WHEN CONGRESS PASSES THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW, WILL THE SUPREME COURT REJECT IT? —

OUR ROMAN CATHOLIC SUPREME COURT

— AND IT WILL REMAIN CATHOLIC DOMINATED FOR YEARS TO COME !

W M 1 4 9 9

I have meticulously researched into this matter—and made some startling discoveries. You will want to carefully consider this information and share it with others.

Will Barack Obama be able to change the courts during his tenure in office? Here is a brief overview of this important matter:

Judge Sonia Sotomayor has much to distinguish her. But one element of her biography stands out in the world of those interested in religion and the public square: She is Catholic; and, ***if approved as a Supreme Court justice, she will be the sixth Catholic on the nine-member court!*** That is a remarkable accomplishment for **American Catholics, who make up 23% of the nation's population, and will now potentially hold 67% of the high court's seats.** Two of the justices are Jewish. The resignation of Justice David Souter, who is an Episcopalian, will leave (amazingly given the history of this nation) just one Protestant on the Supreme Court: 89-year-old Justice John Paul Stevens.

Here are the other Roman Catholic justices on the U.S. Supreme Court:

Anthony M. Kennedy; Clarence Thomas; Antonin Scalia; Samuel A. Alito, Jr.; and Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr.

When President Obama first introduced Sotomayor on May 26, part of his recommendation was the fact that she had received a Catholic schooling!

"When Sonia was nine, her father passed away. And her mother worked six days a week as a nurse to provide for Sonia and her brother . . But Sonia's mom bought the only set of encyclopedias in the neighborhood and **sent her children to a Catholic school because of her belief that with a good education here in America** all things are possible."—*President Obama.*

Checking into this further, we find that, in spite of poverty and becoming widowed when Sonia was only 9, **her mother, living and working in the Bronx, was careful to always keep her daughter Sonia in Catholic schools.**

SOUTER RETIRING

Only a few weeks after Inauguration Day, Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg received surgical treatment for pancreatic cancer. Many worried that the court's only woman jurist might retire. And she still might soon; for cancer of the pancreas is among the deadliest of all.

But it was Justice David Souter who was first to announce that, in June, he is retiring.

THE YOUNGEST ARE THE CATHOLICS

Here are the ages of each of the Supreme Court justices:

The four who generally vote liberal tend to be older: John Paul Stevens, 89 (heavily liberal); David Souter, 69 (liberal, and retires in June); Ruth Bader Ginsburg, 76 (may not live more than a year or two); and Stephen Breyer, 70.

Antoin Scalia, 73 (strongly conservative, in good health, Catholic—**and a dedicated member of *Opus Dei);*** Anthony Kennedy, 72 (the most influential jurist, because he is the "swing voter" deciding most 5-4 decisions—and most tend to be 5 to 4).

The three youngest are all conservatives: Clarence Thomas, 60; Samuel Alito, 59; John Roberts, 54.

For her part, Ginsburg, who is 76, apparently will remain on the court for the present.

From the above information, we learn that the youngest members of the high court tend to be Roman Catholics!

Anthony M. Kennedy, 72.
Antonin Scalia, 73.
Clarence Thomas, 60.
Samuel A. Alito, Jr. 59.
Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. 54.

When Sonia Sotomayor, the sixth Catholic, joins the court, she will only be 55.

The five Catholics now on the Supreme Court tend to be the most important.

Here are some facts:

***Kennedy* is the "swing vote," and nearly always votes with the majority. Since many decisions are tied, he is one who casts the crucial vote.**

***Scalia* is extremely influential; for, more than any other Justice, he pushes for information and urges others to vote as he does.**

***Thomas* nearly always votes in unison with Scalia, thus increasing even more Scalia's influence. (They even attend Catholic church together and sit beside each other on Sundays.)**

***Roberts* is Chief Justice, and thus carries a fair amount of weight on the court.**

DATE OF PUBLICATION: JULY 2009

***Alito,* along with Thomas and Roberts, are the three youngest members of the court. Very soon, Sotomayor, also quite young, will add her vote to that of the rest.**

How often does each Justice vote with the majority? Kennedy 94%, Scalia and Thomas 85%. Roberts and Alito 83%. Ginsburg 73%. Souter 69%. Stevens 67%.

These statistics reveal that the five Catholic Justices are generally the ones making the decisions handed down by the high court.

CHANGING THE COURTS

Like all presidents, Barack Obama will have the chance to shift the direction of the nation's courts by virtue of those he appoints to the bench and to federal prosecuting posts.

