

American Sentinel Articles (1886-1899)

American Sentinel, Vol. 1 (1886)

January 1886

"Proposed Union of Church and State" *American Sentinel* 1, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

Notwithstanding the fact that the so-called a National Reform Association repeatedly disclaims any desire to bring about a union of Church and State, and is profoundly opposed to such a thing, it is not very difficult to show that, although its supporters reject the *name*, the thing itself is that for which there most earnestly striving. This is shown plainly enough by that article of their constitution, which states that the object is to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as shall place all Christian institutions and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land. Men do not seriously work for the enactment of laws which they have no intention of enforcing; therefore we may be sure that when they shall have accomplished their purpose, "Christian institutions and usages" will be enforced by law. Now when we consider that the term "the church" refers not to any single denomination, but to all professed believers in the Christian religion, it is plain that the carrying out of the design of the National Reform Party, will be nothing less than a union of Church and State.

But we are not now obliged to draw conclusions as to the intent of this Association. The *Christian Statesman* is the organ of that Association, and it one of the issues of March, 1884, Rev. J. W. Foster expressed its design in so clear a manner as to leave no room for doubt. The first proposition was that, "according to the Scriptures, Church and State are mutually separate and independent divine institutions." This proposition, which may mean anything or nothing, was doubtless intended to prepare the mind for the strong statements of follow, just as the infamous Jefferies used to raise the hopes of his victims of the highest pitch before he pronounced upon them an outrageous and cruel sentence. The second proposition is explicit and enough to satisfy the dullest mind, it is this:-

"According to the Scriptures, *the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the church.*" But the learned it writer and the ingenuous party for which he speaks, would not have anyone imagines that this means a union of Church and State. Oh, no! Both are "mutually independent;" Nevertheless the church is to be master, and the State to exist simply "to the interests of the church." The lion and the lamb are "mutually independent and separate" animals; there can be no equal union between them; but they may lie down together, the lamb taking its position inside the land, the better to serve his lordship's interest.

This was just the condition of things during the Middle Ages, when the pope had gained supreme control of affairs. There was no more union of Church and State then than there would be now if the *Statesman's* ideas were carried out. Then the state was allowed to exist solely for the purpose of serving the interests of the church, and when any secular ruler, as in the case of Henry IV, presumed to act in a way to serve the interests of the Government, he was deposed and excommunicated, and all his dominion was placed under interdict, until he submitted. Human nature has not changed a particle since the eleventh century. Let the body of professed Christians once become thoroughly indoctrinated with the idea that the State exist solely to serve the interests of the church, and, with the power in their hands, the horrors of the Inquisition will be revived, unless all shall allow the claim.

Again Mr. Foster says: "The true State will have a wise reference to the churches interests, in all her legislative, executive, and judicial proceedings. Public vice and crime, in morality and licentiousness, the wild boar from the forest, at that devours the garden of the Lord, it destroys; and morality, virtue, and good order, the handmaids to religion, it promotes and encourages." Every Government tends to promote morality; virtue, and good order; it is for this purpose that Government exist, and unless this is done there is no Government, for government means restraint, and Governments exist for the sole purpose of affording equal rights to all, by restraining the outward manifestation of those passions which would endanger human rights. But this promotion of good order is solely for the sake of good order, and not for the sake of religion. The State promotes virtue and good order, not because they are handmaids of religion, but because without them there will be anarchy and no government. It cannot make men moral, because morality has to do with the heart, and not simply with outward acts, of which alone the State can take cognizance. A man may be vicious at heart, and yet did nothing of which the State can take notice; nay, even his most intimate friends may be ignorant of his in moral tendencies. Religion alone can change a man's heart and make him truly virtuous; and this it can do with the individual, even if there be no State.

But Mr. Foster goes further. He says of the true State; "*The expenses of the church* in carrying on her public aggressive work, *it meets in whole or in passed out of the public treasury.*" It is but just to the *Statesman* to say that it enters a gentle protest to the statement, saying that the National Reform Association "does not hold that the state should contribute *directly* to the financial support of the church." It does, however, indorse the statement that "the church will recognize the good officers of the Christian State; and the true State will formally acknowledged its obligation to serve the church;"

5

and here is an approval of the claim that it is "the duty of the State, as *such*, to enter into alliance with the church of Christ, and to profess, adhere to, *defend*, and *maintain* the true religion."

Is not this a union of Church and state? If it is not, then such a thing is impossible. Equality is not necessary to a union. An alliance may be formed between superior and inferior as well as between equals. And this is the alliance

proposed, and alliances between mistress and servant, in which the church is to act as mistress, and the state as a dutiful and obedient servant. If it is *not* a union of Church and State, it is at any rate a thing most earnestly to be shunned.

It may be wondered why we, as Christians, should object to such a union. We object to it simply because we're Christians. We know that such a union is not in accordance with the spirit of Christianity. The life and practice of our Lord was an example for all Christians. He did not ask the rulers to support him; on the contrary he recognize the right of earthly governors to exact support from him and his followers. He did not desire forced service; he asks not now for anything but willing obedience. He taught his followers that in this world they were to expect tribulation as pilgrims and sojourners, and not that they should exact obedience as kings in their own land; that their time for reigning would come when he himself should come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him. Matt. 23:31-34. Therefore when the church proposes, not simply to unite with the state, but to be served by the State, it is departing from the precepts of the Master, and is becoming unchristian. It is for this reason that we oppose such a step. For ourselves, we have no desire to depart from any true Christian institutions and usages; we acknowledge the divine law that enforces them, and hence have no need that they should be enforced by the law of the land; and we deem it neither just nor wise to force those who do not believe in them to conform to them. The injustice must be apparent to all, and to still say that it is a wise policy to force men to act the hypocrite?

The *Statesman* indignantly repels any accusation that its proposed amendment would infringe upon the rights of any one, much lest take them away. From its own standpoint it would not interfere with the rights of any; because when that amendment should be carried, it would at once appear that all of its composers were possessed of no rights,-a distinction without a enough difference to satisfy the minority. A movement whose obvious result would be to deprive even a single individual of his inalienable rights of the life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, should be vigorously opposed by all two men, and most of all by Christians. E. J. W.

"True Christianity" *American Sentinel* 1, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

If the struggle be between Christianity and infidelity, we take the side of Christianity. If between a Christian and an infidel, we stop and inquire into the cause. If the Christian is endeavoring to deprive the infidel of his rights, we will ignore his profession and defend the infidel. *True* Christianity robs no one of his rights, but its followers do to others as they would that others should do to them. W.

March 1886

"Relation of Civil Governments to the Moral Law" *American Sentinel* 1, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

Among right-minded persons there can be no question as to the right of earthly governments to exist. There is a class of persons known as "Anarchists," who deny that there is any necessity for government or law, or that one person has a right for exercise authority over another; but these persons, true to their name, believe in nothing; had they the power, they would cast God down from the throne of the universe as readily as they would the earth monarch from his limited dominion. With such persons we have nothing to do. It is useless to argue with those who will not admit self-evident propositions. The only argument that can effectually reach them is the strong arm of the law, which they hate. Our argument shall be addressed to those who acknowledge God as the Creator and the supreme Ruler of the universe, and the Bible as the complete and perfect revelation of his will concerning his creatures on this earth. With such, the declaration of the prophet, that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will" (Dan. 4:25), and the statement of the apostle, that "the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:16), together with many other Scripture references to earthly governments, are sufficient evidence that nations have a right to exist.

Admitting that earthly governments are in the divine order of things, the next question is, For what purpose? The word itself indicates the answer: Governments exist for the purpose of governing, or, in other words, for the purpose of enforcing laws by which justice and harmony may be maintained. The apostle Peter says that governments are sent by the Lord "for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well." 1 Peter 2:13, 14. Paul says also that the ruler is God's minister to execute wrath upon them that do evil. Rom. 13:4.

The next step in the investigation would naturally be to find out what laws earthly rulers

22

are to execute. This is plainly indicated in the text first referred to. If the ruler is a minister of God, then the laws against which he is to execute *wrath*, need be such laws as God can approve—they must be in perfect harmony with the laws of God. Indeed, it could not be otherwise; for since God's law is *perfect* (Ps 19:7), covering in its range every act and thought (see Eccl. 12:13, 14; Heb. 4:12; Matt. 5:20-22, 27, 28), even, human law must be embraced within its limits. No one can dissent from this proposition. It is one of the fundamental principles of human law, as will be seen by the following extract from Blackstone's commentaries:-

"Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, that no human laws should be suffered to contradict these. There are, it is true, a great number of indifferent points in which both the divine law and the natural leave a man at his own liberty, but which are found necessary, for the benefit of society, to be restrained within certain limits. And beside it is that human laws have their greatest force and efficacy, for with

regard for such points as are not indifferent, human laws are only declaratory of, and act in subordination to the former. To instance in the case of murder: This is expressly forbidden by the divine, and demonstrably by the natural law; and from these prohibitions arises the true unlawfulness of this crime. These human laws that assess a punishment to it, do not at all increase its guilt, or superadd any fresh obligation, *in fora conscientia* [in the court of conscience], to abstain from its perpetration. Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin as to commit it, we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine."-*Blackstone, vol. 1, p. 36.*

The State, then, according to both sacred and secular testimony, has no power to contravene the law of God, it cannot declare an act to be right or wrong unless God's law so declares it, and in that case the innocence or guilt arising from the performance of the act is due solely to the enactments of God's moral law, and not to the human enactment, the latter being subordinate to the former. The indifferent points, in which, as Blackstone says, human laws have their only inherent force, are such as regulate commerce, the tariff upon imported goods, etc. These are simply matters of convenience or expediency.

These questions being settled, the last and most important one is this: How far in morals have human laws jurisdiction? or, For how much of the violation of the moral law has God ordained that earthly rulers shall be his ministers to execute wrath? The Bible, which settles every important question concerning man's duty, must also divide this. We shall find the answer in the thirteenth chapter of Romans, a portion of which must be briefly examined:-

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good." Rom. 13:1-4.

The "high powers" do not include the *highest* power. While every soul is to be subject to earthly powers, some are absolved from allegiance to God. The service of the two will not be incompatible, so long as the earthly powers fulfill the object for which they are ordained, viz., to act as ministers for *good*. When they forget this, their subjects are bound to follow the example of the apostles under similar circumstances, and say, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 2:28.

The verses above quoted from the thirteenth of Romans show plainly that earthly governments alone are the subject of consideration in that chapter. The following verses show, with equal clearness, the extent of their jurisdiction:-

"Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. 13:8-10.

"He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law," and "love is the fulfilling of the law." What law?-Why, the law concerning which earthly rulers are the ministers. The law of God is summed up in the two great commandments: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." See Matt. 22:36-40. The second great commandment, defining our duty to our fellow-men, is expanded into the last six precepts of the decalogue, showing to what law he refers when he says, "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." To make this still *more* emphatic, he closes his enumeration of the commandments composing the last table of the decalogue, with the statement that "love worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore love is *the fulfilling* of the law." Now since the apostle is speaking only of earthly governments, and the duty of their subjects, we know that he who does no ill to his neighbor-loves his neighbor as himself-has fulfilled all the law of which these earthly governments are empowered to take notice.

Thus it is seen that Paul's argument concerning the office of civil government is confined to the last six commandments of the decalogue. But let it not be supposed that human governments can recognize all violations of even these last six commandments. Earthly governments are solely for the purpose of securing to their subjects mutual rights. So long as a man does no ill to his neighbor, the law cannot molest him. But any violation of the law of God affects the individual himself first of all. For example: Christ said that the seventh commandment may be violated by a single lustful look and evil desire; but such look and desire do not injure anyone except the individual indulging in them; it is only when they result in the commission of the open act of adultery, thus injuring others besides the adulterer himself, that human governments can interfere. To God alone belongs the power to punish sins of the mind.

Of the sixth commandment we are told that whosoever hates another has violated it; but the State cannot prevent a man from hating another, nor take any notice of hatred until it culminates in open crime.

There are innumerable ways in which the fifth commandment may be violated, for which the civil government has neither the right nor the power to punish. Only in extreme cases can the State interfere. A man may be covetous, and yet he is not liable to punishment until his covetousness results in open theft or swindling. Yet before the *act* is accomplished, of which the State can take notice, a man's covetousness or lying or hatred may work great annoyance to his neighbors.

We see, then, how imperfect are human governments even within the sphere allotted to them. God alone has the power to read the heart, and he alone has the right to "bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." With matters of purely a religious nature-those which rest solely upon our relation to God, and not to our neighbor-human governments have no right to interfere. Concerning them, each individual is answerable to God alone.

April 1886

"What Do They Want?" *American Sentinel* 1, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

The second article of the Constitution of the National Reform Association reads, in part as follows: "The object of this society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; . . . And to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

We must suppose that those words are intended to conceal some ulterior design; for we are morally certain that none of the National Reformers care to see just the condition of things which the above article might, on a casual reading, seem to demand. By a little examination of the subject we can see that the expressed object of the National Reform Party could not be realized unless the religious bodies this country should undergo a great transformation.

Our first question is, What is Christianity? Webster defines it as, "The religion of Christians; the system of doctrines and precepts taught by Christ." Then right in connection with this, we must answer the question, What are Christian institutions? The obvious answer is, The ordinances of the Christian religion; instituted by Christ. And as all the professed followers of Christ, professors of the Christian religion, are termed as a body, the church we may say that Christian institutions are ordinances of the Christian church.

When we come to an examination of the subject of Christian ordinances, we shall find that there are very few of them. The apostle Paul describes one of them in 1 Cor. 11:23-26: "For I have received of the Lord that which delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

One Christian ordinance, then, is the Lord's Supper. It was instituted by Christ, is enjoined upon all his followers, and is peculiar to Christianity. One more: Just as Christ was about to ascend to Heaven, he said to his disciples: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall, be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16:15, 16. To these two ordinances some Christians add the washing of feet as found in John 13:1-15; but all are agreed on the first two. Here, then, we have two, or at the most, three Christian ordinances. They are peculiar to Christianity, and besides them there are no others.

Some one will exclaim, "What about the Golden Rule?" We reply, That is not peculiar to Christianity. Do not misunderstand us. We do not say that the keeping of it is not necessary to Christianity, but that it is not peculiar to Christianity. When our Saviour said, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do

ye even so to them," he immediately added, "for this is the law and the prophets." The golden rule is simply a summary of the last six precepts of the decalogue; but the decalogue was in existence and of obligation before man fell, and consequently before there was any need of Christianity. The ten commands, which comprise all primary obligation, would have been just as much in force as they are now, even if there had been no fall involving the necessity for a Christian religion; and more than this, they are now, as they were in the beginning, of universal obligation; so that they are equally binding on Jews, Mohammedans, Christians, and pagans. But baptism and the Lord's Supper not only are not obligatory upon Jews, Mohammedans, and pagans, but they are positively denied to such until they profess allegiance to Christ.

We repeat, therefore, that the only possible Christian ordinances are baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the ordinance of humility, or feet-washing. These are the features which outwardly indicate the possession of Christianity. And therefore if a nation is to be really a "Christian nation," these features must exist in it. If it demands that all its subjects submit to these ordinances, then it will be, in name, a Christian nation; but if none of these features exist in it, then it is in no sense a Christian nation.

Has the United States any of these Christian features? Does it require any or all of them as a condition of citizenship? Everybody answers, No. Then it has no "existing Christian features" to be maintained. National Reform zeal, therefore, in that particular, is entirely misapplied.

Now for a brief consideration of the difficulties in the way of making this a "Christian nation," *i.e.*, a nation having Christian features. At the outset we are met with a controversy over baptism. A large and respectable body of Christian professors hold that nothing but immersion is baptism. Many more hold that sprinkling meets the requirement of the Saviour; while still others teach that either immersion, sprinkling, or pouring is baptism. Most immersionists hold that a single immersion is all that can be allowed, while some claim three immersions are necessary to constitute baptism. Here is an irreconcilable controversy; for though the matter has been under discussion for centuries, it is no nearer a settlement than in the beginning. Concerning the Lord's Supper there is almost equal division. A large part of the so-called Christian church withholds the cup from the laity, while many are of late disposed to dispense with the entire ordinance. As for the third ordinance, it is celebrated by but few, the greater part of professed Christians being utterly opposed to it.

