentiments of their Christian neighbors.

The institutions of our society are founded on the belief that there is an authority higher than the authority of the State; that there is a moral law

which the state is powerless to alter; that the individual possesses rights, conferred by the Creator, which government must respect.

The Declaration of Independence stated the now familiar theme:

'We hold these Truths to be selfevident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happn ess.'

And the body of the Constitution as well as the Bill of Rights enshrined those principles.

The Puritan influence helped shape our constitutional law and our common law as Dean Pound has said: The Puritan 'put individual conscience and individual judgment in the first place.' *The Spirit of the Common Law* (1921), p. 42. For these reasons we stated in *Zorach v. Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 313, 72 S.Ct. 679, 684, 96 L.Ed. 954, 'We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being.'

But those who fashioned the First Amendment decided that if and when God is to be served, His service will not be motivated by coercive measures of government. 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof'-such is the command of the First Amendment made applicable to the State by reason of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth. This means, as I understand it, that if a religious leaven is to be worked into the affairs of our people, it is to be done by individuals and groups, not by the Government. This necessarily means, first, that the dogma, creed, scruples, or practices of no religious group or sect are to be preferred over those of any others; second, that no one shall be interfered with by government for practicing the religion of his choice; third, that the State may not require anyone to practice a religion or even any religion; and fourth, that the State cannot compel one so to conduct himself as not to offend the religious scruples of another. The idea, as I understand it, was to limit the power of government to act in religious matters (*West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, supra; *People of State of Illinois ex rel. McCollum v. Board of Education*,

333 U.S. 203, 68 S.Ct. 461, 92 L.Ed. 649), not to limit the freedom of religious men to act religiously nor to restrict the freedom of atheists or agnostics.

The First Amendment commands government to have no interest in theology or ritual; it admonishes government to be interested in allowing religious freedom to flourish-whether the result is to produce Catholics, Jews, or Protestants, or to turn the people toward the path of Buddha, or to end in a predominantly Moslem nation, or to produce in the long run atheists or agnostics. On matters of this kind government must be neutral. This freedom plainly includes freedom from religion with the right to believe, speak, write, publish and advocate antireligious programs. *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, supra, 319 U.S. 641, 63 S.Ct. 1186. Certainly the 'free exercise' clause does not require that everyone embrace the theology of some church or of some faith, or observe the religious practices of any majority or minority sect. The First Amendment by its 'establishment' clause prevents, of course, the selection by government of an 'official' church. Yet the ban plainly extends farther than that We said in *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, 16, 67 S.Ct. 504, 511, 91 L.Ed. 711, that it would be an 'establishment' of a religion if the Government financed one church or several churches. For what better way to 'establish' an institution than to find the fund that will support it? The 'establishment' clause protects citizens also against any law which selects any religious custom, practice, or ritual, puts the force of government behind it, and fines, imprisons, or otherwise penalizes a person for not observing it. The Government plainly could not join forces with one religious group and decree a universal and symbolic circumcision. Nor could it require all children to be baptized or give tax exemptions only to those whose children were baptized.

Could it require a fast from sunrise to sunset throughout the Moslem month of Ramadan? I should think not. Yet why then can it make criminal the doing of other acts, as innocent as eating, during the day that Christians revere?

Sunday is a word heavily overlaid with connotations and traditions deriving from the Christian roots of our civilization that color all judgments concerning it. This is what the philosophers call 'word magic.'

'For most judges, for most lawyers, for most human beings, we are as unconscious of our value patterns as we are of the oxygen that we breathe.' Cohen, *Legal Conscience* (1960), p. 169.

The issue of those cases would therefore be in better focus if we imagined that a state legislature, controlled by orthodox Jews and Seventh-Day Adventists, passed a law making it a crime to keep a shop open on Saturdays. Would a Baptist, Catholic, Methodist, or Presbyterian be compelled to obey that law or go to jail or pay a fine? Or suppose Moslems grew in political strength here and got a law through a state legislature making it a crime to keep a shop open on Fridays. Would the rest of us have to submit under the fear of criminal sanctions?