Because judges serve long terms—and a single voice can carry extraordinary weight on issues from national security rulings to bankruptcy cases—the fights over judicial appointments are among the most controversial in Washington.

In 2005, the Senate nearly ground to a halt over the issue of blocked federal judicial nominees before a compromise was worked out between the two political parties.

The Supreme Court, which this year will deliberate over landmark cases on campaign contributions, freedom of speech, and voting rights, could initiate the biggest political fights.

But it is not likely that the court's balance will be affected. This is because **the two justices most likely to step down after Souter are Ginsburg and 89-year-old John Paul Stevens,** both of whom tend to side with the court's liberal block.

Seven of the nine justices were appointed by Republican presidents; although recent rulings have shown only a slight conservative tilt, legal observers say, many cases decided on 5-to-4 votes.

Replacing Souter, Ginsburg, or Stevens with a similarly minded jurist is unlikely to dramatically alter the court's makeup.

The situation is similar in the lower courts, which also lean conservative after years of Republican control of the White House. According to the *National Journal*, 54 percent of judges in district courts and 56 percent of all appeals court judges were appointed by Republican presidents. And while these courts have a lower profile than the Supreme Court, they are in many ways more influential in determining how the law of the land is interpreted.

Some 30,000 cases are heard each year in appeals courts, for instance, while the Supreme Court hears fewer than 80.

It would probably require a second term for Obama to fully shift the balance in the federal and Supreme courts.

There are 15 vacancies on the appeals courts and 54 at the district court level. But those openings are not evenly distributed across jurisdictions, which means that it can be more difficult to shift the leanings of a particular circuit's appeals panel.

In addition, the number of vacancies could rise as judges who stayed on the bench to wait for a Democratic president may take the opportunity to retire.

The process of filling those vacancies is already underway. Obama made three early judicial nominations to fill vacancies on the appeals courts.

While Supreme Court nominees are usually selected, based mostly on their ideology (their beliefs), the district and appeals benches tend to be staffed on a different set of criteria. "In the lower courts, it is more likely that patronage and politics will be the more important factor," says Tracey George, a law professor at Vanderbilt University who studies the composition of the lower courts.

Indeed, since the inauguration, Senators Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein from California have established a group to screen and interview potential judicial nominees for the vacancies in their state. The two senators, both Democrats, have agreed to alternate recommending nominees to the president.

For the first time in decades, the president may also find himself appointing judges to newly created seats.

For at least the past two decades, the lower courts have asked Congress to expand their number to handle an ever increasing backlog of cases.

There has been only one modest expansion of the federal judiciary in the past 15 years; and many court watchers say another is likely soon, if for no other reason than to ease the logjam in the district courts.

In the past, such changes have proved exceedingly difficult to move through Congress and have been successful only when a single party controls both houses and the White House, as the Democrats do now.

So now we see the picture far more clearly than we had before! When the U.S. Congress enacts the National Sunday Law,—we have good reason to believe that it will NOT be opposed by the Supreme Court!

This is crucial information. Everything is working out so that when the fateful law is passed,—as predicted in the Spirit of Prophecy, the final crisis will immediately begin.

Carefully checking through the most complete collection of Spirit of Prophecy statements on final events in my hardback compilation, *The End of Time,* you will find that there is not one hint of the Supreme Court interfering in the slightest with this

newly enacted law!

THAT KEY 1961 COURT DECISION

You may not recall that it was a Roman Catholic Chief Justice on our Supreme Court who pushed through the 1961 ruling, that Sunday Laws in America were permissible! The "Warren Court," presided over by Earl Warren, former California governor and a devoted Roman Catholic, issued the quadruple ruling in one day!

Just now, to conclude this research study, I will quote a portion from my book, *Enforced Sunday Law.* (The book is available from us, in boxful quantities, for only a few dimes per copy.)

—It will show that the Roman Catholic Church was behind that 1961 court ruling which opened the way for a later enactment of a National Sunday Law!

Chapter Seven

The Supreme Court JUMPS IN

Opening the door so it can happen again in our nation

In 1892, the Supreme Court ruled that Sunday laws would be Constitutional "because they were Christian laws and America was a Christian nation" *(Soon Hing case: Pacific Exp. Co. vs. Seibert, 142 U.S. 339; 1892).*

In 1896, recognizing that a secular approach was stronger, the same court ruled that Sunday laws were Constitutional because they were only civil "police power" laws *(Hennington case: Hennington vs. Georgia, 163 U.S. 299; 1896).*

In this second ruling favoring Sunday laws John Marshall Harlan, speaking for the court, upheld a Georgia blue law (Sunday-closing law) as acceptable under the Constitution because **the Sunday law was nothing more than "an ordinary police regulation established by the state under its general power to protect the health and morals** and to promote the welfare of its people." That was a landmark Supreme Court decision.