But it is useless to carry this point any further, for if you were to put the question, the entire body of "National Reformers" would with one voice declare that they desire no such thing as that the nation shall recognize baptism, the Lord's Supper, etc. And in so saying they would speak the truth. Nevertheless they do declare that this is, or ought to be, a Christian nation, and that "all Christian laws, institutions, and usages," should be placed "on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land;" and we know that that can be done only by making the Constitution require the celebration of baptism and the Lord's Supper as a condition of citizenship. It must be that they have something else in mind, which in their opinion is peculiar to Christianity, and upon which

there would not be among professed Christians so much difference of opinion. What do they want, anyway? In a future article we shall let them tell for themselves. E. J. W.

May 1886

"A Lesson from Ezra" *American Sentinel* 1, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

While the so-called "National Reformers" continually deny that their movement has any likeness to a proposed union of Church and State, they do not deny that they want to make such changes in our national Constitution as will place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land. It is true that they insert the words "of our Government," after "usages;" but as our Government has no Christian usages, all understand that the usages of the Christian church are referred to. The design of the National Reform party is, then, to so change the Constitution that Christian usages may enforced by civil law. It is not necessary for us to call it a union of Church and State; will simply remember that the avowed purpose is to make it possible to compel people to follow certain Christian usages, and this by the power of the law of the land.

Since the advocates of this state of affairs are fond of referring to the Bible for precedents for their proposed scheme; and since they imagine that they are following in the footsteps of the ancient worthies; we invite them to a brief consideration of the course which was pursued by one excellent man of old, "a ruler in Israel."

Ezra was undoubtedly a man of God. He was a man of stern integrity and of the most sincere piety. Moreover, he was a statesman, well versed in the ways of courts, and was also a brave soldier, and a skilled leader of men. When, after a long delay, and much discouragement, the Jews were confirmed in the privileges granted them by Cyrus, king of Persia, Ezra was the one to whom the work of restoring Jerusalem was intrusted. The Jews had been captives in a foreign land, but God had worked upon the hearts of the heathen king, so that they were allowed to return to their own land and re-establish the worship of Jehovah.

With quite a train of followers, Ezra set out for his own country. But the way was long and dangerous, and there were many even of the subjects of the king of Persia, who wished only evil to the Jews and their work. Here was the time, if ever, for Ezra to invoke the aid of the king, and secure a company of soldiers to protect him and his companions. But he did no such thing. After getting his people together, he halted at the river of Ahava (Ezra 8:15-18), and sent for the priests of the Lord. As soon as the priest had arrived, Ezra proceeded as follows:-

"Then I proclaimed a fast there, at the river of Ahava, that we might afflict ourselves before our God, to seek of him a right way for us, and for our little ones, and for all our substance. For I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way; because we

had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him; but his power and his wrath are against all them that forsake him. So we fasted and besought our God for this; and he was intreated of us." Ezra 8:21-23.

The result is told in the following words:-

"Then we departed from the river of Ahava, on the twelfth day of the first month, to go unto Jerusalem; and the hand of our God was upon us, and he delivered us from the hand of the enemy, and of such as lay in wait by the way." Verse 31.

This is our text. The application is plain. Ezra says: "I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way; because we had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him." Ezra felt that if he should ask the king for protection, it would be virtually a denial of his faith. The Jews had told the heathen of the power of Jehovah, no doubt quoting the words of Moses: "There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, who rideth upon the heaven in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky. The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." And now if Ezra should ask kingly protection, the heathen would say, Where is your God? If he is so powerful, why do you not depend upon him, instead of seeking the protection of an earthly monarch? Such questions would have been well put. Ezra knew it; he knew that to ask for protection from the king would be to proclaim the weakness of Israel.

The same principles will apply to-day. The Christian religion is from God. Christ, its founder, said that he spoke only the words of God. He said also, "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." John 18:36. If Christians in the nineteenth century, contrary to the precept and example of their leader, appeal to force, they simply proclaim their lack of faith in God. The National Reformers will, it is true, disclaim any design to appeal to force in support of Christianity; but laws are for nothing, if they are not to be enforced. No custom is made legal, unless it is desired to enforce that custom. To "enforce" means to support by force. And therefore when Christian usages are placed on a legal basis in the fundamental law of the land, it is nothing else than an appeal to force of arms, if necessary, to support those usages when they are violated. But such an appeal to force would be a virtual proclamation that God had departed from those making the appeal. It would be a confession of one of two things: Either that the ones making the appeal had no faith in God's power to care for his own cause, or else that the customs in whose support civil authority was invoked, did not have the support of divine authority.

It is just as plain now as it was in the days of Ezra, that religion is lowered in the eyes of the world, when civil power is invoked in its behalf. To place Christian institutions on a legal basis in the law of the land, would be to put them on a level with human institutions. Therefore it is in the interest of religion that we oppose this proposed Constitutional Amendment. As Christians we do not want to see any institution or usage that is really Christian, and which therefore bears the divine impress, sunk to the level of "a police regulation." Christian institutions

have the support of God, and therefore do not need the support of the State; and if the institutions which it is proposed to enforce are not really Christian, then certainly should condemn the movement. E. J. W.

June 1886

"What Think Ye of Christ?" *American Sentinel* 1, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

As we have read the arguments of the so-called National Reformers, in which they claim for Christ a political sovereignty, we have involuntarily asked the above question. We have wondered whether they really regarded Christ as the divine Son of God, or as a scheming politicians. Two quotations will suffice to show that our query is well grounded. In the *Christian Statesman* of April 22, in reply to the statement that "The apostles and primitive Christians never tried to get an amendment inserted in the statutes and laws of the Roman Empire," M. A. Gault says:-

"Christ and his apostles did not work to amend the Roman laws and constitution, because it [Rome] was not a republic. Its power did not come to the people. Its laws were not a reflection of the sentiments of the people, and it could not be made a Christian nation in the sense in which ours can."

That is as much as to say that if Christ had come in the days when Rome was a republic, he would have set about amending its laws. Instead of going about Judea and Galilee doing good, preaching the gospel to the poor, healing the broken-hearted, and those that were oppressed of the devil, he would have gone to Rome, got himself elected to the Senate, or as consul, and would at once have set about making Rome a Christian nation, by legal enactment! This is the way the "National Reformers" are doing, and they profess to be followers of Christ. The Lord, through the psalmist, said to the wicked, "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself," and that statement seems to be applicable in this case. Because they bring religion down to the level of party politics, they imagine that Christ would do the same.

Before commenting any further on the above, we will quote the illustration which a "National Reformer" gave to show what Christ did not accept the office of King when he was on earth. The illustration is quoted by Rev. Wm. Ballantine, in his reply to Dr. W. Wishart. Said the lecturer:-

43

"Had General Grant, after taking Richmond, been offered the office of township constable in any locality, he would have repelled the office with disdain. So Christ, being offered the small principality or kingdom of the Jews, refused acceptance; but if he had been offered the kingdoms of the whole world, as Grant the presidency of the United States, like him, Christ would have accepted."

We cannot conceive how a man calling himself a Christian could use such blasphemous language, except on the ground that he was drunk with the idea of a union of Church and State. The question, "What think ye of Christ?" is indeed a pertinent one to put to the self-styled National Reformers. And the answer to the

question, as drawn from their own statements, would be, "A selfish man of the world; a politician seeking the highest office." In this we do not wish to be understood as implying that General Grant was such a man. There is no point of comparison between General Grant and Jesus Christ. General Grant was a man; Jesus Christ is the Son of God. General Grant, as a man, acted with manly dignity; but if Christ had done the same thing he would have been man and not God. The party of which the *Christian Statesman* is the organ, is wont to brand every one who opposes it as an atheist; but the above quotations show that the effect of inviting National Reform principles is to give one low views of Christ in his work. We never heard an infidel express sentiments more derogatory to the character of Christ. Being Christians ourselves and adoring Christ as the divine Mediator between God and man, we oppose the work of the National Reform Party because it is unchristian in its tendency.

To go back to Mr. Gault's assumption that Christ would have attempted to amend the laws of Rome if it had been a republic. Says he, "Its laws were not a reflection of the sentiments of the people; and it could not be made a Christian nation in the sense in which ours can." No, of course not; there would have been just the difference between an empire and a republic. The laws of Rome reflected the sentiments of the emperor, and the people acquiesced in them just the same as the people in a republic do in laws made by their representatives. The emperor was to them a divine being, an object of adoration, and therefore his laws did reflect the sentiments of the people. Therefore if Christ had been such a one as he is described by the Religious Amendmentists, he would have gone to Rome and converted the emperor. The emperor, being converted, would at once have placed "all Christian usages, institutions, and laws" on an undeniable legal basis, and, *presto*, Rome would have been a "Christian nation." And since "the empire of Rome filled the world," by that act the whole world would have been "Christianized."

But, hold; that very thing was done. Not by Christ, however, but a little less than three hundred years after he declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." Constantine the Great is generally known as "the first Christian emperor." He made laws in favor of Christians, and although he was not baptized till near his death, he fully identified himself with the professed Christian party. In his day the whole Roman Empire became "Christianized." At that time there existed just the state of things which the Religious Amendment Party is now striving to bring about. As an evidence of this, and to show how thoroughly "National Reform" principles were carried out the church historian, Socrates, tells us that no one was allowed to possess any Arian document, under pain of being burned at the stake, together with the prescribed document. And so strictly was this edict of that "Christian" emperor carried out, that not a line of the writings of Arius is in existence.

Like causes produce like effects. As the result of the "Christianization" of the State by legal enactments in Constantine's time, bishoprics were bought and sold just the same as secular offices were then and are now. The richest and most influential men secured the office of bishop, and used that office to increase their wealth and influence. Since religion was regulated by the civil law, the emperor

was the natural head of the church; and since He also was the dispenser of patronage, men professed Christianity in order to secure office. The emperor continued to be head of the church until he transferred that dignity to the powerful bishop of Rome, whose assistance he needed in civil matters. Religion was then a matter of policy. And that is just what would happen in this country if religion were upheld by legal enactment. We care not how pure the motives of some of the advocates of the Religious Amendment may be; when the proposed Amendment is adopted, the results briefly indicated above will follow just as surely as the night follows the day. And that is the state of things which these men in their blindness imagine that Christ would sanction!

And this naturally brings us to another thought that was suggested by the second quotation, which says that if Jesus had been offered the kingdoms of the whole world he would have accepted. We call to mind the fact, recorded in two of the Gospels, that Jesus was once offered "all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them." Did he accept? Not even in thought. Why not? Because the condition was that he should fall down and worship Satan. That same offer is still held out to the church. Many are becoming dazzled by the sight, and many, led by a selfish zeal which they suppose is zeal for Christ, are eager to accept. But the conditions have never changed, and if at any time before the nations are given to Christ to be dashed in pieces, his professed followers accept; professedly in his name, and for him, the sovereignty of any or all of the kingdoms of this world, it may be set down as a fact that it is because they have accepted the conditions which Christ rejected with holy scorn.

If those who are so loudly clamoring for Christ to be recognized as the head of this Government, would study his life and get proper ideas of his exalted character and of the nature of his kingdom, they might truly honor him. As it is, their work tends only to degrade Christianity into dishonor Christ. Christ not only did not seek; but he resolutely shunned political alliance, and "he that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even has he walked." E. J. W.

"Religion and the Church" *American Sentinel* 1, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

When so much is said *pro* and *con* about a union of Church and State, it is fitting that we know exactly what is meant by "the church." Many people erroneously suppose that the term refers to some particular denomination, as the Methodists, Baptists, or Presbyterian. But this is not the case. To use the term in that sense would be manifestly unfair. If in speaking of "the church" we should refer to some special denomination, we would thereby imply that no other denomination could be part of "the church." With the exception of the Catholic, nobody uses the term "the church" with reference to any particular sect.

In the Bible "the church" is declared to be the body of Christ. In one place Paul says of Christ that "he is the head of the body, the church" (Col. 1:18); and again he says that God "hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body." Eph. 1:22, 23. Baptism is universally recognized as the entrance to the church, as Paul says, "By one Spirit

are we all baptized into one body," and that this body is Christ is shown by the words, "As many of you as had been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."

"The church," then, in the strict sense of the word, is comprised of those who are "in Christ," who have been converted, "born again," and are consequently "new creatures." From this it is very evident that, strictly speaking, no one religious sect, nor all of them all together, can be called "the church." Everybody is willing to admit that in every denomination there are those who are really members of "the church," because they are united to Christ; but nobody will claim that all of any denomination are truly Christian.

Since we cannot always distinguish the true professor from the false one, it is evident that the extent of the church is known only to Him who can read the heart; but it is not convenient always to make this fine distinction in our conversation, neither, is it possible; and therefore we speak of all who profess the religion of Jesus as members of this church. Thus we *assume*, since we cannot *decide*, that each individual's profession is an honest one.

Now mark this fact: the religion of Jesus, or the profession of that religion, is the distinguishing characteristic of the church. It is that which makes the church, and without that there is no church.

With this matter clearly in mind, we are prepared to decide for ourselves whether or not the Religious Amendment Party is in favor of a union of Church and State. And this decision shall be made from the published statements of that party. In the National Convention held in New York in 1873, Dr. Jonathan Edwards, of Peoria, Ill., said:-

"It is just possible that the outcry against Church and State may spring rather from hatred to revealed religion than from an intelligent patriotism. But where is the sign, the omen of such Church and State mischief coming upon us? Who will begin and who will finish this union of Church and State? If you think the Roman Catholic can do it in spite of the watchfulness of the Protestant, or that one Protestant sect can do it amid the jealousy of all the other sects; or that

46

all these sects would combine to affect a joint union with the State, you have a notion of human nature and of church nature different from what I have. Church and State in union, then, are forever impossible here, and, were it never so easy, we all repudiate it on principle. There are enduring and ever valid reasons against it. But religion and State is another thing. That is possible. This is a good thing-and that is what we aim to make a feature in our institutions."

Exactly, and right here do we see the omen of a union of Church and State. We do not expect that in this country the Catholic Church will be the State Church, nor that any one of the Protestant sects will be honored by an alliance with the State. Neither do we look for all the sects to combine and sink their individual names and thus form a union with the State. But we do look for a desperate effort to unite Church and State, and we claim that this effort will be made by the so-called National Reform Party. And further, we claim that Dr. Edwards has admitted, even while denying it, that such union is the avowed object of that party. We leave it to the candid reader if the short argument at the beginning of this article, defining "the church," taken in connection with Dr.

Edwards's positive declaration, does not prove that a union of Church and State is the grand object sought by the Amendmentists.

"But," says one, "do you not teach that a man should carry his religion into his business? Why then should you object to religion in the State?" We do believe that if a man *has* religion he should manifest it in his business transactions as well as in church; but if he has it not, we would not have him simulate it. So likewise we believe in religion among individuals everywhere, for only individuals can be religious. No man can be religious for another, neither can one man or any number of men make any man religious. And therefore we are not in favor of upholding religion by the laws of the State.

Perhaps it may be made a little plainer that religion in the State is Church and State united. We say that the possession of true religion marks one as a real Christian—a member of the church of Christ. The association together of a body of people professing religion constitutes, outwardly at least, a branch of the church of Christ. And so likewise the profession of religion by the State, constitutes a State church. It is all the union of Church and State that has ever existed. And when such a union shall have been affected, what will be the result? Just this: Religion and patriotism will be identical. No matter how pure some of the principles upheld by the laws may be, they can have no vitalizing, spiritual effect on the hearts of the people, because they will stand on the same level as the law defining who are eligible to office, and regulating the length of the presidential term. In short, the incorporation of religion into the laws of the State, marks the decline of religion in the hearts of the people. And this is what the Religious Amendment Party is pledged to bring about.

Ought not all lovers of pure Christianity to enter a hearty and continued protest against such a proceeding? E. J. W.

July 1886

"National Reform Opposed to the Bible" *American Sentinel* 1, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

When we use the term "National Reform," it is understood that we refer to the theories advanced by the Party which is endeavoring to secure a religious amendment to the Constitution of the United States. A true reform could not, of course, be opposed to the Bible; but the so-called "National Reform" movement is in no sense a reform, and that because it is opposed to the Bible. We use the term because it has been assumed by the Party, and not because we regard the movement as a reform.

A great point which the leaders of that Party aim to make is that Jesus is now the literal ruler and Governor of nations; that, for instance, the President of the United States is only the nominal head of this Government, but that Jesus Christ is the real head—the king—and that therefore his sovereignty should be formally acknowledged. If they were not infatuated they could certainly see the absurdity of speaking of the king of the republic, even if they could not see how antagonistic their position is to the truth of the Bible. We believe, however, that

those who have not become intoxicated with the wine of National Reform error, can readily see the following points:-

When God had created the earth, he said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Gen. 1:26-28.