Dr. John Cogley recently summed up the dominance of the three-religion influence in our affairs:

'For the foreseeable future, it seems, the United States is going to be a three-religion nation. At the present time all three are characteristically 'American,' some think flavorlessly so. For religion in America is almost uniformly 'respectable,' bourgeois, and prosperous. In the Protestant world the 'church' mentality has triumphed over the more venturesome spirit of the 'sect.' In the Catholic world, the mystical is muted in favor of booming organization and efficiently administered good works. And in the Jewish world the prophet is too frequently without honor, while the synagogue emphasis is focused on suburban togetherness. There are exceptions to these rules, of course; each of the religious communities continues to cast up its prophets, its rebels and radicals. But a Jeremiah, one fears, would be positively embarrassing to the present position of the Jews; a Francis of Assisi upsetting the complacency of American Catholics would be rudely dismissed as a fanatic; and a Kierkegaard, speaking with an American accent, would be considerably less welcome than Norman Vincent Peale in most Protestant pulpits.'

This religious influence has extended far, far back of the First and Fourteenth Amendments. Every Sunday School student knows the Fourth Commandment:

'Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy.

'Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work:

'But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates:

'For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and halo wed it.' Exodus 20:8-11.

This religious mandate for observance of the Seventh Day became, under Emperor Constantine, a mandate for observance of the First Day 'in conformity with the practice of the Christian Church.' See *Richardson v. Goddard*, 23 How. 28, 41, 16 L.Ed. 412. This religious mandate has had a checkered history, but in general its command, enforced now by the ecclesiastical authorities, now by the civil authorities, and now by both, has held good down through the centuries. [2] The general pattern of these laws in the United States was set in the eighteenth century and derives, most directly, from a seventeenth century English statute. 29 Charles II, c. 7. Judicial comment on the Sunday laws has always been a mixed bag. Some judges have asserted that the statutes have a 'purely' civil aim, i.e., limitation of work time and provision for a common and universal leisure. But other judges have recognized the religious significance of Sunday and that the laws existed to enforce the maintenance of that significance. In general, both threads of argument have continued to interweave in the case law on the subject. Prior to the time when the First Amendment was held applicable to the States by reason of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth, the Court at least by obiter dictum approved State Sunday laws on three occasions: *Soon Hing v. Crowley*, 113 U.S. 703, 5 S.Ct. 730, 28 L.Ed. 1145, in 1885; *Hennington v. State of Georgia*, 163 U.S. 299, 16

S.Ct. 1086, 41 L.Ed. 166, in 1896; *Petit v. State of Minnesota*, 177 U.S. 164, 20 S.Ct. 666, 44 L.Ed. 716, in 1900. And in *Friedman v. People of State of New York*, 341 U.S. 907, 71 S.Ct. 623, 95 L.Ed. 1345, the Court, by a divided vote, dismissed [3] 'for the want of a substantial federal question' an appeal from a New York decision upholding the validity of a Sunday law against an attack based on the First Amendment.

The *Soon Hing*, *Hennington*, and *Petit* cases all rested on the police power of the State—the right to safeguard the health of the people by requiring the cessation of normal activities one day out of seven. The Court in the *Soon Hing* case rejected the idea that Sunday laws rested on the power of government 'to legislate for the promotion of religious observances.' 113 U.S. at page 710, 5 S.Ct. at page 734. The New York Court of Appeals in the *Friedman* case followed the reasoning of the earlier cases, [4] 302 N.Y. 75, 80, 96 N.E.2d 184, 186.

'Our Puritan ancestors intended that the day should be not merely a day of rest from labor, but also a day devoted to public and private worship and to religious meditation and repose, undisturbed by secular cares or amusements. They saw fit to enforce the observance of the day by penal legislation, and the statute regulations which they devised for that purpose have continued in force, without any substantial modification, to the present time.'