Four years later, in 1900, a Minnesota Sunday-closing law against barbers was upheld by the same court. This was the *Petite case: Petite vs. Minnesota, 177 U.S. 164 (1900).*

The Supreme Court decisions in 1896 and 1900 said that State and local Sunday laws were merely "exercises of police power" and not in any way religious.

But the suggestion of police power in America in support of religious beliefs is dynamite! What its advocates do not realize is that it can work both ways: **If police power can be used to enforce a religious institution, such as Sunday sacredness, then it can also be used to enforce a religious dogma. And, in contrast, it can just as easily be used to forbid religious beliefs. For, indeed, is not that how church-state union always works?** The religious beliefs of the official church are protected and required of the people—and all other beliefs are forbidden.

The Supreme Court had ruled that Sunday laws were entirely civil, both in nature and purpose. But consider these facts:

If Sunday was intended to be a civil holiday for "public benefit and welfare," then why should there be criminal penalties for violating it? Fourth of July and Labor Day observance carry no penalties for non-observance. And, **if the Sunday law is needed in order to "protect labor," then why fine or imprison the man who chooses to work on that day?** It is said that Sunday legislation is needed to give equal rest to all. But then why are some businesses arbitrarily closed on that day while others (such as liquor and tobacco stores) are kept open? **If "blue laws" are needed to "promote health," then what is inherently more healthful about Sunday than some other day in the week?**

It has been suggested by a number of careful thinkers that it would be far wiser—and safer—to simply urge one day of rest and then let each person and family choose their own day!

But, back to this "police power" reasoning as the Constitutional basis for Sunday laws: Such nineteenth-century thinking is both dangerous and ominous; for, if accepted by the Supreme Court in the present century as the justification of such laws,—it could spell deep trouble for everyone.

But, "Oh," someone might say, "This could never happen! Times have changed. We are more enlightened now. The court would not pave the way for such a religious police state in our own time!"

But a court decision to let it happen has already been handed down.

On May 29, 1961, the very liberal Warren Court, which had earlier handed down other unusual decisions, quickly ruled on four cases. That date became a landmark in Sunday-law history. **On that date, four different cases were decided in favor of Sunday laws!** And the reason given for them was the "police power" and "criminal law" concepts that Justice Stephen Field had pioneered on the Supreme Court in 1896 in regard to such laws!

These four Sunday law cases were: *McGowan vs. Maryland, 366 U.S. 420 (1961); Gallagher vs. Crown Kosher Supermarket, 366 U.S. 617 (1961); Braunfeld vs. Brown, 366 U.S. 599 (1961); Two Guys from Harrison vs. McGinley, 366 U.S. 582 (1961).*

Earl Warren, a well-known Roman Catholic, was governor of California from 1942 to 1953, when he was appointed Supreme Court chief justice. Under his leadership, a number of very startling decisions were made by the "Warren Court." But these four May 1961 decisions—all handed down on the same day—were among the most unusual of them all.

Potter Stewart, newest and youngest member of the court, wrote a brief dissent in the Braunfield case, which also involved a Jewish merchant who sold goods on Sunday while his competitors sold theirs on Saturday:

"**Pennsylvania has passed a law which compels an Orthodox Jew to choose between his religious faith and his economic survival.** That is a cruel choice. It is a choice which I think no state can constitutionally demand. For me **this is not something that can be swept under the rug and forgotten in the interest of enforced Sunday togetherness.**"—*Justice Potter Stewart, Braunfeld vs. Brown, 366 U.S. 599, at pp. 611, 616 (1961).*

Voting against the majority decision in every one of the four 1961 Sunday-law cases, **Justice William O. Douglas wrote a lengthy dissenting opinion,—and showed the religious nature of Sunday-law legislation and enforcement.** He believed that the blue laws before the court were in violation of both the "establishment clause" and the "free-exercise clause" of the First Amendment.

