

GENERAL CONFERENCE 2025
SPECIAL EDITION

FREEDOM ALERT

SELECTED WORKS

BY A. T. JONES

&

THE 7 MOUNTAIN MANDATE SERIES

FROM WINGS OF LIBERTY

© 2025 WINGS OF LIBERTY
www.wingsofliberty.net

Published in the USA

June, 2025

GENERAL CONFERENCE 2025
SPECIAL EDITION

FREEDOM ALERT

SELECTED WORKS

BY A. T. JONES

&

THE 7 MOUNTAIN MANDATE SERIES

FROM WINGS OF LIBERTY

CONTENTS



Preface.....	7
1 – The American Papacy.....	9
2 – What is Patriotism in the United States?.....	17
3 – The Immortality of the Soul, Is it a Scriptural Doctrine?.....	39
4 – The Limits of Civil Authority from the Standpoint of Natural Right and Divine Obligation.....	63
5 – Blowing Smoke: The Myths of “Democracy”	71
6 – Is America a Christian Nation?.....	77
7 – The Seven Mountain Mandate – Part 1.....	87
8 – The Seven Mountain Mandate – Part 2.....	93
9 – The Seven Mountain Mandate – Part 3.....	99
10 – The Seven Mountain Mandate – Part 4.....	107
11 – Donkeys, Elephants, and Citizens of a Better Land	113
12 – The Tyrannical Fiction of the Common Good.....	121

PREFACE



Dear Reader,

The saying that “history repeats itself” holds true not only for the troubled history of mankind but the stories of the Bible and their typological significance to the days that we live in.

Ancient Israel was brought twice to the border of the Promised Land, their faltering faith replaced the second time by trust in the mighty God of Jacob Whose promises never fail. Despite much more extensive obstacles upon their return to the Jordan river after forty years, they entered the land of Caanan. Their wanderings had accomplished the purpose the Lord intended. Ancient Israel had sufficiently learned the lesson that modern Israel must learn: that the battle is the Lord’s.

The writings of Seventh-day Adventist pioneer A. T. Jones contained in this book were written during this movement’s first approach to the border of the Promised Land. The issues of church and state, liberty of conscience, patriotism, and the limits of civil authority are as urgently relevant today as they were then.

Momentous and ominous indicators declare in thunder tones that we are approaching the border of the Promised Land once more. The signs of the times mount on every side. Unrest, war and natural calamities are the norm, not the exception. Church and state are in illicit affair. The lesson book of the Bible and the experience of ancient Israel must be our lesson book and our experience. May our eyes be on the Lord Jesus Christ, our great Pillar of Cloud by Day and Pillar of Fire by Night.

That this book will inspire fresh zeal in the cause of our Great Lord and Savior, Jesus, is the sincere and earnest prayer of the Publishers.



THE AMERICAN PAPACY

A. T. Jones, 1889

SINCE the year 1856, a book entitled “Our Country” has been largely circulated, and it has excited a great deal of attention throughout the United States. The book was written for the American Home Missionary Society, its object being to present “facts and arguments showing the imperative need of home missionary work for the evangelization of the land.” In a startling as well as splendid array of facts, it presents the growth, the size, the resources, and the perils of our country.

Among the perils to our country, the author rightly places Romanism, and by many excellent quotations proves that it is indeed a peril. We quote a passage or two:—

“There are many who are disposed to attribute any fear of Roman Catholicism in the United States to bigotry or childishness. Such see nothing in the character and attitude of Romanism that is hostile to our free institutions, or find nothing portentous in its growth. Let us, then, first compare some of the fundamental principles of our Government with those of the Catholic Church.

“The Constitution of the United States guarantees liberty of conscience. Nothing is clearer or more fundamental. Pope Pius IX., in his Encyclical Letter of August 15, 1854, said: ‘The absurd and erroneous doctrines or ravings in defense of liberty of conscience, are a pestilential error—a pest, of all others, most to be dreaded in a State.’ The same pope, in his Encyclical Letter of December 8, 1864, anathematizes ‘those who assert the liberty of conscience and of religious worship,’ also ‘all such as maintain that the church may not employ force.’”

“The pacific tone of Rome in the United States does not imply a change of heart. She is tolerant where she is helpless. Says Bishop O’Connor: ‘Religious liberty is merely endured until the opposite can be carried into effect without peril to the Catholic world.’ ... The Archbishop of St. Louis once said: ‘Heresy and unbelief are crimes; and in Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain, for instance, where all the people are Catholics, and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the law of the land, they are punished as other crimes.’ ...

“Every cardinal, archbishop, and bishop in the Catholic Church takes an oath of allegiance to the Pope, in which occur the following words: Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord (the pope), or his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost persecute and oppose.”

“Cardinal Manning advises Romanists throughout the world to enter politics as Romanists, and to do this especially in England and the United States. In our large cities the priests are already in politics, and to some purpose.... We are told that the native Catholics of Arizona and New Mexico are not energetic as the Protestants who are pushing into these Territories. True, but they are energetic enough to be enough to be counted. The most wretched members of society count as much at the polls as the best, and too often much more.”

All this and much more is true of Romanism. And although there is just cause for fear that the principles of Romanism will let be legalized by the laws of this nation, we are certain that it will never accomplish this of itself nor in its own name. We are perfectly assured that if ever Romanism gains such power in this Government, it will be through the mediumship and by the instrumentalities of the National Reform party; for, as crafty, as crud, as bitterly opposed to our free institutions as Rome is, as this book shows she is, and as men know that she is, yet the National Reformers are willing and even anxious to join hands with her, and enlist her in the promotion of their scheme of so-called reform.

In saying that the National Reformers are willing and even anxious to join hands with Romanism in America, we only state the sober truth, as proved by the following statement from an editorial in the *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884:—

“Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them.”

What the Statesman designates as “political atheism,” is nothing more nor less than the present form of government and the present Constitution of the United States. To oppose National Reform is to them sheer atheism; and to oppose the kind of government, which they indorse is political atheism. That no religious test shall be required of a civil ruler, is declared by Rev. M. A. Gault to be “the infidel theory of government.”—Statesman, December 24, 1885. The theory of government taught in our national Constitution” is declared by Rev. A. M. Milligan to be “the infidel theory.”—Speech in the New York Convention.

The Statesman of December 1, 1884, further says:—

“We cordially, gladly, recognize the fact that in South American republics, and in France and other European countries, the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of national Christianity, and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism.... In a world’s conference for the promotion of national Christianity, many countries could be represented only by Roman Catholics.”

It is beyond question, therefore, that what the Statesman means is, that whenever the Roman Catholics are willing to co-operate with the National Reformers in the scheme for the establishment of national Christianity in the United States, the National Reformers “will gladly join hands with them.” But the Roman Catholics are always ready to co-operate in that thing. That is one of Rome’s clearest characteristics. Rome hates our present form of government and our present Constitution as heartily as do the National Reformers. Rome, too, would readily enough brand our present system of government as “political atheism,” if the National Reformers had not already done it for her. And every body may rest assured that the National Reformers will have the pleasure of “gladly” joining hands with Rome, just as soon as they shall have gained a position of sufficient importance to make it to the interest of Rome to join hands with them. In fact, this is exactly what Roman Catholics are commanded to do, in his Encyclical Letter published in 1885, Pope Leo XIII. Says:—

“All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church, and all Catholic writers journalists should never lose sight, for an instant, from the of the above prescriptions.”

From the foregoing quotations from the Statesman, it is seen, that in European and South American countries the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of national Christianity; National Christianity is the object of the National Reform movement; our Constitution and legislation have to be remodeled before this national Christianity can be established; to remodel our Constitution and legislation in the aim of National Reform; but this is exactly what “all Catholics” are by the Pope *ex cathedra* commanded to do, all and not to lose sight of it for an instant. Therefore, what the National Reformers propose to do with our Constitution and legislation is precisely what the Roman Catholics in this country are commanded by the Pope to do. Therefore the aim of National Reform and the aim of Rome are identical; and why should they not “gladly join hands”?

But that the National Reformers will gladly join hands with Rome, is not all of the story—not near all. They actually and deliberately propose to make overtures to Rome for co-operation. They actually propose to make advances, and repeated advances, and even to suffer rebuffs, to gain the help of Rome in their Romish scheme of “National Christianity.” Proof of this is in the Christian Statesman of August 31, 1881, where Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, a leading National Reformer, says:—

“This common interest [“of all religious people in the Sabbath”—Sunday] ought both to strengthen our determination to work, and our readiness to co-operate in every way with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time is not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches—as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances, and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the necessities of the situation.”

Notice, the advances are all on the side of the National Reformers. They are now only willing to make advances, but are willing to be subjected to “rebuffs,” and, being rebuffed, to make “repeated advances,” to overcome the coquetry and gain the treacherous favor of “the mistress of witchcrafts.” And why this willingness? Because “it is one of the necessities of the situation”—and the italics are his. Shades of Wickliffe, and Luther,

and Zwingli, and Milton, and Wesley, and of all the martyrs! was there ever in the world a more humiliating, a more contemptible surrender to the papacy? How many of the American people are ready to join in it? But know of a surety that every one who joins in the National Reform movement thereby joins in a scheme for the delivery of this free land into the hand of the Papacy. Just here, please read again the quotations from Dr. Strong's book, at the beginning of this article, and see whether the National Reformers in joining hands with Rome, do not equally with Rome show themselves the enemies of the United States Government, and of American institutions—the enemies of human right and human liberty.

It is true, as Mr. Scovel says, the National Reformers now receive somewhat cool treatment, and perhaps sense rebuffs. The Catholic Church does not to any considerable extent directly aid in the National Reform movement. She is too crafty for that. She knows, as well as they, that "it is one of the necessities of the situation," and she is determined to have the surrender come from them. We personally know a gentleman, who, riding in the railroad not long since, fell into conversation with a Catholic priest, and finally said to him, "What is your church going to do with the Religious Amendment movement? are you going to help it forward? are you going to vote for it?" "Oh," said the priest, "we have nothing to do with that. We leave that to the Protestants, we let them do all that. They are coming to us, and we only have to wait."

And when in December, 1855, the demand for a national Sunday law reached the point at which it was supported by six millions of petitioners, Cardinal Gibbons came out with a letter to Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, the leader of the Protestant side, heartily endorsing the national Sunday bill, and gladly adding his name to the number of petitioners. And on the strength of the Cardinal's letter, Dr. Crafts and the W. C. T. U. added seven million two hundred thousand Catholics to the six million names already obtained.

Such is the attitude of the Catholic Church at present; and as the National Reformers find themselves more in need of help, and when, by repeated advances, and in spite of repeated "rebuffs," they have come to her and made the proper surrender, she will let her power and influence be felt. Let the Reformers do the work, as they are doing, and bring the

matter to the point of being voted upon, then there will be found at the polls every Catholic voter its the United States whom the political priests can rule, casting his ballot for the Religious Amendment, which, in the words of the Pope, will “cause the Constitution of” the United “States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true Church,” and by which, as the Archbishop of St. Louis says, “heresy and unbelief” will become “crimes,” and will be “punished as crimes,” as in the Christian countries” of Italy and Spain.

It may be of interest to inquire, What was the subject which drew from Mr. Scovel this expression of willingness, it not anxiety, to gain the co-operation of Rome? He was writing of a movement of the Catholic Church in Europe, for the strict observance of Sunday; and it is to compel everybody to keep Sunday that the National Reformers want the Constitutional Amendment, and legislation under it. Now as the Catholics in Europe are earnestly engaged in it, the question occurs to the National Reformers. “Why shall we not join hands with the Catholics in American, so that we can win? True it is, we may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, for time has not come when the Roman Church will strike hands with other churches—as such; but the time has come for us to make repeated advances and gladly accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the necessities of the situation. For without the help of Rome, we cannot compel people to keep Sunday. But it we can enlist with us the powerful hand, and the masterly organization, of Rome, our success is assured.” That is the sum and substance of this proposition of the National Reformers.

Then, when the time comes for the enforcement of the laws which they now demand, what is to hinder the Catholics from assisting in the work, and that, too, is the Catholic way? Every priest in the United States is sworn to root out heresy. And Monsignor Capel, in our cities and at our very doors, defends the “Holy Inquisition.” And when, by Constitutional Amendment, the refusal to observe Sunday becomes heresy that can be reached by the law, what then is to hinder the Catholics from acting a prominent part in rooting out the heresy? Certainly when the National Reformers shall have been compelled by the necessity of the situation to

call on the Catholics for help to make the laws, it would not be in their power, even were it in their disposition, to repeal the laws independent of the Catholics; so there would then be nothing left but the enforcement of the laws—by Catholics, if by nobody else. This view of the case alone ought to be sufficient to arouse every Protestant and every American to the most uncompromising opposition to the National Reform party.

It is of no use for the National Reformers to say that they will not allow the Catholics to do these things. For when the National Reformers, to gain the ends which they have in view, are compelled by “the necessities of the situation” to unite with Rome, having, by the help of Rome, gained those ends, it will be impossible, without the help of Rome, to make them effective, or to reverse them, or to hinder Rome from making them effective in her own way. When the thing is done, it will be too late to talk of not allowing this or that. The whole thing will then be sold into the hands of Rome, and there will be no remedy.

In a resolution at a meeting in Glasgow, Scotland, October 5, 1875, Dr. Joseph. P. Thompson well declared that “the papacy, as exemplified in the Vatican Decrees, is the most perfected of all existing forms of tyranny.”—*Our Country*, page 50. And Lord Macaulay made no mistake when he wrote the following:—

“It is impossible to deny that the polity of the church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom.... The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved that polity to such perfection that, among the contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place.”—*Essays*, Von Ranke.

And it is into the power of this “most perfected of all existing forms of tyranny,” it is into the hands of this mistress of human deception and oppression, that the National Reformers deliberately propose to surrender the United States Government and the American people. But just as surely as the American people allow the National Reform party, of anything else, cart of seeming friendship for Christianity, or for any other reason, to do this thing, they are undone.

Many people think that those who are directing attention to the dangers of religious legislation, are exerting themselves to no purpose, some claiming that there is no possibility of the success of National Reform, and others declaring that there is no danger if it does succeed. But as the National Reform party is allied with Rome, there is danger. Then put with this the almost universal demand for more rigorous laws, more vigorously enforced, for the stricter religious observance of Sunday, the very thing above all others at which the National Reform movement aims—and the danger is increased, and is imminent. In view of these facts, there is great danger that through the sophistry of the National Reform arguments, thousands upon thousands of people who favor Sunday laws will be induced, with ill-informed zeal, to support the National Reform movement, and so they and the whole nation be delivered into the hands of Rome. There is danger in the National Reform movement. We know it; and by the evidences we here give in their own words, it is high time that the American people began to realize it.

If the National Reformers and the Catholics, or any others, want to keep Sunday, let them do it. If they have not religion enough to lead them to do it without the aid of civil laws to compel themselves to do it, then let them have laws to compel themselves to do it. But Heaven forbid that they shall ever succeed in securing the laws that they ask, by which they will compel others to do it. And we do most devoutly pray, God forbid that they shall ever succeed in their scheme of putting into the hands of Rome the power to enforce religious laws and to correct heresy. God forbid that they shall ever succeed in making free America a slave to Rome.

The success of the National Reform movement will be the success of Rome. Therefore, to support the National Reform movement, is to support Rome. How many of the American people are ready to enter into the National Reform scheme?



WHAT IS PATRIOTISM IN THE UNITED STATES?

A. T. Jones, 1898

[An address delivered to a large audience in the Metropolitan
Temple, San Francisco, June 14, 1896.]

Fellow Citizens, Lovers of Right and Truth: As announced, I am to speak to you this afternoon on the question, What Is Patriotism in the United States?

The first point in this inquiry is, What is patriotism in any country? What is patriotism in itself? Patriotism is usually defined, in brief, as love of country; but love of country is more than the love of the mountains and hills, the plains, valleys, rivers, and rills, of which the country is composed. More fully defined, patriotism is the spirit which prompts obedience to the laws of one's country, and to the support and defense of its existence, rights, and institutions. Thus, love of country is really love of the institutions and the principles which make a country what it is in all respects.

If love of country were simply love of the mountains and hills, valleys and plains, rivers and rills, -the landscape, -of which the country is composed, there could never be any such thing as civil war; for plainly there could never be any dispute over that, among people inhabiting the same territory. It is evident, therefore, that patriotism in truth lies in love of the principles and institutions which make a country what it is in all respects;

it is loyalty to those specific principles and institutions. Hence, the patriot is correctly defined as “any defender of liberty, civil or religious.”

What, then, is patriotism in the United States? In order that this question shall be rightly answered, it is essential that we study the fundamental principles which characterize this nation, which are the basis of its government, and which have made it all that it has ever been among the nations of the earth. Having learned this, and knowing that patriotism is the spirit which prompts obedience to the laws of one’s country, and the support and defense of its principles and institutions, it will be easy for all to discern what is, and what is not, patriotism here. Firm allegiance, strict adherence, to these fundamental principles is in the nature of the case patriotism. Any forgetting, any ignoring, or any disregarding of these principles, however much those who do so may proclaim their patriotism, is in truth, the very opposite.

There can be no question but that the Declaration of Independence was the beginning of this nation. And the first principle embodied in that immortal declaration is that “all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.”

The first and greatest of all the rights of men is religious right. And “religion” is “the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it.” The first of all duties is to the Creator, because to him we owe our existence. Therefore the first of all commandments, and the first that there can possibly be, is this: “Hear, O Israel, The Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment.” Mark 12:29, 30.

This commandment existed as soon as there was an intelligent creature in the universe; and it will continue to exist as long as there shall continue one intelligent creature in the universe. Nor can a universe full of intelligent creatures modify in any sense the bearing that this commandment has upon any single one, any more than if that single one were the only creature in the universe, for as soon as an intelligent creature exists, he owes his existence to the Creator. And in owing to him his existence,

man owes to him the first consideration in all the accompaniments, and all the possibilities of existence. Such is the origin, such the nature, and such the measure of religious right.

Did, then, the fathers who laid the foundation of this nation in the rights of the people—did they allow to this right the place and deference among the rights of the people which, according to its inherent importance, are justly its due? That is, did they leave it sacred and untouched, solely between man and his Creator?

The logic of the Declaration demanded that they should; for the Declaration says that governments derive “their just powers from the consent of the governed.” Governments, then, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, can never of right exercise any power not delegated by the governed. But religion pertains solely to man’s relation to God, and to the duty which he owes to him as his Creator, and therefore in the nature of things it can never be delegated.

It is utterly impossible for any person ever, in any degree, to delegate or transfer to another any relationship or duty, or the exercise of any relationship or duty, which he owes to his Creator. To attempt to do so would be only to deny God, and renounce religion: and even then the thing would not be done; for, whatever he might do, his relationship and duty to God would still abide as fully and as firmly as ever.

As governments derive their just powers from the governed; as governments can not justly exercise any power not delegated; and as it is impossible for any person in any way to delegate any power in things religious; it follows conclusively that the Declaration of Independence logically excludes religion in every sense, and in every way, from the jurisdiction and from the notice of every form of government that has resulted from that declaration.

This is also according to Holy Writ. For to the definition that religion is, “the recognition of God as an object of worship, love, and obedience,” the Scripture responds: “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.” Matthew 4:10. “It is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.” Romans 14:11.

To the statement that religion is “man’s personal relation of faith and obedience to God,” the Scripture responds: “Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God.” “So, then, every one of us shall give account of himself to God.” Romans 14:22, 12.

And to the word that religion is “the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it,” the Scripture still responds: “For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.” 2 Corinthians 5:10.

No government can ever account to God for any individual. No man nor any set of men can ever have faith for another. No government will ever stand before the judgment-seat of Christ to answer even for itself, much less for the people or for any individual. Therefore, no government can ever of right assume any responsibility in any way in any matter of religion.

Such is the logic of the Declaration as well as the truth of Holy Writ. But did the fathers who made the nation recognize this and act accordingly?—They did. Indeed, the enunciation of this principle in a public document, antedates the Declaration of Independence by about three weeks. For, June 12, 1776, the House of Burgesses of the Colony of Virginia, adopted a declaration of rights, composed of sixteen sections, every one of which in substance afterward found a place in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The sixteenth section of that declaration of rights reads in part thus:

“That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience.”

Then on July 4 following, came the Declaration of Independence with its notable principle that the Creator has endowed men with certain inalienable rights; and the people accepted and used the Declaration of Independence as having in this principle enunciated the absolute supremacy of religious right. For no sooner was the Declaration published abroad than the Presbytery of Virginia openly took its stand with the new and independent nation; and, with the Baptists and Quakers of that State, addressed to the General Assembly a memorial in which they said in substance, ‘We

have now declared ourselves free and independent of Great Britain in all things civil; let us also declare ourselves independent of Great Britain in all things religious.’ This they did because the English Church was still the established religion of the State of Virginia. This excellent people, in their memorial, called for freedom of religion in Virginia, and in so doing said:-

“When the many and grievous oppressions of our mother country have laid this continent under the necessity of casting off the yoke of tyranny, and of forming independent governments upon equitable and liberal foundations, we flatter ourselves that we shall be freed from all the incumbrances which a spirit of domination, prejudice, or bigotry has interwoven with most other political systems.... Therefore, we rely upon this declaration, as well as the justice of our honorable legislature, to secure us the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of our own consciences....