And see *Commonwealth v. Dextra*, 143 Mass. 28, 8 N.E. 756. In *Commonwealth v. White*, 190 Mass. 578, 581, 77 N.E. 636, 637, 5 L.R.A.,N.S., 320, the court refused to liberalize its construction of an exception in its Sunday law for works of 'necessity.' That word, it said, 'was originally inserted to secure the observance of the Lord's day in accordance with the views of our ancestors, and it ever since has stood and still stands for the same purpose.' In *Commonwealth v. McCarthy*, 244 Mass. 484, 486, 138 N.E. 835, 836, the court reiterated that the aim of the law was 'to secure respect and reverence for the Lord's day.'

The Pennsylvania Sunday laws before us in Nos. 36 and 67 have received the same construction. 'Rest and quiet, on the Sabbath day, with the right and

privilege of public and private worship, undisturbed by any mere worldly employment, are exactly what the statute was passed to protect.' Sparhawk v. Union Passenger R. Co., 54 Pa. 401, 423. And see Commonwealth v. Nesbit, 34 Pa. 398, 405, 406-408. A recent pronouncement by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court is found in Commonwealth ex rel. v. American Baseball Club, 290 Pa. 136, 143, 138 A. 497, 499, 53 A.L.R. 1027: 'Christianity is part of the common law of Pennsylvania *** and its people are Christian people. Sunday is the holy day among Christians.'

The Maryland court, in sustaining the challenged law in No. 8, relied on *Judefind v. State*, 78 Md. 510, 28 A. 405, 22 L.R.A. 721, and *Levering v. Board of Park Commissioner*, [5] 134 Md. 48, 106 A. 176, 4 A.L.R. 374. In the former the court said:

'It is undoubtedly true that rest from secular employment on Sunday does have a tendency to foster and encourage the Christian religion, of all sects and denominations that observe that day, as rest from work and ordinary occupation enables many to engage in public worship who probably would not otherwise do so. But it would scarcely be asked of a court, in what professes to be a Christian land, to declare a law unconstitutional because it requires rest from bodily labor on Sunday, except works of necessity and charity, and thereby promotes the cause of Christianity. If the Christian religion is, incidentally or otherwise, benefited or fostered by having this day of rest, (as it undoubtedly is,) there is all the more reason for the enforcement of laws that help to preserve it.' 78 Md., at pages 515-516, 28 A. at page 407.

In the *Levering* case the court relied on the excerpt from the *Judefind* decision just quoted. 134 Md. at pages 54-55, 106 A. at page 178.

We have then in each of the four cases Sunday laws that find their source in Exodus, that were brought here by the Virginians and by the Puritans, and that are today maintained, construed, and justified because they respect the views of our dominant religious groups and provide a needed day of rest.

The history was accurately summarized a century ago by Chief Justice Terry of the Supreme Court of California in *Ex parte Newman*, 9 Cal. 502, 509:

'The truth is, however much it may be disguised, that this one day of rest is a purely religious idea. Derived from the Sabbatical institutions of the ancient Hebrew, it has been adopted into all the creeds of succeeding religious sects throughout the civilized world; and whether it be the Friday of the Mohammedan, the Saturday of the Israelite, or the Sunday of the Christian, it is alike fixed in the affections of its followers, beyond the power of eradication, and in most of the States of our Confederacy, the aid of the law to enforce its observance has been given under the pretense of a civil, municipal, or police regulation.'