Here are a few of his statements:

"**I do not see how a state can make protesting citizens refrain from doing innocent acts on Sunday because the doing of those acts offends sentiments of their Christian neighbors . . The 'establishment' clause [of the First Amendment] protects citizens also against any law which selects any religious custom**, practice, or ritual, or otherwise penalizes a person for not observing it . . Every Sunday school student knows the fourth commandment: [Douglas then quotes Exodus 20:8-11.] **This religious mandate for observance of the seventh day became, under Emperor Constantine, a mandate for observance of the first day** . . The fact that the Christian voluntarily keeps the first day of the week does not authorize the legislature to make that observance compulsory. The legislature cannot compel the citizen to do that which the Constitution leaves him free to do or omit . . The question is whether a state can impose criminal sanctions on those who . . worship on a different day or do not share the religious scruples [of those who keep Sunday holy]."—*William O. Douglas, Dissent, United States Supreme Court, in McGowan vs. Maryland, U.S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 420, 561-581.*

Justice William J. Brennan, in his dissent, wrote:

"The issue in this case . . is **whether a state may put an individual to a choice between his business and his religion . . But I dissent, believing that such a law prohibits the free exercise of religion** . . The Court forgets a warning uttered during the congressional discussion of the First Amendment itself: 'The rights of conscience are, in their nature, of peculiar delicacy, and will little bear the gentlest touch of the governmental hand.' "—*Justice William J. Brennan, Ibid.*

The First Amendment is one of your best guarantees of freedom in our land. For a moment, read it again for yourself:

"**Congress shall make *no law* respecting *an establishment of religion* or prohibiting the *free exercise thereof* or abridging the *freedom of speech* or of the *press* or the right of the people *peacefully to assemble* and to *petition* the government for a redress of grievances.**"—*First Amendment, U.S. Constitution.*

It is clear that **some of our most basic civil and religious freedoms are to be found in the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.** And it is equally clear that **the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws violate each one of those freedoms.**

"**The 'establishment of religion' clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the federal government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another** . . No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs . . Neither a state nor the federal government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect a wall of separation between church and state."—*United States Supreme Court, Everson vs. Board of Education, 330, U.S. 1, 15-16 (February 10, 1947).*

That "wall" was erected to keep the State from controlling the Church, and keep the Church from controlling the State.

In a 60,000-word decision, longest in recent history, Chief Justice Earl Warren, speaking for the Court in the majority opinion, in an attempt to excuse their decision, admitted that "there is no dispute that the original laws which dealt with Sunday labor were motivated by religious forces." **Later we will discover the dramatic way those earlier "religious forces" rammed through the first Sunday Law in history—and then used it to persecute and slay faithful Christians who obeyed the Bible.**

Warren also spoke of "the power of a state to establish a secular day of rest, and [this Court has] held irrelevant the fact that the day generally appointed has a religious origin and for many people a continuing religious significance." That sentence is contrary

OUR ROMAN CATHOLIC SUPREME COURT

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

to itself. **It is admitted that Sunday is only a rest day to certain very religious people. How then can it be mandated by the court as a "secular day of rest" which everyone should obey?**

Chapter Eight

WHO PULLED the Strings?

Bragging that they were behind that Supreme Court decision

In the fall of 1960, the Supreme Court agreed to consider these four Sunday Law cases. About three months later,—and four months before the four Supreme Court Sunday-law rulings were issued,—an unusual statement of boasting was made by someone who apparently had advance information on what those rulings would be.

Hinting that an important advance in protecting Sunday sacredness was soon to be made, he gave strong assurance that it would reveal the power of the Roman Catholic Church to accomplish its objectives on a national level in America. **Apparently, the Catholic hierarchy in our country felt confident that it had access to someone important in Washington, D.C.** Here is part of this statement:

"For three centuries, Protestantism was the sole guardian in America of the Christian Sabbath. To police enforcement of Sunday statutes and to resist efforts to liberalize the laws, the Lord's Day Alliance [a Protestant church coalition] was founded . . **In recent years, however, organized Protestantism seems to have yielded primary responsibility for guarding the Christian Sabbath to the Roman Catholic Church** . . The Lord's Day Alliance has become something of a stepchild of American Protestantism. **The Catholic Church has become the new champion of the Sunday!**"—*Richard Cohen, "Blue Sunday," in The Christian Century, January 4, 1961, 11.*

Cohen's message, published in a major interfaith religious journal just prior to the four May Sunday law decisions—appeared to be a signal that something important was forthcoming, and that it would be Catholic influence that brought it about.

A brief four months later, the decision on four major Sunday law cases was written by Earl Warren, a faithful Roman Catholic and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. In order to avoid more unfavorable public reaction than necessary to those four decisions, they were all handed down—publicly on the same day: May 29, 1961, rather than being spread out over a period of time. Nevertheless, they hit like a bombshell.