“In this enlightened age, and in a land where all of every denomination are united in the most strenuous efforts to be free, we hope and expect that our representatives will cheerfully concur in removing every species of religious, as well as civil bondage. Certain it is, that every argument for civil liberty gains additional strength when applied to liberty in the concerns of religion; and there is no argument in favor of establishing the Christian religion but may be pleaded with equal propriety for establishing the tenets of Mohammed by those who believe the Alcoran; or, if this be not true, it is at least impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith without erecting a claim to infallibility, which would lead us back to the church of Rome.”

The result of this memorial was that the Episcopal Church was disestablished in Virginia, dating from Jan. 1, 1777. This was the disestablishment of a particular sect, or denomination. This was no sooner done, however, than a strong movement was made by certain denominations to secure the establishment of “Christianity” as such, without reference to particular sects, under cover of a bill introduced in the General Assembly of Virginia to establish by general tax “the support of teachers of the Christian religion.” This movement was opposed by the same churches, And others who had accomplished the disestablishment of the English Church in Virginia. Accordingly, they presented again a memorial to the

General Assembly, repeating much of their former memorial, and adding considerable to it, in which they said:-

“We would also humbly represent that the only proper objects of civil government are the happiness and protection of men in the present state of existence, and security of the life, liberty, and property of the citizens, and lo restrain the vicious and-to encourage the virtuous by wholesome laws equally extending to every individual; but that the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner” of discharging it, can only be directed by reason and conviction, and is nowhere cognizable but at the tribunal of the universal Judge. To illustrate and confirm these assertions, we beg leave to observe that to judge for ourselves and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeable to the dictates of our own consciences, is an unalienable right which, upon the principles on which the gospel was first propagated and the Reformation from popery carried on, can never be transferred to another.”

Jefferson and Madison espoused the cause of religious right, as represented in these memorials. By their efforts, and also the “strenuous efforts of the Baptists,” the “Bill establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion,” was defeated in 1779. Then Jefferson prepared with his own hand, and proposed for adoption is a part of the revised code of Virginia, an “Act for Establishing Religious Freedom,” of which the following is a part:-

“Well aware that Almighty God hath created the mind free; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the Holy Author of our religion, who, being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either as was in his almighty power to do; that the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who, being themselves but fallible, and uninspired men, have assumed a dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such, endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world and through all time; that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical; ... “Be it therefore enacted by the General Assembly, 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 or belief; but that all men shall be free to express, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in nowise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities. And though we well know that this assembly, elected by the people for the ordinary purposes of legislation only, have no power to restrain the acts of succeeding assemblies, constituted with powers equal to our own, and that therefore to declare this act irrevocable would be of no effect in law, yet we are free to declare, and do declare, that the rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present, or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural rights.”

This proposed law was submitted to the whole people of Virginia for their “deliberate, reflection” before the vote should be taken in the General Assembly for its enactment into law as a part of the revised code.

By this time the war for independence had become the all-absorbing question, and forced into abeyance the movement for the establishment of “the Christian religion.” At the first opportunity, however, after peace had come to the country, the subject was again forced upon the General Assembly of Virginia in the fall of 1784, by the introduction of the original” Bill, Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion.” Personally, Jefferson was out of the country, being minister to France, but his bill for establishing’ religious freedom which had been submitted to the people in 1779 was still before them; and though personally absent, he took a lively interest in the question, and his pen was active. His place in the General Assembly was most worthily filled by Madison as a leader in the cause of religious right. Against the bill” establishing the provision for the teaching of the Christian religion, he said:-

“The assessment bill exceeds the functions of civil authority. The question has been stated as though it were. Is religion necessary? The true question is, Are establishments necessary to religion? And the answer is, They corrupt religion. The difficulty of providing for the support of religion is the result of the war, to be remedied by voluntary association for religious purposes. In the event of a statute for the support of the Christian religion, are the courts of law to decide what is Christianity? and as a consequence, to decide what is orthodoxy, and what is heresy? The enforced support of the Christian religion dishonors Christianity.”

The bill was put upon its third reading and passage, and its opponents succeeded in checking it only by a motion to postpone the subject until the next General Assembly; meanwhile to print the bill and distribute it among the people that their will in the matter might be signified to the next General Assembly which then could act accordingly. "Thus the people of Virginia had before them for their choice the bill of the revised code for establishing religious freedom and the plan of desponding churchmen for supporting religion by a general assessment,"

"All the State, from the sea to the mountains and beyond them, was alive with the discussion. Madison, in a remonstrance addressed to the Legislature, embodied all that could be said against the compulsory maintenance of Christianity, and in behalf of religious freedom as a natural right, the glory of Christianity itself, the surest method of supporting religion, and the only way to produce harmony among its several sects."

This noble remonstrance, which "embodied all that could be said" upon the subject, should be ingrained in the minds of the American people to-day; because all that it said then needs to be said now, and with a double emphasis. I have quoted considerable already; and I know that reading in a public address is always tedious; yet in this case, because these things are so largely forgotten, necessity compels, and I must beg your indulgence. This masterly document on the subject of religious right, holds the same high place as does the Declaration of Independence on the subject of rights in general. The material passages of it I beg you to consider. So I read:-

"We, the subscribers, citizens of the commonwealth, having taken into serious consideration a bill printed by order of the last session of General Assembly, entitled 'A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion,' and conceiving that the same, if finally armed with the sanctions of a law, will be a dangerous abuse of power, are bound as faithful members of a free State to remonstrate against it, and to declare the reasons by which we are determined. We remonstrate against the said bill:-

"Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth that religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence. The religion, then, of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its

nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable, because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated in their own minds, can not follow the dictates of other men. It is unalienable, also, because what is here a right towards men is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation, to the claims of civil society. Before any man can be considered as a member of civil society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governor of the universe; and if a member of civil society who enters into any subordinate association must always do it with a reservation of his duty to the general authority, much more must every man who becomes a member of any particular civil society do it with a saving of his allegiance to the universal Sovereign. We maintain, therefore, that in matters of religion no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society, and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance.

"Because it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment upon our liberties. We hold this prudent jealousy to be the first duty of citizens, and one of the noblest characteristics of the late Revolution. The free men of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents. They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences, by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much soon to forget it. Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish, with the same case, any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects? that the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute threepence only, of his property, for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform' to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?

"Because the bill violates that equality which ought to be the basis of every law, and which is more indispensable in proportion as the validity or expediency of any law is more liable to be impeached. 'If all men are by nature equally free and independent,' all men are to be considered as entering into society on equal conditions, as relinquishing, no more, and, therefore, retaining no less, one than the other of their natural rights. Above all, are they to be considered as retaining an equal title to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience. Whilst we assert for ourselves a freedom to embrace, to profess, and to observe the religion which we believe to be of divine origin, we can not deny an equal freedom to them whose minds have not yet yielded to the evidence which has convinced us. If

this freedom be abused, it is an offense against God, not against man. To God therefore, not to man, must an account of it be rendered.

“Because the bill implies either that the civil magistrate is a competent judge of religious truths, or that he may employ religion as an engine of civil policy. The first is an arrogant pretension, falsified by the contradictory opinions of rulers in all ages throughout the world; the second, an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.

“Because experience witnesseth that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of religion, have had the contrary operation. During almost fifteen centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits?—More or less, in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both superstition, bigotry, and persecution. Inquire of the teachers of Christianity for the ages in which it appeared in its greatest luster; those of every sect point to the ages prior to its incorporation with civil polity. Propose a restoration of this primitive state in which its teachers depend on the voluntary regard of their flocks, many of them predict its downfall. On which side ought their testimony to have greatest weight—when for, or when against, their interest?

“Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy which, offering an asylum to the persecuted and oppressed of every nation and religion, promised a luster to our country, and an accession to the number of our citizens. What a melancholy mark is this bill, of sudden degeneracy! Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of citizens all those whose opinions in religion do not bend to those of the legislative authority. Distant as it may be in its present form from the Inquisition, it differs from it, only in degree. The one is the first step, the other is the last, in the career of intolerance. The magnanimous sufferer of this cruel scourge in foreign regions, must view the bill as a beacon on our coast, warning him to seek some other haven, where liberty and philanthropy, in their due extent, may offer a more certain repose from his troubles.

“Because, finally, ‘the equal right of every citizen to the free exercise of his religion, according to the dictates of conscience,’ is held by the same tenure with all our other rights. If we recur to its origin, it is equally the gift of nature; if we weigh its importance, it can not be less dear to us; if we consult the declaration of those rights ‘which pertain to the good people of Virginia as the basis and foundation of government,’ it is enumerated with equal solemnity, or rather with

studied emphasis. Either, then, we must say that the will of the Legislature is the only measure of their authority, and that in the plenitude of that authority they may sweep away all our fundamental rights, or that they are bound to leave this particular right untouched and sacred. Either we must say that they may control the freedom of the press, may abolish the trial by jury, may swallow up the executive and judiciary powers of the State; nay, that they may despoil us of our very rights of suffrage, and erect themselves into an independent and hereditary assembly, or we must say that they have no authority to enact into a law the bill under consideration.

“We, the subscribers, say that the General Assembly of this commonwealth have no such authority. And, in order that no effort may be omitted on our part against so dangerous an usurpation, we oppose to it this remonstrance, earnestly praying, as we are in duty bound, that the Supreme Lawgiver of the universe, by illuminating those to whom it is addressed, may, on the one hand, turn their councils from every act which would affront his holy prerogative or violate the trust committed to them; and, on the other, guide them into every measure which may be worthy of his blessing, redound to their own praise, and establish more firmly the liberties, the prosperity, and the happiness of the commonwealth.”

Washington, being asked his opinion on the question, as it stood in the contest, answered that “no man’s sentiments were more opposed to any kind of restraint upon religious principles” than were his, and further said:-

“As the matter now stands, I wish an assessment had never been agitated; and as it has gone so far, that the bill could die an easy death.”

The foregoing remonstrance was so thoroughly discussed and so well understood, and the will of the people on the subject was made so plain and emphatic, that “when the Legislature of Virginia assembled, no person was willing to bring forward the assessment bill; and it was never heard of more. Out of one hundred and seventeen articles of the revised code which were then reported, Madison selected for immediate action the one which related to religious freedom. The people of Virginia had held it under deliberation for six years. In December, 1785, it passed the house by a vote of nearly four to one. Attempts in the Senate to amend, produced only insignificant changes in the preamble, and on the 16th of January, 1786, Virginia placed among its statutes the very words of the original draft by Jefferson with the hope that they would endure forever:

‘No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; opinion in matters of religion shall in nowise diminish, enlarge, or affect civil capacities. The rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind.’”

Of this blessed result Madison happily explained:-

“Thus in Virginia was extinguished forever the ambitious hope of making laws for the human mind.”

The effect of this notable contest in Virginia could not possibly be confined to that State, nor was such a thing desired by those who conducted it. It was understood and intended by those who then and there made this contest for religious right, that their labors should extend to all mankind this blessing and this natural right. The benefit of it was immediately felt throughout the country; and “in every other American State, oppressive statutes concerning religion fell into disuse, and were gradually repealed.”

This statute of Virginia is the model upon which the clause respecting religious right has been framed in the constitutions of all the States in the Union to this day. In every instance this statute has been embodied in its substance, and often in its very words, in the State constitutions.

Nor was this all. It had also “been foreseen that ‘the happy consequences of this grand experiment ... would not be limited to America.’ The statute of Virginia translated into French and into Italian was widely circulated through Europe. A part of the work of ‘the noble army of martyrs’ was done.”

Yet the work of those who accomplished this grand victory was not then fully done, even in their direct efforts relating to their own country.

As we have seen, this victory was completed Jan. 16, 1786. Just a month before this, December, 1785, a proposition made by Maryland to Virginia to call together commissioners from all the States to consider and “regulate restrictions on commerce for the whole” had been laid before the very legislature which passed the “Bill Establishing Religious Freedom in Virginia.” This proposition, of Maryland created the opening which was instantly seized by Madison, through which to push to successful issue the desire for the creation of the nation by the forming of the Constitution

of the United States. And in pushing to successful issue the desire for the creation of a national power, there was carried along, also, and finally fixed in the Constitution of the United States, the same principle of religious right that had been so triumphantly fixed in the code of Virginia.

The sole reference to religion in the Constitution as formed by the convention and submitted to the people, is in the declaration that “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.”

The national government being one of delegated powers only, no mention whatever of religion, nor any reference to the subject in the Constitution, would have totally excluded that subject from the cognizance of the government. And this sole mention that was made of it was a clear and positive evidence that the makers of the Constitution intended to exclude the subject of religion from the notice of the national power. So the people-understood it when the Constitution was submitted to them for their approval. And the assurance of “the perfect liberty of conscience prevented religious differences from interfering with zeal for a closer union.”

As we have seen, the contest for religious right in Virginia in 1785-86 had awakened a deep interest in the subject in the other States, and when the principle of this natural right had triumphed in Virginia, the effect of it was felt in every other State. And when the Constitution came before them with a clear recognition of the same principle, this was a feature immensely in its favor throughout the country.

After five States had ratified the Constitution, “the country from the St. Croix to the St. Mary’s fixed its attention on Massachusetts, whose adverse decision would inevitably involve the defeat of the Constitution.” Massachusetts ratified the Constitution, and in the doing of it, she considered this very question of religious right.

One member of the convention objected against the proposed Constitution that “there is no provision that men in power should have any religion. A papist or an infidel is as eligible as Christians.” He was answered by three members that “no conceivable advantage to the whole will result from a test.”

Another objected that "It would happy for the United States if our public men were to be of those who have a good standing in the church." To this it was answered that "human tribunals for the consciences of men are impious encroachments upon the prerogatives of God. A religious test, as a qualification for office, would have been a great blemish."

Again it was objected that the absence of a religious test would "open the door to popery and the inquisition." And to this it was answered: "In reason and the Holy Scriptures, religion is ever a matter between God and individuals, and therefore no man or men can impose any religious test without invading the essential prerogative of the Lord Jesus Christ. Ministers first assumed this power under the Christian name; and then Constantine approved of the practise when he adopted the profession of Christianity as an engine of state policy. And let the history of all nations be searched from that day to this and it will appear that the imposing of religious tests has been the greatest engine of tyranny in the world."

As the action of Massachusetts by its example, made sure the adoption of the Constitution; and as this particular point of religious right was specially discussed in that convention, and was decided in favor of the Constitution as it stood, with reference to that subject; it is certain from this fact alone, if there were no other, that it was the intent of the Constitution and the makers thereof, totally to exclude religion in every way from the notice of the general government.

Yet this is not all. In the Virginia convention, objection was made that the Constitution did not fully enough secure religious right, to which Madison, "the father of the Constitution," answered:-

"There is not a shadow of right in the general government to intermeddle with religion. Its least interference with it would be a most flagrant usurpation. I can appeal to my uniform conduct on this subject that I have warmly supported religious freedom."

Nor yet was this all. By the people of the United States, even this was not deemed sufficient. Knowing the inevitable tendency of men in power to fall in love with power, and to give themselves credit for inherent possession of it, and so to assert power that in nowise belongs to them, the people of the United States were not satisfied with the silence of the

national charter; nor yet with this clear evidence of intention to exclude religion, from the notice of the national power. They demanded positive provisions which should in so many words prohibit the government of the United States from touching any question of religion. They required that there should be added to the Constitution articles of the nature of a Bill of Rights; and that religious right should in this be specifically declared. Here is a letter of Jefferson's, dated Paris, Feb. 2, 1788, which tells the whole story as to this point:-

"Dear Sir: I am glad to learn by letters, which come down to the 20th of December, that the new Constitution will undoubtedly be received by a sufficiency of the States to set it agoing. Were I in America I would advocate it warmly till nine should have adopted, and then as warmly take the other side to convince the remaining four that they ought not to come into it until the declarations of rights is annexed to it; by this means we should secure all the good of it, and procure as respectable opposition as would induce the accepting States to offer a Bill of Rights; this would be the happiest turn the thing could take. I fear much the effects of the perpetual re-eligibility of the President, but it is not thought of in America, and have, therefore, no prospect of a change of that article. But I own it astonishes me to find such a change wrought in the opinions of our countrymen since I left them, as that three fourths of them should be contented to live under a system which leaves to their governors the power of taking from them the trial by jury in civil cases, Freedom of Religion, freedom of the press, freedom of commerce, the habeas corpus laws, and of yoking them with a standing army. That is a degeneracy in the principles of liberty to which I had given four centuries instead of four years, but I hope it will all come about."

To see how fully this letter stated the case, it is necessary only to read the first ten amendments to the Constitution. These ten amendments were the Bill of Rights which the people required to be added to the Constitution as it was originally framed. The first Congress under the Constitution met March 4, 1789, and in September of the same year, these ten amendments were adopted. And in the very first of these provisions, stands the declaration of the freedom of religious right under the United States government:-

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Thus the people of the United States, in their own capacity as such, made the supreme law of the land positively and explicitly to declare the total exclusion of religion from any consideration whatever on the part of the national government.

Nor was the matter permitted to stand even thus on that question; for in 1797 the treaty of Tripoli was made and signed by President Washington, and approved by the Senate of the United States, in which it is declared that:

“The Government of the United States is not in any sense founded upon the Christian religion.”

This being a material part of a treaty, “made under the authority of: the United States,” it thus became a material part of “the supreme law of the land.”

Such is the history, such the establishment, and such the perfect supremacy of religious right in the United States. Thus for the people of the United States, and for the world, “religion was become avowedly the attribute of man and not of a corporation.”

I present to you this matter thus fully because most of the people of the United States have forgotten that these invaluable documents ever existed, and that this history was ever made; and further, because the identical things which were then attempted, and which produced this history, are now being attempted throughout this whole land in defiance of these essential principles of the nation. And since this is so, it is all-important that the principles upon which this evil thing was then defeated, and which became the fundamental and constitutional principles of the government of the United States, should now be carefully considered; because these are the only principles upon which the same evil repeated in our day can be rightfully opposed. The same contest is now on throughout the whole larger nation, that was then on throughout the nation—then small in numbers and in territory, but exceeding great and mighty in prospect because of the force and inherent value of its immortal American and Christian principles.

I have said that the same thing is now being attempted upon the nation that was then attempted upon the State of Virginia; namely, the establishment of the “Christian religion” as such, “not sectarian Christianity, but broad, general Christianity.” Ever since 1863, there has been an organization—the National Reform Association—whose sole purpose of

existence is to secure an amendment to the Constitution of the United States,” acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government; the Lord Jesus Christ as the ruler among the nations, and his revealed will as the supreme law of the land; and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages upon an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.”

This association has secured, and wrapped up in alliance with itself to accomplish this thing which our fathers repudiated, the Prohibition party, the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, the American Sabbath Union, the Young Peoples’ Christian Endeavor Societies, the Christian Citizenship League, and the most prominent officials of the Catholic Church in this country. These all are enlisted, and are working in combination, to secure the governmental recognition and establishment of the Christian religion in this country,—the very thing which was definitely excluded and repudiated in the making of the nation,—in defiance of the principles which our fathers established as the fundamental principles of the nation in the noble efforts which they made in expressly repudiating it.

These principles which our fathers established, the history of the establishment of which I have sketched before you this afternoon,—it is these which have made this nation what it has been, and is, in all that deserves the attention and respect of the nations of the earth. These principles, then, being that which has made this nation what it is in all respects as a worthy nation; and patriotism being the spirit which prompts allegiance to the principles and fundamental laws of one’s country; it follows that allegiance to these principles, and these alone, is true patriotism in the United States.

And in view of this mighty combination of the loudly self-proclaimed “patriots,” who are using their utmost endeavors to supplant these principles with that thing which our fathers repudiated when they established these principles, it is high time, and all-important, to awaken and arouse in the people throughout this whole land “the spirit which prompts to allegiance to the fundamental law and principles” of this nation—the spirit of true patriotism,

Yet this is not all. Nor yet is it the worst. It is a fact, and a disgraceful fact, that the three branches of the United States government have

been by official action definitely committed to this thing,-to this unpatriotic thing,-which was definitely repudiated by the noble men who established this nation upon the principles, and by the history, to which I have called your attention.

Ever since the year 1886 the different administrations and Congresses of the United States Government have been paying hundreds of thousands of dollars of the money of all the people to the churches to support them in carrying on their own church work and the propagation of their own church doctrines, in their own church schools. All these years the government has, from the public revenue, been making "a provision for teachers of the Christian religion," the very thing the makers of the nation repudiated as "sinful and tyrannical," the very thing that was the specific point around which clustered the whole controversy, and the repudiation of which developed the principles and established the supreme law of this nation as I have brought to your attention to-day.

Feb. 29, 1892, the Supreme Court of the United States unanimously rendered a decision, in which, as the result of a long, and professedly "historical" argument, there was made the declaration, as "the meaning of the Constitution," that "this is a Christian nation."

In the summer of 1893, in the matter of closing the World's Fair on Sunday, the Congress of the United States, in each House respectively, did by definite action exclude from its place the Sabbath of the fourth commandment; and did put in its place the Sunday as the Christian Sabbath, recognized and sustained by the national authority. This action of Congress was definitely approved by the national executive.

And thus the three branches of the government of the United States, which is the whole government of the United States, have in defiance of the essential principles of the government, definitely adopted, and committed the government to, the very thing which the makers of the nation definitely repudiated.