In this work of creation the Son was associated with the Father, and was the active agent for by him the worlds were made (Heb. 1:2) and John says, "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." John 1:3. Therefore it was the Son, as well as the Father, who gave the dominion of the earth to man.

With the narrative in Genesis agree the following words of the psalmist: "The Heaven even the heavens, are the Lord's; but the earth hath he given to the children of men." Ps. 115:16. From these two texts nothing can be plainer than that the dominion of this world has been entrusted to men.

Let no one imagined that we would intimate that God has nothing to do with this earth. We do not so believe, and the texts that we have quoted do not so teach. The greater includes the less, and the statement that the heavens are the Lord's, is equivalent to saying that God rules over all, as is stated in Ps. 103:19: "The Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all." Therefore "the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein." Ps. 24:1. But, while these texts recognize God's right to all things, as Creator, they do not conflict with the statement, "the earth hath he given to the children of men."

For what purpose has he given it to the children of men? That they may govern it, even as stated in Gen. 1:26, 27. This is shown in Rom. 13:1-4, where it is stated that the powers that be are ordained of God, and that rulers are appointed to bear the sword of justice. The expression, "the powers that be are ordained of God," refers to authority in general, rather than to particular Governments. And this should be sufficient to show that, although God rules the entire universe, he is not the head of any earthly Government. If he were, then there would be but one correct form of Government, and the officers of that Government would be appointed directly by Him, as in the case of the ancient Jewish Government. But no one can claim that of the various nations of earth, one is ordained of God, to the exclusion of the others.

Take for instance, Russia, Germany, England, and the United States. Here we have four Governments, all differing in their structure. Which of them is ordained of God? All of them. They are all for the purpose of preserving order, and of guarding the rights of each individual against the encroachments of others. This is all that earthly Governments are ordained to do. The whole of the law against the violation of which they can execute wrath is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as

thymself," and this they can enforce only so far as concerns outward acts. They cannot compel a man to love his neighbor in his heart, but they can see that he does his neighbor no personal wrong, and when they do this, they are carrying out that for which they were appointed. And in thus executing justice between man and man the ruler is ordained of God, whether he is born to the throne, or whether he is elected by the people, or appointed by a few. The Czar of Russia, the Emperor of Germany, the Queen of England, and the President of the United States, are all equally ordained of God as ministers of justice; not because God is personally at the head of any one of these Governments, but because he has ordained that man shall be under authority, and the individuals above referred to are in authority in their respective Governments. In the discharge of their duty, they are each personally responsible to God, just the same as the humblest peasant.

But, although man was given dominion over the earth and all that it contains, all things are not now under him. Adam was overcome by the tempter, and so forfeited his dominion. He has not now perfect dominion over the earth, because it does not yield to him the increase that it formerly did; and the beast of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea are not passively subject to his control. What man forfeited, he has no power to regain. And so, since we do not now see all things put under him, Paul says that "we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." Heb. 2:9. Not only did Christ taste death in order to restore to man his forfeited life, but he also bore the curse of the earth (compared Gen. 3:17, 18 and Matt. 27:29), that He might redeem it, and restore to man the possession that he lost.

52

Since Christ alone could redeem the lost dominion, and has paid the price, it is to him that it is to come. Says the prophet, "And thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it *come*, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem." Micah 4:8. And so Paul directs the minds of the disciples forward to the time of "the redemption of the purchased possession." Eph. 1:14. And when that time shall come, and the kingdom shall be given to Him "whose right it is," those who have suffered with Christ shall also reign with him. 2 Tim. 2:12; Rom. 8:17.

But it is not within the power of men to restore the kingdom to Christ. Here is where the would-be National Reformers make their fatal blunder. They say, "We must gain the world for Christ, and place him in his rightful position as Sovereign." But God says to the Son, "Ask of *me*, and *I* shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Ps. 2:8. When some of the people "thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear," Christ told them that he was as one going into a far country "to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." Luke 19:11, 12. And Daniel, in the prophetic vision, saw the giving of the kingdom to Christ by the Father, and has described it in the following language: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was

given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. 7:13, 14.

Add to the above the following prophetic account of the time and circumstances of the giving of the kingdoms of this world to Christ, and the utter folly of the claims of the Amendmentists will be apparent:-

"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 for ever and ever. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth." Rev. 11:15-19.

Here we see that the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, only when the time comes that the dead shall be judged, and when the corrupt of earth shall be destroyed. Compare Ps. 2:8, 9 and Rev. 19:11-21.

In this brief survey we have learned concerning Christ's sovereignty, (1) That He is not now ruler of this world; the dominion given to man in the beginning, has been forfeited, and Satan having usurped the authority is "God of this world." (2) Man has no power to recover the lost dominion; Christ alone has the power, and he has paid the price. The controversy therefore, is between Christ and Satan. (3) We are now only waiting "the redemption of the purchased possession," when the kingdoms of this world shall be given to Christ, and he will reign forever as actual sovereign of this world. (4) He has now gone to receive the kingdom, and to return. (5) The Father has promised "the uttermost parts of the earth" to Christ for a possession, and he alone has power to bestow the gift. (6) Men do not win the kingdom to Christ and then place him on the throne, but on the contrary, when Christ comes on the throne of his glory, having received the kingdom, he will call the righteous to come and share it with him. Matt. 25:31-34. And (7) this will be only at the end of the world, when the dead shall be judged, and the wicked destroyed.

It has been before shown that the so-called National Reform theory is absurd; we think this shows that it is unscriptural. That is the reason for its absurdity, for whatever is unscriptural must be absurd. When we consider God's great plan of salvation, and the infinite price that has been paid for the redemption of the earth, and of man, that he may be assisted to a place in the kingdom of God, it seems little less than blasphemous presumption for the puny creatures to arrogate to themselves the task of placing the Creator on his own throne! E. J. W.

August 1886

"Will 'National Reformers' Persecute?" *American Sentinel* 1, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

In the "National Reform" convention held in Pittsburgh, in February, 1874, Dr. A. A. Hodge made a speech in favor of the proposed amendment, in the course of which he uttered the following words:-

"If the Christian majority prevail and maintain Christian institutions, the infidel minority will be just where they have always been, and the exact position in which they voluntarily accepted citizenship; and while they may be restrained from some self-indulgence, they can be constrained as to violation of their convictions.

"On the other hand, if the unbelieving minority prevail, the Christian majority will lose their precious heritage from their fathers, which they held in trust for their children, and they will be outlawed. For, when the law of man contradicts the law of God, the Christian has no alternative but to obey the law of God, disobey the law of man, and take the consequences."

From this deliverance we draw the following necessary conclusions:-

The idea intended to be conveyed is that "we," the "National Reformers," are all good; "we," would not persecute anybody; but if the unbelieving minority should prevail, "we," the innocent and helpless majority, would be at their mercy. As a piece of sentimental cant, the utterance was a success; to common sense and truth, it was a failure, for minorities have never yet persecuted majorities, and the very idea of such a thing is absurd. No matter how violent a man may be, the man who has twice the power that he has is in no danger. What Dr. Hodge calls the "unbelieving minority," now occupies, according to the "National Reformers," the very ground for which they are striving. The "Reformers" claim that they want to Christianize this Government, then it must be that this "unbelieving minority" now holds the ground, and yet we have not heard of any persecution being raised against the "Christian majority." As a matter of fact, no people have ever suffered persecution for consciences' sake, except from the hands of those who professed some form of religion.

These "National Reformers" do not agree among themselves. Dr. Hodge says that: If their project carries, infidels will be just where they have always been. But Mr. Coleman says that the essence of their movement will "*disfranchise* every logical conscientious infidel." We believe Mr. Coleman's statement because (1) from the very nature of the case the "Reformers," if successful, must disfranchise those who dissent from their position, and because (2) Dr. Hodge's very statement provides not only for the persecution of those Christians who may disagree with the majority. Notice carefully the following:-

"On the other hand, if the unbelieving minority prevail, the Christian majority will lose their precious heritage from their fathers, which they hold in trust for their children, and they will be outlawed. For, when the law of man contradicts the law of God, the Christian has no alternative but to obey the law of God, disobey the law man, and take the consequences."

With the last clause we agree. Where there is a conflict between the law of God and the law of man, the law of God must have a preference. "But," say the

"National Reformers," "we propose to make the law of God the law of the land, and then there can be no persecution, because a law of men will coincide with that of God. "The fallacy in this proposition lies in the assumption that they, if successful, will make the perfect law of God the law of the land, or that, if they should do so, all who revere God's law would agree with their understanding of it. They count on there being no dissenters except infidels, forgetting or ignoring the fact that there are conscientious differences of opinions even among Christians.

It is a fact that among professed Christians there is not perfect unanimity of opinion concerning the law of God. On this point the Christian world may be divided into the following classes:-

1. Those who hold that the law of God is binding upon all men.

2. Those who hold that the law was abolished at the cross, and that it now has no claim upon anybody. The first class may be still further divided as follows:-

1. Those who hold that the fourth commandment requires the observance of the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday.

2. Those who believe that the fourth commandment now enjoins the observance of the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

As all of those who reject the authority of God's law are agreed that Sunday is the proper rest day for mankind, it follows that the only practical controversy over the law of God is concerning the application of the fourth commandment; the great majority of professed Christians including the National Reformers, construe it as enjoining the Sunday rest, while a small minority are positive in their conscientious conviction that it requires them to keep Saturday. Now even allowing that the majority are actually right, and that their interpretation of the law of God is correct, the fact remains that a minority do not admit their interpretation. Those in the minority are conscientious in their belief that the laws which the majority sustain is opposed to the law of God, and when the law of man conflicts with the law of God, Christians have no alternative but to obey the latter, and disobey the former, they must follow their convictions, and, as Dr. Hodge says, "take the consequences." That these "consequences" would be punishment for violating the law of the land, is a necessary and obvious conclusion. Dr. Hodge says in the same speech from which we have quoted:-

"The Christian minister receives the word of God as the law of the church, and interprets it for himself! The Christian magistrate receives the same word as his rule in the State, so far as it casts light upon human duties and relations involved in the function of government; and the magistrate interprets it for himself."

Those who violate the laws so interpreted by the magistrates, are always punished by the magistrates. It may be that the accused one has obeyed the law, according to his own view of it, but that does not shield him from punishment; in the eyes of the magistrate, he is a criminal, but punishment for following one's own conviction concerning the law of God, is persecution for consciences' sake. Therefore we say that if the Amendmentists succeed in carrying out their plans, there will be religious persecution just as surely as there will be conscientious Christians who dissent from their views. He who cannot see this is blind indeed. Indeed, the only ground on which they pretend that they will not persecute is that

infidels have no convictions; and that all but infidels will agree with them. We are not prepared to admit that infidels have no convictions; but we are prepared to say that there are Christians who do not accept "National Reform" doctrine, and who have convictions. E. J. W.

"National Reformers' the Enemies of American Institutions"
***American Sentinel* 1, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

The readers of the Sentinel must know that in its opposition to the so-called National Reform Movement it is actuated by no personal feelings whatever. Although frequent reference is made to the men and papers that are working for the amendment, it is not done with the design of impugning their motives or calling special attention to them, but because the only way we can show the errors of the National Reform movement is by quoting what its supporters say for it. We believe that many if not all of the leaders in the movement are honest in their motives but they have become blinded by a selfish ambition which they mistake for religious zeal. To show that the movement is directly contrary to the spirit of the golden rule, we quote from an article by Rev. J. J. Carrell, entitled "The Civil Sabbath," in the *Christian Nation* of June 9. He says:-

"Those who have come from afar, and find life a burden here, knew the character of our institutions before they came. If they have helped to develop our resources and fight our battles, we are not slow to recognize the full value of those services. We accord to them the full rights of citizenship, and all the blessings of preserved nationality, the common reward of all alike. But we decline to accept the doctrine that those services confer upon them the privilege of bringing upon our beloved land a worse scourge and destruction than those averted by the civil war. If any of our citizens find our institutions intolerable, our strict Sunday laws too hard to bear, our attempts to secure sobriety, quietness, and decency, too great a burden for their freedom-loving souls, there is only one way of escape from this bondage. Our gates of egress are three thousand miles broad, and are shut neither by day nor by night. If these oppressed and overburdened souls wish to seek a better country under the sun, the way is open, and not a tongue will ever wag dissent."

We wish it to be distinctly understood that we would be second to none in upholding "American institutions" against any attempt on the part of "those who have come from afar," to overthrow them. With anarchy and Anarchists we have no sympathy. When men combine to overthrow the laws that protect the rights of men we would oppose them in every lawful way. But we have no more objection to this kind of work when done by "those who come from afar" than when done by those born in the land. Now let us notice the inconsistency and the selfishness and disregard of the rights of others, that is manifested in the above paragraph.

The writer says that foreigners who do not choose to conform to our customs and usages should leave; and the keeping of Sunday presumably on the authority of the fourth commandment, is regarded as one of those usages. If men do not want to keep Sunday according to the strict law of Pennsylvania, they

have no business here. Now we would like to know how the Amendmentists can harmonize such a position with the position which they take on the Chinese question. The Chinese are heathen; they do not acknowledge God, but bow down to the most disgusting idols, thus breaking the first and second commandment; they know and care nothing about Jesus Christ; like all heathen, they think it no wrong to defraud or steal, if they are not detected; and they pay not the slightest regard to Sunday, and know no rest-day but their New Year Holiday. Many American citizens are endeavoring to have these Chinese driven from our country, and have succeeded in securing laws prohibiting their further immigration. But the Amendmentists utterly condemn all such proceedings. They claim that such a course is unjust. Now we ask how they can harmonize their wish to drive off the man who objects to their strict Sunday laws, with their objections to driving off the Chinaman who not only disregards Sunday, but who openly and repulsively violates all the commandments? The application of the National Reform principles to-day, or ten years from to-day, would make it necessary to press every ocean steamer into the service of carrying Chinamen back to their native land. It would exclude the Chinese from this country as effectually as would the wildest scheme ever advocated by Kearney or O'Donnell. So we say that National reformers are inconsistent.

Now as to their selfishness. This country was settled by those who came here that they might worship according to the dictates of their own conscience, free from oppression for opinion's sake. The principle of religious freedom is the principle on which this Government was founded. It is the first and best of our "American institutions." Now the error of the National Reformers is in regarding the particular beliefs and practices of the pilgrim fathers as American institutions, which must be upheld all hazards, forgetting that the principle of liberty, both civil and religious, is the only distinctive American institution. They say, "Our fathers, who settled this country, venerated the 'Christian Sabbath'; they have bequeathed it to us as an American institution; and if we would not be false to their memory we must see that the Sunday is kept by all men, and kept as they kept it." But in that very resolution they are false to the memory of our fathers who bequeathed to us the principles of liberty which we possess. True loyalty to American institutions would be to say, "Here are some who do not hold as we do on some points of religious faith and practice; now we will not only allow them to hold and carry out their ideas, but will protect them in so doing, just as we ourselves would like to be protected in our opinions." This would not only be in accordance with American institutions, but it would be in harmony with the golden rule: "All things whatsoever ye would that man should do to you, do ye even so to them."

Of course it is always understood that in guaranteeing all men liberty of thought and action, the Government stipulates that no one shall disturb others in the exercise of their rights. Nothing less than this would be liberty to all. But the further error of the National Reformers is in supposing that all who differ with them are infringing on their rights. Mr. McCarrell of Pennsylvania, together with enough Pennsylvanians to make a strict Sunday law, imagine that because they

want to keep Sunday strictly everybody else must do the same. It may be that their neighbor does not believe that Sunday

69

ought to be observed; he may be a strict and conscientious observer of Saturday; but that makes no difference; "we are *the* people, and you must do as we do; if you don't like our ways, you may go somewhere else." And this they call upholding American liberty? Surely, American history has been written to no purpose, so far as National Reformers are concerned.

But Mr. McCarrell and his fellow Amendmentists, in their selfish blindness, forget that some of those who differ with them have not, like the Chinaman, some other place to go to. Says he, "If any of our citizens. . . find our strict Sunday laws too hard to bear. . . there is only one way of escape from this bondage. Our gates of egress are just as wide as our gates of ingress." Does he not know that there are in this country thousands of native-born Americans, many of whom can trace their ancestry even to the *Mayflower*, who strenuously and conscientiously object to the strict Sunday laws which oblige them to rest on Sunday after having devoted the preceding day to rest and sacred worship? Where shall these go? The gate of ingress through which they entered this country was that of birth, and if they are to return whence they came, annihilation awaits them.