Paul Blanshard was, at that time, one of the leading Protestant investigators into the inner workings of the Roman Catholic Church in America. In an important book he published in 1960, **he stated that the Catholics were among the most urgent of the Sunday-law promoters in the United States:**

"One of the oddities of the situation is that the Catholic Church . . has now become one of the chief defenders of Sunday laws in the commercial sphere . . Today, while the Protestant-dominated Lord's Day Alliance has declined in power, Catholicism has begun to place new emphasis on a non-commercial Sunday."—*Paul Blanshard, God and Man in Washington, 1960, 71.*

Blanshard (the author of the well-known book, *American Freedom and Catholic Power)* then went on to mention the strong opposition that the Catholic hierarchy mounted, when the Massachusetts Federal district court earlier ruled in favor of one of those four Sunday law cases *(Crown Kosher Supermarket).* **That adverse ruling against Sunday Laws was destined to set powerful church machinery in motion**. And it did not stop until it had effectively reached judicial ears in Washington, D.C.

"Both Cardinal Spellman and Cardinal Stritch issued special statements in 1956 championing Sunday laws. Cardinal Cushing, in 1959, severely criticized a three-judge federal court in Massachusetts for declaring the Sunday law of that state unconstitutional in a kosher market case. He said: 'Let us ourselves eliminate from Sunday the unrestrained commercialism which the courts give deference to what they interpret to be our own wishes and are attempting to legalize.' "—*Ibid.*

As mentioned earlier, the four May 29, 1961, rulings startled thinking Americans everywhere, when they were announced to the public.

Two days after the landmark Supreme Court decision was handed down, the *Detroit Free Press* expressed utter amazement at the court's statement that "the laws against doing business on Sunday have nothing to do with religion." And the editorial added:

"The machinations of great minds are frequently fascinating, and not easily understood by those who rely on common sense instead of technicalities . . **How, when the words are written into the law, the Justices can pretend they aren't [religious rulings] is beyond our comprehension** . . The clear wording and all past experiences indicate that blue laws are intended to enforce religious concepts. Even when providing exceptions such as Michigan's, **they can interfere with the right of a minority to a different belief.** As of this week, they may be considered Constitutional, but that does not mean they are reasonable! The court has ruled for the majority and totally ignored the religious rights of minorities."—*Detroit Free Press, June 1, 1961.*

***Time Magazine* condemned it even more severely:**

"**Seldom has an issue of liberty been argued on flabbier grounds . . U.S. blue laws are riddled with erratic contradictions.** In Pennsylvania, it is legal to sell a bicycle

on Sunday but not a tricycle; in Massachusetts, it is against the law to dredge for oysters but not to dig for clams; in Connecticut, genuine antiques may lawfully be sold but not reproductions. The New York blue law code is particularly messy. Bars may open at 1 p.m., but baseball games may not begin until 2 p.m. It is legal to sell fruits but not vegetables, an automobile tire but not a tire jack, tobacco but not a pipe. It is unlawful to sell butter or cooked meat after 10 a.m. except that delicatessens may sell these foods between 4 p.m. and 7:30 p.m."—*Time Magazine, October 25, 1963, p. 56.*

***The Washington Post,* recognized that this would eventually lead to additional Sunday Laws.**

"If, as we fear, the decision spawns a spate of such blue laws, the religious motivation will become so clear that the court will no longer be able to ignore it."—*Washington Post, June 18, 1961.*

The religious journal, *Christian Century,* predicted the same zealous results *(Christian Century, July 19, 1961, pp. 867-868)*. **And this is exactly what happened.** For example, the following Tuesday, in Michigan, the Detroit Council of Churches declared war on Sunday commerce, and tried hard to get rid of it all. Similar efforts occurred in many other places in America.

Throughout the months of behind-the-scenes work to legalize Sunday closing in Massachusetts, Northeastern dioceses worked closely with the *Lord's Day League* of New England in achieving their objectives. **The *Lord's Day League* of New England later revealed the secret lobbying, by many northeastern church groups, to gain the victory** in the Massachusetts Crown Kosher Supermarket case.

"After many months of cooperative effort between the office of the Massachusetts attorney general and other concerned groups, the Sunday laws have been held Constitutional.