In their contention against the evil thing of governmental recognition of the Christian religion, the men who made this nation declared that it is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects professing the Christian faith without erecting a

claim to infallibility which would lead us back to Rome. In that transaction in the United States Senate, July 10 and 12, 1892, with reference to closing the World's Fair on Sunday, the fourth commandment was read from the Bible as the "reason" for such legislation. But when it was discerned that the fourth commandment says only that "the seventh day is the Sabbath," and that if left standing so the management of the Fair might possibly choose to close the gates on the seventh day, and open them on Sunday, then this argument was made:-

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

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

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

This argument was accepted, and this proposed amendment was adopted. The House of Representatives accepted all this, and so made it the action of the legislative branch of the government.

Now note the principle: The Seventh-day Baptists and their observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the commandment quoted, were definitely named in contrast with those who observe "the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath," with reference to the commandment quoted. And the preference was adjudged in favor of the latter.

Now the Seventh-day Baptists are a sect professing the Christian faith. The original Sabbath commandment was quoted word for word from the Scriptures. The words of that commandment, as they stand in

the proceedings of Congress, say “the seventh day is the Sabbath.” The Seventh-day Baptists, a sect professing the Christian faith, observe the very day—the seventh day—named in the scripture quoted in the Record. There are other sects professing the Christian faith who profess to observe the Sabbath of this same commandment by keeping “the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday,” and hence it is that that day is “generally known as the Christian Sabbath.” These facts were known to Congress, and were made a part of the record. Then upon this statement of facts as to the difference among sects professing the Christian faith, touching the very religious observance taken up by Congress, the Congress did deliberately, and in set terms, adjudge the right of preference between these sects professing the Christian faith. Congress did adjudge the right of preference in favor of those sects which observe “the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath,” as against the plainly named sect which observes the day named in the commandment which Congress quoted from the Bible. Thus Congress did the very thing which the fathers of the nation declared it “impossible” to do “without erecting a claim to infallibility, which would lead us back to the church of Rome.”

When patriotism is loyalty to the principles, laws, and institutions of one’s country,—and this afternoon I have set before you the indisputable principles and the supreme law of this country,—where has been the patriotism of the administrations and Congresses which, since 1886, in utter disregard of these principles and this supreme law, and against protest, have sinfully and tyrannically made a “provision for teachers of the Christian religion”?

When patriotism is loyalty to the laws, principles, and institutions of one’s country,—and this afternoon I have set before you the indisputable principles and the supreme law of this country as to religious right, and the absolute exclusion of religion from governmental cognizance,—where was the patriotism of the Supreme Court of the United States Feb. 29, 1892, when, as the conclusion of a long argument, in total oblivion of these principles, and in direct contradiction of the supreme law, it declared that “this is a Christian nation”?

When patriotism is loyalty to the principles, laws, and institutions of one’s country,—and this afternoon I have set before you the indisputable

principles and the supreme law of this country as to religious right, and the absolute exclusion of religion from legislative governmental cognizance,-where was the patriotism of those members of Congress who in total disregard, not to say defiance, of the fundamental principles and the supreme law of the country, took upon themselves to “adjudge the right of preference among sects professing the Christian faith”?

When patriotism is loyalty to the principles, laws, and institutions of one’s country,-and this afternoon I have set before you the indisputable principles and the supreme law of this country,-where was the patriotism of the President of the United States who, in 1892, in total disregard of these principles and this supreme law, and against remonstrance, approved, and so made the law of the land, the unpatriotic action of Congress which adjudged the right of preference among sects professing the Christian faith, and so gave governmental recognition to a religious ordinance?

When patriotism is loyalty to the principles, laws, and institutions of one’s country,-and this afternoon I have set before you the indisputable principles and the supreme law of this country, which, in the very words of those who made the nation, positively exclude religion and specifically the Christian religion from the cognizance of the government,-where is the patriotism of the members of the National Reform Association; of the members of the Prohibition party; of the members of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union; of the members of the Young People’s societies of Christian Endeavor; of the members of the Christian Citizenship League; or, of the members of any other league, society, party, association, or organization; or of any individual anywhere, who calls for, or in any way favors, the governmental recognition of the Christian religion, or legislation in favor of “the Lord’s day,” the Christian Sabbath, or any other religious rite or institution, or the payment of public money to any church or religious institution under any pretense whatever? According to indisputable American principles and supreme law, where is the patriotism of all these persons?

Yet once more: In view of all these things, where is the patriotism of all the people who without protest allow all these unpatriotic and unconstitutional things continuously to be done?

With respect to religious right, then, What is patriotism in the United States?-It is unswerving loyalty to the principles and the supreme law of this nation in the absolute exclusion of all religion from any and all recognition of the government in any way or under any pretext whatever. On this subject, this and this alone, is patriotism in the United States.

Where then are the patriots? Where are the defenders of popular liberty, religious and civil? For only in the maintenance of, religious liberty, can there be any firm assurance of civil liberty.



THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, IS IT A SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE?

A. T. Jones, September 1890

The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul is one of the oldest and one of the most widespread doctrines that has ever been in this world. It was preached in the world before ever faith in Christ the Saviour was preached. "The serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die;" and from that day to this that doctrine has been believed more generally by the children of men than has the truth of God. Indeed, in our day the doctrine of the immortality of the soul has gained such favor among even those who profess the word of God as their standard of belief, that to deny it is considered by the majority of them as equivalent to a denial of the Bible itself. But, instead of such denial being in any way a denial of the truth of revelation, the fact is that the truth of revelation can be logically and consistently held only by the total and unequivocal denial of the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul. This, the Scriptures plainly show.

There is no truth more plainly taught nor more diligently insisted upon in the Bible than this: That the future existence of men depends absolutely upon either a resurrection of the dead or a translation without seeing death at all. Paul's hope for future existence was in the resurrection of the dead. In speaking of his efforts to "win Christ," he says: "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his suf-

ferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.” Philippians 3:10, 11. It was of “the hope and resurrection of the dead” that he was called in question by the council (Acts 23:6); and when he had afterward to make his defense before Felix, he declared that the resurrection of the dead was the end of his hope, saying: “And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.” Acts 24: Time and again Paul thus expresses his hope of future life.

Nor is Paul the only one of the writers of the Bible who teaches the same thing. The resurrection of the dead is that to which Job looked for the consummation of his hope. Job 14:14, 15; 17:13-15; 19:23-27. David says: “Thou which hast showed me great and sore troubles, shalt quicken [give life to] me again, and shalt bring me up again from the depths of the earth.” Psalm 71:20. And, “As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness.” Psalm 17: And what shall we more say? For the time would fail us to tell of Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and Daniel, and Hosea, and Micah, and all the prophets and apostles, and of our fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; for Jesus himself declared that it was the resurrection of the dead of which God spake when he said, “I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.” More than this, Jesus pointed his disciples always to the resurrection of the dead, through which alone they could obtain the reward which he promised. In John 6:39-54 we find that no less than four times the Saviour, in giving promise to those who believe in him, sets it forth as the consummation of that belief that “I will raise him up at the last day.” And in Luke 14:13, 14 we read: “When thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind; and ... thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.”

Paul, however, gives us, upon this subject, a straight-forward, logical argument, which leaves the doctrine of the immortality of the soul not a particle of ground to rest upon. The fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians is devoted entirely to an argument in proof of the resurrection of the dead. The apostle first proves, by hundreds of living witnesses who had seen him after he was risen, that Christ arose from the dead. Still there were

some who said, "There is no resurrection of the dead," and in refutation of that idea, he introduces three points of argument, any one of which utterly excludes the doctrine of the immortality of the soul from any place whatever in Christian doctrine.

1. In verse 16, his premise is, "If the dead rise not." The first conclusion from that is, "Then is not Christ raised;" then upon this conclusion follows the logical sequence, "Your faith is vain," and upon that another, "Ye are yet in your sins." From his premise,—*"If the dead rise not,"*—the second conclusion is, verse 18, "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." Nothing can be plainer than that this statement and the doctrine of the immortality of the soul cannot both be true. For if the soul be immortal, as is held, it cannot perish, and, therefore, so far as its existence is concerned, it is utterly independent of the resurrection of the dead. Is it not supposed by all those who believe the soul to be immortal that all who have passed from this world in the faith of Christ, have gone to heaven, and are now enjoying its bliss?—Assuredly it is. Then, if that be the truth, upon what imaginable principle can it be conceived that they "are perished," if there be no resurrection? What need have they of a resurrection? Have they not, without a resurrection, all that heaven can afford?—Upon that theory they certainly have. Then it just as certainly appears that not one of them has perished, even though there never be a resurrection.

Over against this theory stands the word of God, that "if the dead rise not, then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." That word is the truth. Therefore it follows that if there be no resurrection of the dead, there is no hereafter for any who have ever died, or who shall ever die.

But God has given assurance to all men that there shall be a hereafter, and that assurance lies in the fact "that he hath raised him [Christ] from the dead" (Hebrews 9:27; Acts 17:31). The resurrection of Christ is the God-given pledge that there shall be a resurrection of all the dead: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," and, "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Therefore it is by virtue of the resurrection of the dead, and not by the immortality of the soul, that there will be any hereafter for the dead, whether just or unjust.

2. The second point that the apostle makes in this connection is in *The Voice in Speech and Song*, 32: “If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die.” On this nothing can be better than to present Dr. Adam Clarke’s comment upon this same passage. He says (and the italics are his):—

“I believe the common method of pointing this verse is erroneous; I propose to read it thus: ‘If, after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it advantage me? If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die.’ What the apostle says here is a regular and legitimate conclusion from the doctrine that there is no resurrection; for if there be no resurrection, then there can be no judgment—no future state of rewards and punishments; why, therefore, should we bear crosses, and keep ourselves under continual discipline? Let us eat and drink, take all the pleasure we can; for tomorrow we die, and there is an end of us forever.”

That is sound exegesis, and a just comment upon the words of the apostle. As we have shown, that is the point of Paul’s argument throughout, and it is the thought of the whole Bible upon this subject. But if the soul be immortal, neither Dr. Clarke’s comment nor Paul’s argument is sound. For if the soul be immortal, when-soever it may be that we die, that is not the “end of us forever,” resurrection or no resurrection. By this it is plain that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul nullifies the plainest propositions of Scripture, and is therefore false.

This view fully explains the query which Dr. Clarke propounds in his remarks at the close of his comments on 1 Corinthians. He says:—

“One remark I cannot help making: the doctrine of the resurrection appears to have been thought of much more consequence among the primitive Christians than it is now! How is this? The apostles were continually insisting on it, and exciting the followers of God to diligence, obedience, and cheerfulness through it. And their successors in the present day seldom mention it! ... There is not a doctrine in the gospel on which more stress is laid; and there is not a doctrine in the present system of preaching which is treated with more neglect!”

From the doctor’s insertion of exclamation points and his query, “How is this?” it would appear that he was surprised that it should be

so. It is indeed surprising that it should be so. But it is easily enough explained. The fact is that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul has become so all-pervading "in the present system of preaching" that there is no room for the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. If the doctrine of the immortality of the soul be true, then the doctrine of the resurrection is indeed of no consequence. If that doctrine be true, then all need of laying stress upon the gospel doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is destroyed. And although "the apostles were continually insisting on" the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and although there is "not a doctrine of the gospel upon which more stress is laid," yet it is through the insidious deceptive influence of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul that the preachers of the present day "seldom mention it," and that in the present system of preaching there is indeed "not a doctrine that is treated with more neglect," and nothing is needed to show more plainly than does this the irreconcilable antagonism between the truth of God and the doctrine of the immortality of the soul.

3. The third point is in verse 36: "That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die." To quicken is "to make alive." What Paul says therefore is, "That which thou sowest is not made alive except it die." That this is spoken directly of man and his resurrection, is evident from verses 42-44, "It is sown a natural body," etc. Now the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is that the body properly has no life, that it is not the real man, but that the soul is the real, living, sentient man, that it is that about man which alone possesses real life. In other words, the body is only the house in which the real man lives. The real "I," the soul, dwells within the body, and death is simply the separation of the soul from the body. Death breaks down the house, and lets the occupant free. According to this doctrine, there is no such thing as death, because the body properly has no life, consequently it does not die, and the soul-the real man-is immortal, and it cannot die; therefore, there is in reality no such thing as death. If this be true, there is not only no such thing as death, but there is, likewise, no such thing as a resurrection of the dead; for upon the apostle's premise that "that which thou sowest is not quickened [made alive] except it die," it follows that, as the body, having no life, does not

die, it cannot be quickened (raised from the dead); and as the soul does not die, it cannot be raised from the dead; consequently, there is no such thing as a resurrection of the dead.

Therefore it stands proved to a demonstration that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is utterly subversive of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. But the resurrection of the dead is a Bible doctrine; it is the very truth of God. So then it is plain that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is subversive of the truth of God, and is therefore false, deceptive, and destructive.

There is another doctrine of the Bible which holds just as important a place in the divine scheme as does that of the resurrection; and that is, the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. This likewise is subverted by a belief in the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul. The subversion of this truth is, in a measure, involved in that of the resurrection, because without the second coming of Christ there would be no resurrection, and anything that destroys belief in the resurrection of the dead, by that means destroys faith and hope in the second coming of the Lord.

That the event of the resurrection of the dead depends wholly upon the second coming of Christ, is easily shown by the Scripture, which, of course, in these things is the only authority. We have before shown that the righteous are rewarded only at the resurrection; and to show plainly the connection, we will repeat a verse before quoted: "When thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind. And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke 14:13, 14. And of his own coming, Jesus says: "Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Revelation 22:12. The coming of the Lord, and the resurrection of the righteous dead, are directly connected by Paul thus: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17. And again: "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment,

in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" 1 Corinthians 15:51-55.

"Then shall be brought to pass the saying." When?—"At the last trump," certainly; "for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised." When is it that the trump shall sound?—"This we say unto you by the word of the Lord, ... The Lord himself shall descend from heaven ... with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise." "Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." Then it is, and not till then, that men shout, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" But through belief in the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, it is now sought to be made to appear that this "saying" is "brought to pass" when men die! There can be no more direct perversion of the word of God than to represent this saying as being brought to pass when men die. But what does the doctrine of the immortality of the soul care about the perversion of the word of God? The first time that that doctrine was ever uttered, it was in direct contradiction of the express word of the Lord himself. The Lord said, in the event of man's disobedience, "Thou shalt surely die" (Genesis 2:17); and the devil said, "Ye shall not surely die" (Genesis 3:4; Revelation 20:2.) And there is no shadow of reason to expect that the doctrine will, in reality, ever assume any other position.

It is not alone a perversion of Scripture to so apply the "saying" in question; it is alike a perversion of the plainest principles of reason and experience. For instance, here are death and a saint of God struggling for the mastery. Presently death obtains the mastery. The saint lies lifeless; death has the victory. When he is dead, is that a time to claim victory over death? When he is being lowered into the grave, is that a time to shout the victory over the grave?—Nay, verily. But it is not to be always so. There is One who exclaims, "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell [the grave] and

of death.” Revelation 1:18. And when that glorious One “shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God,” and with power that bursts the bars of the cruel grave and destroys the strength of death, then the saint arises triumphant over death, and “then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.” Then the saint can shout exultingly, “O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?” And, “Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.” And thrice thanks, yea, “blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,” 1 Peter 1:3.

However, it is not alone through the subversion of the doctrine of the resurrection that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul strikes against the coming of the Lord. The issue is directly joined. For by those who believe in the natural immortality of the soul, it is held that those who die in the Lord go straight to heaven; that they go direct to the place where the Lord is; and so they sing,—

“Then persevere till death Shall bring thee to thy God; He’ll take thee,
at thy parting breath, To his divine abode.” — Gospel Hymns, No 112.

And obituaries are actually written by them such as the following, which we read not long since in the *Christian Cynosure*: “Alvah Palmer went to heaven from” a certain place in New York; and then the notice went on to tell when and of what he died, etc. And Dr. Talmage, in relating how a certain saintly woman was “emparadised,” tells how the chariot of Elijah was outdone; for there it must have taken some little time to turn out the chariot and hitch up the horses; but here, in this instance, the transition was all made instantaneously, without waiting for either horses or chariot! And all this when a person died! These are only notable expressions of the common idea of those who believe in the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul.

Now, if these things be true,—if it be true that death brings people to God; that men and women go direct to heaven from their homes in this world, and this so instantaneously that there is no time to get ready the chariot of God, as was done when Elijah went without dying at all,—we

say if these things be true, then there is literally no place left for the coming of the Lord. It would be simply the height of absurdity to talk about the Lord's coming to this world after people who are not here at all, but are, and have been, for years and hundreds of years, in heaven,—in the very place which he leaves to come here! This is why the doctrine of the coming of the Lord is so neglected, so despised, in fact. Believing this, and there is no need to believe in the coming of the Lord; indeed, it is a palpable inconsistency to believe in it. Believing this, and there is no need to look, or wait, for the coming of the Lord; all there is for such to do is to wait till death shall come and take them; and so death—"the last enemy," "the king of terrors"—is given the place and the office of Him who is our life (Colossians 3:4), of Him "that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood."

But this belief is not the "belief of the truth." There is no element of truth, in any form, in the idea of people going to God or to heaven when they die. Christ himself said as plainly as tongue can speak, "Whither I go, ye cannot come." John 13:33. Then when his disciples were troubled because of these words, he told them, in words equally plain, of the event upon which they must place their only hope of being with him where he is, and that event is, "I will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." John 14:3. And that word "that" shows positively that that is the only way in which men may ever be with him where he is. Therefore the coming of the Lord is the Christian's hope. And the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, in supplanting, as it certainly does, the doctrine of the coming of the Lord, supplants the Christian's hope. Then when the doctrine of the immortality of the soul sends men to heaven before the end of the world, before the sounding of the last trump, before the time when the Lord himself shall descend from heaven and raise the dead, before he appears in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, and sends his angels to gather together his elect—we say when the doctrine of the immortality of the soul puts men into heaven before the occurrence of these events, it does it in defiance of the word of Christ, which liveth and abideth forever. Therefore we say it stands proved that the belief of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is subversive of the doctrine of the second coming of Christ, and, in that, is subversive of the truth of God.

The judgment is one of the certainties of Bible doctrine. Time and again Jesus sets before us the awful scenes and the all-important decisions of the judgment. "I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." Matthew 12:36. "The queen of the South shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them; for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here." Luke 11:31, 32. In the parable of the wheat and tares, in the parable of the marriage of the king's son (Matthew 22:1-14), in the parable of the talents (Matthew 25:14-30), in fact, in all his teaching, the judgment was made prominent. In Matthew 25:31-46, he sets before us a view of the very judgment itself.

The Old Testament as well as the New tells of the judgment. Solomon says: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14. Daniel says: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him; the judgment was set, and the books were opened." Daniel 7:9, 10. Isaiah, David, Job, and other prophets speak of this, as well as Solomon and Daniel. Even "Enoch, the seventh from Adam," prophesied of this, saying, "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all." Jude 14,

This is not a judgment that is constantly going on during men's lives and completed at their death, so that then their reward is given, whether for good or ill. "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." Hebrews 9:27. Paul "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come" (Acts 24:25), not judgment already come, nor

constantly going on. There is a time appointed for the judgment "Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Acts 17:31. "As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law;" "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel." Romans 2:12, 16. And again: "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that everyone may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Corinthians 5:10. It is not that alone that he has done in his direct personal acts for which he must account; he must answer for the fruit of his doings. "I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings." Jeremiah 17:10.

The time when men shall receive for that which they have done, whether it be good or bad, is at the coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and the end of the world. "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever." "And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth." Revelation 11:15, 18. Again we quote the words of Jude: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." Jude 14, With this agree exactly the words of Christ: "Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Revelation 22:12. And Paul, in his charge to Timothy, and to all ministers of Christ, says: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ,

who shall judge the quick [living] and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom: Preach the word." 2 Timothy 4:1, 2. Peter also says: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." 2 Peter 2:9.

More texts might be given on these points, but these are sufficient. From these it is plain (1) that there is a time "appointed" for the judgment; (2) that this is after death; (3) that it is the time of reward to all, for good or evil; (4) that this is called the "day of judgment;" (5) that it is at the appearing and kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ; (6) that then, and not till then, it is that the righteous receive their reward; (7) and that the "unjust" are "reserved" until that time to be punished, and are not punished before that great day of judgment. Yet, however plain all this may be, it is equally plain that there is not one of these propositions that the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul does not tend to subvert. For if, at death, righteous men enter immediately into their reward, and the unrighteous go immediately to the place of punishment, then where is there any possible room for the judgment (unless, perhaps, the absurd idea be adopted that men should spend hundreds or thousands of years in happiness or misery, and then be brought to the judgment to see whether they be worthy of that which they have enjoyed or suffered!!)?

For if at death men enter immediately into their reward or punishment, as the case may be, then it follows, if there be any judgment at all, that instead of there being a time "appointed" "after this" for judgment, there must necessarily be a judgment constantly going on in the life of each individual, and that that judgment closes at his death, and that he in consequence of judgment passed enters then upon his destiny, whether for good or for ill. It can be seen at a glance that such a view is utterly subversive of the Bible doctrine of the judgment. If such be the truth, then there can be no such thing as a day of judgment when the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints to execute judgment upon all, because all are judged as fast as they die; there can be no such thing as Christ judging the living and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom, because all the dead have been judged when they died; there can be no such thing as the "time of the dead that they should be judged" when the seventh

angel sounds, and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, for all the dead will have been judged before the seventh angel shall have sounded; and there can be no such thing as reserving “the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished,” because by this theory they are sent to punishment as soon as they die. In short, if the doctrine of the immortality of the soul be the truth, the Bible doctrine of the judgment cannot be the truth. And the time has now come when a choice must be made between them. As for us, we choose the Bible, with all its doctrine, and with all that that choice involves.