If we happen to differ with the National Reformers, they certainly differ with us to the same extent; then why should we leave the country any more than they? This is our country as much as it is theirs. We will not attempt to characterize the proposal of Mr. McCarrell as it deserves, but will simply quote a few words from the speech of Mr. Blaine in regard to a similar proposal by Lord Salisbury concerning the Irish: "Lord Salisbury gives the remedy. He says, if the Irish do not want to be governed by the British they should leave. But the Irish have been in Ireland quite as long as Lord Salisbury's ancestors have been in England. . . Therefore we have to say that Lord Salisbury may be called impudent. We would not transgress courtesy if we called him insolent. We would not transgress truth if we called him brutal." We can only add, We would not be uncharitable if we substituted "the National Reformers" for "Lord Salisbury," and applied Mr. Blaine's language to them.

Now we claim that these conscientious observers of the seventh day, have the same right to protection that the strict observers of Sunday have. The "American institution" of equal liberty for all, grants each party the right to worship on the day which they regard holy, and forbids either party to interfere with the worship of the other. It also guarantees to the non-religious the privilege of observing no day at all, but forbids him to disturb those who conscientiously rest.

We submit to any candid, unprejudice person that the liberty that is guaranteed by our Constitution as it now stands, is all that can be asked by any consistent follower of the golden rule; and that they who ask for a religious amendment to the Constitution, are seeking to overthrow the only distinctive institution which America has; and if all who are seeking to overthrow American institutions should be banished, the National Reformers should be the first to go.
E. J. W.

October 1886

"State Recognition of Christianity" *American Sentinel* 1, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

The advocates of the so-called "National Reform" claim that we do them in justice by asserting that they are working for a union of Church and State, and that if their movement shall succeed they will persecute people for conscience sake. They say that we either misunderstand the principles of "National Reform" or else we willfully misrepresent them. We claim that we do neither. We get our ideas of the "National Reform" movement from its official organs, and give the people the utterances of its advocates just as we find them publish. True, they deny that they are working for a union of Church and State, and we publish their denial; but unfortunately for them their arguments go to show that Church and State union is the real object of their ambition.

In the *Christian Nation* for July 7 and 14, 1886, we find an article bearing the same title as the one at the head of this article. It is by the late Wm. Sommerville, of Nova Scotia, and is edited from the original manuscript by the Rev. R. M. Sommerville, New York. The *Christian nation* is devoted to the interests of the "National Reform" movement, and was endorsed by the Annual Convention of the National Reform Association, Pittsburg, Pa., April, 1885; consequently what ever we find in it may be regarded as official.

The article in question starts out with the statement that the Bible is a revelation from God: that it will make wise and the salvation all who receive it; that no one can know by intuition what the Scriptures teach, but that they must be searched, and that the obligation to search the Scriptures rests upon all men. To these propositions we give a most hearty assent. We also agree with Mr. Sommerville that there are "great difficulties to be encountered in the study of the divine word," and that for these difficulties the word itself is not responsible, but that they arise from education, from the current of public sentiment, from its bearing on our worldly interests and prospects, and from a determination to find in it what it was never intended to teach. We also believe that "the great difficulty, and that from which all others derive their existence or their force, is the depravity of the human heart, and our natural enmity to God. There is the reluctance to submit the judgment, the every thought, to the teachings of the spirit. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them, because there spiritually discerned."

These propositions are sound, but the conclusion which Mr. Sommerville presumes to draw from them is unsound to the same degree. He says:-

"This consideration suggests the imperative obligation to place men who have the spirit at the political health. Those who are expected correctly to apply the word of the Spirit are such as have the Spirit. The seventy elders who are called to assist Moses in the Government of Israel, are made partakers of the Spirit of the Lord, by whose directions they are brought forward. When Moses made asks successor, he is directed to take Joshua, a man in whom was the Spirit, and to lay his hands upon him and to set him before all the people. Those who are

appointed to take charge of the temporal affairs of the primitive church must be men honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom. The recognized minister of God must, all cases, be one who has the Spirit of God."

Let us be sure that we do not misunderstand this matter. It is imperatively necessary that only men who have the Spirit should be placed at the political helm. If this were carried out, it would involve the striking out of the last clause of Article Six of the United States Constitution, which reads, "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." Now since religion and the church are inseparable; it follows that what Mr. Sommerville considers as "imperative obligation" is nothing less than the union of Church and State.

Indeed, the latter part of the paragraph which we have quoted would indicate so close a union of Church and State that they will be identical. He would have the civil rulers correspond to the seventy leaders appointed to assist Moses in the government of Israel. But the Government of Israel was a theocracy, and in a theocracy the Government is the church. Among the Jews there were not two distinct organizations, the Church and the State, but every circumcised Jew was a member of the church, and circumcision was the badge of nationality. What Mr. Sommerville here implies, other national reformers openly assert, namely, that this Government ought to be modeled after the Jewish Government, and that this will be the case when their movement succeeds. Mr. Sommerville says, "Those who are appointed to take charge of the temporal affairs of the primitive church must be men of 'honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.'" Remember that he is not giving a homily on the Christian church, but is writing about recognition of Christianity; and if the sentence which we have just quoted has anything to do with his subject, it means that the civil rulers of the United States should be regarded simply as ministers to take charge of the temporal affairs of the church. And this agrees exactly with what Mr. Foster says in a *Statesman* March, 1884: "The State and its sphere exist for and to serve the purpose of the church. If this does not imply union of Church and State we would like to have the National Reformers tell us what in their estimation would constitute such a union.

We would not be understood as implying that there was anything wrong in the Government of Israel. That form of government was instituted by the Lord himself. He chose the Jews as his peculiar people, and constituted himself their sole ruler. The men who were directly over the people were not chosen by the people but were appointed by the Lord, and they received directly from the mouth of the Lord instruction as to how the people should be governed. But none of these things can be paralleled in the United States, even though the

National Reformers succeed in changing the Constitution to suit their own ideas; for the Lord has nowhere stated that he has chosen the people of the United States as his own peculiar people. On the contrary, we are told that he is "no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Moreover the National Reformers themselves do not claim that in the proposed new order of government God will

himself appoint the rulers, for they expect that the rulers will be elected by the people, just as they are now. And they certainly are not so wild as to suppose that the rulers whom they may elect will be in personal connection with Heaven. Therefore while their proposed amendment will indeed be a union of Church and State, the union will not have the sanction of God, but will be an unlawful union. It will be in his sight adultery. By that unlawful union the church will be in the condition described in Rev. 18:1-3.

But Mr. Sommerville continues:-

"Civil rulers, then, are not sent to Rome or to Geneva, to Canterbury or Edinburgh, for information whether an association claiming to be the church, and presenting its creed, form of worship, and laws, is to be accepted; but, with all confidence, to the Word. There is no more difficulty pressing on the magistrate than on any other individual in determining what is to be his course, that he may honor the Sovereign at the head of his body, the church."

This is in perfect accord with his idea that the State and the Church are to be identical, for he would have "an association claiming to be the church, and presenting its creed, form of worship and laws" accepted by the civil rulers. True he says that the rulers should go to the Bible to determine the proper creed, for of worship, and laws of the church that should be accepted by them, and says that the magistrate should have no more difficulty in determining his course in such a matter than any other individual; but when we consider how differences of opinion there are on these points, even among those who profess to be led by the Spirit, we can see only one way in which a magistrate could solve the problem with ease, and that would be to accept and uphold the creed, form of worship, and laws of that association which elected him to his position.

Sommerville proceeds: "Knowing then, the church, what is his [the magistrate's] duty respecting it?" and answers his question as follows:-

It is the duty of civil rulers, in subordination to Christ, to recognize the church, its ordinances and its laws. It is not merely that the existence of such an organization is owned and tolerated, but a statutory arrangement, confessing the divine origin of the church, and the divine obligation resting on the Nation to accept its doctrine and order, and engaging to regulate their administration in conformity with its Constitution and object."

The answer is plain enough even if it is not grammatically expressed. Civil rulers are to recognize the church, its ordinances, and its laws. This recognition, moreover, is not simply an acknowledgement of the church's existence, but is to take the form of a statutory arrangement to enforce the ordinances, and laws of the church "in conformity with its Constitution and object." The meaning of this is made still more clear by the writer. He says further in the same article:-

"Civil rulers owe it to their supreme Lord and to society to encourage and to stimulate the church in its work of faith and labor of love, and, when it may be necessary, to give pecuniary aid to its ministers, that the gospel may be preached in every part of their dominions, and to all classes without respect of persons."

And then he adds:-

"But shall we take-is it right to take-public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed? Most certainly. The gospel from its very nature is aggressive, contemplates the rectification of corrupt, disorderly, and degraded human nature, casts down every high thing that would exalt itself against the knowledge of God, and brings every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ."

The latter part of this last paragraph is eminently true. The gospel is indeed designed to purify corrupted, disorderly, and degraded human nature, and to bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And the church is the channel through which the design of the gospel is to be effected. But Mr. Sommerville says, as quoted above, that it is the duty of civil rulers to enforce the ordinances, and laws of the church in conformity with its Constitution and object; which is equivalent to saying that it is the duty of the State to compel men to accept the gospel. In other words, what the church ought to do by persuasion, Mr. Sommerville would have the State do by force.

Note carefully the first part of the paragraph last quoted. Mr. Sommerville says that it is most certainly right to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed. This can mean nothing less than that according to National Reform principles it is right to compel people to accept customs to which they are conscientiously opposed, and to make them contribute the means for this purpose. For he does not say simply, that it is right to take public money to *teach* principles to which many members of the community may be conscientiously opposed; that might be endured; but he says that the State may enforce church laws and customs, in opposition to the conscientious convictions of some of the citizens, provided, of course, it is only the minority that are thus opposed. But in any government the laws are enforced not upon one class of citizens but upon all; the law knows no difference in persons. Therefore we are justified in concluding that if Mr. Sommerville and the *Christian Nation* are competent exponents of National Reform doctrine, that doctrine contemplates nothing less than the *compelling* of every individual in the United States to conform to one certain set of religious laws, customs, and usages. This cannot be endured by freemen.

If in this article we have in any way misrepresented "National Reform" we shall esteem it a favor if some of its devotees will tell us wherein. If we have not, then it is as clear as the noonday sun that "National Reform" means a union of Church and State. National Reformers cannot deny this conclusion without recalling their indorsement of the *Christian Nation*. E. J. W.

November 1886

"A Pernicious Fallacy" *American Sentinel* 1, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

VOX POPULI, VOX DEI.-"The voice of the people is the voice of God,"-is a very popular saying. This might be expected from the very nature of the case; for anything which tends to give the people a good opinion of themselves is sure to be popular. At the same time, no saying was ever invented that was farther from the truth. It is one of the most dangerous of Satan's lies. Its effect is to lead people to ignore the plain commandments of God, which are revealed in His Word, and to put themselves in the place of God. It is taken for granted that what "the people" say and do must be right, even though there may be a command of God to the contrary. And thus this mischievous saying leads "the people" to exalt themselves above God, by making them think that by their united action they can change the decrees of God.

Men ought to be able to learn something from history; if they do not, history is written in vain. The lessons which we learn from the history of the past are equivalent to lessons concerning the future, for, "The thing that hath been," said Solomon, "it is that which shall be; end that which is done is that which shall be done." This is true because human nature is the same among all people, and in all ages. Let us recall a few of the things that have been.

Within a thousand years after the creation,

83

God saw that "the people" had corrupted their way on the earth, and so nearly universal was the downward tendency, that only one man was found who followed the expressed commandment of the Lord. Yet, although the people were so nearly unanimous in their choice of evil, it did not cease to be evil, neither did they change the mind of God. Every man who followed the way that was "right in his own eyes" was destroyed by the flood.

It was "the people" who, shortly after the flood, thought to make a name for themselves by building a city and a tower whose top should reach to heaven; but God frustrated their plan to exalt themselves above Him, and their city was destroyed and they were scattered.

Coming down to later times, we find that when God would have a people for Himself, who should honor Him and keep the knowledge of His will alive in the earth, He found only one man, Abraham, whom He could select as the father of His people. And when that people had become great and were being conducted to the land which God had given to them, they were told, "The Lord did not set His love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people, for ye were the fewest of all people." Deut. 7:7. The majority of "the people" ignored God, and did as they pleased. Surely, if it were true that "the voice of the people is the voice of God," God would not have rejected the bulk of mankind for a comparatively insignificant race.

Leaving out the great world who had rejected God, and had in consequence been rejected by Him, we find that "the people" whom God chose as His own peculiar people were, as a people, more often in opposition to God than in harmony with Him. It was "the people" who said to Aaron, "Make us gods, which shall go before us;" and when the golden calf was made, "the people" worshiped it. It was "the people" who said, "Let us make a captain, and let us return into

Egypt;" and it was "the people" who time and again murmured against the Lord's chosen prophet, and were often on the point of stoning him to death.

In the days when Christ was on earth, it was His own people to whom He came, who rejected Him. When He was accused before the Roman governor, it was "the people" of Israel-God's own chosen people-who cried, "Crucify Him!"

Still later, when the disciples of Christ were many thousands in number in Jerusalem, they were still a poor, despised sect, and so few in number in comparison with "the people" who constituted the Church, that they were compelled to flee for their lives. Then Herod the king stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the church. And he killed James with the sword; and when he saw that "the people" were pleased, he proceeded to take Peter also. This same Herod it was who a short time afterwards made an oration to a vast concourse who had assembled to do him honor, "And 'the people' gave a shout, saying, It is the voice of a god, and not of a man." In this case "the voice of the people" was immediately shown to be not the voice of God for God rebuked their impiety, and caused the vile creature, whom they called a god, to die a loathsome death.

Still later we find that "the people" whom God had taken out from among the Gentiles, became so great that they were deemed worthy of State recognition. In the great empire of Rome, which filled the world, the "Christians" were so numerous that the crafty and worldly-wise Constantine saw that it would be greatly to his advantage to favor them rather than his pagan subjects. So "the church" was "recognized" by the civil power. Thus the sect, which in the days of Paul was "everywhere spoken against," now sat in the high places of the earth, and all nations were flowing unto it. See Isa. 2:3, 3. Surely now the voice of the people must have been the voice of God, because Rome, which was then only a synonym for "the world," was a "Christian nation." This had not been brought about by a mere legal enactment without the concurrence of "the people," but Christianity was exalted to the throne of the world because the majority so willed it. Constantine was too wise a ruler to make laws that would not receive the commendation of the majority of his subjects. The voice of the people was to him the voice of God, and when Christianity became the religion of the empire, it was simply the recognition of the prevailing sentiment.

But was the voice of the people in that case really the voice of God? Far from it. This expression of the will of "the people"-the church-was only the last step but one in that great apostasy of which Paul had written (2 Thess. 2:1-8), and which culminated in the establishment of the Papacy, that "man of sin," "the son of perdition," who opposed and exalted himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he as God sat in the temple of God, showing himself to be God. This was the practical working of the adage, "The voice of the people is the voice of God." The falsity of that claim is shown by the fact that "the people" who have impiously exalted themselves above God by claiming that their voice is His, are to be consumed with the spirit of the Lord's mouth, and destroyed with the brightness of His coming.

In the brief description of the rise of the Papacy, the reader cannot fail to recognize the words which the "National Reformers" use to describe their movement. It is a significant fact that the same language which they use to

describe what they are working for, most accurately describes the establishment of the Papacy, that professedly Christian power that persecuted Christians to the death. There is not a plea which the National Reformers use in behalf of their proposed Amendment to the Constitution, which will not apply exactly to the setting up of the Papacy. They say, This movement is wholly in the hands of the Christian Church; so was the great apostasy of the first three centuries. National Reformers say, We do not want an Amendment to the Constitution until it will be the natural outgrowth of the sentiment of the Christian people of the country; all Constantine and his successors did was to make laws voicing the sentiments of "the Christian people" of the empire. Say the "Reformers," "The success of this movement will make the United States a Christian nation; that is what Rome became. Say they, *We* will never persecute; so said "Christian" Rome under similar circumstances, but time will in this case demonstrate the fact that like causes always produce like effects.

"Woe unto you, . . . because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchers of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers." Matt. 23:29-32.

And like effects bring like punishments. Let those who are inclined toward so-called "National Reform" take heed and beware.