That case involved the validity of a Sunday law under a provision of the California Constitution guaranteeing the 'free exercise' of religion. Calif. Const., 1849, Art. I, § 4. Justice Burnett stated why he concluded that the Sunday law, there sought to be enforced against a man selling clothing on Sunday, infringed California's constitution:

'Had the act made Monday, instead of Sunday, a day of compulsory rest, the constitutional question would have been the same. The fact that the Christian voluntarily keeps holy the first day of the week, does not authorize the Legislature to make that observance compulsory. The Legislature can not compel the citizen to do that which the Constitution leaves him free to do or omit, at his election. The act violates as much the religious freedom of the Christian as of the Jew. Because the conscientious views of the Christian compel him to keep Sunday as a Sabbath, he has the right to object, when the Legislature invades his freedom of religious worship, and assumes the power to compel him to do that which he has the right to omit if he pleases. The principle is the same, whether the act of the Legislature compels us to do that which we wish to do, or not to do. * * *

'Under the Constitution of this State, the Legislature can not pass any act, the legitimate effect of which is forcibly to establish any merely religious

truth, or enforce any merely religious observances. The Legislature has no power over such a subject. When, therefore, the citizen is sought to be compelled by the Legislature to do any affirmative religious act, or to refrain from doing anything, because it violates simply a religious principle or observance, the act is unconstitutional.' *Id.*, at pages 513-515.

The Court picks and chooses language from various decisions to bolster its conclusion that these Sunday laws in the modern setting are 'civil regulations.' No matter how much is written, no matter what is said, the parentage of these laws is the Fourth Commandment; and they serve and satisfy the religious predispositions of our Christian communities. After all, the labels a State places on its laws are not binding on us when we are confronted with a constitutional decision. We reach our own conclusion as to the character, effect, and practical operation of the regulation in determining its constitutionality. *Carpenter v. Shaw*, 280 U.S. 363, 367-368, 50 S.Ct. 121, 122-123, 74 L.Ed. 478; *State ex rel. Dyer v. Sims*, 341 U.S. 22, 29, 71 S.Ct. 557, 561, 95 L.Ed. 713; *Memphis Steam Laundry Cleaner v. Stone*, 342 U.S. 389, 392, 72 S.Ct. 424, 426, 96 L.Ed. 436; *Society for Savings in City of Cleveland, Ohio v. Bowers*, 349 U.S. 143, 151, 75 S.Ct. 607, 99 L.Ed. 950; *Gomillion v. Lightfoot*, 364 U.S. 339, 341-342, 81 S.Ct. 125, 127, 5 L.Ed.2d 110.

It seems to me plain that by these laws the States compel one, under sanction of law, to refrain from work or recreation on Sunday because of the majority's religious views about that day. The State by law makes Sunday a symbol of respect or adherence. Refraining from work or recreation in deference to the majority's religious feelings about Sunday is within every person's choice. By what authority can government compel it?

Cases are put where acts that are immoral by our standards but not by the standards of other religious groups are made criminal. That category of cases, until today, has been a very restricted one confined to polygamy (*Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145, 25 L.Ed. 244) and other extreme situations. The latest example is *Prince v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, 321 U.S. 158, 64 S.Ct. 438, 88 L.Ed. 645, which

upheld a statute making it criminal for a child under twelve to sell papers, periodicals, or merchandise on a street or in any public place. It was sustained in spite of the finding that the child thought it was her religious duty to perform the act. But that was a narrow holding which turned on the effect which street solicitation might have on the child-solicitor:

'The state's authority over children's activities is broader than over like actions of adults. This is peculiarly true of public activities and in matters of employment. A democratic society rests, for its continuance, upon the healthy, well-rounded growth of young people into full maturity as citizens, with all that implies. It may secure this against impeding restraints and dangers within a broad range of selection. Among evils most appropriate for such action are the crippling effects of child employment, more especially in public places, and the possible harms arising from other activities subject to all the diverse influences of the street. It is too late now to doubt that legislation appropriately designed to reach such evils is within the state's police power, whether against the parent's claim to control of the child or one that religious scruples dictate contrary action.' *Id.*, 321 U.S. 168-169, 64 S.Ct. 443.

None of the acts involved here implicates minors. None of the actions made constitutionally criminal today involves the doing of any act that any society has deemed to be immoral.

The conduct held constitutionally criminal today embraces the selling of pure, not impure, food; wholesome, not noxious, articles. Adults, not minors, are involved. The innocent acts, now constitutionally classified as criminal, emphasize the drastic break we make with tradition.