"**This decision, announced by the U.S. Supreme Court on May 29, culminated much dedicated work of numerous legislators, church groups of many beliefs, and the *Lord's Day League*.** The preservation of Sunday as a day of rest and relaxation from secular business is a welcome assurance to the entire community."—*Lord's Day League, quoted in "Love Blue Laws," in Springfield, Massachusetts, Free Press, June 3, 1963.*

Protestant and Catholic leaders all over America responded with praise for the May decision. But the most impressive approval came from the pope himself in September. He stated that government laws were needed to guard the sanctity of Sunday.

Appearing before delegates at a union convention, the pontiff pleaded "for the proper observance everywhere of Sunday as a day of rest . . **This presupposes a change of mind in society and intervention of the powers of the state.** Sunday will really be the 'day of God' when this comes about. **It will be recognized as a social right to be enjoyed by all classes of society for the exercise of their religious duties** and the practicing of works of charity. The church will be happy when this takes place."—*Pope John XXIII, quoted by Religious News Service, September 21, 1961.*

It is obvious that the Roman Catholic Church has a special concern to see enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws. But why is this?

The truth of the matter, as we shall learn in the next chapter,—is that Sunday is actually their day! They are the ones that brought Sunday sacredness into the church!

Chapter Nine

WHY Do They Want It?

Why one church wants Sunday Laws so urgently

Throughout this entire controversy, **the big question is: Why is Rome so anxious to see Sunday exalted as the great national day of rest? The answer may come as a surprise.** Here it is:

"Strange as it may seem, **the state, in passing laws for the due sanctification of Sunday, is unwittingly acknowledging the authority of the Catholic Church**, and carrying out more or less faithfully its prescriptions."—*John G. Shea, "The Observance of Sunday and Civil Laws for Its Enforcement," in American Catholic Quarterly Review, January 1883, 139.*

John Shea, a high-ranking Catholic priest, then goes on to explain what he means in more detail:

"**The Sunday, as a day of the week set apart for the obligatory worship of Almighty God, to be sanctified by a suspension of all servile labor, trade, and worldly avocations and by exercises of devotion,—is purely a creation of the Catholic Church.**

"It is not the Jewish Sabbath; it is, in fact, entirely distinct from it, and not governed by the enactments of the Mosaic law. **It is part and parcel of the system of the Catholic Church as absolutely as is any other of her sacraments**, her festivals and fasts, her days of joy and mourning, her indulgences, and jubilees.

"**The Catholic Church created the Sunday and made the very regulations which have come down on the statute books**, and she still constantly, from her pulpits, her catechists' chairs, and the confessional, calls on her faithful to obey them, to sanctify the day, and refrain from all that desecrates it.

"**Protestantism, in discarding the authority of the [Catholic] Church, has no good reason for its Sunday theory, and ought, logically, to keep Saturday as the Sabbath** . . For their present practice, Protestants, in general, have no authority but that of a church which they disown, and **there cannot be a greater inconsistency than theirs in asking the state to enforce the Sunday laws.**"—*John G. Shea, "The Observance of Sunday and Civil Laws for Its Enforcement," in American Catholic Quarterly Review, January 1883, 139, 149, 152.*

Here are several more statements:

"**Sunday is a Catholic institution**, and its claim to observance can be defended only on Catholic principles . . From beginning to end of Scripture there is not a single passage that warrants the transfer of weekly public worship from the last day of the week to the first."—*Catholic Press, Sydney, Australia, August 1900.*

"Ques.—Have you any other way of proving that the [Catholic] Church has power to institute festivals of precept [to command holy days]?

"Ans.—**Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her: She could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day**, a change for which there is no Scriptural authority."—*Stephen Keenan, Doctrinal Catechism, p. 176.*

"Protestants . . accept Sunday rather than Saturday as the day for public worship **after the Catholic Church made the change** . . But the Protestant mind does not seem to realize that in accepting the Bible, in observing the Sunday, they are accepting the authority of the spokesman for the church, the Pope."—*Our Sunday Visitor, February 5, 1950.*

"If Protestants would follow the Bible, they should worship God on the Sabbath Day. In keeping the Sunday they are following a law of the Catholic Church."—*Albert Smith, Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, replying for the Cardinal, in a letter dated February 10, 1920.*

"We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the Catholic Church transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday."—*Peter Geiermann, CSSR, A Doctrinal Catechism, 1957 edition, p. 50.*

Protestants acquainted with history agree:

BAPTIST: "There was and is a command to keep holy the Sabbath day, but that Sabbath day was not Sunday. It will however be readily said, and with some show of triumph, that the Sabbath was transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week, with all its duties, privileges and sanctions. Earnestly desiring information on this subject, which I have studied for many years, I ask, where can the record of such a transaction be found? Not in the New Testament—absolutely not. There is no scriptural evidence of the change of the Sabbath institution from the seventh to the first day of the week."—*Dr. E.T. Hiscox, author of the Baptist Manual.*