American Sentinel, Vol. 2 (1887)

January 1887

"Both Sides" *American Sentinel* 2, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

From the Rev. Robert White, of Steubenville, Ohio, we have the following communications under the heading, "Hear the Other Side," which in harmony with his request we gladly give place in the SENTINEL:-

"Through your kindness I have received the AMERICAN SENTINEL for January, February, March, October, and November, 1886. I have given them careful perusal, and have also noted some things to which, with your permission, I would like to reply in your columns.

"As your aim and mine is only to know and to do what is right, and as it is not victory for its own sake, but for truth's sake that we are (or ought to be) striving for, I feel sure you will cheerfully accord me the privilege of correcting what I regard as misstatements made (no doubt honestly) by you of the sentiments, purposes, and position of the National Reform Association. This, and not the 'Religious Amendment party,' or the 'God-in-the-Constitution' party, is our correct designation. These and all similar titles we disown and disclaim. Whatever may be the design of those who employ them, they convey a wrong, because a one-sided and imperfect, notion of the object of the National Reform Association.

"Before however, proceeding to the correction of what I consider misinterpretations and misapprehensions of the declarations and views of the advocates of National Reform, I desire to enter my protest against the very serious charges you lay at their door. Although you pay a not undeserved tribute to the respectability, learning, piety, and patriot-ism of its published list of officers, over and over again you affirm that our professed object is one thing while our real object is another and a totally different thing (p. 76). You assert that we are laboring to subvert the Constitution of our country (p. 78), and to overthrow all that was done by the Revolutionary fathers (p. 81); that we propose to put in practice persecution for conscience' sake (pp. 78, 84); that we are seeking our own aggrandizement (p. 86); that we are actuated by ambition (p. 76); and that our repeated re-affirmations or denials that we do not contemplate in any sense a union of Church and State is a mere blind (p. 19), a display of effrontery (p. 81), an exhibition of duplicity (p. 74), and a piece of Jesuitical casuistry to hide our real intention (p. 19). You also say that 'we do not see how we can expect anything else of that party. Its cause is worthy only of Jesuitism and the Inquisition, and can only be justified by such casuistry as a Jesuit might envy' (p. 20).

"Do you really think, Messrs. Editors, that this is an honorable mode of warfare? Is it necessary to the success of your cause? If it is, then verily it must be a bad one. When such questionable measures have to be employed to defend it, it is 'condemned already.' If you think the advocates of National Reform are mistaken or misguided, have a zeal that is not according to knowledge, and do not perceive the natural and necessary consequences of their movement, you have an undaunted right to say so, and also to try to prove what you say. But to hold them up to public reprobation as deliberate and intentional deceivers is, to say the least, very unfair Insinuation, defamation, and aspersion of motives are not arguments. Let us reason together, but because we differ, let us not descend to vituperation.

"A great deal of what you have written against the National Reform Association arises from a misreading (how to account for it I do not know) of the constitution of the Association. In almost every paper you sent me (and I suppose the same is true of those I have not received), you say that the object of the National Reform Association, in the Amendment to our National Constitution they wish incorporated in that instrument, is 'to legalize the laws and institutions of Christianity, or of that which they may claim is Christianity;' or 'to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal basis' (pp. 1, 3, 4). How foreign this is to our purpose will be seen almost at a glance by comparing your way of putting it with the language of the constitution of the National Reform Association. As many of your readers may never have seen it, and as it is of itself a sufficient reply to much that has appeared in the SENTINEL, I ask as a matter of justice, and that your readers may have an opportunity of judging for themselves, that you publish it in full. The readers of the SENTINEL will do themselves a favor by referring to it as often as may be necessary.

CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION

"Believing that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Ruler of nations, and that the revealed Will of God is of Supreme authority in civil affairs;

"Remembering that this country was settled by Christian men, with Christian ends in view, and that they gave a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established;

"Perceiving the subtle and persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our Public Schools, to overthrow our Sabbath Laws, to corrupt the Family, to abolish the Oath, Prayer in our National and State Legislatures, days of Fasting and Thanksgiving and other Christian features of our institutions, and so to divorce the American Government from all connection with the Christian religion;

"Viewing with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, the legal sanction of the Liquor Traffic, and the disregard of moral and religious character in those who are exalted to high places in the nation;

"Believing that a written Constitution ought to contain explicit evidence of the Christian character and purpose of the nation which frames it, and perceiving that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government;

"We, citizens of the United States, do associate ourselves under the followings ARTICLES, and pledge ourselves to God, and to one another, to labor, through wise and lawful means, for the ends herein set forth:-

ARTICLE I

"This Society shall be called the "NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION."

ARTICLE II

"The object of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed reforms in the action of the Government touching the Sabbath, the institution of the Family, the religious element in Education, the Oath, and Public Morality as affected by the Liquor Traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure such an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.'

"After reading this constitution law, can any one truthfully affirm that the aim of the National Reform Association is 'to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal basis'? It distinctly specifies 'the Christian laws, usages, and institutions of our Government'-these and no more.

Between the statement of the SENTINEL, 'to place the laws, usages, and institutions of the Christian religion on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental laws of the land,' and the one in the constitution of the National Reform Association, 'to place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government' on such a basis, there is a world-wide difference. The former embraces all the doctrines, roles, and principles of Christianity; the latter only such 'moral laws of the Christian religion' as are necessarily involved in the practical administration of our Government. The chief of these are mentioned in the constitution of the Association, and the undeniable fact 'that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government,' is asserted. The SENTINEL'S version of our aims and purposes is as wide of the mark as it possibly can be. To any such scheme as that attributed by the editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to the friends of National Reform, the latter are as much opposed (and as honestly) as are or can be the former. The AMERICAN SENTINEL, therefore, is wasting its ammunition, firing at a specter of its own creating, fighting a ghost of its own imagining.

"As this communication is already perhaps too long, I reserve, with your permission, further criticisms to a future article.

"ROBERT WHITE.

"Steubenville, Ohio."

We have no desire to present a one-sided view, and shall always be glad to publish views of the other side when they are presented in as temperate and candid a manner as are the above. Indeed this has been our course from the first.

Mr. White refers to several expressions which he has found in different numbers of the SENTINEL, and asks if we "really think that this is an honorable mode of warfare?" We can answer that if the expressions had been used with no director dependent connection, if they had been printed as a series of expletives with no explanation, we should not consider such to be an honorable mode of warfare. But when in every instance the expressions are simply and only the logical deduction from the propositions of the National Reformers themselves, then we are prepared to say without hesitancy that such is an honorable mode of warfare.

It is an honorable mode of warfare to trace every proposition to its logical conclusion; and if sound logic demonstrates that while the professed object of National Reform is one thing, the real object is a totally different thing; if the logic of the thing shows that it is subversive of the constitution; if not only logical conclusions, but their own words, show that the practice of persecution for conscience will be the outcome of the success of National Reformers; if sound logic develops casuistry and even Jesuitical casuistry; then we say that in all this there is nothing but an honorable mode of warfare.

Mr. White speaks of our "insinuations," etc. Now Webster's Unabridged says that to insinuate is "to hint; to suggest by remote allusion." So far as we know we have insinuated nothing. What we have had to say we have said openly and plainly. And if what we have said appears to him as "insinuations," then we should be glad for him to tell us how we can speak plainly and directly.

We wish Mr. White had spent his time in showing that our reasoning is not logical, and that our expressions are not the plain statements of logical conclusions from the propositions of National Reformers, instead of complaining of the expressions themselves. If our reasoning is not sound, if our conclusions are not logical, it ought to be easy enough for the principals in the movement to show it. There are certainly enough professors, and Doctors of Divinity, and Doctors of Laws, pledged to National Reform, to furnish some one to point out wherein we have reasoned wrongly, or where we have missed the point in our arguments on the propositions of the National Reformers. Besides this, if in our arguments we have so constantly missed the point of National Reform, how does it happen that our efforts hurt the National Reformers so much? If they are not hit, how does it happen that they are hurt? And if the real point of National Reform is missed, how does it happen that the National Reformers are hit?

If the reader will look over the numbers of the SENTINEL, he will find copious extracts from the writings of National Reformers. We have endeavored to represent them fairly, and in order to do this, have uniformly quoted their own language. If we have misconstrued the sentiments, the purpose, and the position of the National Reform Association, it can only have been because its advocates have not meant what they said. In noticing the strictures of Mr. White, we shall simply re-quote a few statements made by National Reformers. And here we would say that we have never yet used the expression "God-in-the-Constitution" party. We have referred to the National Reform Association as the "Religious Amendment party," and we think justly, although they may disclaim that distinctive title. To show that this is so, we quote from a speech made by Professor Blanchard in the National Reform, Convention held in Pittsburg in 1874. He said:-

"Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and, of course, Congress establishes a standard for money, weight, and measure. So Congress must establish a standard religion or admit anything called religion."

In the same convention President Brunot said:-

"The American people must say that the Bible is the word of God, and that Christianity is the religion of this country."

In March, 1884, Rev. J. M. Foster, writing in the *Christian Statesman*, concerning the model State, said:-

"According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere existed for the sake and to serve the interests of the church." And again "The expenses of the church in carrying on her aggressive work it meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury."

Rev. R. M. Somerville, in the *Christian Nation* of July 14, 1886; declared that it is right to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed.

The National Reform Association has for its avowed object the securing of such an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will indicate that this is a Christian Nation. And when that Amendment shall have been secured, Congress must, according to Professor Blanchard, establish a standard religion. If, then, the Amendment which they desire is not a Religious Amendment,

language does not mean anything. Moreover, Christianity cannot be separated from religion, for it *is* religion. A Christian man is a religious man and a Christian nation must be a religious nation; therefore we say again, that is the Constitution is so amended that this Nation shall *seem* to be a Christian Nation, the Amendment which secures that object will be a Religious Amendment. Although National Reformers repudiate the title of "Religious Amendment party," their own writers proclaim the fact that they do want a religious test for citizenship. We do not see, therefore, how the emphatic declarations, made again and again by National Reformers, that they do not want a *Religious* Amendment to the Constitution, nor anything like Church and State, can be considered as anything else than a "blind," or a manifestation of Jesuitical casuistry.

In view of the above quotations, we think we are justified in calling the National Reformers the "Religious Amendment party." In fact, we always wince whenever we write "National Reformers" and "National Reform Association," for we cannot regard their movement as a reform in any particular. It is true that many advocates of this movement are highly respectable and learned and pious, and we cannot believe that they realize what will be the result of their proposed Amendment. But we cannot allow that they are patriots, even though they are honest in their purpose, for patriotism seeks only the welfare of the country, and the success of their movement would be the greatest calamity which this Nation ever suffered. We are obliged, however, to discredit the piety of many who stand high in the National Reform counsels, and the reason for this will shortly appear.

Now a few words concerning constitution of the National Reform According Association. According to that its idea is to place "all Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." If they purpose to follow the letter of their constitution, they might as well stop at once, for in our Government there are no Christian laws or institutions. "Christian laws" are precepts

5

regulating the practice of the Christian religion. Christian institutions are those ordinances which Christ has placed in the church, as baptism and the Lord's supper. To claim that it is desired to regulate marriage laws, judicial oaths, and the observance of the Sabbath, we submit that these are not Christian institutions. The moral law of ten commandments antedates Christianity and is obligatory on all mankind. For the observance or non-observance of its precepts, Jew and Gentile, Pagan and Christian, will alike have to give an account to God. That part of the law which relates especially to man's duty to his fellows and tends to secure harmony and good order in society, human Governments are empowered to enforce, and that without regard to the form of religion that may be professed. The Czar of Russia, the Shah of Persia, the emperors of China and Japan, the queen of England, and the President of the United States are alike ministers of God to execute wrath upon those who trample upon the rights of their neighbors. And it is a fact that in many heathen countries the rights of citizens have been as well maintained as in some so-called Christian nations. It is also a fact that there is no such thing as Christianity in marriage. Marriage was instituted in Eden for the whole race, and the marriage of the Jew is just as

sacred as that of the Protestant. The regulation of marriage is within the province of every nation, whether it is Christian or Pagan.

Mr. White uses the expression "moral laws of the Christian religion." This is simply an absurdity. The Christian religion has no moral laws. The moral law is of primary and universal obligation. It covers every conceivable act or thought. If the moral law had never been broken there would be no necessity for the Christian religion, but since it has been violated, Christianity is the means devised to bring man back to obedience to it. We cannot refrain from saying, what we believe to be the truth, that if those who call themselves National Reformers had a just conception of the true object of the Christian religion, and of the Spirit which actuated its Founder, they would cease their efforts to tamper with the Constitution of the United States. Christ said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and steadfastly resisted all human efforts to make him king. When two of his disciples wished to call down fire upon some who did not acknowledge his divinity, he rebuked them, saying, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." And when Peter drew his sword in defense of the Master, he was sternly rebuked.

Mr. White is grieved because the SENTINEL attributes to National Reformers the purpose to put in practice persecution for conscience' sake. Let National Reformers answer for themselves on this point. Rev. Jonathan Edwards, one of the vice-presidents of the Association, says: "Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon." And the same man classes deists, Jews, Seventh-day Baptists, and, in fact, all who deny the claims of the National Reform Association, as atheists. And now remembering that opposition to the so-called National Reform movement is counted as infidelity and atheism, we quote the following from another vice-president, Rev. E. B. Graham. He says:-

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

This is the fate to which at least one National Reformer would consign, not only those who deny the existence of God, but also those who, believing in God and Christ and the Bible, are content to rely upon the aid of the Spirit of God alone in their efforts to spread the gospel, and who refuse to invoke civil aid in that work, or to yield their consciences to the will of any human power. Again we quote from the pen of Rev. M. A. Gault, one of the leading lights of the National Reform Association. He says:-

"Whether the Constitution will be set right on the question of the moral supremacy of God's law in Government without a bloody revolution, will depend entirely on the strength and resistance of the forces of antichrist."

That is to say that National Reformers are ready to shed blood if need be in order to enforce their ideas of Christian morality upon the people. If this does not mean persecution for conscience' sake, then such a thing never existed. It may be that we have been mistaken in charging duplicity and Jesuitical casuistry upon National Reformers who claim that they desire no union of Church and State, and

that the success of their movement cannot result in persecution; but if so, then we are forced to attribute to them a degree of ignorance which is inconceivable.

Once more: The *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884, stated its desire to join hands with Roman Catholics in carrying forward the work of National Reform. And in the *Statesman* of August 31, 1881, Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, speaking of this desire to secure the co-operation of Roman Catholics, said:-

"We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike bands 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."

Now when we remember what the Catholic Church has been and has done in the past, and that it is the church's boast that Rome never changes, and that in the encyclical letter published by Pope Leo XIII. only a little over a year ago, every act of every Pope was endorsed, certainly every one who is not willingly blind must see that when National Reformers co-operate with the Catholic Church on its own terms, and when by such co-operation they have secured the power which they desire, persecution will follow as a matter of course. The idea that in matters of religion the minority must submit to the majority is of long standing with Roman Catholics, and is openly avowed by National Reformers. But minorities do not always submit willingly, and if that idea is carried out, force must be used.

But space forbids our making further quotations. We submit to Mr. White that it is strictly an honorable mode of warfare to condemn an opponent out of his own mouth. We have made no statements concerning National Reformers which the facts will not warrant. While we cannot believe that all self-styled National Reformers are actuated by sincere motives, we do believe that many of them are honest at heart and desire only the truth, but are deceived as to the real object and the necessary result of the National Reform Association. In this latter class we gladly place our correspondent. And as our desire is to reclaim those who have fallen into error, as well as to bring the real truth before all, we hold our columns open to any one who is competent and authorized to speak for the National Reform Association, who shall wish to make a statement as to its nature and object. E. J. W.

February 1887

"The Legacy from Our Fathers" *American Sentinel* 2, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

One of the stock arguments of the National Reformers in favor of their movement is that loyalty to the memory of our forefathers demands it. One of the reasons given in the preamble of their constitution is, "that this country was settled by Christian men with Christian ends in view, and that they gave a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established." And "the legacy which we have received from our fathers" is a common method of

commending those "Christian institutions" which they wish to enforce by civil law. We wish to notice a few things in the early history of our country to see how strong this argument really is.