That we do not misrepresent the popular doctrine of the immortality of the soul when we say that it puts men into heaven or hell at death, can be proved by anyone who will consult the hymn books, or the papers of the religious denominations that believe that doctrine, or listen to the average funeral discourse or revival sermon.

But that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is subversive of the Bible doctrine of the judgment is not all. By virtue of that doctrine, men have usurped the seat of the Judge of all, and have arrogated to themselves the prerogative of reading into heaven whomsoever they see fit. How often we read that such and such a person is in heaven! But what right has any man to say who is worthy of a place in that bright world? Who knows the heart?—None but God alone. He alone it is who pronounces upon the worthiness of men “to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead,” and when men take upon themselves to read into heaven this man or that man, they are simply usurping the awful prerogative of the Most High. And only for belief in the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, no man would ever think of it. We repeat: It is God alone to whom belongs the right to pronounce that decision. He will pronounce it in every case, but it will be in the judgment; not at death, but at the resurrection of the dead, and before the assembled universe, and by the voice of the glorious Son of God, who hath loved us and hath washed us from our sins in his own blood; for he “hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.” John 5:27-29. Any doctrine that will lead men to thus usurp the prerogative of the Judge of all the earth, cannot be the truth. This is exactly what the doctrine of the

immortality of the soul does, therefore it cannot be the truth; and as it is subversive of the Bible doctrine of the judgment, it is not only not the truth, but the belief of it is subversive of the truth.

God created man upon the earth, and gave him dominion over all upon it. He made him, not as the angels, but lower than they—inferior to the angels. Psalm 8:5; Hebrews 2:7, margin. God made man upright, but through the deception of Satan he turned to crooked ways—he sinned. And although God had put all things in subjection under him, and “left nothing” that was not “put under him,” yet now, says Paul, we see not all things put under him. Hebrews 2:8. Through sin he has been deprived of his glory, and honor, and dominion, which God gave him, and which the Lord intended that he should forever enjoy. This sin was brought upon him by Satan, and, hard upon sin, death followed.

But when man had thus sold himself under sin, God gave by promise, and in the “fullness of time” he gave in fact, his only-begotten Son, “that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.” When man had so sold himself under sin, under the curse, God gave his dear Son to redeem him from sin, from the curse, and from all condemnation. “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” Romans 8:1. “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree.” Galatians 3:13. “He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” 2 Corinthians 5:21. “For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” Romans 8:3, 4.

To put away sin and plant righteousness in its stead, is the mission of Christ to this world. That he might accomplish this, he had to make the awful sacrifice of himself, the Creator of the universe. “Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” Hebrews 9:26. By the greatness of the sacrifice we may judge

of the enormity of sin, and how abhorrent it is in the sight of God, and also how widely contrary it is to every principle of the government of the King of eternity. To deliver man from its thralldom he spared not his own Son. Rather than to see the blight and stain of sin upon the fair face of his universe, God gave up the "Son of his love" to die the cruel death of the accursed tree. John says: "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." 1 John 3:8. The work of the devil is sin; for he says, "He that committeth sin is of the devil." Therefore when it is said that the Son of God was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, it is simply expressing, in other words, that which we quoted from Paul, that Christ appeared to put away sin.

As therefore Christ's mission is to destroy the works of the devil-to put away sin-it follows that as long as there is a vestige of sin remaining, his mission is not accomplished. Whatever, therefore, tends to perpetuate sin, tends just so far to delay the accomplishment of the mission of Christ. And if by any means sin were made eternal, the inevitable result would be to nullify and subvert the mission of Christ. Now that is exactly what is done by the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul. The very meaning of the word immortal being "not subject to death," it follows that if the soul be immortal, it must live eternally, whatever its condition may be; and from this again it follows that when the awful sentence is pronounced, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still," whatsoever soul it be that shall then be unjust must live so to all eternity; which is simply to make sin eternal, and so to subvert the mission of Christ.

That sin is to be eternal is strenuously maintained by those who believe that the soul is immortal. This is shown positively in the doctrine of the eternal torment of the wicked. In fact, the belief in the eternal torment of the wicked is simply the necessary consequence of the belief in the immortality of the soul. We know, for the word of God says it, that the wicked will be punished. We know likewise, by the same authority, that they will be punished as long as they live (aion-a life-time). Now if they live eternally, it is evident that they will be in pain eternally. But the word

of God says just as plainly that the wicked shall die as it says anything at all about them. "The wages of sin is death." Romans 6:23. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Ezekiel 18:4. That word tells us of a time when "every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them," shall be heard saying, "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." Revelation 5:13. This scripture can never be fulfilled if the doctrine of eternal suffering be true, or, in other words, if the doctrine of the immortality of the soul be true; for every living intelligence joins in the song of joy and praise. Again, we read of a time when "there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away." Revelation 21:4. If the doctrine of eternal suffering be the truth, it is literally impossible that there can ever come a time when there shall be "no more pain."

But there stands that faithful word, that there is coming a time when there shall be no more pain; there is coming a time when every voice in the universe will ascribe "honor, and glory, and power," "unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." This is the truth of God; he has given his only-begotten Son that it might be accomplished; and we have seen that the mission of the Son is declared to be "to put away sin," to "destroy the works of the devil." And the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, in making sin eternal, and in immortalizing the works of the devil, frustrates the purpose of God and subverts the mission of Christ.

Once more: The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul makes the body only worthless clay, formed into a prison that binds, and fetters, and clogs the free action of the soul, while death is the friendly messenger that bursts the prison bars, and sets free the aspiring soul to seek its native sphere. One of the most influential of American preachers said lately, of one who had died, that that person "is living, and more thoroughly living to-day than any of us who are clogged and hampered and chained down by earthly impediment." This is simply the expression of the common belief of those who hold to the idea that the soul is immortal. Embodied in meter so that it can be sung, it runs on this wise:—

"Why should we start and fear to die?"

What timorous worms we mortals are!
Death is the gate to endless joy;
And yet we dread to enter there."

Now we read in the word of God as follows: "O death, I will be thy plagues." Hosea 13:14. And again we read that "death" "shall be destroyed." 1 Corinthians 15:26. Can it be that God is going to visit with plagues, and destroy, the gate to endless joy? Is he so displeased to have his creatures entering into endless joy that he is determined to destroy the very means by which they enter that blissful state? If the words of this preacher, the language of this hymn, and the doctrine upon which they are founded, be the truth, then the Lord is going to do just the thing that is here pointed out, that is, he is going to visit with plagues. and destroy, the gate to endless joy.

But this is not all. We read further of Christ: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Hebrews 2:14. Granting the claim that death is the gate to endless joy, then from this scripture it follows, just as absolutely as logic can demonstrate, that the devil, having the power of death, is the gate-keeper. And so the Lord is not only going to destroy this "gate to endless joy," but he is going to destroy him that keeps it. Nor yet is this all. Granting not only the claim based upon the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, that death is the gate to endless joy, but also that the soul is clogged, and hampered, and imprisoned by its confinement in the body, and that it is released by death, it follows that if there had never been any death in the world, no soul could have ever been set free, and there never would have been any gate to endless joy. And as it was the devil who brought death into the world, therefore, under that doctrine, to him must be accorded the honor of setting men free from this world, and of creating and opening to men the gate of endless joy. But this is the very thing that Christ says that he himself came to do. He says: "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me." John 14:6. "I am the door; by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved." John 10:9. Therefore when the doctrine of the immortality of the soul makes

death the gate to endless joy, and the friendly messenger that releases men from this world, it supplants the Saviour of the world, and bestows upon Satan the honor that is due to Christ.

And by all this we lay against the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul the legitimate and logical charge that it frustrates the purpose of God, that it nullifies the mission of Christ, and supplants the Saviour of the world. And if anything more is needed to show that between that doctrine and the truth of God there is a difference wide as eternity, it will be found in the following pages.

“For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Romans 6:23. “Sin entered into the world, and death by sin,” and “all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” But when man had sinned, and thus brought himself under the doom of death, then Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, presented himself, and was accepted of God, in man’s behalf. God had before pronounced the penalty of death against transgression. And Adam would have died the day he sinned had not the Son of God interceded in his behalf, and presented himself in satisfaction of the demands of the broken law of God. But by the love of Christ and the mercy of God, man was given a second probation, a second opportunity to attain to righteousness. Only for the mediation of Christ, the race of man would have ceased the day that Adam sinned. Only for Christ there never would have lived a man after Adam. So that every man who has ever lived, or who shall ever live, from the sin of Adam to the end of the world, owes that life to the fact that Christ, the Son of God, offered himself when Adam sinned.

This is shown in the words of Christ: “I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.” John 10:10. Christ offering himself in behalf of Adam is the only means by which men have life at all,—“I am come that they might have life.” But this life is only temporal. It is only extended as an opportunity for man to approve himself worthy of eternal life, that he may show himself worthy of having life more abundantly; for as Christ said, he is come that they might have life, “and that they might have it more abundantly.” The way in which men use the life which is already given, will decide whether they shall have

life more abundantly, or whether they shall have life at all. The man who shows himself abusive of the trust of God, and ungrateful for his favor shown in granting this life, only shows himself unworthy of that which he already has, and much less can he be intrusted “more abundantly” with anything pertaining to life.

In this view is contained the very basic principle of the lesson inculcated in the parable of the unjust steward: “He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous riches, who will commit to your trust the true riches? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man’s, who shall give you that which is your own?” Luke 16:10-12. And also in the lesson of the parable of the talents: “Unto everyone that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.” Matthew 25:29. If men will turn to purposes of iniquity, and transgression, and sin, a life which is committed to them for a time, how can the Lord commit to them this gift for eternity? If this life, which is not their own, they will devote simply as an instrument of unrighteousness unto sin, to rebellion, and unfaithfulness to Him who giveth it, how shall He give to such immortal life—a life which, not being subject to cessation, may properly be called their own? To do so would be only to subvert His own authority and the principles of His government. Such a thing He will never do. But such as devote this life to the honor of Him who giveth it, and to righteousness before Him, to them will be given life “more abundantly,” even eternal life, in which to honor and glorify Him; while from all who do not so shall be taken away even that which they have. “Of a truth ... God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.” Acts 10:34, 35.

The righteousness which is acceptable with God is the righteousness “which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” Romans 3:22, 23. “He became the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.” Hebrews 5:9. And “God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not

perish, but have everlasting life.” John 3:16. Christ’s coming to this world was not in vain. He came for a purpose, and that purpose is that those who will believe in him may not perish, but have eternal life; and as surely as those who believe in him shall have eternal life, just so surely those who do not believe in him shall perish. If not, if those who do not believe in him do not perish, then this record which he has given cannot be true. If, by virtue of the immortality of the soul, those who do not believe in Christ live as long as those who do, then where is there any point in these scriptures? We know full well the meaning that is put upon the word “perish” by those who believe in the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul; that is, that it means eternal life in misery. But no such idea is contained in the Scripture. Eternal life is the heritage of those who believe in Christ, and of those alone. Nor will language allow any such meaning to be put upon the word “perish.” That word is defined thus: “To be destroyed; to go to destruction; to pass away; to come to nothing; to be blotted from existence; to die; to lose life.” This is Webster’s definition of perish; and every part of it can be duplicated time and again from the Scriptures. But no part of this definition can be true if the soul be immortal.

In Psalm 37:10 we read: “For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be.” Again, in Isaiah 41:11, 12, we read a promise of what the Lord will do with those who contend with the “seed of Abraham,” “the friend of God:” “Behold, all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded; they shall be as nothing; and they that strive with thee shall perish. Thou shalt seek them, and shalt not find them, even them that contended with thee; they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of naught.” But to the meek, to those who learn of Christ, it is promised: “But the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace.” “The seed of the wicked shall be cut off. The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein forever.” Psalm 37:11, 28, 29. All is summed up by the Lord Jesus in one sentence, as follows: “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life.” John 3:36. And again: “Verily,

verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” John 6:53.

If these scriptures, from the first to the last, do not show that future life is obtained only in Christ, then it would be impossible for the Lord himself to put words together that would show such a thing. If the Lord wanted to tell men that without believing in Christ they could have no life; that without believing in him they should perish; if he wanted to tell them that the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ, how would it be possible to tell them so more plainly than he has already told, in the words quoted? Yet in defiance of these plain, positive scriptures, and in direct subversion of them, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which gives to all men immortal life irrespective of Christ, is held by the majority of professed Christians as a veritable article of Christian faith. Why is it that men will not believe the record that God has given on this subject? Why is it that they will not believe that future life is given alone through Christ? It is no light thing to disbelieve this. Many seem to think, and will even so express themselves, that it makes no difference particularly whether this be believed or not. But it does make a difference. We state it as the simple truth that not to believe that eternal life for man is in Christ alone, is one of the greatest insults that can be offered to the God of heaven.

Please read carefully the following scripture, and see whether we have stated more than the exact truth:—

“He that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” 1 John 5:10-12.

Here is the plain statement that to believe not a certain “record” is to make God a liar. That record is just as plainly stated to be that the eternal life that is given us “is in the Son” of God, and that “he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” Now the doctrine of the immortality of the soul causes men not to believe that record. They who believe the doctrine of the immortality of the soul do not believe that they who have not the Son of God have not life. Therefore the doctrine of the immortality of the soul “hath made God a liar,” because it causes men to “believe not the

record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” Therefore we say that not to believe that future life is given us in Christ alone, is to insult the God of heaven by making him “a liar.” It does make a difference how we believe on this question; for when God is made a liar, he ceases to be Jehovah, he ceases to be God.

Nor is that all; for when the Lord is thus removed from his throne, Satan is put into his place. See here: In the event of man’s sinning,—

GOD SAID,

“Thou shalt surely die.”

SATAN SAID,

“Ye shall not surely die.”

Which of these told the truth? It is impossible for both to be true. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul teaches that the devil told the truth, for that doctrine teaches that there is no death, and if there be no death, then every man has life, independent of belief in Christ, which, as we have read from the word, makes God a liar. Therefore, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul sets God aside as a liar, and exalts Satan as the one who tells the truth, and as the one who is to be believed.

Here we close our investigation of this subject. These evidences certainly show that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is subversive of the truth of God. We have proved by logical deduction from sound Scripture premises, that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is subversive of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead; that it is subversive of the doctrine of the coming of the Lord; that it is subversive of the doctrine of the judgment; that it is subversive of the mission of Christ; that it supplants Christ in the honor of opening the way from this world to another, and bestows that honor upon Satan; and finally, that it puts God aside as a liar, and exalts Satan to his place as the one who tells the truth.

The logical summary of all this is contained in one word—Spiritualism. The immortality of the soul is the foundation of Spiritualism; and

through the already prevalent belief of that doctrine, Spiritualism will yet lead the world to the active acceptance of every point which we have charged. Therefore, we pray all to flee this thing, and believe “the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.”



THE LIMITS OF CIVIL AUTHORITY FROM THE STANDPOINT OF NATURAL RIGHT AND DIVINE OBLIGATION

A. T. Jones, 1892

THERE seems to be in this country at the present time an urgent need of a better understanding by the public, upon the subject of the boundaries of the domain of popular government; for there are indications of an ignorance upon this point which cannot fail to be attended with grave wrongs to individuals and evils to the State. The principle that “the majority must rule,” is the correct one, but is not of universal application. There is danger that it may be extended altogether too far; for it must be evident to all, that the majority cannot prescribe rules for the minority in everything, no matter how small that minority may be. If it can, there is no such thing as individual rights, for that which is subject to the will of a majority is not a right. A right is something which, in its very nature, is inherent in the one possessing it, independent of the will of all other persons. Otherwise it would be but a mere privilege, such as a superior might grant to an inferior, and take away again at his pleasure; and the saying would be true that “might makes right.” But it is one of the fundamental

principles of our government, that “all men are created equal.” It is not the prerogative of any one to be lord over any other, to prescribe rules by which he must live. They are equal in this, that all have an equal right to think and act as suits their inclinations. But this right is limited by the fact that all are equal, which forbids each to do anything that would encroach upon the rights of his neighbor. For that which would interfere with the rights of others is not a right. Rights cannot conflict. Rights run in parallel lines, never crossing, never clashing.

All individuals have rights. The Declaration of Independence declares that “all men are created equal,” “and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights;” that among these are “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;” and the same great truths are embodied in the fundamental principles of English and American law. (See Cooley’s Edition of Blackstone’s Commentaries, book 1) and these rights are a necessary consequence of the fact that all men are created equal. This fact gives to each one equal authority, and leaves no one with any natural authority over and above another. No man gets his rights and liberties from his fellows, but from his Creator, who, as the Declaration of Independence says, endowed him with them; and therefore only his Creator can rightfully take them away. Otherwise than this, he can be deprived of them only by forfeiture for misconduct.

The purpose of governments, as the Declaration of Independence asserts, is to protect these rights,—the rights of the individual. Governments are not instituted merely to run themselves, to become rich and great and powerful at the expense of the individuals composing them, and to perpetuate themselves regardless of the wishes of the governed; but to protect each individual in the enjoyment of his rights. The individual could not well protect himself against all others, so each delegates his right in this respect to certain ones chosen to make laws and preserve peace and order, and who are backed up by the power of the people who choose them. This is what constitutes government in its republican form,—the delegation of the power and authority of the people, the individuals, to their representatives. And this is done, directly or indirectly, by means of an election, in which each individual has an equal voice. The people do the

governing, and those chosen to office are but the servants of the people, to carry out their will, and not in any sense rulers over them.

Governments should, therefore, exercise themselves in doing what they are instituted to do; viz., protect the people in the enjoyment of their rights; and outside of this they have no legitimate authority whatever; for governments, in their popular form, are but the expression of the will of the majority. The majority can and must rule in the sphere which governments are instituted to fill, in prescribing the manner in which the purpose of the government—the protection and preservation of individual rights—shall be carried out, whether that government be municipal, State, or national. Beyond this the majority has no right to go. And let it be remembered that while popular governments represent the will of the majority, they are instituted to protect the rights of the minority,—the individual. The moment therefore that the government undertakes to regulate an individual's conduct in matters which do not concern the rights of others, it begins to do just the opposite of that which it was instituted to do, since it begins to invade, not protect, the rights of the minority.

When, therefore, we hear it said that Mr. A. or Mr. B. must stop doing as he does, because in this country the majority must rule, it is proper to stop and inquire whether his conduct pertains to that upon which the majority have the right to speak. If his conduct is an infringement upon the rights of his neighbors, if it is an infringement of the will of the majority in that which concerns the equal rights of all citizens, it must be regulated by their will. But if not, the individual is within the sphere of his own rights and liberties, so far, at least, as his fellow-men are concerned, and no one has the right to molest him, however foolish or unwise his conduct may appear to others. He is outside the lines which mark the limitations of majority rule.

But there are other considerations that enter into this question. Man's first and highest allegiance in all things is due to his Creator; therefore the domain of conscience is one which human government, whether of one or of many, has no right to invade. No man can surrender his conscience to the keeping of another, and maintain his loyalty to God; but as a responsible moral being, he must remain loyal to his Creator at whatever

cost, even at the sacrifice of life itself. In such cases the word of the Lord is: Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it." God's word is, "Thou shalt not go with the multitude to do evil." This places every man on his own responsibility, and shows that a question of duty toward God, a question of conscience, is a question with which majorities and minorities have nothing to do.

The first and great commandment in the divine law is supreme love to God. The test of love is obedience: "If ye love me," says the Saviour, "keep my commandments." And again we are told in the divine word that "by this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." Hence, the commandment to love God is in effect a command that we obey him. And this the divine law says alike to every man. "We know," says the apostle, "that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God."

But while God demands man's first and best affections, he throws the safeguards of his law around his creatures, and to each moral being he says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." But at an early period in the history of the race, man rebelled against the law of his Creator. The divine injunction of equal love for fellow-creatures no longer afforded the protection necessary, and so God ordained that men should organize for the protection and securing of their own natural rights. This we call civil government. But this in no way supersedes the divine government; it does not in any measure release the individual from obligation to obey the divine law. It simply provides a way whereby men may compel their fellows to yield to them that which is their due.

Notwithstanding the ordinance of civil government, God is still the great moral Governor; to him every soul is responsible; to him every free moral agent must give account. To permit any power whatever to come between the individual and God, would destroy individual responsibility toward God. if it were the province of the State to enforce the law of God, the individual would naturally seek to know not the will of God but the will of the State. The effect would be to put the State in the place of

God, just as the papacy puts the pope in the place of God. On the other hand, had God not committed to man the conservation of his own natural rights, one of two things would have happened; either vengeance for transgression against human rights would have been so swift and certain as to defeat the very object of God in making and in leaving man free to choose or refuse his service, or else punishment would have been so long delayed as to afford no protection to those in need of it. Civil government as it exists is an absolute necessity for a race of social free moral agents, in a state of alienation from their Creator.