These laws are sustained because, it is said, the First Amendment is concerned with religious convictions or opinion, not with conduct. But it is a strange Bill of Rights that makes it possible for the dominant religious group to bring the minority to heel because the minority, in the doing of acts which intrinsically are wholesome and not antisocial, does not defer to the majority's religious beliefs. Some have religious scruples against eating pork. Those scruples, no matter how bizarre they might seem to

some, are within the ambit of the First Amendment. See *United States v. Ballard*, 322 U.S. 78, 87, 64 S.Ct. 882, 886, 88 L.Ed. 1148. Is it possible that a majority of a state legislature having those religious scruples could make it criminal for the nonbeliever to sell pork? Some have religious scruples against slaughtering cattle. Could a state legislature, dominated by that group, make it criminal to run an abattoir?

The Court balances the need of the people for rest, recreation, late sleeping, family visiting and the like against the command of the First Amendment that no one need bow to the religious beliefs of another. There is in this realm no room for balancing. I see no place for it in the constitutional scheme. A legislature of Christians can no more make minorities conform to their weekly regime than a legislature of Moslems, or a legislature of Hindus. The religious regime of every group must be respected—unless it crosses the line of criminal conduct. But no one can be forced to come to a halt before it, or refrain from doing things that would offend it. That is my reading of the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause. Any other reading imports, I fear, an element common in other societies but foreign to us. Thus Nigeria in Article 23 of her Constitution, after guaranteeing religious freedom, adds, 'Nothing in this section shall invalidate any law that is reasonably justified in a democratic society in the interest of defence, public safety, public order, public morality, or public health.' And see Article 25 of the Indian Constitution. That may be a desirable provision. But when the Court adds it to our First Amendment, as it does today, we make a sharp break with the American ideal of religious liberty as enshrined in the First Amendment.

The State can, of course, require one day of rest a week: one day when every shop or factory is closed. Quite a few States make that requirement. Then the 'day of rest' becomes purely and simply a health measure. But the Sunday laws operate differently. They force minorities to obey the majority's religious feelings of what is due and proper for a Christian community; they provide a coercive spur to the 'weaker brethren,' to those who are indifferent to the claims of a Sabbath through apathy or scruple. Can there be any doubt that Christians, now aligned vigorously in favor of

these laws, would be as strongly opposed if they were prosecuted under a Moslem law that forbade them from engaging in secular activities on days that violated Moslem scruples?

There is an 'establishment' of religion in the constitutional sense if any practice of any religious group has the sanction of law behind it. There is an interference with the 'free exercise' of religion if what in conscience one can do or omit doing is required because of the religious scruples of the community. Hence I would declare each of those laws unconstitutional as applied to the complaining parties, whether or not they are members of a sect which observes as its Sabbath a day other than Sunday.

When these laws are applied to Orthodox Jews, as they are in No. 11 and No. 67, or to Sabbatarians their vice is accentuated. If the Sunday laws are constitutional, kosher markets are on a five-day week. Thus those laws put an economic penalty on those who observe Saturday rather than Sunday as the Sabbath. For the economic pressures on these minorities, created by the fact that our communities are predominantly Sunday-minded, there is no recourse. When, however, the State uses its coercive powers—here the criminal law—to compel minorities to observe a second Sabbath, not their own, the State undertakes to aid and 'prefer one religion over another'—contrary to the command of the Constitution. See *Everson v. Board of Education*, supra, 330 U.S. 15, 67 S.Ct. 511.

In large measure the history of the religious clause of the First Amendment was a struggle to be free of economic sanctions for adherence to one's religion. *Everson v. Board of Education*, supra, 330 U.S. 11-14, 67 S.Ct. 509-510. A small tax was imposed in Virginia for religious education. Jefferson and Madison led the fight against the tax, Madison writing his famous Memorial and Remonstrance against that law. *Id.*, 330 U.S. 12, 67 S.Ct. 509. As a result, the tax measure was defeated and instead Virginia's famous 'Bill for Religious Liberty,' written by Jefferson, was enacted. *Id.*, 330 U.S. 12, 67 S.Ct. 510. That Act provided:

'That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained,

molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions of belief * * *.'