One of the institutions which we received as a legacy from our fathers was slavery. All are acquainted with the fact that in the colonies, both North and South, slavery was practiced. In McMaster's "History of the People of the United States" we read the following:-

"If the infamy of holding slaves belongs to the South, the greater infamy of supplying slaves must be shared by England and the North. While the States were yet colonies, to buy negroes and sell them into slavery had become a scourge of profit to the inhabitants of many New England towns. Scarce a year passed by but numbers of slavers went out from Boston, from Medford, from Salem, from Providence, from Newport, from Bristol, in Rhode Island. The trade was of a threefold kind: Molasses brought from Jamaica was turned to rum; the rum dispatched to Africa bought negroes; the negroes, carried to Jamaica or the Southern ports, were exchanged for molasses, which, in turn, taken back to New England, was quickly made into *rum*."-*Chap. 7, par. 15.*

It cost the nation millions of dollars and thousands of lives to get rid of this legacy, yet Mr. Gault, speaking of the National Reform Association, is willing to have another revolution equally bloody, if necessary to secure their ends.

But slavery will hardly be called a Christian institution, hence it cannot be what they refer to in their constitution. We must remember, however, that it was engaged in by the Christian men who settled this country; and even they could not give it a Christian character. Let us look, then, at some of the acts which they did in the name of and for Christianity. In the "Encyclopedia Britannica," art. "Quakers," we read the following:-

"The earliest appearance of Quakers in America is a remarkable one. In July, 1656, two women Quakers, Mary Fisher and Aria Austin, arrived at Boston. Under the general law against heresy their books were burnt by the hangman, they were searched for signs of witchcraft, they were imprisoned for five weeks and then sent away. During the same year eight others were sent back to England.

"In 1657 and 1658 laws were passed to prevent the introduction of Quakers into Massachusetts, and it was enacted that on the first conviction one ear should be cut off, on the second the remaining ear, and that on the third conviction the tongue should be gored with a hot iron. Fines were laid upon all who entertained Quakers or were present at their meetings. Thereupon the Quakers, who were perhaps not without the obstinacy of which Marcus Antoninus complained in the early Christians, rushed to Massachusetts as if invited, and the result was that the general court of the colony banished them on pain of death, and four Quakers, three men and one woman, were hung for refusing to depart from the jurisdiction, or obstinately returning within it. That the Quakers were irritating cannot be denied; some of them appear to have publicly mocked the institutions and the rulers of the colony, and to have interrupted public worship; and some of their men and women too acted with fanaticism and disorder. But even such conduct furnishes but a poor apology for inflicting stripes and death on men and

women. The particulars of the proceedings of Governor Endicott and the magistrates of New England as given in Besse are startling to read. On the restoration of Charles II. a memorial was presented to him by the Quakers in England, stating the persecutions which their fellow members had undergone in New England. Even the careless Charles was moved to issue an order to the colony which effectually stopped the hanging of Quakers for their religion, though it by no means put an end to the persecution of the body in New England."

In McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia, art. "Baptists," we find the following as a further illustration of how the Puritan Fathers put the stamp of Christianity on this country:-

"Massachusetts issues laws against them in 1644, imprisoned several Baptists in 1651, and banished others in 1669. In 1680 the doors of a Baptist meeting-house were nailed

12

up. In New York laws were issued against them in 1662, in Virginia in 1664. with the beginning of the eighteenth century the persecution greatly abated. They were released from tithes in 1727 in Massachusetts, in 1729 in New Hampshire and Connecticut, but not before 1785 in Virginia. The spread of their principles was greatly hindered by these persecutions."

In Bancroft's "History of the United States," we find an account of the struggle which Roger Williams and the Baptists had for religious liberty. Since the National Re-formers are desirous of having this country sustain the same relation to religion which it did then, we quote quite largely from those chapters. In the following paragraphs the reader will find a very correct picture of the result of National Reform principles:-

"A fugitive from English persecution, he had revolved the nature of intolerance, and had arrived at its only effectual remedy, the sanctity of conscience. In soul matters, he would have no weapons but soul weapons. The civil magistrate should restrain crime, but never control opinion; should punish guilt, but never violate inward freedom. The principle contained within itself an entire reformation of theological jurisprudence; it would blot from the statute-book the felony of non-conformity; would quench the fires that persecution had so long kept burning; would repeal every law compelling attendance on public worship; would abolish tithes and all forced contributions to the maintenance of religion; would give an equal protection to every form of religious faith; and never suffer the force of the Government to be employed against the dissenter's meeting-house, the Jewish synagogue, or the Roman cathedral. In the unwavering assertion of his views, he never changed his position; the sanctity of conscience was the great tenet, which, with all its consequences, he defended, as he first trod the shores of New England; and, in his extreme old age, it was the last pulsation of his heart. The doctrine was a logical consequence of either of the two great distinguishing principles of the Reformation, as well of justification by faith alone as of the equality of all believers; and it was sure to be one day accepted by the whole Protestant world. But it placed the young emigrant in direct opposition to the system of the founders of Massachusetts, who were bent on making the State a united body of believers."

"The Government avoided an explicit rupture with the Church of England; Williams would hold no communion with it on account of its intolerance; 'for,' said he, 'the doctrine of persecution for cause of conscience is most evidently and lamentably contrary to the doctrine of Christ Jesus.' The magistrates insisted on the presence of every man at public worship; Williams reprobated the law; the worst statute in the English code was that which did but enforce attendance upon the parish church. To compel men to unite with those of a different creed, be regarded as an open violation of their natural rights; to drag to public worship the irreligious and the unwilling seemed only like requiring hypocrisy. 'An unbelieving soul is dead in sin,' such was his argument; and to force the indifferent from one worship to another 'was like shifting a dead man into several changes of apparel.' 'No one should be bound to worship, or,' he added, 'to maintain a worship, against his own consent.' 'What!' exclaimed his antagonists, amazed at his tenets; 'is not the laborer worthy of his hire?' 'Yes,' replied he, 'from them that hire him.'

"The Magistrates were selected exclusively from the members of the church; with equal propriety, reasoned Williams, might 'a doctor physick or a pilot' be selected according to his skill in theology and his standing in the church."-*Chap. 9, par. 54, 70, 71.*

"Anabaptism was to the establishment a dangerous rival. When Clarke, the pure and tolerant Baptist of Rhode Island, one of the happy few who have connected their name with the liberty and happiness of a commonwealth, began to preach to a small audience in Lynn, he was seized by the civil officers. Being compelled to attend public worship with the congregation of the town, he expressed his aversion by a harmless indecorum, which would have been without excuse, had his presence been voluntary. He and his companions were tried, and condemned to pay a fine of twenty or thirty pounds; and Holmes, who refused to pay his fine, was whipped unmercifully.

'Since a particular form of worship had become apart of the civil establishment, irreligion was now to be punished as a civil offense. The State was a model of Christ's kingdom on earth; treason against the civil Government was treason against Christ; and reciprocally, as the gospel had the right paramount, blasphemy, or what a jury should call blasphemy, was the highest offense in the catalogue of crimes. To deny any book of the Old or New Testament to be the written and infallible word of God was punishable by fine or by stripes, and in case of obstinacy, by exile or death. Absence from 'the ministry of the word' was punished by a fine.

"By degrees the spirit of the establishment began to subvert the fundamental principles of independency. The liberty of prophesying was refused, except the approbation of four elders, or of a county court, had been obtained. Remonstrance was useless. The union of Church and State was fast corrupting both: it mingled base ambition with the former; it gave a false direction to the legislation of the latter. And in 1658 the general court claimed for itself, for the counsel, and for any two organic churches, the right of silencing any person who was not as yet ordained. The creation of a national, uncompromising church led the Congregationalists of Massachusetts to the indulgence of the passions which

had disgraced their English persecutors; and Laud was justified by the men whom he had wronged."-Chap. 10, par. 78-80.

Many more quotations might be made, but these are sufficient. Let it be remembered that the men who practiced these cruelties were Christian men urged on by Christian ministers. These men were no worse than are the men who to-day occupy similar positions. Their action was simply the natural result of the idea that the State was "a model of Christ's kingdom on earth." And this, let it be remembered, is the position taken by National Reformers. Whoever wishes to know the result of the success of the National Reform Association, has only to read the history of the Salem Witchcraft and of the persecutions of the dissenting Baptists and Quakers. Those are the only "Christian features" which our forefathers gave to the Government. We do not wish to disparage the men who settled this country; they lived up to the light which they had. They had themselves suffered oppression for their religious convictions, and had never known such a thing as religious toleration, consequently it took them some time to accord to others that freedom which they demanded for themselves.

But we are happy to say that these "Christian features" were not permanently stamped upon our Government. By the time that the ship of State was fairly launched, men had learned more of the principles of religious toleration. The Declaration of Independence recognized the fact that all men had equal rights, and the Constitution of the United States declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion prohibiting the free exercise thereof" and that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust, under the United States."

The Constitution comprises all that we have received from our forefathers. We believe it to be the best Constitution ever formed by man, because it carefully guards the rights of all, and leaves the conscience of everyone free. It is this Constitution which makes the United States the best country in the world for the spread of the gospel. And allows perfect freedom for the preaching of the gospel from the Bible alone, we are desirous of having it kept as it is, and we cannot countenance those men who, having far more light than the Puritan Fathers had, would revive in this country the practice of the Dark Ages.

E. J. W.

March 1887

"A Substitute for the Church" *American Sentinel* 2, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* of Dec. 16, 1886, after considering the manner in which the Labor Party in Philadelphia was captured by Socialists said:-

These proceedings, taken in connection with the utterances of Henry George and his supporters in the campaign, the intercession of the Knights of Labor in convention at Richmond for the condemned Anarchists at Chicago, the efforts which have been made to secure for them a new trial, and the stay of proceedings granted by the Supreme Court which reprieves them for five

months, are ominous signs of the impending social struggle. They render more timely and significant too the religious declarations in the platforms of the Prohibition party, and the efforts which are to be made to secure such acknowledgments by all existing parties. The party which will make and adhere to a simple and hearty acknowledgment of Jesus Christ as the actual ruler of nations, and of the supreme authority of his moral laws, will, by virtue of that very fact, become the leading party in the struggle which is even now upon us. There are multitudes of laboring men who will not stand on the Socialist platform and who will be powerfully attracted toward any party which declares for a fearless and uniform application of the law of God to civil affairs."

We agree with the *Statesman* that these are ominous signs of the impending social struggle. We do not think that the danger to which this country is subject from the Socialistic element can be overestimated. But we cannot see how this danger is to be averted by the formation of a political party whose platform shall contain religious declarations. There is no condition of affairs which the Statesman, or any lover of order, may desire to see, which cannot be brought about by the simple influence of the gospel, if it can be brought about at all; that is to say, if the spread of Socialistic ideas is prevented at all, it must be through the gospel, which is directly opposed to Socialism. Just to the extent that the gospel is accepted, the spread of Socialism will be hindered. The *Statesman*

19

admits this when it says, "There are multitudes of laboring men who will not stand on the Socialist platform and who will be powerfully attracted to any party that declares for the fearless and uniform application of the law of God to civil affairs."

The acceptance of the gospel is necessarily an acceptance of the entire Bible, the moral law included, for the apostle Peter, speaking of the word of God, says: "This is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1 Peter 1:25. The sole business of the church is to teach the gospel; therefore it is the church's duty to declare for the "fearless and uniform application of the law of God," not only to civil affairs but to every affair in life. Thus the Lord, speaking to the church through the prophet Isaiah said: "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." Isaiah 58:1. The church was established for the express purpose of "holding forth the word of life" and teaching obedience to the law of God, at the same time that it announces pardon for sins already committed. If it does its duty it teaches men how to regulate their conduct toward one another, by announcing Christ's summary of the second table of the decalogue: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

The church is not only the body that is appointed to teach the application of the law of God to human affairs, but it is the only power to which this duty has been committed. Moreover, it is the best adapted for the carrying on of this work, because it addresses itself to the individual, and not to mankind as a whole. If it were possible to entirely convert men from Socialistic ideas, then the church, dealing as it does with individuals, would present the most feasible plan of work. For if each Socialist were converted, Socialism would be at an end. We do not wish to be understood as claiming that the church should be expected to convert

all men, for the Bible expressly declares that but few will find the way leading to life. But we do say that as far as any progress is made in bringing men to the acceptance of the law of God, it must be made by the church. A political party with a religious platform would simply be trying to do the work which the church is set to do. The *Statesman* says that such a party would draw multitudes of laboring men who will not stand on the Socialist platform. If that be true, why are they not drawn to the church? The answer is simply because they do not care for the law of God, but for their own selfish aims. If therefore they were drawn to such a political party it would be because they could gain political preferment.

We should think that for professed Christians to announce that the work which should be done by the church can be done only by political parties would be a humiliating confession. When the church itself applies to the civil power for aid, it acknowledges that it has lost its own power; the spirit of the gospel has departed from it, and the salt has lost its savor. They may *seem* to get what they desire, namely, the peace of the millennium, but it will be only the shell with a blasted kernel inside. If the church has lost its power to convert men, of what used will a "religious" party be? "If the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?"

E. J. W.

"Ethics of Sunday Legislation" *American Sentinel* 2, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

In quite a number of the States there is at present considerable stir over the passage of Sunday laws. This is directly in the line of National Reform work, and is a danger to American liberty, of which the AMERICAN SENTINEL, as a watchful guardian, must give warning. There are very many people who are opposed to the work of so-called National Reform, who would heartily support a law enforcing Sunday observance, not perceiving that the very argument against National Reform in general is equally valid against this particular phase of that work. We purpose to note a few features of Sunday legislation, and how it will work injustice to a large class of citizens.

There are two grounds upon which Sunday legislation is based: one the civil, and the other the religious; and the two are antagonistic, although both are often held by the same individual. On one side it is claimed that Sunday should be enforced, not as a religious institution, but as a civil holiday, and that Sunday laws are to be regarded as police regulations. Others plead for laws enforcing Sunday rest, on the ground that Sunday is the "Christian Sabbath." But upon whichever ground Sunday legislation is urged, such legislation is entirely inconsistent with perfect civil and religious liberty. If it be urged that man's physical nature requires rest on one day in seven, and that the Government should set apart Sunday as a civil holiday, and restrain people from working thereon, it comes directly in conflict with all usage in respect to holidays, and cannot be consistently sustained by sound reason. There are quite a number of days that are set apart as national holidays, yet on none of them are people forcibly restrained from labor if they choose to work. This very fact shows the

absurdity of the claim that Sunday legislation is not religious legislation, for no advocate of Sunday laws would be content for a moment with a law placing the day on a level with other holidays.

Again, the absurdity of the idea of enforcing Sunday observance because of man's physical need for rest is equally evident. For example: It is just as certain that man's physical nature requires a certain amount of sleep in every twenty-four hours as it is that his physical nature requires rest one day in seven. It is an undeniable truth that thousands of people do not take regular rest, and that they suffer physically because of the lack of a proper amount of sleep. Now if it be granted that a State has a right to enforce Sunday observance because people need the physical rest, then it necessarily follows that the State has a right to enact that everybody shall take a given amount of rest in each twenty-four hours. And on that ground we might expect the Government to compel people to go to bed every night at ten o'clock, and to prescribe the hour when they should arise. It is certain that no one can maintain Sunday legislation from a civil standpoint, and it is equally certain that no one really has this in view.

It must be, then, that it is as the "Christian Sabbath" that the plea is made for enforced Sunday observance. But when it is put upon this ground, we have the State legislating on matters of religion, and thus stepping outside of its sphere. Indeed, Sunday legislation stands for union of Church and State. For if the State can legislate in behalf of one Christian institution, it may with equal propriety legislate in behalf of all of them. If it can enforce the observance of the "Christian Sabbath," it has also a right to enforce Christian baptism. But the right to enforce any religious tenet depends upon the right to decide upon matters of faith, for before the State legislates in behalf of any practice, it must first decide that that practice is correct. Indeed, such decision is implied in the very act of passing the law. Therefore we say, if the State can enforce the observance of the Christian Sabbath, it may also enforce baptism, and may determine what Christian baptism is, whether sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. It may also with equal propriety enforce the sacrament of the Lord's Supper on all within its jurisdiction, and can determine how it shall be celebrated, whether in one kind or in both. And this is union of Church and State, as much as has ever existed in any age or in any nation. So we say that all, no matter what their religious belief, who are opposed to the union of Church and State, must be opposed to the enactment of Sunday laws.