It is evident from the facts stated that there never can be any conflict between legitimate civil authority and the claims of the divine law. And yet the fact remains that there have been many and serious conflicts. Civil governments have frequently required of their subjects that which the divine law forbids, and have forbidden that which the divine law requires. Why is this? The answer is that those in power have either wilfully or ignorantly exceeded their legitimate authority. Were this not true, it would have been the duty of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego to have fallen down and worshiped the great image set up by Nebuchadnezzar in the plain of Dura, and God would not have delivered them out of the furnace into which they were cast. It would likewise have been Daniel's duty to have refrained from asking any petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of the king only, when so commanded by his earthly sovereign; and God would not have sent an angel and closed the mouths of the lions into whose den he was cast for his disregard of civil authority. But God did deliver Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, and he did vindicate Daniel's course, thus declaring in an unmistakable manner, and in thunder tones, that he alone is Sovereign of the conscience, that to him alone is unqualified allegiance due, and that he alone is the moral Governor of the universe.

Nor are these instances cited isolated cases in which the devoted servants of God have, in the face of death, chosen to obey God rather than men. The Bible and the history of the Christian Church are full of such cases. This principle was well understood and was fearlessly announced by the apostles who had received it from the Lord himself, couched in

these matchless words, "Render unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." And when commanded by the civil rulers to refrain from doing something which Jesus had commanded, "Peter and John answered and said unto them, 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." And again, "Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men." And such must be the Christian's answer to-day to any and every demand that conscience be subordinated to civil authority. The Christian can go to prison or to death, but he cannot disobey God even at the behest of the greatest of civil powers. His invariable answer must be, "We ought to obey God rather than men."

Nor is this the expression of religious fanaticism. The principle thus stated is known and recognized by the best and most enlightened thinkers everywhere. In his work on moral philosophy, President Fairchild says:—

"It is too obvious to need discussion, that the law of God, the great principle of benevolence, is supreme, and that, 'we ought to obey God rather than men,' in any case of conflict between human law and the divine. There are cases so clear that no one can question the duty to refuse obedience. In all times and in all lands such cases have arisen. In a case of this kind, either of two courses is possible; to disobey the law, and resist the government in its attempt to execute it, or to disobey and quietly suffer the penalty. The first is revolutionary, and can be justified only when the case is flagrant and affects such numbers that a revolutionary movement will be sustained.... The second course will, in general, commend itself to considerate and conscientious men. It is a testimony against the law as unrighteous, and, at the same time, a recognition of government as a grave interest."

The reader has doubtless assented thus far to the correctness of the position taken in this paper, and to the principle so succinctly stated by President Fairchild; it remains, therefore, only to illustrate this principle by citing one or two cases sufficiently near in point of time to enable all to understand fully what is involved in its practical application.

In Massachusetts, in 1644, a law was promulgated requiring all parents to have their children sprinkled. A Baptist by the name of Painter, refused to obey the law and was whipped, which punishment he bore

without flinching. This is only one of many similar instances that occurred in that colony. The Baptists not only held that immersion alone was baptism, and that persons old enough to exercise faith for themselves were the only proper subjects of the ordinance, but they regarded sprinkling as a counterfeit baptism, and believed that to submit to it would be to commit sin. Hence their refusal to submit to it. Even Pede-Baptists now honor them for their fidelity to their faith.

In our own land to-day there are thousands of people who dissent from the prevailing view of the Sabbath, and instead of observing Sunday, the first day of the week, keep Saturday, the seventh day of the week, in harmony with the express provisions of the fourth commandment of the decalogue. These people are Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists. The former, especially, look upon the fourth commandment not only as enjoining rest upon the seventh day, but as requiring that the other six days be spent habitually in industrial pursuits, and in a manner different from the Sabbath day.

But as the law of Massachusetts required all to have their children sprinkled, so the laws of several of our American States require all to observe Sunday by refraining on that day from all secular labor and business, "works of necessity and charity only excepted." But as was the case with the Massachusetts Baptists, to obey the Sunday laws is with the Adventists to violate conscience, and, as they view it, to sin against God. They, therefore, as did the Baptists before them, violate the law and suffer the penalty, as they have done repeatedly,—notably in Tennessee and Maryland. Could they do otherwise and retain their Christian integrity, or remain loyal subjects of the King of kings? And is not fining and imprisoning Adventists in the nineteenth century for disregard of the Sunday law, as truly persecution for conscience' sake as was the whipping of Baptists two hundred years ago for disregarding the law which required them to have their children sprinkled? If not, why not?



BLOWING SMOKE: THE MYTHS OF “DEMOCRACY”

Democracy is government by the people, as opposed to rule by kings or dictators. After centuries of often oppressive monarchical rule, democratic reforms promised people input in the laws which govern them. It could be argued it has been an improvement.

But many mistakenly believe that democracy is *the* shield which protects individual rights from state overreach. This is a mistake. History has shown that democracy without a strong constitution to protect individual rights against majoritarian oppression is simply rule by the mob.

In the French Revolution, it was seen that the mob can be as cruel and capricious as any dictator,¹ and that individual rights fall to the crowd just as easily as to the whims of a king.

The Scriptures say that the heart of mankind is “deceitful above all things and desperately wicked” – Jeremiah 17:9. Direct democracy in France resulted in riots, orgies in the churches, and guillotines on nearly every street corner in the city of Paris. Citizens were accused and massacred on the slimmest allegation, the sentence carried out without due process or appeal.

Humanity is no different today. It is not more enlightened now. Direct democracy in the hands of Antifa, Extinction Rebellion or Black Lives Matter would result in nothing less than the re-creation of the French Revolution. The Roman Catholic Inquisition persecuted and tor-

¹ <https://hannenabintuherland.com/europa/the-french-revolution-and-democratic-tyranny-a-study-of-mob-rule-hanne-nabintu-herland-wnd-column/>

tured dissenters for centuries. If in charge today it would act no differently than it has in the past. The Puritans of New England were known to be as intolerant as the Roman Catholic Inquisitors, but they lacked civil power to exercise their wicked aspirations.

For this reason, it is only when a good constitution is made the supreme law of the land, above the rule of either mobs or kings, above the maneuvers of politicians of the left or the right, that individual rights are safeguarded.

Another word for a strong constitutional government is *republicanism*.² Contrary to popular belief, America is not a democracy, but rather a constitutional republic, which incorporates representative government and constitutionalism. The U.S. Constitution does not even use the word, “democracy”, but rather describes the American system of government as republican in nature.

In other words, the Founding Fathers designed the Constitution itself to be the supreme law of the land, over even the desires of the majority.

Let us return to today. In a world where people are losing their individual rights, the political invocation of democracy is often intended to pacify the populace while their rights are stripped away. There even appears to be some correlation between the size of the tyrant and the number of public references to “democracy” that he or she makes, as though tyranny can be offset with sufficient formulistic references to democracy.

For example, it is part of the communist playbook to assert that a totalitarian society is in fact a free and democratic society, when it is not. China claims its one-party authoritarian system is a “democracy” even though there are no meaningful political alternatives to the ruling power in China, and it cruelly stifles and punishes dissent.³

² This is not a reference to the Republican Party, but rather to the principles of a republic which codifies the rule of law, and specifically the Constitution, as the highest law of the land.

³ <https://www.cnn.com/2021/12/08/china/china-us-democracy-summit-mic-intl-hnk/index.html>

Venezuela has “elections”, not because dictator Nicholas Maduro cares about representative government, but because he suspects token elections may help stave off greater international condemnation of his regime.⁴

The Cuban government claims it is a “people’s democracy”.⁵

This is all naked, self-serving propaganda. And similar gaslighting is evident in the western world as freedom crumbles and western governments imitate their communist counterparts.

European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen says that she will implement a “European Democracy Shield” if re-elected, but this does not mean she will take steps to ensure robust public discussion, dissent, and criticism of the European Commission’s policies. Far from it. The “Democracy Shield’s” stated purpose, rather, is to “combat disinformation”,⁶ which we know is code for suppression of dissent and undesirable public discourse.

We recently saw how much the European Commission values individual rights when it suppressed “disinformation” during Covid by attempting to eliminate public disagreement with compulsory Covid vaccine mandates.⁷

In Canada, a country with constitutional protections for individual rights that are unfortunately subject to a powerful override clause in section 1 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, Justin Trudeau trampled on the rights of peaceful protesters who opposed vaccine mandates and Covid lockdowns, and did so in the name of protecting “democracy”.⁸ Wartime emergency legislation was invoked to prevent peaceful protests,

⁴ <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/may/18/venezuela-election-sunday-nicolas-maduro-henri-falcon>; <https://apnews.com/article/venezuela-election-european-union-electoral-observers-maduro-5e05e255f0b67bf9f476aa7a1b889016>;

⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics_of_Cuba

⁶ <https://reclaimthenet.org/eus-von-der-leyen-calls-for-more-censorship-amid-re-election-campaign>

⁷ https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/coronavirus-response/fighting-disinformation_en

⁸ <https://www.politico.com/news/2022/03/11/trudeau-takes-disinformation-fight-to-europe-00016709>

and citizens were arrested and had their bank accounts frozen.⁹ These actions were consistent with Chinese authoritarianism, which Trudeau stated publicly that he appreciates.¹⁰

Like Ursula von der Leyen, Trudeau also talks big about how much he cares about democracy. He recently announced an C8.4 million dollar grant to study the impact of climate change in the southern hemisphere on democracy.¹¹

In 2022, Trudeau announced more funding for the G-7 Rapid Response Mechanism to strengthen coordination between countries in responding to threats to their democracies. The “mechanism” was created in 2018 to fight “disinformation and misinformation”, so-called.

If only there was a grant to study politicians who work for the WEF instead of the citizens who elected them, and the resultant impact on democracy.

The Biden administration frequently invoked democracy. In Joe Biden’s State of the Union Address in 2023, he stated, “Folks, there’s one reason why we’ve been able to do all of these things: our democracy itself.” But the Biden administration oversaw vast government collusion with social media platforms like Facebook and YouTube to censor Americans that disagreed with the state on lockdowns and Covid.¹²

It’s strange how the same politicians who often trumpet their commitment to democracy rarely mention the constitutions which were created to limit their overreach against citizens’ rights.

The truth is that the western world is riddled with corruption. It doesn’t usually have one party rule, *per se*, but it has a corrupt and power hungry administrative state (a shadow branch of government not subject to the electorate), an increasingly dictatorial executive branch, and courts

⁹ <https://tnc.news/2024/01/23/federal-court-declares-trudeaus-emergencies-act-unconstitutional/>

¹⁰ <https://www.themainewire.com/2022/02/justin-trudeau-said-he-admired-chinas-dictatorship-canadians-should-have-believed-him/>

¹¹ <https://nationalpost.com/opinion/trudeau-pledge-democratic-decline-climate-change-study>

¹² <https://nypost.com/2023/03/09/matt-taibbi-eviscerates-twitter-in-congressional-hearing/>

which fail to follow the rule of law established in their countries' respective constitutions. It has leaders who have betrayed their electorate to globalist ambitions and who refuse to secure their own borders.¹³

Europe does not need a "Democracy Shield". It needs recognition of the Creator's gift of inalienable rights to every human being so that politicians can't strip individuals of their rights of speech and religion. This is the greatest need in Europe, China, Venezuela, Cuba, Canada, America and every other country in the world which claims to value individual rights.

Without these constitutional protections, assertions of democracy are just gaslighting from tyrants.

¹³ <https://rumble.com/user/LibertyRUS>



IS AMERICA A CHRISTIAN NATION?

The political temperature in America, already hot, has increased to a boil following the assassination attempt on former President Trump. The stunning (and thankfully unsuccessful) attempt has served to galvanize the right, bringing a unity improbable a few short weeks previous.

It is not hard to understand why. Trump is not only beloved by many, but he has long been the target of the deep state. There is a strong sense among some, even those who were not ardent Trump supporters, that it is possible the attempt on his life was something more than a lone gunman on a slanted roof that was “accidentally” unsecured by Kim Cheatle’s (and Alejandro Mayorkas’s) Secret Service.

After all, Mayorkas’ failure to secure the southern border is intentional. Thinking people are now solemnly considering the implications of the failure to secure the rooftop at Butler, PA, a task which also falls under the purview of the Secretary of Homeland Security.¹ As former Navy Seal and Blackwater founder, Erik Prince, stated, “the fact that [the Secret Service] allowed a rifle armed shooter within 150 yds to a preplanned event is either malice or massive incompetence.”²

¹ <https://thenewamerican.com/opinion/why-well-never-know-what-really-happened-in-butler-pa/>

² <https://www.zerohedge.com/political/massive-secret-service-failure-led-nearly-successful-assassination-donald-trump>

Of course, the deep state is conducting its own investigation,³ while running interference to impede congressional investigation.⁴

CHRISTIAN NATIONALISM

Unsurprisingly, the assassination attempt appears to have vitalized certain religious elements within conservatism. But even before the attempt on Trump's life, the assertion that "America is a Christian Nation" had been gaining force for some time.⁵

Most recently, at the 2024 National Conservatism Conference and five days before the attempted assassination, Senator Josh Hawley claimed (incorrectly) that America was founded in the tradition of Augustine as carried on by "stern Puritans", and stated:

And I'm sure some will say now I am calling America a Christian nation. And so I am. And some will say that I am advocating for Christian Nationalism. And so I do.⁶

Senator Hawley's assertions are false, and Americans of all political persuasions need to understand they are false.

Most of the Founding Fathers were not Puritans, nor could any sort of viable argument ever be made that they were. George Washington, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin: none of them were Puritans, nor were they followers of Augustine. Far from it.

Augustine of Hippo was born in 354 AD, died in 430 AD, and repeatedly advocated for torture and forced conversion.⁷ His tyrannical

³ <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/secret-service-check-box-senate-briefing-leaves-questions-infuriating>

⁴ <https://www.foxnews.com/us/congress-denied-access-crucial-trump-protection-plan-screams-cover-your-mode-expert>

⁵ <https://thehill.com/homenews/house/3540071-boebert-says-she-is-tired-of-separation-between-church-and-state-the-church-is-supposed-to-direct-the-government/>

⁶ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tgNbGxdDZ2I> – see minute 4:20.

⁷ Augustine's Letters #185 Ch.6: "It is indeed better (as no one ever could deny) that men should be led to worship God by teaching, than that they should be driven to it by fear of punishment or pain; but it does not follow that because the former course produces the better men, therefore those who do not yield to it should be neglected. For many have found advantage (as we have proved, and are daily proving by actual experi-

views on the subject formed the basis of both the Crusades carried out by the Roman Catholic Church and the Inquisition, including the torture and murder of supposed Protestant “heretics”.⁸

Augustine was opposed to liberty of conscience, not in favor of it. Augustine, if he were alive, would have been opposed to the Declaration of Independence, and the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

In contrast, the Founding Fathers passionately believed in liberty of conscience and were fiercely opposed to state coercion on religious grounds. This was the foundation of America – a land for all, without king or Pope, where no religious zealot could use the power of the state to impose his creed on his fellow men.

Senator Hawley stated the following in the same speech:

Twenty thousand practicing Augustinians made their way to these shores to found a society here on his principles. History knows them as the Puritans. Inspired by the ‘City of God’ they founded “The City On a Hill”.

We are a nation forged from Augustine’s Vision, a nation defined by the Dignity of the Common Man. The twenty thousand Puritans

ment), in being first compelled by fear or pain, so that they might afterwards be influenced by teaching, or might follow out in act what they had already learned in word.”

Augustine’s Letters #185 Ch.6: “Why, therefore, should not the Church use force in compelling her lost sons to return, if the lost sons compelled others to their destruction? Although even men who have not been compelled, but only led astray, are received by their loving mother with more affection if they are recalled to her bosom through the enforcement of terrible but salutary laws, and are the objects of far more deep congratulation than those whom she had never lost. Is it not a part of the care of the shepherd, when any sheep have left the flock, even though not violently forced away, but led astray by tender words and coaxing blandishments, to bring them back to the fold of his master when he has found them, by the fear or even the pain of the whip, if they show symptoms of resistance; especially since, if they multiply with growing abundance among the fugitive slaves and robbers, he has the more right in that the mark of the master is recognized on them.”

⁸ <https://victorspen.wordpress.com/2015/03/30/the-horror-of-the-inquisition/>;
<https://churchandstate.org.uk/2016/04/the-dark-side-of-christian-history-the-inquisition-and-slavery/>

that arrived on the shores of North America were most certainly “practicing Augustinians” when they arrived...⁹

Again, Senator Hawley’s comments are demonstrably false. America was not “forged on Augustine’s vision”, but was founded most decidedly in opposition to Augustine’s tyrannical ideas. The Founding Fathers speak for themselves.

James Madison stated the following regarding liberty of conscience and religious freedom:

That Religion or the duty we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, being under the direction of reason and conviction only, not of violence or compulsion, all men are equally entitled to the full and free exercise of it according to the dictates of Conscience.¹⁰ ...

It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage and such only as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation, to the claims of Civil Society.¹¹ ...

Conscience is the most sacred of all property.¹² ...

We are teaching the world the great truth that Governments do better without Kings & Nobles than with them. The merit will be doubled by the other lesson that Religion Flourishes in greater purity, without than with the aid of Government.¹³

In the fight to pass the Virginia Bill for Religious Liberty, Madison remonstrated with that generation’s version of “Christian Nationalists” who tried to insert the words “Jesus Christ” in a preamble. Madison stated, “The better proof of reverence for that holy name would be not to profane it by making it a topic of legislative discussion...”¹⁴

Benjamin Franklin stated, “When a religion is good, I conceive it will support itself; and when it does not support itself so that its professors

⁹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tgNbGxdDZ2I>

¹⁰ James Madison, Amendments to the Virginia Declaration of Rights, June 1776

¹¹ James Madison, Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments, circa June 20, 1785

¹² James Madison, essay on Property, March 29, 1792

¹³ James Madison, letter to Edward Livingston, July 10, 1822

¹⁴ <https://vftonline.org/EndTheWall/VFT-UL/candst/detach.htm>

are obliged to call for the help of the civil power, 'tis a sign, I apprehend, of its being a bad one."

George Washington, in a letter to Touro Synagogue to assure the religious freedom of the Jews in the U.S., stated:

The Citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for giving to Mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy: a policy worthy of imitation... It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection, should demean themselves as good citizens. May the Children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other Inhabitants; while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and figtree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.¹⁵

Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, wrote of inalienable rights for every person under the sun.

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...¹⁶

According to the Founding Fathers, it is for the purpose of securing and protecting "these rights" – the very rights that Augustine opposed – that government is instituted. Augustine's endorsement of torture and persecution is not only un-Christian, it is un-American. In fact, that is the very point of America: it was the intention of the Founding Fathers to render the creation of a persecutorial Augustinian state forever unconstitutional.

It is strange to have Senator Hawley invoke Augustine and Puritans instead of the Founding Fathers. But Senator Hawley *is* correct about the Puritans insofar as it is true that the Puritans were just as tyrannical and

¹⁵ George Washington, Letter to the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, Rhode Island, Aug. 18, 1790 in: *The Writings of George Washington*, p. 766-67.

¹⁶ <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript>

intolerant as Augustine. The Puritans were so persecutorial, most of the Pilgrims settled south of Massachusetts to get away from them.

They were especially cruel in their persecution of the Quakers, whom they drastically outnumbered, and with whom they had certain theological disagreements.

Beginning in 1656, Puritan church-state laws forbade any sea captain to land Quakers in Massachusetts. “Any individual of that sect was to be committed at once to the House of Correction, to be severely whipped on his or her entrance, and kept constantly at work, and none were suffered to speak with them.”¹⁷

“It was decreed that any Quaker arriving in the Colony should have one of his ears cut off. For another offence, he should lose the other ear. Every Quaker woman should be severely whipped. For a third offence, the tongue was to be bored through with a hot iron.”¹⁸

Quackers were sentenced to death in several cases at Boston.¹⁹

A 1661 law ordered that “any wandering Quakers be apprehended, stripped naked from the middle upward, tied to cart’s-tayle and whipped thro the town.”²⁰

As Providence designed, however, Roger Williams, the eventual founder of Rhode Island, was raised up to face the Puritans’ intolerance. America was forged on *Roger Williams’* vision of a free land.

As a preacher standing for civil and religious liberty and against the intolerance of the church/state, Roger Williams’ preaching made a clash with Puritan Governor John Winthrop and the leadership in Massachusetts inevitable. Roger Williams insisted that “forced worship stinks in God’s nostrils.” He held “God requireth not a uniformity of religion.” Williams held that, “[E]nforced uniformity confounds civil and religious

¹⁷ <https://historicipswich.net/2022/11/29/persecution-of-quakers-by-the-puritans/>

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ <https://www.quakersintheworld.org/quakers-in-action/15/Mary-Dyer>; <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Mary-Barrett-Dyer>

²⁰ <https://historicipswich.net/2022/11/29/persecution-of-quakers-by-the-puritans/>

liberty and denies the principles of Christianity and civility. No man shall be required to worship or maintain a worship against his will.”²¹

Williams was summoned to return to England to face the charge of sedition, but before his arrest word from the coiner of the phrase “City of God”—John Winthrop warned him to flee before capture. William Jackson Armstrong, an author and citizen of Ohio referenced Roger Williams in 1889 as follows:

The civil power has no jurisdiction over the human conscience. Conscience belongs to the individual, and is not the property of the body politic. All human laws which prescribe or prohibit religious doctrines are damnable and unjust. Magistrates are but the agents of the people; on them no spiritual power whatever can ever be conferred. Down amid the shadows and fogs of his sea-girt land, there had fallen upon this man [Roger Williams] an inspiration that was to roll back the tide of human hate and fear that had devastated this world for forty centuries. Reflecting upon the suffering of his race from religious cruelty, there had broken into his brain the conception, simple and sublime, of the words of Jesus of Nazareth to the Herodians with the tribute money : “Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.” ...