The reverse side of an 'establishment' is a burden on the 'free exercise' of religion. Receipt of funds from the State benefits the established church directly; laying an extra tax on nonmembers benefits the established church indirectly. Certainly the present Sunday laws place Orthodox Jews and Sabbatarians under extra burdens because of their religious opinions or beliefs. Requiring them to abstain from their trade or business on Sunday reduces their work-week to five days, unless they violate their religious scruples. This places them at a competitive disadvantage and penalizes them for adhering to their religious beliefs.

'The sanction imposed by the state for observing a day other than Sunday as holy time is certainly more serious economically than the imposition of a license tax for preaching,' which we struck down in *Murdock v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105, 63 S.Ct. 870, 87 L.Ed. 1292, and in *Follett v. Town of McCormick*, 321 U.S. 573, 64 S.Ct. 717, 88 L.Ed. 938. The special protection which Sunday laws give the dominant religious groups and the penalty they place on minorities whose holy day is Saturday constitute, in my view, state interference with the 'free exercise' of religion.

I dissent from applying criminal sanctions against any of these complainants since to do so implicates the States in religious matters contrary to the constitutional mandate. Reverend Allan C. Parker, Jr., Pastor of the South Park Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Washington, has stated my views:

'We forget that, though Sundayworshipping Christians are in the majority in this country among religious people, we do not have the right to force our practice upon the minority. Only a Church which deems itself without error and intolerant of error can justify its intolerance of the minority.

'A Jewish friend of mine runs a small business establishment. Because my friend is a Jew his business is closed each Saturday. He respects my right

to worship on Sunday and I respect his right to worship on Saturday. But there is a difference. As a Jew he closes his store voluntarily so that he will be able to worship his God in his fashion. Fine! But, as a Jew living under Christian inspired Sunday closing laws, he is required to close his store on Sunday so that I will be able to worship my God in my fashion.

'Around the corner from my church there is a small Seventh Day Baptist church. I disagree with the Seventh Day Baptists on many points of doctrine. Among the tenets of their faith with which I disagree is the 'seventh day worship.' But they are good neighbors and fellow Christians, and while we disagree we respect one another. The good people of my congregation set aside their jobs on the first of the week and gather in God's house for worship. Of course, it is easy for them to set aside their jobs since Sunday closing laws inspired by the Church-keep them from their work. At the Seventh Day Baptist church the people set aside their jobs on Saturday to worship God. This takes real sacrifice because Saturday is a good day for business. But that is not all-they are required by law to set aside their jobs on Sunday while more orthodox Christians worship.

'* * * I do not believe that because I have set aside Sunday as a holy day I have the right to force all men to set aside that day also. Why should my faith be favored by the State over any other man's faith?'

With all deference, none of the opinions filed today in support of the Sunday laws has answered that question.



Appendix B





Historical Perspectives

The modern concept of intolerance developed out of the religious controversies between Protestants and Catholics in 17th- and 18th-century England. The doctrine of 'religious toleration' at this time, sought to eradicate religious sentiments and dogmas from the political demesne.[

According to the 19th century British historian Arnold Toynbee, for a religious establishment to persecute another religion for being "wrong" ironically puts the persecuting religion in the wrong, undermining its own legitimacy.

CONTEMPORARY ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE

A statue of the Buddha at Bamiyan before and after its March 2001 destruction by Taliban forces

The constitutions of some countries contain provisions expressly forbidding the state from engaging in certain acts of religious intolerance or preference within its own borders, examples of such include the First Amendment of the United States Constitution, the Article 4 of the Basic Law of Germany, Article 44.2.1 of the Constitution of The Republic of Ireland, Article 40 of the Estonian Constitution,[3] Article 24 of the Constitution of Turkey,

Article 36 of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China, and Article 3 Section 5 of the Constitution of the Philippines.