CONGREGATIONALIST: "It is quite clear that however rigidly or devotedly we may spend Sunday, we are not keeping the Sabbath . . The Sabbath was founded on a specific divine command. We can plead no such command for the observance of Sunday . . There is not a single line in the New Testament to suggest that we incur any penalty by violating the supposed sanctity of Sunday."—*Dr. R.W. Dale, The Ten Commandments, pp. 106-107.*

BAPTIST: "The Scriptures nowhere call the first day of the week the Sabbath . . There is no Scriptural authority for so doing, nor of course, any Scriptural obligation."—*The Watchman.*

PRESBYTERIAN: "There is no word, no hint in the New Testament about abstaining from work on Sunday. The observance of Ash Wednesday, or Lent, stands exactly on the same footing as the observance of Sunday. Into the rest of Sunday no Divine Law enters."—*Canon Eyton, Ten Commandments.*

METHODIST: "It is true that there is no positive command for infant baptism. Nor is there any for keeping holy the first day of the week. Many believe that Christ changed the Sabbath. But, from His own words, we see that He came for no such purpose. Those who believe that Jesus changed the Sabbath base it only on a supposition."—*Amos Binney, Theological Compendium, pp. 180-181.*

AMERICAN CONGREGATIONALIST: "The current notion, that Christ and His apostles authoritatively substituted the first day for the seventh, is absolutely without any authority in the New Testament."—*Dr. Lyman Abbot, in the Christian Union, June 26, 1890.*

BAPTIST: "To me it seems unaccountable that Jesus, during three years' discussion with His disciples, often conversing upon the Sabbath question, discussing it in some of its various aspects, freeing it from its false [Jewish traditional] glosses, never alluded to any transference of the day; also, no such thing was intimated. Nor, so far as we know, did the Spirit, which was given to bring to their remembrance all things whatsoever that He had said unto them, deal with this question. Nor yet did the inspired apostles, in preaching the gospel, founding churches, counseling and instructing those founded, discuss or approach the subject.

"Of course I quite well know that Sunday did come into use in early Christian history as a religious day, as we learn from the Christian Fathers and other sources. But what a pity that it comes branded with the mark of paganism, and christened with the name of the sun god, then adopted and sanctified by the Papal apostasy, and bequeathed as a sacred legacy to Protestantism."—*Dr. E.T. Hiscox, report of his sermon at the Baptist Ministers' Convention, New York Examiner, November 16, 1893.*

Now I believe you can understand why Rome claims Sunday as her own! **The Catholic Church claims to have made the day sacred, and considers that non-Catholics who keep the day holy are really honoring the Catholic Church!**

But how did all this get started?

It began over 200 years after the last book of the Bible was written and the last Apostle had died. At that time, nearly every Christian was still keeping the Bible Sabbath holy, in keeping with God's commands all through the Bible.

In the fourth century, Pope Sylvester I and Emperor Constantine worked together to bring Sunday sacredness into the Christian church. Sylvester's objective was to bring millions of the unconverted into the church, and increase both its prestige and the flow of funds into it. Constantine's objective was to strengthen the empire by uniting nearly everyone into one vast megachurch. History has proven that, at that time and down through the centuries that followed, both objectives were fulfilled by the enactment of a series of ever more restrictive National Sunday Laws.

Later in this book, we will discover much more about earlier Sunday Laws in history—and intense persecution of faithful Christians that resulted.

But, before A.D. 321, when the first Sunday Law in history was enacted, the majority of the Christians kept the Bible Sabbath—the seventh-day Sabbath. And the reason for this was simple enough: **It was the only weekly Sabbath day ever commanded by God in the Holy Scriptures!** This simple fact can be tested by you. Just open the Bible and look for the first day sacredness. It is not there—anywhere. Then

see what God says about the seventh day of the week, the Bible Sabbath.

Back, when our world was first made, the sacredness of the seventh day was one of the first things given by God to mankind.

"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. **And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it**: because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made."—*Genesis 2:1-3.*

This was no meaningless requirement; **the Bible Sabbath was given as the memorial of the creation of our world in six days by the Lord God**, the Maker of heaven and earth. **It is by keeping that day holy unto Him that we acknowledge Him as the Creator and our God!** That is the teaching of Scripture.