From that declaration of Roger Williams, two hundred and forty years ago, was born the American Constitution. Presbyterian England in the first half of the seventeenth century was not big enough to hold this inspired man. His continued presence would have split the throne of the Tudors and Plantagenets. From English religious persecution Roger Williams fled to the Puritans of New England. These gentlemen, too, had fled from Europe to enjoy (as they said) the blessings of religious liberty. But they had only enough liberty for Puritans and not enough for Roger Williams. So this brave man fled once more from the New England Puritans to the wilderness, and, among the barbarians of the North American forests in the Province of Rhode Island, established the first government according religious tolerance ever founded on this earth.²²

²¹ <https://www.inspirationalstories.com/quotes/roger-williams-enforced-uniformity-confounds-civil-and-religious-liberty/>

²² William Jackson Armstrong “Romanism and Civil Liberty” <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/7Tracts/SL/SL18891015-20.pdf>

Historian, professor and religious liberty advocate Alonzo T. Jones succinctly points to the roots of Puritan intolerance:

But yet those ambitious prelates of the fourth century were not content with stopping all manner of work, and closing public places on Sunday. They had secured the power of the State so far, and they determined to carry it yet further and use the power of the State to compel everybody to worship according to the dictates of the church. And one of the greatest Fathers of the church, was father to this theory. That was the great church Father and Catholic saint, Augustine— and by the way, he is grandfather to National Reform, too, as we shall prove one of these days.

Augustine taught that,— “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.”²³

Notes the theologian and historian August Neander, “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.”²⁴

THE WOKE LEFT AS INTOLERANT AS THE PURITANS

It is doubtless true that the woke Left is as intolerant as the Puritans. It has used its increased power in education, media and government to impose its intolerable ideology on society. Large and hairy men who think they are women dominate women’s sporting events. Children are taken from parents by force and given cross sex hormones and have their genitals cut off. Sodom owns the month of June by government edict.

Millions of babies are aborted every year in cold blood. Governments collude with social media companies to make war on free speech. Organized groups loot and burn in large cities with impunity. The border is

²³ Schaf, Church History, Vol. II, section 27.

²⁴ Neander, Id., p. 217. “

open and millions of illegal immigrants have entered the country, and the Left thinks they all ought to be allowed to vote.²⁵

Is it any surprise that the cry arises: “America is a Christian Nation! We must go back to God!”

The state of society is dire. We are witnesses to the moral, social, and economic decay of not only America, but of all the western world in real time. Rome fell from corruption, decadence and profligacy, and the West falters similarly.

But the solution to America’s problems does not lie in so-called Christian Nationalism, a union of church and state, or government legislation to compel some tortured and hypocritical pantomime of the Christian religion. Shall we replace the forced confession of preferred pronouns with forced compliance or confession of some religious tenet?

Make no mistake – what many dislike most about the Left is its tyrannical use of government to cram its hideous ideology down our collective throats. A neutral state ought not to be controlled by religious or ideological partisanship. The state is tasked with the governance of a vast multitude, with vastly different spiritual and religious views. There ought to be no rainbow flags flying at the White House any more than there ought to be flags with a cross or a crescent moon flying at the White House.

The U.S. Constitution makes no mention of God, or Jesus Christ. The first clause of the First Amendment forbids Congress from passing any laws tending to the “establishment of religion”. There is no state religion in the U.S.

In 1796, in the last year that George Washington was President, the Treaty of Tripoli was signed to protect American merchant ships from piracy by the Barbary States. Article 11 states as follows:

*As the government of the United States of America is **not in any sense founded on the Christian Religion**, – as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility of Musselmen [Muslims], – and as the said States never have entered into any war or act of hostility against any Mehomitan nation, it is declared by the parties that no pretext arising from*

²⁵ <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-13621419/democrats-republicans-vote-illegal-aliens-voter-id-trump.html>

*religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries.*²⁶

The Treaty was unanimously ratified in 1797 by the Senate, and copies were provided to every senator. Then President of the United States, John Adams, endorsed it as follows:

Now be it known, That I John Adams, President of the United States of America, having seen and considered the said Treaty do, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, accept, ratify, and confirm the same, and every clause and article thereof. And to the End that the said Treaty may be observed, and performed with good Faith on the part of the United States, I have ordered the premises to be made public; And I do hereby enjoin and require all persons bearing office civil or military within the United States, and all other citizens or inhabitants thereof, faithfully observe and fulfill the said Treaty and every clause and article thereof.

There are increasing calls for a church-state union. Friends, we already have one. That's what government by left wing ideologues in the Church of the Woke is. How do you like it?

It is no more a solution to America's problems to have religious tyrants legislating their religion than it is to have left wing zealots legislating their ideology. Tyrants are tyrants. Tyranny is tyranny.

Unity in the political right is desirable if it is in favor of the rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. A new intolerant Puritanism is as anti-American as the ideological oppression of the Left.

²⁶ https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/bar1796t.asp



THE SEVEN MOUNTAIN MANDATE – PART 1

MY KINGDOM IS NOT OF THIS WORLD

There was a time in the not-too-distant past when Protestant Christianity affirmed that Christ’s kingdom was “not of this world”. John 18:36

One of the criticisms from the Protestant Reformers against the outrageous worldly excess of the papacy was its many violations of the teachings of Jesus Christ. Not only did the papacy accumulate gold and silver sufficient to make a sultan blush, not only did it flood the world with superstitious and unbiblical teachings such as the doctrine of purgatory, the veneration of the saints, the teaching of the mass etc., it claims the right to command the civil state.

The Popes of Rome have expressly declared that the Pope is the ruler of this world. They have never resiled from these statements, or many others like them.

“The Pope and God are the same, so he has all power in Heaven and earth.”¹

“The appellation of God had been confirmed by Constantine on the Pope, who, being God, cannot be judged by man.”²

¹ Pope Pius V, quoted in Barclay, Chapter XXVII, p. 218, *Cities Petrus Bertanous*.

² Pope Nicholas I, Labb IX Dist.: 96 *Can. 7, Satis evidentur, Decret Gratian Primer*

“The pope is of so great dignity and so exalted that he is not a mere man he is as it were God on earth, sole sovereign of the faithful of Christ, chief of kings, having plenitude of power.”³

“The supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore, requires... complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to God Himself.”⁴

Protestantism condemned the papacy’s greed for temporal authority. As recorded in the book, *History of the Reformation*, D’Aubigne writes,

In an appeal to the emperor and nobility of Germany in behalf of the reformation of Christianity, Luther wrote concerning the pope: “It is a horrible thing to behold the man who styles himself Christ’s vicegerent, displaying a magnificence that no emperor can equal. Is this being like the poor Jesus, or the humble Peter? He is, say they, the lord of the world! But Christ, whose vicar he boasts of being, has said, ‘My kingdom is not of this world.’ Can the dominions of a vicar extend beyond those of his superior?”⁵

Jesus Christ did not come to this earth to live in a palace and compel obedience to Himself via the power of government. The Bible clearly describes the nature of His kingdom. It is not like the kingdoms of the empires that have risen and fallen throughout human history.

“And when the Pharisees had demanded of Him when the Kingdom of God should come, He answered them and said, “The Kingdom of God cometh not with outward show. Neither shall they say, ‘Lo, it is here!’ or ‘Lo, it is there!’ **For behold, the Kingdom of God is within you.**” Luke 17:19-21

“**My kingdom is not of this world**, otherwise my servants would fight.” John 18:36

You have an “inheritance that is imperishable, undefiled, and unfading, **kept in heaven** for you”. 1 Peter 1:4 ESV

“Lay up for yourself treasure **in heaven.**” Matthew 6:19-21

“In my Father’s house are many mansions.” “**I go to prepare a place for you...** I will come again and receive you unto myself that where I am there ye may be also.” John 14:2-6

³ Lucius Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, 1763, Volume VI, ‘Papa II’, pp. 25-29

⁴ Leo VIII, *On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens*, *Encyclical letter*, 1890

⁵ D’Aubigne, *History of the Reformation*, b. 6, ch. 3; see also Great Controversy 88 140.3

Christ teaches “the meek shall inherit the earth.” Matthew 5:5, a standing rebuke to haughty prelates. Christ says, in this world we will have tribulation. John 16:33. “All those who live godly will suffer persecution.” 2 Timothy 3:12

In conjunction with these principles, Christ taught the separation of church and state: “Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God.” Matthew 22:21. Caesar (government) is to be obeyed when Caesar stays in his lane, and exercises only the legitimate authority delegated by God.⁶ But the individual is not to yield to Caesar when Caesar’s claims conflict with the territory of God.

In like manner, the territory Christ instructed His apostles to win was not geographic territory or countries. Christ told His followers to preach the Gospel and win the hearts of the individuals that Christ had died for. “Go therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Matthew 28:19.

Jesus had 12 Apostles. History tells us that none of His Apostles were statesman. They were preachers. Healers. Witnesses to Christ and to His resurrection. Ten of them died as martyrs, murdered for preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of Christ. The only apostle who meddled and schemed with earthly authorities for political gain was Judas. Judas the traitor.

Given Christ’s clear declaration of these unmistakable principles, Christians ought to be both alarmed and indignant at the aggressive movements of so-called “Christian Dominionism”, and its “Seven Mountain Mandate”.

The Seven Mountain Mandate refers to the contention that Christians are called to control and conquer the seven prominent pinnacles of societal influence, namely family, religion, education, media, arts and entertainment, business, and government.⁷ Members of what is referred to as the “New Apostolic Reformation” (NAR) claim to have a mandate from Jesus Christ to conquer the seven mountains and control them for Christ.⁸ Once this is accomplished, they believe that Jesus will return to this earth.

⁶ This point will be examined in greater detail in an upcoming article.

⁷ <https://www.adelaidenow.com.au/news/world/the-seven-mountains-revelation/news-story/be825c6262f5e764a3c2cbd385442702>

⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seven_Mountain_Mandate

Frederick Clarkson, a senior research analyst at Political Research Associates writes that the NAR movement is an expression of dominionism, defined as “the theocratic idea that ... Christians are called by God to exercise dominion over every aspect of society by taking control of political and cultural institutions.”⁹

The movement is growing rapidly. Amongst its most powerful political adherents are Congresswoman Loren Boebert, Speaker of the House of Representatives Mike Johnson, and spiritual advisor to the President-elect, Paula White.

There are a fascinating number of significant similarities between the Roman Catholic Papacy and the NAR movement. Consider the following partial list.

1. The Papacy claims to have “apostolic authority” stemming from the Apostle Peter, and running down through the line of popes. It is by virtue of this supposed apostolic succession that it takes the authoritarian positions it does.

The NAR movement *also* centers around the restoration of apostolic authority, “**essentially reversing the Protestant Reformation’s centering of the individual believer working out their own salvation**, and its **democratic** church governance structures based on systems of elders.”¹⁰

In other words, the NAR movement restores a papacy-type model of human authoritarianism by virtue of its claim of having new “apostles”. Unsurprisingly, these “apostles” speak authoritatively, and their decrees may supersede Scripture.¹¹ This is a reversal of

⁹ <https://politicalresearch.org/strategy/pr-news/meet-new-apostolic-reformation-cutting-edge-christian-right>

¹⁰ <https://www.salon.com/2024/01/02/meet-the-new-apostolic-reformation-cutting-edge-of-the-christian-right/> [emphasis added]

¹¹ <https://www.biola.edu/blogs/biola-magazine/2015/a-new-reformation#:~:text=NAR%20leaders%20call%20their%20new%20movement%20apostolic,be%20greater%20than%20the%2016th%2Dcentury%20Protestant%20Reformation>

the Reformation and its focus on individual rights and the authority of the Bible.

The significance of this cannot be overstated.

“If you submit to their leadership, then you too will work mighty miracles. You’ll become part of a great end-time army that will bring about a world revival and cleanse the earth of evil by calling down hailstones, fire and the other judgments of God described in the New Testament book of Revelation.

If you do not submit to their leadership then, at the very least, you will miss out on God’s end-time plans. And if you actively oppose the apostles and prophets, then brace yourself for the fallout. Others must be warned that you are the pawn of a powerful demon, known as the “spirit of religion.””¹²

2. The Papacy is the harlot that sits on the seven mountains mentioned in Revelation 17. “The seven heads [of the scarlet beast] are seven mountains on which the woman sits.” Revelation 17:9

The NAR movement specifically references the seven mountains of Revelation 17:9 as the target of its political and cultural efforts.¹³ Thus, both the Papacy and the NAR want control of the same territory. Or, put another way, there is perhaps sufficient common purpose between them to make common cause to accomplish it. This will be discussed in more detail in the future.

3. Both the Papacy and the NAR movement expressly reject the separation of church and state.

It is common knowledge that the Papacy rejects the separation of church and state. The Papacy itself *is* both church and state, as the Pope is the Bishop of Rome and head of the Catholic church, and he is also the king of Vatican City, known formally as The Holy See. As noted above, the papacy asserts sovereignty over the world.

¹² R. Douglas Geivett and Holly Pivec, *God’s Super-Apostles: Encountering the Worldwide Prophets and Apostles Movement*, Pivec, Weaver Book Co., December 2014.

¹³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seven_Mountain_Mandate

But Protestantism in America has a long history of affirming the separation of church and state, beginning with Roger Williams, and continuing with Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, and many others. Read more on this subject on the link on the footnote.¹⁴

The express rejection of the separation of church and state by the NAR movement, and its stated intention to rule over society by conquering the seven mountains is a rejection of the Bible and the teachings of Protestantism.

For the purposes of concluding this introductory article today, we wish to note the oft-cited words of Benjamin Franklin. “When a religion is good, I conceive it will support itself; and when it does not support itself so that its professors are obliged to call for the help of the civil power, ‘tis a sign, I apprehend, of its being a bad one.”

We apprehend the same.

In upcoming articles on the Seven Mountain Mandate, we will more closely examine the teachings of the New Apostolic Reformation and compare them with the teachings of Jesus, and Bible prophecy.

¹⁴ <https://www.wingsofliberty.net/is-america-a-christian-nation>



THE SEVEN MOUNTAIN MANDATE – PART 2

“AND TO WHOSOEVER I WILL GIVE IT”

The New Apostolic Reformation (NAR) claims to have a mandate to conquer and rule society in the name of Christ. Coupled with the promise of wealth and influence, it is unsurprising that the NAR has become wildly popular. Power, influence, money – are these not the things that people love? According to some estimates, the NAR has 32 million adherents globally, and is growing at a rate of nine million members per year.¹ Some estimates place its influence as much larger, especially in the United States.²

Popularity, however, is no determiner of righteousness, or truth. Rather, Christ stated that the gate was wide that leads to destruction, and many go in thereat – Matthew 7:13.

How then is a perplexed person to know which is the right way? We are to go to the Scriptures for the answer. To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them – Isaiah 8:20.

¹ https://www.rutlandherald.com/opinion/perspective/on-faith-new-apostolic-reformation/article_c9d37e4b-b7af-593a-8443-515b2dcda749.html

² <https://www.texasobserver.org/new-apostolic-reformation-texas-leaders/> - some estimates place the number of Christians in America influenced by NAR teachings as high as 33 million.

The Scriptures record that following His baptism, Christ fasted in the wilderness for forty days and forty nights. When He was weak and emaciated and near the point of death, Satan personally approached Christ to tempt Him. It was Satan's purpose to make the Savior doubt His divinity, and turn Him from a life of self-denial and sacrifice if possible.

The book of Matthew records the moment when Satan offered the world to Christ:

Matthew 4:8-11: ⁸ Again, the devil taketh Him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth Him all the **kingdoms of the world**, and **the glory of them**; ⁹ And saith unto Him, **All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.** ¹⁰ Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve. ¹¹ Then the devil leaveth Him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto Him. [emphasis added]

Satan claims this world as his own. The Bible calls him, the “god of this world” – 2 Corinthians 4:4, and “the prince of this world” – John 14:30. He is the thief and liar who stole it from Adam and Eve at the fall. And Luke records that Satan bargained with Christ on the mountaintop: “All this **power** will I give thee, **and the glory of them**: for that is delivered unto me; **and to whomsoever I will I give it**” – Luke 4:6.

Satan still offers earthly power and wealth today. As Hollywood and the music industry well know,³ the stated prerequisite for obtaining fortune and power on this earth is the same as it was on the mountaintop two thousand years ago: “fall down and worship me”.

Though Christ rejected the devil's temptations on the mountaintop and rebuked him, Christian Dominionism claims to know better. Lance Wallnau, one of the New Apostolic Reformation's “apostles”, and promoter of the claim that Jesus gave the NAR the “seven mountain mandate” to conquer and rule society, asserts that things are different today. Christ now *wants* His church to take earthly power. He asserts that *now* Christ wants His church to rule the nations.

According to Wallnau,

...when Satan offered Him [Christ] all the kings of the world in a moment of time, he said “all this is yours if you'll bow down and

³ See for example, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vOJ-UoZ7uo>

worship me.” He [Jesus] said, get behind me Satan for Thou shalt Worship the Lord thy God and Him only shall thou serve. He rejected Nations when they were offered.

But now the Father says, “I’m offering them this time. Ask.”

Here’s the challenge I’ve got right now: the Father is looking for a church that will give Jesus what belongs to Him, which is Nations.⁴

Wallnau’s claims appeal mightily to the carnal heart but the Lord Jesus does not need His followers to take earthly power for Him. Jesus Christ is already “heir of all things” – Hebrews 1:2. He has already “overcome the world” – John 16:33. The Father said to Christ – “sit Thou on My right hand until *I make* Thine enemies Thy footstool” – Psalms 110:1; Matthew 22:44; Luke 20:42; Acts 2:34. [emphasis added]

The Rock that hits the statue of the successive nations from Babylon until the end of the world in Daniel 2 is a symbol of Christ, and it is “cut out without hands” – Daniel 2:34. No human assistance is required to establish the Lord’s kingdom. The work is His. The glory is His. The Rock strikes the statute in its feet and breaks “in pieces and consumes all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever” – Daniel 2:44.

Christ’s instructions to his disciples have nothing to do with taking control of governments and ruling the world. He has instructed His followers to “go into all the world and preach to all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit” – Matthew 28:19, 20. He said to His disciples, “take up your cross, and follow Me.”

The temptation to Christianity from Lance Wallnau and the other NAR “apostles” is as subversive of this mission as was Satan’s temptation to Christ. “This life of self-denial, tribulation and persecution is not for you. Oh no. You are meant to rule. You are meant to have dominion over the nations.”

“Christian dominionism”, however, is a contradiction in terms. There’s no such thing.

The word “dominion” comes from the Latin, “dominium”, from “dominus”, which means “lord, master”. The new apostles of NAR claim that they are meant to be lords and masters. Is that what Jesus said?

⁴ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q9InAiJYH5I>, “The 7 Mountains of Culture 3”

The Bible records the story of the mother of two of Jesus' disciples coming to Him with an unusual request.

Then came to Him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, worshipping Him, and desiring a certain thing of Him.²¹ And He said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in Thy kingdom.²² But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask.

...

24 And when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren.²⁵ But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them.²⁶ **But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister;**²⁷ **And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant:**²⁸ **Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.**

Jesus says it is the princes of the Gentiles which exercise authority over their fellow human beings. Dominance is what the pagans aspire to. Christ informed his followers **"but it shall not be so among you."** This is a standing rebuke from Christ to any who will come after Him who want to make an earthly kingdom where they rule in the name of Jesus.

It is a rebuke to the papacy, and its constant meddling in political matters. It is a rebuke to the "new apostles" of the NAR.

The Bible says that Satan is the one who covets dominion:

¹² How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!

¹³ For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north:

¹⁴ I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High.

¹⁵ Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit.

¹⁶ They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, and consider thee, saying, Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms? – Isaiah 14:12-16.

The carnal human heart is in harmony with Satan, not God. It is the fallen human heart that says, "I will ascend", not the converted heart of

the new birth spoken of by Jesus. The New Apostolic Reformation's lust for temporal power and dominion is the fruit of the unconverted heart.

The thing Satan wants is power. His children want the same thing.

But God says, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise" – Psalms 51:17.

Jesus says it is the meek who will inherit the earth – Matthew 5:5.

We will conclude with these short clips of Paula White, NAR apostle and spiritual advisor to the President-elect.

<https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=VJVS9RsIrN8&pp=ygUTUGF1bGEgd2hpdGUgdG9uZ3Vlcw%3D%3D>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yy_m93qKmsE

Can you imagine Moses claiming that everywhere Moses walks is holy ground? Us neither. ...

In the next article on the Seven Mountain Mandate, we will more closely examine the New Apostolic Reformation and its connections with the Roman Papacy, and begin to consider the implications in light of Bible prophecy.



THE SEVEN MOUNTAIN MANDATE – PART 3

CLASPING HANDS

What is the link between the Papacy and the New Apostolic Reformation (NAR)? This installment hopes to provide some answers to this question.