Other states, whilst not containing constitutional provisions directly related to religion, nonetheless contain provisions forbidding discrimination on religious grounds (see, for example, Article 1 of the French Constitution, article 15 of Canada's Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and article 40 of the Constitution of Egypt). These constitutional provisions do not necessarily guarantee that all elements of the state remain free from religious intolerance at all times, and practice can vary widely from country to country.

Other countries, meanwhile, may allow for religious preference, for instance through the establishment of one or more state religions, but not for religious intolerance. Finland, for example, has the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland and Finnish Orthodox Church as its official state religions, yet upholds the right of free expression of religion in article 11 of its constitution.

Some countries retain laws forbidding defamation of religious belief. Some retain laws forbidding all forms of blasphemy (e.g., Germany where, in 2006, Manfred van H. was convicted of blasphemy against Islam). This is seen by some as official endorsement of religious intolerance, amounting to the criminalization of religious views. The connection between intolerance and blasphemy laws is closest when the laws apply to only one religion. In Pakistan blasphemy directed against either the tenets of the Qur'an or the Prophet Mohammed is punishable by either life imprisonment or death. Apostasy, the rejection of one's old religion, is also criminalized in a number of countries, notably Afghanistan with Abdul Rahman being the first to face the death penalty for converting to Christianity.

The United Nations upholds the right to free expression of religious belief in articles 18 and 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights while article 2 forbids discrimination on the basis of religion. Article 18 also allows for the freedom to change religion. The Declaration is not legally binding, however the United States chose in 1998 to pass

the International Religious Freedom Act, creating the Commission on International Religious Freedom, and mandating that the United States government take action against any country found to violate the religious freedoms outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Human Rights Council in 2011 adopted Resolution 16/18 on "Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief" which was hailed by stakeholders from all regions and faiths as a turning point in international efforts to confront religious intolerance. The European Convention on Human Rights, which is legally binding on all European Union states (following the passage of the Human Rights Act 1998 in the United Kingdom), makes restricting the rights of an individual to practice or change their religion illegal in article 9, and discrimination on the basis of religion illegal in article 14.

In its 2000 annual report on international religious freedom, the U.S. State Department cited China, Myanmar, Iran, Iraq and Sudan for persecuting people for their religious faith and practices. The report, which covers July 1999 through June 2000, details U.S. policy toward countries where religious freedom is violated in the view of the U.S. State Department.

The advocacy group Freedom House produced a report entitled "Religious Freedom in the World" in 2000 which ranked countries according to their religious freedom. The countries receiving a score of 7, indicating those where religious freedom was least respected, were Turkmenistan, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Myanmar and North Korea. China was given a score of 6 overall, however Tibet was listed separately in the 7 category. Those countries receiving a score of 1, indicating the highest level of religious freedom, were Estonia, Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway and the United States.

Within those countries that openly advocate religious tolerance there remain debates as to the limits of tolerance. Some individuals and religious groups, for example, retain beliefs or practices which involve acts contrary to established law, such as the use of cannabis by members of the Rastafari

movement, the religious use of eagle feathers by non-Native Americans (contrary to the eagle feather law, 50 CFR 22), or the practice of polygamy amongst the LDS Church in the 19th century.