But whether the observance of Sunday be enforced from a civil or from a religious standpoint, it cannot fail to be unjust and oppressive to a large class of law-abiding citizens. We refer to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week. We know that it is commonly urged that Sunday laws do not interfere with the rights of any Sabbatarian, because they leave him perfectly free to carry out his conscientious convictions by resting on the seventh day of the week. But if it is man's religious *duty* to rest on one day in seven, which all advocates of Sunday laws allow, then it is also his religious *privilege* to labor on six days in seven. Now if a man conscientiously believes that the word of God demands that he shall rest upon the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath,

and the State compels him also to rest upon the first day of the week, it is certain that his religious privileges are interfered with.

Again, if rigid Sunday laws are enacted, and a man is punished for laboring on Sunday after having conscientiously kept Saturday, such punishment is nothing less than persecution for conscience' sake. His punishment is really as much for his observance of the seventh day as it is for laboring on the first day. Thus: Necessity compels him to labor six days in the week for the support of his family; and the divine command certainly gives him the privilege of working six days, if it does not really command it. But his conscience imperatively forbids him to labor on Saturday, the seventh day of the week, therefore necessity and religion compel him to labor on the first day of the week. That is to say, his labor on the first day of the week is made necessary by his conscientious observance of the seventh day of the week. So then if he is punished for his first day labor, he is equally punished for his seventh day rest; and so it becomes

22

clear that the enactment of Sunday laws, and the execution of penalties for the violation thereof, is simply persecution for conscience' sake.

We are not now concerned as to whether Sunday is or is not the Christian Sabbath; in either case the argument is the same. Neither if we take, it for granted that Sunday is the rest-day enjoined by divine command, is there, as some claim, any analogy between the punishment by civil authority, of a man who quietly labors on that day, and the punishment of the polygamist, even allowing that the polygamist is conscientious in his practice; for polygamy is the violation of the seventh commandment, which is contained in the second table of the decalogue, defining the relations of men with one another, and is thus a proper subject for civil legislation. But the keeping of the Sabbath is enjoined by the fourth commandment, which is a part of the first table of the decalogue, defining man's duty to God, and is not a proper matter for civil legislation. The polygamist and the adulterer, for a polygamist is an adulterer, sins not alone against God, but against society in general, and some person or persons in particular. Like the thief, he takes that which belongs to some one else, and to which he has no right. But the man who pursues his own lawful occupation on the first day of the week, interferes with no one's rights or privileges. He deprives no conscientious observer of that day, of his Sabbath, even if he observes no day whatever; so long as he does not disturb the rest and worship of anyone else, he is answerable alone to God.

Again, Sunday legislation virtually places a premium upon crime. This may seem a bold and unwarranted statement, but we can easily show its truthfulness. I have before me the bill which it is purposed to have passed by the present California Legislature. It provides that every person that shall sell goods, keep open any store or other place of business, or shall sell or give away to be drunk any spirituous, vinous, malt, or other intoxicating liquors, on the first day of the week, or who shall engage in any riot, fighting, horse-racing, gambling, or other public sport, exercises, or shows, or any person who shall keep open any place where such sports, exercises, or shows, are carried on, shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanor. It will be seen that gambling, rioting, fighting, and the selling of

intoxicating liquor, are placed on a level with the keeping open of stores to sell goods. The sale of goods at proper times is not only legitimate, but it is absolutely necessary. It is wrong only when engaged in upon the day divinely set apart for rest. Now to pass a law forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquors upon Sunday, saying nothing about its sale upon other days, puts that business on a level with legitimate industry, and virtually says that the sale of intoxicating liquors is all right upon any day but Sunday.

As a matter of fact, liquor selling is an unmitigated evil; it does nobody any good, but does untold harm. The only one whom it enriches is the man who sells it. It is a drain upon all classes of citizens. The man who drinks spends his money without receiving an equivalent; his family is robbed of that which rightfully belongs to them; and the man who abstains entirely is taxed in order that the paupers, insane people, and criminals, that are made by the sale of intoxicating liquor may be provided for. And now for the State to enact a law enforcing the observance of the "Christian Sabbath," and declaring that the carrying on of the business of liquor selling is a violation of the "Christian Sabbath," and therefore punishable by a fine, is simply to place the infamous traffic on a level with the dry-goods or grocery business, and to say that it is all right to engage in it on any day but Sunday.

That this is putting a premium upon crime, may be made still more apparent. Suppose the State should enact a law to the effect that anyone who should steal or commit a murder upon the first day of the week, should be deemed guilty of felony and should be punished, everybody would cry out against such a law. They would say that stealing and murder are in themselves criminal, and that the perpetration of those crimes on the first day of the week does not add to the criminality of the act. They would justly claim that such legislation virtually made murder and theft legitimate acts if committed on any other day than Sunday, thus putting a premium upon crime. The case is the same with Sunday laws wherever they exist or are proposed. By specifying gambling, the selling of intoxicating liquor, etc., they virtually place such occupations in the list of legitimate employments when pursued on any other day. And so we say that Sunday legislation is not only contrary to religious liberty, but it is also against the interests of true morality.

Next month we purpose to take up this matter still further and demonstrate these propositions by actual facts.

E. J. W.

May 1887

"National Reform Principles Despotism" *American Sentinel* 2, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

We have received an address which a gentleman of Quincy, Mass., has addressed to the Legislature of that State. The writer strongly objects to making the Sunday laws any less strict, or to making concessions in favor of any, and says:-

"The greatest good to the greatest number of our citizens, demands that the Sunday laws shall remain unchanged. They may be slightly oppressive in some respects, but the Legislature which is capable of pruning them just enough to make them perfect, and stopping at that point, has, in my humble opinion, yet to be elected. Better let well enough alone."

This is the idea that underlies all National Reform would-be legislation,-the idea that laws are simply for the majority, that if the majority are satisfied it matters not if a few are oppressed. Such an idea of law is in harmony with despotism, but not with a republican, or any other just form of government. A despotism is simply the rule of the majority, only the majority of strength is lodged in one man. But the principle is the same, no matter whether the majority of strength be lodged in one man, or whether the numerical majority has the majority of strength. Five hundred men have no more right to unite to oppress one man, than one man has to oppress five hundred men.

It is not true that a just law is ever oppressive to a few. A law that does injustice to one man, is an unjust law. We heartily agree with President Cleveland, who, in a recent interview on the land laws, said:-

"If by any construction of a law, seeming injustice is done to the humblest the farmer in the furthest corner of the land, then that law ought to be changed, and changed at once."

If a law oppresses a single honest man, it has in it the elements of oppression, and so is an unjust and oppressive law. Just laws cannot by any possibility be made to oppress an upright man. This is the principle upon which our laws are framed. It is a legal maxim that it is better to let a guilty man escape than to punish an innocent man. This does not imply that a just law will sanction the escape of a guilty man, but it simply recognizes the fact that men are fallible, and are liable to improperly execute even a just law; and therefore it provides that the failure, if there be any failure, shall lean to the side of mercy.

The fact that National Reformers claim that majorities should have their way, even though it might oppress some citizens, shows that if they should gain control oppression would certainly follow. Let us beware of despotism, whatever form it may assume. E. J. W.

"Personal Liberty" *American Sentinel* 2, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The editor of the *Christian Union* Dr. Lyman Abbott, is writing in his paper a series of "Letters to Workingmen," in which he is discussing the labor problem. In the issue of March 10, he considers the principle of strikes and boycotts, and among other illustrations he gives the following:-

"My friend Michael S. owns a horse and cart. He goes out to work with his horse and cart, and for a day's work receives \$3.50. he is a capital workman, and is always in great demand. . . . His horse and his cart are his own. I have no right to tell him where or how he can use them. If he should choose now to get a Pole to help him load his cart, and I should not like Poles, and should say to him, 'Mr. S. you must not have a Pole to help you; you must have an American or an

Irishman,' I should expect the same answer from him, 'Mind your own business. This is my horse and cart,' he would say, 'and I am one free man, and this Pole is another free man, and if he chooses to help me, and I choose to have him help me, it is none of your business.' And it would clearly be none of my business. And it would not dignify or materially improve my impertinence, if I should go round our village and stir up the people to demand of Mr. S. that he only use his horse and cart so many hours a day, or get only Irishmen or Americans as helpers.

37

I might perhaps succeed in making life so uncomfortable for Mr. S. that he would yield. But if he did, it is palpably clear that he would yield to an impertinence and an injustice.

There is also in our village a steam saw-mill. The men who own it have built it up by hard work, thrift, and economy. They have acquired it just as Michael S. has acquired his horse and cart, by honest industry. It is theirs, honestly theirs. Suppose I should undertake to tell them how many hours they may work their mill, and whether they may employ a Pole in it; this would be no less an impertinence. I have a little garden, and I sometimes work in it with garden tools which I have bought with my own money. It is nobody's business but my own when or how I work, or what I do with my tools. And it nobody's business but their own when or how my friend Michael S. works with his horse and cart, or my friends, the owners of the steam-mill, work with their steam-mill, or whom they get to help them."

This is sound doctrine, and nobody can gainsay it. That every man is of right master of his own actions, so long as he does no injury to his fellow-men, is self-evident. This is in harmony with our famous declaration of human rights: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." And this was but the enunciation of the Golden Rule, the divine law which says: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." That means that in every transaction with a fellow-man you should "put yourself in his place." I love liberty, and do not like to be dictated to arbitrarily; therefore I must allow others the same freedom by not presuming to interfere in their affairs.

If I have hired myself to another man, I have the liberty to leave his employ if I do not like the work or the wages. But here is B. who is satisfied with both the work and the wages. Now if I say to him, "I am dissatisfied, and am going to leave, and therefore you must leave too," all right-minded people can see that it would be insufferable impertinence on my part, which B., if he has the spirit of a man, will resent or ignore. If I bring influences to bear which he cannot resist, and force him to leave, I make him my slave. In so doing I violate the fundamental principles of all morality; for I certainly do to him What I would not like to have him do to me, thus showing that I do not love my neighbor as myself; and "he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

THE RIGHT TO REST

Dr. Abbott says: "I have a little garden, and I sometimes work in it with garden tools which I have bought with my own money. It is nobody's business but my own how or when I work, or what I do with my own tools." Now suppose we make a little broader application of the principles above laid down. Dr. Abbott's neighbor across the street has a garden also, in which he works when occasion demands. Some fine summer morning while Dr. A. is working in his garden, neighbor C comes over, and says: "Dr. Abbott, you must not work in your garden to-day." "Why not?" "Because I am going to take a holiday to-day," says C. "Very well," says the Doctor, "go ahead, and have your holiday; I have no objection; but I don't feel as though I could afford a holiday to-day, for I took one yesterday; therefore I shall continue work." Everybody will say that Dr. A. does just right, and most people will say that if neighbor C. should insist on his laying off for the day, the Doctor would be justified in politely signifying to him that he better mind his own business.

The case would be none the less absurd if Mr. C. should come over to Dr. A.'s garden, and say: "Doctor, I want you to stop work to-day, for I have worked very hard for several days past, and I feel as though it would be an injury to my physical system if I should work to-day. It is a law of nature that man should have regular periods of rest, and I am going to take mine to-day, and so you must rest too." Dr. A. would say: "I rested all day yesterday, and feel perfectly refreshed. My system is in good condition, and does not at present require rest; if you need rest, I would certainly advise you to take it at once; my corn needs attention, and it would be wrong for me to neglect it, when I can attend to it as well as not; but I will not lay a straw in the way of your resting; go right home and rest."

Will not everybody say that C.'s request is very unreasonable, and that if he should insist upon it, and should force Dr. A. to leave his quiet work in his garden, he would be acting most unjustly? None could say otherwise; for Dr. A.'s working does not in the least interfere with Mr. C.'s resting.

The reader sees by this time that we are not discussing the labor problem, in the generally accepted sense of that term; and yet the principles which apply in the matter of strikes and boycotts, apply equally to the matter of Sunday rest or labor. If I choose to rest on Sunday I have that privilege, but I have no right to say that somebody else must rest just because I do. If my neighbors choose to work in their shops or gardens on Sunday, they do not hinder me from resting. In like manner if I choose to rest on Saturday, I have no right to request or demand that others shall likewise rest, unless they feel free to do so.

We know that the plea is constantly being made that observers of Sunday must be protected in their right to rest. We readily agree. No man on earth, nor any company of men, has the right to say that another man shall work on Sunday. To do so would be a gross interference with his rights. But, by the same rule, no man, or set of men, has the right to say that another man shall not work on Sunday. A man may say, "You shall not work *for me* on Sunday;" a corporation may say, "You shall not work *for us* on Sunday;" and they have the right to say so to any man any day in the week. But when they undertake to say, "You shall not work for yourself, or for some other man if he wishes to hire you," they are going beyond their rights.

THE RIGHT OF CONSCIENCE

But the case is put as a matter of conscience. Thus, A. says, "My conscience requires me to rest on Sunday, and it offends and grieves me sorely to see others working on that day. To be sure, it doesn't hinder me from resting, but it disturbs my peace of mind." Well, suppose we interview your neighbor who thus disturbs your peace of mind. B. says, "My conscience and my understanding of the Bible demand that I should rest on Saturday, and consequently labor on Sunday. It grieves me sorely to see neighbor A. working as I am going to church, and my worship is often disturbed by the rattling of his heavy wagon, or the sound of his hammer." Now is there any principle which can be invoked to uphold the State in compelling B. to rest on Sunday, so that A.'s feelings shall not be ruffled, while it allows A. to go his way on Saturday, regardless of the feelings of B.? We have never heard of any, except that ninety-nine one-hundredths of the people want to rest on Sunday, while only about one one-hundredth of the people care to rest on Saturday. But this is the principle that the wishes of the majority must be gratified regardless of the wishes, or even the rights, of the minority. It is the principle of tyrants, the principle that might makes right. It is the principle which protects the lion from the lamb; which grants concessions to the rich, who can take care of themselves, at the expense of the poor, who have not power to protest. It is the principle which directly contravenes the divine command: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." "This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish."

But it is urged that Sunday is the day divinely appointed for rest, and that, therefore, the State in enforcing its observance, is compelling men simply to do what is right, and what they ought to do voluntarily. Well, suppose that men really ought to keep Sunday; here are some honest, conscientious men who cannot see it so; they read their Bibles carefully, and can see no command for Sunday observance, but think that they are plainly commanded to observe the seventh day. They cannot rest on Sunday without working on Saturday, and their conscience will not allow them to do that. If now the State steps in and says that they must, because it is right, the State becomes conscience for them, and Paul's declaration, "To his own Master he standeth or falleth," is ignored. And if the man submits in this, he becomes the worst kind of a slave. One may by force of circumstances yield his bodily strength to another, and still be a free man, but he who submits his conscience to another, parts with his manhood. We think no one who has a mind capable of deciding a case upon its merits, can deny the simple principles which are here laid down. They are in harmony with the law of God and our own charter of liberty; and therefore they who seek to compel even a single individual to violate his conscience, proclaim themselves the enemies both of God and of man. E. J. W.

July 1887

"A Little Comparison" *American Sentinel* 2, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* of February 24 says:-

"The constant struggle for place and self and power in American politics, closely resembles the struggles for the throne in the last days of the Roman Empire, and every thoughtful student of history must be struck by the correspondence."

Very true; and the thoughtful student of history will be struck by another correspondence which the *Statesman* forgot to mention. In the last days of the Roman Empire many professed Christians, whose zeal outran their piety, thought that politics would be vastly improved if only the church were placed under State patronage, and were allowed a controlling voice in public affairs. Accordingly Constantine did for the church just what the National Reform Association is trying to accomplish in these days. What he did, and its consequences, is thus told by Eugene Lawrence:-

"In the last great persecution under Diocletian the bishops of Rome probably fled once more to the catacombs. Their churches were torn down, their property confiscated, their sacred writings destroyed, and a vigorous effort was made to extirpate the powerful sect. But the effort was vain. Constantine soon afterward became emperor, and the bishop of Rome emerged from the catacombs to become one of the ruling powers of the world. This sudden change was followed by an almost total loss of the simplicity and purity of the days of persecution. Magnificent churches were erected by the emperor in Rome, adorned with images and pictures; where the bishop sat on a lofty throne, encircled by inferior priests, and performing rites borrowed from the splendid ceremonial of the pagan temple. The bishop of Rome became a prince of the empire, and lived in a style of luxury and pomp that awakened the envy or the just indignation of the heathen writer Marcellinus. The church was now enriched by the gifts and bequests of the pious and the timid; the bishop drew great revenues from his farms in the Campagna, and his rich plantations in Sicily; he rode through the streets of Rome in a stately chariot, and clothed in gorgeous attire; his table was supplied with a profusion more than imperial; the proudest women of Rome loaded him with lavish donations, and followed him with their flatteries and attentions; and his haughty bearing and profuse luxury were remarked upon by both pagans and Christians as strangely inconsistent with the humility and simplicity enjoined by the religion which he professed.