On a stage in a Los Angeles stadium on April 9, 2016, NAR Apostle Lou Engle warmly welcomed a delegation from Pope Francis before a packed crowd of ecstatic worshippers. The wet weather had not deterred the throng of 60,000 people who had gathered to commemorate the 110-year anniversary of the original Azusa Street Revival, recognized as the beginning of both the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements.¹ The crowd eagerly welcomed the messengers of the Pope.

Pope Francis' delegates greeted the gathered masses in the name of the Catholic church, and especially the 100 million plus charismatic Catholics whose worship practice closely resembles those in the Pentecostal/Charismatic movements. Charismatic Catholicism has grown rapidly around the globe, and like its Protestant cousins, focuses on deep emotional experiences, uplifted hands during worship singing, speaking in tongues, and a personal relationship with Jesus.² Vatican II encouraged ecumenism, for-

¹ <https://news.ag.org/en/article-repository/news/2016/04/what-azusa-had-and-we-need>

² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catholic_Charismatic_Renewal

mally declaring that “The restoration of unity among all Christians is one of the principal concerns of the Second Vatican Council.”³

After effusive mutual expressions of unity and forgiveness, the Pope’s delegate and Lou Engle kissed each other’s feet before the gathered masses and the world, proclaiming a holy moment ending the “the diabolical sin” of division between Catholics and Protestants. The papal delegates proclaimed, “Jesus doesn’t care about our differences [in doctrine]”, “we must fly united”. The exchanges can be seen starting at the 6 hour and 50 minute mark.⁴

This incident, and other ecumenical gatherings like it, are a stunning and ominous development in the Protestant world. It is a fulfillment of Bible prophecy.

It is all too clear that the aims of Vatican II have been balefully successful. For Pentecostalism and the Charismatics, gone is the protest of Luther, forgotten are the lives of Huss, Jerome, and Wycliffe. Abandoned are the works of John Knox and John Bunyan. Forgotten are the martyrs who died by the rack and at the stake, killed by the papal power. Forgotten are the centuries of persecution, and the suffering of Pilgrims who fled Europe for America to escape the persecution of that worst of all evils, the combined rule of the church and the state. Forgotten are the warnings of Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, Roger Williams and many others.

For many in what passes for Christianity today, the faith of their fathers is gone. Gone is *sola scriptura*. Instead, the paramountcy of the Bible has been replaced with the primacy of emotional ecstasy. The doctrines of salvation are supplanted, and dismissed as unimportant. Repetitive and trance-inducing rock music leads to an emotional high and what is seen by many charismatics as the worship’s climax: the ecstatic emotional utterances of congregants speaking in gibberish tongues.

Today, this worship experience is not only for Pentecostals. Its entrenchment is well advanced in almost every major denomination in the world, including, as stated, in the ranks of over a hundred million Catholics.⁵

³ *Unitatis Redintegratio*, the Decree on Ecumenism (1964, #1).

⁴ Video link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZK2DkDKejcs>

⁵ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HLmMHdYjWGI>

A clip of NAR Apostle, Lance Wallnau, teaching his followers to speak in tongues can be viewed at the link in the footnote.⁶

BIBLE PROPHECY AND THE PAPAL POWER

The Bible revealed that the Roman papacy would be dominant for a period of 1260 years.⁷ History demonstrates the truth of the infallible Word. From 538 AD, when civil power was assumed by the Bishop of Rome pursuant to the decree of Emperor Justinian, to 1798 and the capture of Pope Pius VI by Napoleon's general Berthier, the Papacy had tremendous authority and influence over western Europe. Kings knelt at the feet of the Pope for centuries, and did the bidding of the Roman pontiff.

Church and state in union brought incredible peril to the human family. The Dark Ages were marked by superstition, censorship and persecution. It was the age of the suppression of the Bible, of the Inquisition, and the burning of so-called heretics.

With the Protestant Reformation, the power of the papacy to control the state gradually weakened until the pope of that period, Pius VI, was taken captive and died in exile in France. The Bible had prophesied that at the conclusion of the 1260 years the papal power would receive a deadly wound, and so it did. To hear a detailed presentation on this subject, use this link.⁸

A beast in Bible prophecy symbolizes a kingdom.⁹ There are two beasts, or kingdoms, mentioned in Revelation 13. The Protestant Reformers knew and taught that the leopard beast of Revelation 13 was the papal power. They knew from the Bible that the papacy was predicted to persecute God's people,¹⁰ and then one day receive a deadly wound.¹¹ They

⁶ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IZi9F-5pXf8>

⁷ Revelation 13:5 – the time period of the 42 months is the same as the time period of the 1260 years mentioned in Daniel 7: . Using a Hebrew lunar month of 30 days, 42 months is 1260 days. The day for a year principle of prophetic interpretation is found in Ezekiel 4:6.

⁸ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5-0X2Fzr1IU>

⁹ See Daniel 7.

¹⁰ Revelation 13:7

¹¹ Revelation 13:3

were aware that the book of Revelation also foretold the rise of another kingdom around the time the papacy was to lose its dominance. In 1752, the Reformer John Wesley correctly predicted that the lamb-like beast with the two horns of Revelation 13 was not far away.¹²

History shows that only one nation was rising to global prominence at the time of the deadly wound to the papal power, and that nation was the United States of America.

America is the greatest nation the world has ever seen, **and it was founded on an express rejection of papal teaching and authority.** The papacy vehemently opposes the separation of church and state.¹³ The U.S. Constitution requires a separation of church and state in the First Amendment.¹⁴ The Papacy is opposed to liberty of conscience.¹⁵ The

¹² <https://ccel.org/ccel/wesley/notes/notes.i.xxviii.xiv.html>

¹³ Pope Pius X, *Vehementer Nos*, 1906: “That the State must be separated from the Church is a thesis absolutely false, a most pernicious error.” “Hence, mindful of Our Apostolic charge and conscious of the imperious duty incumbent upon Us of defending and preserving against all assaults the full and absolute integrity of the sacred and inviolable rights of the Church, We do, by virtue of the supreme authority which God has confided to Us, and on the grounds above set forth, reprove and condemn the law voted in France for the separation of Church and State, as deeply unjust to God whom it denies, and as laying down the principle that the Republic recognizes no cult. We reprove and condemn it as violating the natural law, the law of nations, and fidelity to treaties; as contrary to the Divine constitution of the Church, to her essential rights and to her liberty; as destroying justice and trampling underfoot the rights of property which the Church has acquired by many titles and, in addition, by virtue of the Concordat. We reprove and condemn it as gravely offensive to the dignity of this Apostolic See, to Our own person, to the Episcopacy, and to the clergy and all the Catholics of France. Therefore, We protest solemnly and with all Our strength against the introduction, the voting and the promulgation of this law, declaring that it can never be alleged against the imprescriptible rights of the Church.”

Also see - Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirari Vos*, 1832: “Nor can We predict happier times for religion and government from the plans of those who desire vehemently to separate the Church from the state, and to break the mutual concord between temporal authority and the priesthood. It is certain that that concord which always was favorable and beneficial for the sacred and the civil order is feared by the shameless lovers of liberty.”

¹⁴ First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

¹⁵ Pope Pius IX, in his Encyclical Letter of August 15, 1854, said: ‘The absurd and erroneous doctrines or ravings in defense of liberty of conscience are a most pestilential error—a pest, of all others, most to be dreaded in a state.’ Pius IX, in his Encyclical Letter

U.S. Constitution protects liberty of conscience and religious liberty as a God-given right.¹⁶ The papacy is opposed to freedom of speech and freedom of the press,¹⁷ and maintained a list of banned books for centuries.¹⁸ The U.S. Constitution guarantees freedom of speech and freedom of the press, and the Founding Fathers taught that without a free press liberty would perish.¹⁹ The papacy systematically trampled on the principles of due process both before and during the centuries of the Inquisition, torturing people to obtain a confession to so-called heresy.²⁰ The U.S.

of December 8, 1864, also anathematized ‘those who assert the liberty of conscience and of religious worship,’ also ‘all such as maintain that the church may not employ force.’

¹⁶ First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

¹⁷ Pope Pius IX, *Mirari Vos*, 1832: “This shameful font of indifferentism gives rise to that absurd and erroneous proposition which claims that liberty of conscience must be maintained for everyone. It spreads ruin in sacred and civil affairs, though some repeat over and over again with the greatest impudence that some advantage accrues to religion from it. “But the death of the soul is worse than freedom of error,” as Augustine was wont to say.[21] When all restraints are removed by which men are kept on the narrow path of truth, their nature, which is already inclined to evil, propels them to ruin. Then truly “the bottomless pit” is open from which John saw smoke ascending which obscured the sun, and out of which locusts flew forth to devastate the earth. Thence comes transformation of minds, corruption of youths, contempt of sacred things and holy laws — in other words, a pestilence more deadly to the state than any other. Experience shows, even from earliest times, that cities renowned for wealth, dominion, and glory perished as a result of this single evil, namely immoderate freedom of opinion, license of free speech, and desire for novelty. <https://rsf.org/en/dangerous-comments-pope-freedom-expression>

¹⁸ <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Index-Librorum-Prohibitorum>

¹⁹ “Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost” —Thomas Jefferson, 1786. “The basis of our governments being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.” —Thomas Jefferson, 1787.

²⁰ <https://www.ccel.org/f/foxe/martyrs/fox105.htm>

Constitution constitutionalizes due process, including a right to remain silent,²¹ and rejects torture.²²

The Bible foretold that the Bride of Christ would flee into the wilderness to escape the dragon and from the power of the Roman papacy. Ultimately, Protestantism found its way to the New World, and one of the last great wilderness areas on the planet. How fitting that the lamb-like beast, the United States, comes up “out of the earth” – Revelation 13:11, as opposed to the point of origin of the other beasts in Daniel 7 and Revelation 13! Geographically, those other beasts come out of the water, and specifically find their geographic location around the Mediterranean, as noted in Daniel 7:2.²³ But America rose from the ground of the New World.

The Declaration of Independence repudiated the contentions of the church/state system and thus rejected the dominionist claims of the Pope. The Founders trumpeted that human rights come from God, not from the state. The Founders declared as “self-evident truth” “that all men are created equal, and endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights.”

“Righteousness exalts a nation” – Proverbs 14:34. America’s protection of the rights and freedoms of humanity has brought it greatness. It’s secret strength, like Samson’s, has its source in the Almighty. America was raised by the Lord as a haven for the persecuted, and as a place where the Gospel and the light of the Scriptures could be proclaimed to all the world. Individual rights, constitutionalism, and the separation of church and state have made America great.

²¹ The Fifth Amendment states: No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation. <https://constitution.congress.gov/constitution/amendment-5/>

²² <https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/constitutional-amendments-amendment-8-freedom-excessive-bail-fines-and-cruel-punishments>

²³ Daniel 7:2 “Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea.” The Great Sea of Daniel’s vision is the Mediterranean. All of the beasts come up out of that sea, and all of the nations in the vision find their geographic location around the Mediterranean.

But like Samson, even the mighty may fall.

Samson, the mightiest man recorded in the Scriptures, fell through continued liaison with a harlot.²⁴ Delilah wooed him and plied him with her charms until he violated the secret trust between himself and God and gave up the secret of his great strength. In liaison with the Philistine civil powers, Delilah cut his hair and took his power. His two eyes were put out, and his liberty was taken from him.

Sadly, the Bible predicts that America will fall the same way. The harlot who seeks America's power is the papal harlot, described in Revelation 17.²⁵ Long has she sought to bring America to its knees.

As discussed in the first²⁶ and second²⁷ parts of *The Seven Mountain Mandate* series, the NAR apostles also want political power. The Papacy is more than willing to ally with the NAR to accomplish her ends.



In 2016, NAR leaders met personally with Pope Francis to discuss their mutual interests. This is a photo of NAR Apostle Che Ahn and Pope Francis. Further details of this meeting, see link in the footnote.²⁸

²⁴ See Judges chapters 13-16.

²⁵ Revelation 17 will be examined in an upcoming segment.

²⁶ <https://www.wingsofliberty.net/the-seven-mountain-mandate>

²⁷ <https://www.wingsofliberty.net/seven-mountain-mandate>

²⁸ <https://www.hollypivec.com/blog/2016/06/nar-leaders-meet-with-the-pope/6045>

CONCLUSION

The Bible foretells that the Papacy's deadly wound will be healed.²⁹ The Bible states that the world will wonder after the first beast, the Papal power, and it is. And the Bible states that America and the Papacy will work together to bring about the final events of Bible prophecy.

Today, both the New Apostolic Reformation and the Catholic Integralism of the Heritage Foundation, which openly advocates for a reunification of church and state, are within striking distance of their goal. This will be the subject of an upcoming installment in this series.

For now, we conclude with words written nearly a hundred and thirty years ago regarding the events now taking place before our eyes:

Through the two great errors, the immortality of the soul and Sunday sacredness, Satan will bring the people under his deceptions. While the former lays the foundation of spiritualism, the latter creates a bond of sympathy with Rome. The Protestants of the United States will be foremost in stretching their hands across the gulf to grasp the hand of spiritualism; they will reach over the abyss to clasp hands with the Roman power; and under the influence of this threefold union, this country will follow in the steps of Rome in trampling on the rights of conscience.³⁰

²⁹ Revelation 13:3 The healing of the papacy's deadly wound will be covered in detail in an upcoming segment. It is the position of the author that the wound has been healed, and current events demonstrate the proof of this.

³⁰ Great Controversy, p. 588. <https://m.egwwritings.org/en/book/132.2635#2659>



THE SEVEN MOUNTAIN MANDATE – PART 4

THE LOVE OF MONEY

For centuries, the Roman Catholic Church has fraudulently told the world that it holds the keys to salvation. It has even placed these keys, symbolizing its usurped authority over all things in heaven and in earth, on the Vatican flag.¹ And it has made merchandise of salvation, advertising that people can pay to enter the kingdom of heaven, selling forgiveness by issuing “indulgences” and relaxed punishments for sin.

Catholicism teaches the unbiblical doctrine of eternal torment in hell, as well as the doctrine of purgatory, another place of punishment in addition to hell where a person must supposedly suffer for their sins and be refined before going to heaven.

The Catechism of the Catholic Church states, “All who die in God’s grace and friendship, but still imperfectly purified, are indeed assured of their eternal salvation; but after death they undergo purification, so as to



¹ Bruno Bernhard Heim, *Heraldry in the Catholic Church: Its Origin, Customs and Laws* (Van Duren 1978 ISBN 9780391008731), p. 54, see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coat_of_arms_of_the_Holy_See#:~:text=the%20previous%20century.-,Keys,the%20hands%20of%20the%20pope

achieve the holiness necessary to enter the joy of heaven”.² But (surprise, surprise!!) this process can be rapidly sped up, it is claimed, as long as the living are willing to pony up and pay for expedited cleansing of the dead. In the 15th century, Johann Tetzel, one of these false hawkers of salvation, famously broadcast that, “As soon as a coin in the coffer rings, the soul from purgatory springs.”

This blasphemous and shameless exploitation of public ignorance and fear led Martin Luther in his 95 Thesis to proclaim that “They preach only human doctrines who say that as soon as the money clinks into the money chest, the soul flies out of purgatory.”³ Luther wrote that indulgences were sold by the papacy for the most vile crimes, so that even if a person had raped Jesus’ mother they could get forgiveness by paying money to the Pope.⁴

The practice of issuing indulgences is still practiced by the Papacy today. Pope Francis before his death offered indulgences for sin and escape from purgatory during the Jubilee year of 2025.⁵ These indulgences can be obtained, according to the Catholic Church, by going on a pilgrimage to Rome.

Another indication that the New Apostolic Reformation is among the daughters of the Roman Church of Revelation 17 is its obsession with the accumulation of filthy lucre.

C. Peter Wagner, church growth specialist, self-styled “apostle”, and often-credited originator of the name, “New Apostolic Reformation”, declares that, “Prosperity is the will of God, while poverty is the will of Satan.”⁶ Wagner claimed that the reason Christianity had not succeeded in the Gospel commission is because it did not have enough money,

² Catechism of the Catholic Church, No. 1030.

³ Martin Luther, 95 Thesis, #27. <https://www.luther.de/en/95thesen.html>

⁴ Martin Luther, 95 Thesis, #75. <https://www.luther.de/en/95thesen.html>

⁵ <https://www.nashvillecatholic.org/news/posts/pope-offers-indulgences-for-pilgrimages-penances-during-2025-jubilee>

⁶ Wagner, C. Peter. *Invading Babylon*, p. 101.

asserting that money is the key to societal transformation.⁷ NAR Apostle Bill Johnson claims that “poverty is demonic”.⁸

Wagner taught that the NAR apostles needed to enter spiritual warfare with the powerful demons that controlled the seven mountains of society, and that “we will not experience sustained societal reformation until we bind the spirit of poverty through the blood.”⁹ NAR apostle Lance Walnau claims that Christianity **doesn’t need more conversions to shift the culture**, what it needs is “more disciples in the right places, the high places.”¹⁰ It seems to have eluded Mr. Walnau that the apostate kings of ancient Israel also went to the high places to practice their idolatry.¹¹

According to the teachings of NAR apostles, these assertions aren’t just opinions, either. “While there are several things that distinguish apostles from other members of the Body of Christ, the major characteristic that stands out over the others is their exceptional authority.”¹² Like mother like daughter: the claim to authority is also papal.

So, is the problem with the advancement of the Gospel in this world due to a lack of funds? Is Jesus waiting for His people to get a big pot of money before He can send them out successfully to do His work? Is that biblical, or is it unbiblical? The test of all doctrine is the Scriptures. We are to compare the teachings of the NAR with the Bible: “To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them” – Isaiah 8:20.

The Pope claims to be the successor of Peter. He makes this boastful claim in regard to the same Apostle Peter who said to the lame man who looked to him for alms, “silver and gold have I none” – Acts 3:6. Jesus instructed the apostles to take “neither bread, neither money” (Luke 9:3)

⁷ *Ibid*, p. 100.

⁸ Wagner, C. Peter. *Invading Babylon*, p. 42, quoting Bill Johnson

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 101.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, p. 65.

¹¹ See for example, 2 Kings 16:4, describing King Ahaz’s practice of worshipping idols in the high places of Israel.

¹² Wagner, C. Peter. *Apostles Today* (p. 2). Baker Publishing Group. Copyright 2006, Kindle Edition. p. 22.

when they went out in ministry: they were to rely on the power and providence of God. But the Popes of Rome could hardly say that they have no silver or gold. The Vatican is full of both silver and gold, and all manner of costly riches in extraordinary abundance.

When Simon Magus attempted to purchase salvation and the power to work miracles, Peter sternly denounced him, saying, “They money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money” – Acts 8:20.

But Peter wasn’t finished. He continues: “Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God” – Acts 8:21. Simon had no lot or part in the Gospel ministry.

The Bible says that “the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows” – 1 Timothy 6:10.

Who had the money bag during the time Jesus was with His apostles on earth? It wasn’t Peter – it was Judas. But Judas was a thief, and he was stealing from the money bag.

Paula White Cain, another of the New Apostolic Reformation’s Apostles and official leader of the White House Faith office, recently also monetized the blessings of heaven by selling Passover cups to her followers, and promising them that if they donated more than \$1000 they would receive a crystal cross and 7 blessings, including God’s assignment of an angel to them, prosperity, healing, long life, etc.

Release 7 Supernatural Blessings of Passover

- *Assign an Angel To You
- *Be an Enemy to Your Enemies
- *Give You Prosperity
- *Take Sickness Away
- *Give You Long Life
- *Cause Increase For You
- *A Special Year of Blessing

Honor God WITH YOU
 Passover/Easter
 Resurrection Offering
 OF \$1000 OR MORE

CALL TOLL FREE: **1.800.598.8892**
 ONLINE: www.paulawhite.tv

GIVE YOUR GIFT BY TEXT: "PWM" to 45777
 WRITE: PO Box 680334, Orlando, FL 32868

So dull has the sensibilities of Christianity become that there was hardly a ripple in response to Paul White's outrageous advertisements. But make no mistake, promising God's blessings in exchange for money is a page straight out of the papal playbook. God does not send angels, healing or long life if you give Paula White a thousand dollars. Martin Luther would have cried out against Paul White and her greed and exploitation of the Gospel in the same way he cried out against the corruption of the Papacy.

Notably missing from the New Apostolic Reformation's theology is the warning to the world of the mark of the beast, which includes the end-time test where all those faithful to Christ will be **unable** to buy or sell – Revelation 13:17. The NAR claims that poverty is “demonic”, but Jesus was poor in this earth's goods, and so were His apostles. The faithful end time church will also be impoverished because governments around the world, influenced by the apostate churches, will prevent those who do not have the mark of the beast from buying or selling.

Do not be deceived, Friends. The words of Christ sound the warning down to our generation. At the end, those who have hoarded earthly wealth “will cast it to the moles and the bats”, and “call for the rocks to fall” on them – Isaiah 2:19-21; Luke 23:30; Revelation 6:16. A wealthy church is no sign of the favor of God at the end, for Babylon is declared by the angel of Revelation 17 to be clothed in wealth – Revelation 17:4. The true church of God, in contrast, will be impoverished as it goes through end time events, unable to buy or sell. But like the early church, it will once more be full of the Holy Spirit, having finally heeded Christ's message to the Laodicean Church to buy of Him gold tried in the fire, and the white raiment of the righteousness of Christ – Revelation 3:18.