"**And hollow My Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between Me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.**"—*Ezekiel 20:20.*

That is why the seventh-day Sabbath is in the heart of the most important set of commandments ever given by God to mankind: the *Ten Commandments*. Here is the *Fourth Commandment:*

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. **Six days shall thou labour, and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the Sabbath** of the Lord thy God: **in it thou shalt not do any work**, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. **For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth**, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: **wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hollowed it.**"—*Exodus 20:8-11.*

Notice that **all the other six days are, in the sight of God, nothing more than common working days.**

In keeping that day as a special day of rest and worship, we honor God as our Creator; but He also, in turn, blesses us with a deeper and closer walk with Himself. He said in Scripture, "Them that honour Me I will honour" (*1 Samuel 2:30).*

"**Verily My Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between Me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.**"—*Exodus 31:13.*

"Moreover also I gave them My Sabbaths to be a sign between Me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctity them."—*Ezekiel 20:12.*

And this promise is for us today; for the Bible predicts that **the Sabbath, set aside for centuries because of repressive persecutions by the church of the Dark Ages, is in these last days to be restored.** The people of God are again to repair the breach (the hole) in the law of God and rebuild Sabbathkeeping in their lives and in the lives of their children. **Accompanying the prediction is the promise of God's favor and blessing as they seek to do it.**

"And the Lord shall guide thee continually, and satisfy thy soul in drought, and make fat thy bones: and thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water, whose waters fail not. And **they that shall be of thee shall build the old waste places**: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and **thou shalt be called, the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in. If thou turn away thy foot from [stepping on] the Sabbath**, from doing thy pleasure on My holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor Him, not doing thing own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: **Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord;** and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father. For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."—*Isaiah 58:11-14.*

Now that is a wonderful promise, isn't it? It is a promise that I want to claim. It is a promise I am sure you want a share in also. But what about all those who do not know the precious truth about the Bible Sabbath? God understands the sincerity of their hearts and is leading them. And then, when they suddenly learn this glorious truth about the Bible Sabbath, the beauty and simplicity of this weekly day-by-day walk with God—that ends with a Sabbath blessing—thrills their hearts and they want it for themselves. **For in every command of God is enfolded a promise. As we, by faith in the enabling merits of Christ our Lord and Saviour, seek to obey the command, the blessings of the promise begin to be fulfilled in our lives.**

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

W
M

1
4

10

10 Waymarks

11

W
M

1
4

Our Roman Catholic Supreme Court

11

12

12 Waymarks

Continued on the next tract

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

W
M

1
4

14

14 Waymarks

15

16

16 Waymarks

Continued on the next tract

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

W
M

1
4

18

18 Waymarks

19

20

Continued on the next tract

21

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

Our Roman Catholic Supreme Court 21

W
M

1
4

22

22 Waymarks

23

W
M

1
4

Our Roman Catholic Supreme Court

23

24

24 Waymarks

Continued on the next tract

25

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

Our Roman Catholic Supreme Court 25

W
M

1
4

26

26 Waymarks

27

28

Continued on the next tract

Our Roman Catholic Supreme Court

W M 9

Continued from the preceding tract in this series _____

Continued from the preceding tract in this series _____

W M 9

PART ONE OF TWO

PART ONE OF TWO

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE: XXXXXX

More help along life's pathway - from —
TRAIL GUIDES
BOX 300 - ALTAMONT, TN 37301 USA

More help along life's pathway - from —
TRAIL GUIDES
BOX 300 - ALTAMONT, TN 37301 USA

More ***WAYMARKS*** *- from —*
PILGRIMS REST
HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305 USA

Continued on the next tract

More ***WAYMARKS*** *- from —*
PILGRIMS REST
HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305 USA

MAKE PHOTOCOPIES AND DISTRIBUTE TO CHURCH MEMBERS - THEY NEED IT ALSO

MAKE PHOTOCOPIES AND SHARE WITH OTHERS - THEY NEED IT ALSO

PILGRIMS REST HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305 USA Continued on the next tract

PILGRIMS REST HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305 USA

Continued on the next tract

More ***WAYMARKS*** *- from* _____ **PILGRIMS REST** HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305 USA

Continued on the next tract

More ***SPECIALS*** *- from* _____ **HARVESTIME BOOKS**
BOX 300 - ALTAMONT, TN 37301 USA

Continued on the next tract

More ***WAYMARKS*** *- from* _____ **PILGRIMS REST**
HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305 USA

Continued on the next tract

More ***HELP YOU CAN USE*** *- from* _____ **TRAIL GUIDES**
ALTAMONT, TN 37301 USA

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 2000