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Religious_intolerance



Bibliography



1. The Pilgrim Fathers... [https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pilgrims_\(Plymouth_Colony\)](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pilgrims_(Plymouth_Colony))
2. Roger Williams...https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roger_Williams
3. Chapters 3,4,5 & 9- Civil Government & Religion, or Christianity and the American Constitution by Alonzo T Jones. American Sentinel, Atlanta, Georgia 1889
4. AT Jones: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alonzo_T._Jones
5. Thomas Jefferson: <https://www.history.com/topics/us-presidents/thomas-jefferson>
6. James Madison: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_Madison
7. George Bancroft: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Bancroft
8. AT Jones 59 <http://www.adventpioneerbooks.com/Text/NationalSundayLaw-Jones.pdf>
9. August Neander: https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/August_Neander
10. Philip Schaff: https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philip_Schaff
11. Transportation of Mail on the Sabbath: <https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbpe.02106400/?st=text>
12. Roman Republic: https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roman_Republic
13. 19 Greatest Inventions of the Roman Empire That Helped Shape the Modern World: <https://interestingengineering.com/19-greatest-inventions-of-the-roman-empire-that-helped-shape-the-modern-world>
14. Barbarian Invasions of the Roman Empire - <https://www.penfield.edu/webpages/jgiotto/onlinetextbook.cfm?subpage=1492781>
15. Jean-Henri Merle d'Aubigné - Wikipedia: https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jean-Henri_Merle_d%27Aubign%C3%A9

16. William Torrey Harris - https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Torrey_Harris
17. J.N. Andrews - https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/J._N._Andrews
18. The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire - https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_History_of_the_Decline_and_Fall_of_the_Roman_Empire
19. Rights of the People by Alonzo T. Jones - <http://www.imsmedia.org/webstore/rights-of-the-people-by-alonzo-t-jones/>
20. Treaty of Tripoli - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Tripoli

Once to Every Man and Nation

EBENEZER (TON-Y-BOTEL) 8.7.8.7.D.

James Russell Lowell, 1845; alt.

Thomas John Williams, 1890

1. Once to ev-ery man and na-tion Comes the mo-ment to de-cide,
 2. Then to side with truth is no-ble, When we share her wretch-ed crust,
 3. By the light of burn-ing mar-tyrs, Christ, your bleed-ing feet we track,
 4. Though the cause of e-vil pros-per, Yet 'tis truth a-lone is strong;

In the strife of truth with false-hood, For the good or e-vil side;
 Ere her cause bring fame and prof-it, And 'tis pros-perous to be just;
 Toil-ing up new Cal-varies ev-er With the cross that turns not back;
 Though her por-tion be the scaff-ol'd, And up-on the throne be wrong,

Some great cause, God's new Mes-si-ah, Of-fering each the bloom or blight,
 Then it is the brave man choos-es While the cow-ard stands a-side,
 New oc-ca-sions teach new du-ties, Time makes an-cient good un-couth;
 Yet that scaff-ol'd sways the fu-ture, And, be-hind the dim un-known,

And the choice goes by for-ev-er 'Twi'x that dark-ness and that light.
 Till the mul-ti-tude make vir-tue Of the faith they had de-nied.
 They must up-ward still and on-ward, Who would keep a-breast of truth.
 Stands our God with-in the shad-ow Keep-ing watch a-bove his own. A-men.

A large, white, decorative initial letter 'T' with elegant flourishes, positioned at the start of the first paragraph.

he banner of truth and religious liberty held aloft by the founders of the gospel church and by God's witnesses during the centuries that have passed since then, has, in this last conflict, been committed to our hands. The responsibility for this great gift rests with those whom God has blessed with a knowledge of His word. We are to receive this word as supreme authority. We are to recognize human government as an ordinance of divine appointment, and teach obedience to it as a sacred duty, within its legitimate sphere. But when its claims conflict with the claims of God, we must obey God rather than men. God's word must be recognized as above all human legislation. A "Thus saith the Lord" is not to be set aside for a "Thus saith the church" or a "Thus saith the state." The crown of Christ is to be lifted above the diadems of earthly potentates.

We are not required to defy authorities. Our words, whether spoken or written, should be carefully considered, lest we place ourselves on record as uttering that which would make us appear antagonistic to law and order. We are not to say or do anything that would unnecessarily close up our way. We are to go forward in Christ's name, advocating the truths committed to us. If we are forbidden by men to do this work, then we may say, as did the apostles, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

AA 69.1