May it be so. Even so, come Lord Jesus.



DONKEYS, ELEPHANTS, AND CITIZENS OF A BETTER LAND

Christians are not immune to becoming entrenched politically and allowing a partisan mindset to obscure the spiritual and prophetic significance of events taking place around them. If there were any doubt on this point, the global Covid pandemic provides many examples of Christians doing this very thing.

Christians ought to have been the last people fooled by global lockdowns and digital passports during Covid. Anyone with a proper working familiarity with the Bible knows that it tells us the signs that the world will end. We are instructed in the most solemn terms to discern the signs of the times. Jesus Himself stated, “Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find **watching**: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them” – Luke 12:37. Also see Luke 21:34-36, Matthew 24.

Amongst the many other prophecies of this sort interspersed throughout Scripture, there are two main books which speak extensively on prophecy and the end of the world. Those books are the books of Daniel and the Revelation. In both there are specific *revelations* from God regarding end time events. The book of Revelation begins with the statement that this is the “revelation of Jesus Christ” to the Apostle John regarding the end of the world – see Revelation 1:1.

Revelation 13 contains the prophecy of the “mark of the beast”, and describes it as a condition imposed on every person on earth by civil

authorities who operate under the directions and influence of the “Lamb-Like Beast”. The mark of the beast, simply put, is a test for participation in society – it is a condition imposed by governments which completely restricts an individual from buying or selling if he or she does not have the mark. That means restrictions on commerce, transportation and mobility, speech, internet usage – everything.

If you think that sounds a lot like central bank digital currencies, digital passports, a cashless society, and the profound restrictions on personal freedom and movement that arose over the course of nearly four years, you’d be right. The global events we have witnessed are surely a harbinger of things to come. The system is being built before our very eyes.

The Bible emphasises that no one on the earth will be immune from the test of the mark of the beast, and in case there was any doubt, Revelation emphasises that it applies to “**all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond**” – Revelation 13:16.

Contrary to what the “once saved always saved” crowd says, the mark of the beast test is determinative of the salvation of the people at the end of the world. The class that refuses the mark is persecuted and ordered to be put to death by civil powers – Revelation 13:15, but triumphs in the end – Revelation 15:2. They get “the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name”. The class that takes the mark can buy and sell for a short time, but then it receives the plagues mentioned in Revelation 16, and is thrown into the Lake of Fire with the devil and his angels – Revelation 14:9-11; 19:20.

Most Christians who study their Bibles to some extent, as opposed to the vast number of professed Christians who do not, have some general awareness of these prophecies. And yet during Covid, there were millions upon millions of Christians who failed to recognize that near-global forced lockdowns, vaccine passports, restrictions on cash, segregated societies etc. were a prophesied move in the direction the events described in Revelation 13.

Those who failed to recognize the prophetic implications can be generally subdivided into two classes.

One group of Christians, as stated, were oblivious to the prophetic significance because they simply do not read their Bibles, or only read them cursorily. These people have essentially obtained all of their understanding of the Bible, such as it is, from their pastor or priest. They fail to inquire of the Word of God themselves.

While this nominal and uninformed type of Christianity is still labeled by the world as “Christianity”, this is illusive because Christians are instructed to study and watch - for example, see Mark 13:35-37.¹ Christ never instructed His followers to be ignorant and uninformed, to bow to public pressure on matters of conscience, or to receive their information from their equally ignorant and uninformed pastors or priests.

The other group of Christians in this category, however, failed to recognize the prophetic significance of the events around them even though they read the Bible to some greater or lesser extent. A large number in this class of persons, it can safely be said, often missed the prophetic significance of global lockdowns and economic restrictions because of their political allegiance to left wing ideology and/or parties.

Since it was primarily *their* tribe which imposed lockdowns and vaccine passports, etc., these Christians often proved incapable of putting sufficient distance between their party's positions and their obligation to uphold and align themselves with Christian principles which have superior claims, such as liberty of conscience, the right to bodily autonomy, and freedom of speech. When governments around the world began to violate the right of free speech, these Christians sided with the state. When Christian pastors were being arrested for having a Bible study or a church service, these Christians sided with the state. When the governments told their citizens they had to have injections from Pfizer or Moderna or Astra Zeneca, these Christians sided with the state. They were unable to discern that what was taking place all around them was in fact an obvious advance toward the events of Revelation 13.

To underscore the depth of their blindness, many in this class are so deluded that they still think that coercing billions of people to take the

¹ Mark 13:35-37: Mar 13:35 Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning: 36 Lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. 37 And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch.

useless and dangerous Pfizer shot, and locking them away from society if they refused, was a good idea.

We could generally summarize all the points made so far thusly: **in America, if a Christian person was a member of Team Donkey, they were much more likely to rationalize oppression because it was Team Donkey that was doing the oppressing.**

An observer might reasonably conclude from this, therefore, that a Christian person could avoid this spiritual blindness by simply not being a member of the Donkey Party. And of course, that would be a good idea for further reasons we will come to momentarily.

But it turns out the phenomenon is not exclusive to only to Team Donkey. It can be readily proven, in fact, that Christians who are on Team Donkey or Team Elephant *both* have a similar problem applying Bible principles objectively to a given fact scenario which touches on Revelation 13.

In case there were any doubt of this, Providence has now determined to demonstrate the point for the world to see by way of observation of those Christians who are members of Team Elephant. Observation supports the proposition that Christians on Team Elephant experience a similar cognizance-impairing bias.

When the Lamb-Like Beast imposes and threatens to impose aggressive global tariffs,² or threatens land seizures (Greenland, Canada, Panama Canal, and now the Gaza Strip)³, Christians on Team Elephant tend to ignore it.

When the Lamb-Like Beast makes public pronouncements from the Executive Branch that society needs to return to God, or that God's plan for America will be fulfilled "sooner rather than later",⁴ they are silent. Most are not inclined to defend the separation of church and state or the First Amendment of the Constitution.

² <https://www.tribuneindia.com/news/world/brics-is-dead-donald-trump-reiterates-100-pc-tariff-threat-on-brics-nations/>

³ <https://allisrael.com/shock-proposal-trump-tells-netanyahu-us-is-going-to-take-over-gaza-pacify-rebuild-and-run-it>

⁴ <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/trump-christian-bias-attorney-general-b2693563.html>

When the very co-author of Project 2025, which outlines plans for the state to legislate a national Sunday law, becomes part of the White House Cabinet, they are silent.⁵ Sunday legislation is undoubtedly the prophesied mark of the beast, the enforcement of the day of the Roman Papacy which boasts of its claimed change of the law of God as the special “mark” of its authority.⁶ But many Christians, even those from the Seventh-day Adventist and Seventh-day Baptist denominations, are quiet.

The Bible prophesies that the Lamb-Like Beast will make use of coercion as a mechanism to persuade the nations to impose the mark of the beast. Notice the language in Revelation 13:14 and 16: **“saying to them that dwell on the earth** that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by the sword, and did live”, and, **“he causes** all, both small and great” etc, to “receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads”.

Tariffs are a tool of coercion. America has the greatest economic clout on the planet, and prophecy indicates that it will utilize its leverage to compel nations to impose the mark. We know the nations of the world will fall into line.⁷

We appear to have come to an inflection point in the timeline of Bible prophecy, and ought to know that the imposition of the mark is on the near horizon. When the leader of the Lamb-Like Beast boastfully claims that it has the nations of the world “over a barrel” economically,⁸ watch out.

⁵ <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/24088042-project-2025s-mandate-for-leadership-the-conservative-promise/?q=Sabbath&mode=document#document/p621> – see page 589. <https://apnews.com/article/trump-russell-vought-confirmation-budget-project-2025-7d1c476694176876256e95cecbd49231> - Russ Vought, co-author Project 2025 confirmed.

⁶ “Sunday is our mark of authority The church is above the Bible, and this transference of sabbath observance is proof of that fact” (The Catholic Record of London, Ontario, Sept. 1, 1923).

⁷ <https://www.cnn.com/2025/02/11/asian-economies-scramble-to-appease-trump-as-the-us-president-ratchets-up-tariff-threats-.html>;

⁸ <https://www.tribuneindia.com/news/world/brics-is-dead-donald-trump-reiterates-100-pc-tariff-threat-on-brics-nations/>

Around the world, plans to control buying, selling, speech and movement are being implemented in phases using digital IDs and artificial intelligence. Team Elephant has committed to funding AI in America to the tune of \$500 billion dollars.⁹ There is a proposal to replace most Federal employees with machines.¹⁰ But there is little comment by Christians, and can there be any doubt their political allegiances are causing this silence?

The call in Revelation 18:4 to “Come out of her my people” applies not only to the apostate churches, but in principle applies to earthly party allegiances. It includes a separation from human tribalism. Therefore, come out of Team Donkey, and come out of Team Elephant, and be free of partisan loyalties because both of them will support the taking of the mark, and both of them will receive the plagues, and both of them will be thrown into the lake of fire. And if you are in them still, so will you.

According to the Apostle Paul, Christians ought to stand as registered independents with respect to political allegiances. God calls His followers “citizens with the saints” – a group who is called out and who’s allegiance is to heaven first, not second. They are of the “household of God”, not Team Donkey or Team Elephant.

Speaking of those who had gone before, Paul writes:

Heb 11:13 These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.

Heb 11:14 For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country.

Heb 11:15 And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned.

Heb 11:16 But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

⁹ <https://www.forbes.com/sites/garthfriesen/2025/01/23/trumps-ai-push-understanding-the-500-billion-stargate-initiative/>

¹⁰ <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/us/elon-musk-led-doges-big-plan-for-the-us-government-replace-humans-with-ai-tools-and-automate-majority-of-jobs/articleshow/118126032.cms>

This world is not our home. We have a city. We have a country. Let us stand as independents, judging righteously and not corrupted with partisanship. Let us watch faithfully and impartially, and weigh each issue against the inerrant standard of the Word of God. For we seek a city also, “Whose Builder and Maker is God” – Hebrews 11:10.



THE TYRANNICAL FICTION OF THE COMMON GOOD



British statesman and Prime Minister, William Pitt the Younger, once stated in a speech in the House of Commons¹ in 1783 that “Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom. It is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves.”

House of Commons, 1783, William Pitt the Younger

Mr. Pitt’s observation is an apt platform from which to analyze the world we live in today. No matter where on the planet you live, you have been through some combination of nearly three years of lockdowns, church and business closures, mass surveillance, threatened or forced Covid inoculation with an ineffective and dangerous drug therapeutic, and technocratic censorship by social media platforms of anyone

¹ <https://www.britannica.com/biography/William-Pitt-the-Younger>

who questions the wisdom or beneficence of any of it. There is evidence of substantial state involvement in this censorship.^{2,3}

In Orwellian China, 280 million people were recently locked in their apartments and homes for months, unable to do basic tasks like grocery shopping or banking, and suffering intimidation by armed state police.⁴

Millions of Chinese recently took to the streets to protest lockdowns and China's "zero Covid" policy, despite a violent government crackdown against protesting.⁵

In diverse places, officials have used supposed Covid "non-compliance" as a pretense to arrest dissenters and foment social division and snitching.

⁶Without exception, it was claimed by the powerful that each of the foregoing violations of the God-given liberties of humanity was "necessary" for the sake of the common good. On the horizon in 2023, there are new "common good" initiatives pending: "climate lockdowns", more "green passes", and central bank digital currencies. In Oxford, England, a plan has been approved to build gates at city entrance points to limit vehicle travel in order to battle climate change^{7,8}.

² <https://www.foxnews.com/media/twitter-files-part-9-vast-web-coordination-between-tech-giant-cia-state-department>

³ <https://twitter.com/mtaibbi/status/1606701397109796866>

⁴ <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-63310524>

⁵ <https://edition.cnn.com/2022/12/02/china/china-covid-lockdown-protests-2022-intl-hnk-dst/index.html>

⁶ <https://twitter.com/TheRealKeean/status/1604279623051014144?t=-uzEAR-PYj36D-IPvPomEvw&s=09>

⁷ <https://www.oxford.gov.uk/news/article/2250/proposals-to-trial-six-new-traffic-filters-in-oxford-announced>

⁸ <https://www.oxfordshirelive.co.uk/news/oxfordshire-news/green-light-oxford-traffic-filters-7880655>

The plan will restrict residents to 100 exits per year, absent special authorization. These pending measures are increasingly linked to centralized control over buying and selling and a looming forced “climate Sunday” initiative.^{9,10,11,12,13}

Of course, we are told Sunday laws are for the common good, also.^{14,15,16,17}

So let us return to Mr. Pitt’s statement. The first and second part can be characterized as observations about the nature of tyranny and tyrants generally. At a basic level, Mr. Pitt states, tyrants always attempt to justify cruelty and despotism with the excuse that it is “necessary”. This, Pitt states, is the “argument of tyrants”.

The last part of Pitt’s statement refers to the response of human beings to tyrants. There will be tyrants in this wicked world until Jesus returns, which raises the question of how one should respond to tyrants in their various forms, be they tyrants of the church or tyrants of the state. So, what does it mean that necessity “is the creed of slaves”?

It means this: when the individual, or society, accepts the lie from tyrants that their mistreatment and loss of human freedoms is “necessary”, their acceptance is an act of self-enslavement. Or, put another way, it is the essence of slavery to believe the lie that tyranny is justified under any circumstances.

There is no more fallacious theory extant than that which is embodied in the common idea that natural rights must be limited by law in order to promote the “common good.” Natural rights are the rights

⁹ <https://www.climatesunday.org/>

¹⁰ <https://seasonofcreation.org/2021/09/08/climate-sunday-an-opportunity-for-churches-to-act-for-creation/>

¹¹ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/cif-green/2009/sep/17/low-carbon-sunday>

¹² <https://www.fulcrum7.com/news/2022/7/22/united-nations-climate-sunday>

¹³ <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/radical-green-overhaul-to-avoid-climate-lockdown-by-mariana-mazzucato-2020-09>

¹⁴ <https://www.climatesunday.org/>

¹⁵ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/cif-green/2009/sep/17/low-carbon-sunday>

¹⁶ https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html

¹⁷ <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/06/18/statement-president-pope-francis%e2%80%99s-encyclical>

given to man by the Creator. They are neither more nor less than what the Creator made them. To say that they need to be clipped and pruned down ... is to reflect upon the wisdom of the Creator.

Rights were given to the individual for his good. Among man's "inalienable rights" the Declaration of Independence enumerates "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The more of these things an individual has, the better off he is, and the more of prosperity does he enjoy. And the more individuals there are of this kind in the community, the more prosperity and happiness is there in the community.

What, on the other hand, is the "common good"? It is a very indefinite term. Each person defines it to suit himself. Government define it to suit themselves. Over in Russia it is declared to be for the "common good" that the little children of heretical parents should be taken from their homes and sent away to be brought up in the orthodox "faith." In Peru, until recently, it was considered to be for the common good that no Protestant marriage ceremonies should be recognized as valid by the state. In Spain it was for the common good that Protestants should not be allowed to worship in church buildings. The list of instances in which personal rights have been invaded under the plea of the "common good," might be extended indefinitely. How are these things decided to be for the common good? Oh, it is by the decision of the majority, at least of those in power. And this is the way the question is always decided; this is the way it is proposed to decide the question to day, and the only way in which civil government can consider it, in this country at least. A natural right, therefore, as limited by the "common good," is simply such a privilege as the majority may see fit to grant. And this would take the matter out of the hands of the Creator entirely. It would leave no force to the term "natural" right at all. For what a person is allowed to have by the majority, cannot be his by nature—by birth. [emphasis added]

American Sentinel April 21, 1898, page 243

Jones sets the matter out faithfully and clearly. The gift of inalienable rights is to ensure that those rights bestowed by the Creator cannot be alienated (removed) from His children by tyrants. Even, and especially, by tyrants who claim to justify their oppression by claiming the false necessity of the common good.

Nor are these inalienable rights solely the property of Americans. No, they are the property of every child of the Creator. As Abraham Lincoln stated,

Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourself with the chains of bondage, and you prepare your own limbs to wear them.

Abraham Lincoln, in a speech at Edwardsville, Ill, September 13, 1858

Today, the western world is preparing to wear these chains. A growing chorus of voices is calling for the subordination of the concept of individual rights and freedoms for the sake of what is falsely claimed to be the common good. On issues of climate, social justice, public health, economics and family cohesion, the argument is that centralized authority must control the lives of humanity despite the objections of individuals or minorities with their trifling quibbles of conscience and “rights”. Make no mistake, this is the argument of tyrants.

Let us consider recent examples of the use of this false justification.

Example 1.

It was at equal parts urged and threatened that it was necessary for the good of all to compel humanity to submit to forced Covid vaccination.^{18, 19, 20}

It should surprise no one after this display of naked authoritarianism that the efficacy of the Covid shots was a lie.^{21, 22, 23}

¹⁸ <https://www.ncronline.org/opinion/ncr-connections/do-your-part-common-good-get-vaccinated>

¹⁹ <https://www.voanews.com/a/pope-francis-calls-covid-19-vaccination-moral-obligation-/6390278.html>

²⁰ <https://thehill.com/opinion/judiciary/580930-bidens-illegal-vaccine-mandate-is-about-politics-not-science/>

²¹ https://thepostmillennial.com/we-were-lied-to-by-everyone-ben-shapiro-walks-back-support-for-covid-vaccine?utm_campaign=64494

²² <https://www.ehealthme.com/vs/pfizer-biontech-covid-vaccine/arrhythmias/>

²³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?app=desktop&v=2jTgDj7uiX8&feature=youtu.be>

The shots do not stop infection or transmission; they are neither safe nor effective.^{24, 25}

State and industry leaders, including many religious entities, shamefully collaborated to compel Covid vaccine uptake against the conscientious objections of dissenters, and utilized the false argument of the common good to do so.²⁶

Example 2.

Pope Francis says that global problems, such as climate change and protecting family rest time, need a supranational authority to enforce rules for the common good. According to a 2022 article in the Times of Malta, the “common good ... entails devolving authority upwards to international bodies to defend family and individual rights...Human rights cannot be advanced to support claims to individual demands that are morally inappropriate.”

“Supranational authority” is simply another term for a centralized global authority which exists beyond the democratic and constitutional safeguards which exist nationally to protect representative government, national sovereignty and individual rights. The papacy for centuries has opposed strong concepts of nationalism for this reason. The reader will note the Times of Malta’s circular reasoning regarding individual rights and centralized moral authority:

1. human rights cannot be asserted if it is determined that individual demands are “morally inappropriate”;
2. the same centralized international body which determines what is in the common good also has the power to determine whether objections to its initiatives are “morally inappropriate”.

²⁴ https://rumble.com/v1rcdjm-until-proven-otherwise-two-of-the-top-cardiologists-in-the-world.html?utm_source=substack&utm_medium=email

²⁵ <https://x.com/MaajidNawaz/status/1587794977882624002>

²⁶ <https://timesofmalta.com/article/may-the-common-good-prevail-claudio-farrugia.937575>

Such rationale neatly deprives individuals both of rights, and the ability to assert them, which is the essence of totalitarianism and a re-establishment of the absolute power of the papacy during the Middle Ages.

Example 3.

In his commentary for World Youth Day on January 1, 2023, Pope Francis stated the following:

We can no longer think exclusively of carving out space for our personal or national interests; instead, we must think in terms of the common good, recognizing that we belong to a greater community, and opening our minds and hearts to universal human fraternity. We cannot continue to focus simply on preserving ourselves; rather, the time has come for all of us to endeavour to heal our society and our planet, to lay the foundations for a more just and peaceful world, and to commit ourselves seriously to pursuing a good that is truly common²⁷.”

Example 4.

A number of “Catholic integralists” are openly urging U.S. courts to reject the originalism method of constitutional interpretation in favor of a new concept known as, unsurprisingly, “common good constitutionalism”. “Originalism” is that doctrine which requires courts to interpret the Constitution as it was originally intended, with, for example, its paramount protections for the individual rights of religion, speech, the press, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances. “Common good constitutionalism”, on the other hand, is a cloak for the subordination of these individual rights in favor of papal social moralism.

Proponents of these ideas would give global moral authority to the papacy, just as the Pope has now been made the moral authority of many companies, including Visa and Mastercard, in the so-called Council for Inclusive Capitalism.

²⁷ <https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2022/12/16/221216a.html>

CONCLUSION

Obviously, if it is accepted that the common good necessitates and excuses authoritarianism, it follows that those deemed to be non-compliant should and will be punished because, it is argued, all non-conformists endanger the common good.

History warns that there is no regard for individual rights in such a system.

But this is not Christ's way, and this is not Christ's system of government, for "the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" – 2 Corinthians 3:17. Christ searches and calls for each one, but compels none. He says, "Come, let us reason together" – Isaiah 1:18, and, "Let him who is athirst com. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely" – Revelation 22:17. Christ provides the water of life for all, but He compels none to drink.

As Thomas Jefferson maintained in the Virginia Act for Establishing Religious Freedom:

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

Act for Establishing Religious Freedom, January 16, 1786

In contrast to the principles of the religion of Christ, Revelation 13's end time scenario is built on the argument by civil and religious powers that it is necessary to prevent buying and selling for those who have refused the mark of the authority of the first beast. There is no doubt that this end time mandate will also be couched in the false argument of the common good, and that it will cruelly persecute dissenters. There will be no exceptions allowed.

And it will still be the argument of tyrants, and the creed of slaves.