"The bishopric of Rome now became a splendid prize, for which the ambitious and unprincipled contended by force or fraud. The bishop was elected by the clergy and populace of the city, and this was the only elective office at Rome. Long deprived of all the rights of freemen, and obliged to accept the senators and consuls nominated by the emperors, the Romans seemed once more to have gained a new liberty in their privilege of choosing their bishop. They exercised their right with a violence and a factious spirit that showed them to be unworthy of possessing it. On the election day the streets of Rome were often filled with bloodshed and riot. The rival factions assailed each other with blows and

weapons. Churches were garrisoned, stormed, sacked, and burned; and the opposing candidates, at the head of their

53

respective parties, more than once asserted their spiritual claims by force of arms."

Much more might be given to the same effect. The struggle for place and power is not yet so openly shameless as it was in the days of Rome's decline; but once let the church, as a church, enter into politics, and the climax will be reached. The lesson which the thoughtful student of history will draw from this, is that men cannot be converted by the forms of religion, and that if the State is controlled by unprincipled men, a union of Church and State will simply result in the church's being controlled by the same wicked men. The unregenerated human nature that is in any man will make itself manifest whether he is in the church or out of it.

E. J. W.

August 1887

"Convicted on Their Own Testimony" *American Sentinel* 2, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

A gentleman in Ohio, having received a copy of the SENTINEL, sent it to his pastor, requesting him to give his opinion of its sentiments. Accordingly the pastor writes to us, giving his objections to the teaching of the SENTINEL. As his objections and arguments have been answered time and again in these columns, it is not necessary to formally answer them here; but we will quote one paragraph from his letter. He says:-

"I should say at the outset that we are both members of the National Reform Association, in opposition to which your paper seems to be published; and as for myself, I preach National Reform doctrine on all proper occasions. Moreover, we are both lineal descendants of men who, in the days of the tyrannical Stewarts, [*sic.*] contended for 'Christ's Crown and Covenant;' and for that civil and religious liberty which makes it possible for you to publish the SENTINEL to-day. This being the case, it cannot be supposed that we are in favor of a 'union of Church and State,' which you so much fear, for this is the very thing which our fathers contended against even to the death."

The main point in this paragraph is the admission that the National Reform movement is identical with that of the Covenanters. This being the case, and it is the simple truth, it is easy to ascertain whether or not National Reform aims at union of Church and State, and how much religious liberty it stands for. We wish first, however, to call attention to the statement that the Covenanters contended for that civil and religious liberty which makes it possible for us to publish the SENTINEL to-day. Well, granting for the moment that that is true, what do the National Reformers want more? Since their movement is identical with that of the Covenanters, and we now have the liberty for which the Covenanters contended, what reason is there for the existence of the National Reform Association? Or do

they want something else? Are they like the physician who, when he found that his patient slept well, and had a good appetite and good digestion, said, "Well, we shall soon change all that." Let them answer. But it is not necessary for them to answer. Their boast that they are descendants, lineal or otherwise, of the Covenanters is sufficient answer. We are well assured that if National Reform principles were in force to-day, it would not be possible for us to publish another SENTINEL. Now for the proof.

The Encyclopedia Britannica gives the following brief history of the Covenanters:-

"Covenanters, in Scottish history, the name applied to a party embracing the great majority of the people, who during the seventeenth century bound themselves to establish and maintain the Presbyterian doctrine and polity, as the sole religion of the country, to the exclusion of Prelacy and Popery. . . . There were several successive covenants, similar in spirit and expression, the most important being the National Covenant of 1638 and the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643. These were both based upon earlier documents. . . . The Solemn League and Covenant was established in the year 1643, and formed a bond between Scotland, England, and Ireland for the united preservation of the Reformed religion in the church of Scotland, the reformation of religion in England and Ireland, according to the word of God and the example of the best Reformed churches, and the extirpation of Popery and Prelacy. It was sworn [to] and subscribed by many in both nations, approved by the Parliament and Assembly at Westminster, and ratified by the General Assembly of Scotland in 1645. King Charles I. disapproved of it when he surrendered himself to the Scottish army in 1646; but in 1650 Charles II. by a solemn oath declared his approbation both of this and of the National Covenant; and in August the same year he made a further declaration at Dunfermline to the same purpose, which was renewed on the occasion of his coronation at Scone in 1651. In the same year also *the Covenant was ratified by Parliament, and subscription to it required from every member*, -it being declared that without such subscription the constitution of the Parliament was null and void."-*Art. Covenanters.*

Lest any should think that this is prejudiced testimony, we quote what W. G. Blakie says in the Schaff-Herzog Cyclopedia. This is Presbyterian testimony. After speaking of the "Solemn League and Covenant," Blakie says:-

"This Covenant, besides binding the subscribers to maintain the Reformed church, in its integrity, according to the word of God, pledged them 'to endeavor the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy (*i.e.*, church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy), superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and power of godliness, lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues; and that the Lord may be one, and his name one in the three kingdoms.'"

Here we have Church and State union in the most narrow sense, the union of a denomination with the State. But this will appear still more plainly when we read the following exact copy of the "Covenant" above referred

"ASSEMBLY AT EDINBURGH, AUGUST 30, 1639, SESSION 23."

"Act ordaining, by Ecclesiastical Authority, the Subscription of the Confession of faith and Covenant with the Assembly's Declaration.

"The General Assembly considering the great happiness which may flow from a full and perfect union of this kirk and kingdom, by joining of all in one and the same covenant with God, with the King's Majesty, and amongst ourselves; having, by our great oath, declared the uprightness and loyalty of our intentions in all our proceedings; and having withal supplicated his Majesty's high Commissioner, and the Lords of his Majesty's honorable privy council, to enjoin, by act of council, all the lieges in time coming to subscribe the Confession of Faith and Covenant; which, as a testimony of our fidelity to God, and loyalty to our king, we have subscribed: And seeing his Majesty's high Commissioner, and the Lords of his Majesty's honorable privy council, have granted the desire of our supplication, ordaining, by civil authority, all his Majesty's lieges, in time coming, to subscribe the foresaid Covenant: that our union may be the more full and perfect, we, by our act and constitution ecclesiastical, do approve the foresaid Covenant in all the heads and clauses thereof; and ordain of new, under all ecclesiastical censure. That all the masters of universities, colleges, and schools, all scholars at the passing of their degrees, all persons suspected of Papistry, or any other error; and finally, all the members of this kirk and kingdom, subscribe the same, with these words prefixed to their subscription. 'The Article of this Covenant, which was at the first subscription referred to the determination of the General Assembly, being determined; and thereby the five articles of Perth, the government of the kirk by bishops, the civil places and power of kirkmen, upon the reasons and grounds contained in the acts of the General Assembly, declared to be unlawful within this kirk; We subscribe according to the determination foresaid.' And ordain the Covenant, with this declaration, to be insert in the registers of the Assemblies of this kirk, general, provincial, and *presbyterial, ad perpetuam rei memoriam*. And in all humility supplicate his Majesty's high Commissioner, and the honorable Estates of Parliament, by their authority, to ratify and *enjoin the same, under all civil pains*; which will tend to the glory of God, preservation of religion, the King's Majesty's honor, and perfect peace of this kirk and kingdom."

Notice that this act ordained "a *full and perfect union*" of the church and kingdom, and the suppression of error "under all civil pains." We cannot but smile when our friend tells how the Covenanters contended for liberty of conscience. They contended for liberty for themselves, that is true; but having obtained it, they were not content therewith, but must needs *force their liberty* upon everybody else! They reasoned, no doubt, that what suited them was good for everybody else, and if other people did not chance to think so, why then they ought, for the good of their own souls, to be *compelled* to accept the Covenanters' liberty of conscience.

To show how completely the church ruled the State, we quote again from the Encyclopedia Britannica. After having described the manner by which the Act of 1639 was secured, the writer says:-

"The church was now secure. She had gained the day, because on this occasion the zeal of the ministers and the interests of the nobles had been both enlisted in her service. The victory had been won in her name, and the influence of her ministers was vastly increased. For the spiritual tyranny which they introduced, the reader should refer to Buckle's famous chapter; or, if he think those statements to be partial or exaggerated, to original records, such as those of the presbyteries of St. Andrews and Cupar. The arrogance of the ministers' pretensions, and the readiness with which these pretensions were granted, the appalling conceptions of the Deity which were inculcated, and the absence of all contrary expressions of opinion, the intrusion on the domain of the magistrate, the vexatious interference in every detail of family and commercial life, and the patience with which it was borne, are to an English reader alike amazing. 'We acknowledge,' said they, 'that according to the latitude of the word of God (which is our theme) we are allowed to treat in an ecclesiastical way of greatest and smallest, from the king's throne that should be established in righteousness, to the merchant's balance that should be used in faithfulness.' The liberality of the interpretation given to this can only be judged of after minute reading."- *Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Presbyterianism.*

It will not be denied that Buckle was not partial toward religion; yet since his statements are supported by the records, and he gives the authority for them all, no one can deny that he has written the truth. Accordingly we quote one paragraph from the "famous chapter" to which the Britannica refers.

It will show the effect of the "full and perfect union" of that "kirk and kingdom:"-

"According to the Presbyterian polity, which reached its height in the seventeenth century, the clergyman of the parish selected a certain number of laymen on whom he could depend, and who, under the name of elders, were his counselors, or rather the ministers of his authority. They, when assembled together, formed what was called the Kirk-session, and this little court, which enforced the decisions uttered in the pulpit, was so supported by the superstitious reverence of the people, that it was far more powerful than any civil tribunal. By its aid the minister became supreme. For, whoever presumed to disobey him was excommunicated, was deprived of his property, and was believed to have incurred the penalty of eternal perdition. Against such weapons, in such a state of society, resistance was impossible. The clergy interfered with every man's private concerns, ordered how he should govern his family, and often took upon themselves the personal control of his household. Their minions, the elders, were everywhere; for each parish was divided into several quarters, and to each quarter one of these officials was allotted, in order that he might take special notice of what was done in his own district. Besides this, spies were previously appointed, so that nothing could escape their supervision. Not only the streets, but even private houses were searched, and ran-sacked, to see if anyone was absent from church while the minister was preaching. To him all must listen, and him all must obey. Without the consent of his tribunal, no person

might engage himself either as a domestic servant, or as a field laborer. If anyone incurred the displeasure of the clergy, they did not scruple to summon his servants and force them to state whatever they knew respecting him, and whatever they had seen done in his house. To speak disrespectfully of a preacher was a grievous offense; to differ from him was a heresy; even to pass him in the streets without saluting him, was punished as a crime. His very name was regarded as sacred, and not to be taken in vain. And, that, it might be properly protected, and held in due honor, an Assembly of the church, in 1642, forbade it to be used in any public paper, unless the consent of the holy man had been previously obtained."-*History of Civilization in England, Vol. 2, chap. 5.*

We who have never experienced of ecclesiastical supremacy, can scarcely believe that such a state of things could ever exist. Yet all know that under Papal supremacy the Inquisition carried on the most barbarous system of espionage, and why should we wonder that it could be done under Presbyterian supremacy. A Catholic is no worse by nature than a man of belief. The Catholics did not persecute because they were by nature worse than others, neither was it because their religious tenets were erroneous, but because by their polity they were bound to enforce their religious tenets, right or wrong, upon everybody. If the Catholics were not bound by their superiors to carry their religion into politics, they would be just as good citizens as men of any other denomination. And when men of any or all denominations try to enforce their opinions, no matter how true those opinions may be, upon others, nothing but persecution can come. So the Covenanters contended against Catholic Popery, but established a Protestant Popery that was equally bad.

We do not quote these things for the purpose of bringing Scotch Presbyterianism into disrepute, nor for the purpose of holding Covenanters up to scorn. We simply wish to show the inevitable result of a union, no matter what its nature, between religious bodies and the State. We know that the National Reformers say that they do not want a union of Church and State, but a union of religion and the State; but, as we have many times shown, this is a distinction without any difference. That was all the Covenanters wanted. It is sufficient at this time to remind the reader that there can be no religion where there are no people to profess religion. Religion cannot therefore be exhibited abstractly, but only in connection with some religious body. And so, when you have a union of religion and the State, you necessarily have a union of some religious body or bodies and the State.

The last quotation we made showed the power which the ministers arrogated to themselves. The way in which this came about was very natural. They had been foremost in the fight against Catholic oppression, and thus were looked up to with great reverence as in a sense the saviours of the country. Then when freedom from Catholic rule was gained, they were loth to lay down the power which they had acquired, and which the people readily acknowledged. All history and experience show that when any man once gets power in his hands, he imagines that the people can never be so well off with that power in any other hands. So the Protestant clergy, believing that the religion which they professed

was "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," and having the power in their hands, enforced their religion, even to the smallest minutia, upon the people.

Now let it be remembered that the National Reform Association has set for its model the work of the Covenanters; that the leading National Reformers boast of their descent from the Covenanters; and that the liberty which was had under the "Covenant," is the liberty which they wish to establish in this country, and then decide whether such "liberty" is better than that which we now enjoy. That the National Reformers do expect to have a Protestant hierarchy, who shall rule with as much despotism as did the Covenanter clergy, or the priests of Rome, is evident from the following utterance of Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, one of the leading National Reformers:-

"If our nation will accept God as the source of all authority, Christ Jesus as the nation's king, and his law as of supreme authority over them, its creed is orthodox. The theological questions referred to do not belong to the nation as a civil organism, nor to our movement, which is a civil and not an ecclesiastical one; *the churches must settle these questions* among themselves and with each other, and at least *we will not allow the civil Government* to decide between them, and to ordain church doctrines, ordinances, and laws."-*Christian Statesman, Feb. 21, 1884.*

"We will not allow," etc. Nothing shall be enacted which we ministers do not approve. This is the language of ecclesiastical despotism. Plenty more might be given to the same effect, but this is sufficient to show that National Reform success means not only a union of Church and State, but a union with the State subordinate to the Church, and bound to carry out the commands of the clergy. That means "liberty of conscience"-to those who are in the ascendancy-but galling oppression to all dissenters. We know of no higher ground upon which we could base a request to the people of this country to support the AMERICAN SENTINEL, than that it is firmly set for the defense of the people against such "liberty" as the National Reform Association would give us. E. J. W.

September 1887

"A 'Virtual Theocracy' Promised" *American Sentinel* 2, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

It has been the aim of the SENTINEL, not only to set forth the principles that underlie the National Reform movement, and the loss of freedom that would follow its success, but also to arouse the people of this country to a sense of the fact that that movement has already acquired alarmingly large proportions. To this end we have repeatedly stated that the movement is by no means confined to the body of men called the National Reform Association. The Prohibition party and the Women's Christian Temperance Union are fully committed to the movement, and these are endeavoring, with good prospects of success, to beguile the Knights of Labor into the movement. It is through the combined action of these various societies, as societies, and of the Protestant and Catholic

Churches, as representing the Christianity of *America* (not of *Christ*, be it understood), that National Reform ideas will be made realities in this country. That National Reform ideas will prevail when these classes unite their forces, is too evident to call for proof.

The Women's Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association have been wedded, so that the aims of one party may be said to be the aims of the other. What the ultimate aim of both is, is incidentally revealed in the following, which is part of the last paragraph of an article by Miss Willard, in the *Chicago Advance* of June 30:-

"We of this matchless epoch are preparing material for future orators, who, as they descant upon 'the wonder that shall be,' will point to these days of the saloon, the prize-fight, the trampled Sabbath, the grinding monopoly, the disfranchised womanhood, as a period of semi-barbarism from which they thank God for deliverance into the New Republic with its virtual theocracy and universal brotherhood in Christ."

Miss Willard is *the* spokesman of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, so that the above may safely be taken as setting forth the aim of that association. Her statement is identical with that of the National Reformers themselves, who talk of the republic with Christ as its king. She confidently expects "a virtual theocracy" when these various "reform" associations and parties become consolidated, which she predicts will be in '92 or '96. Now "a virtual theocracy" is nothing more nor less than a union of Church and State, with some other name, and with the church element the controlling power in the union. National Reform evasions cannot conceal this.

67

Such a state of things cannot fail to be followed by disastrous consequences. We care not by whom it is brought about, the result will be the same. We are not impugning the motives of the gifted ladies who compose the working force of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, nor would we be understood as being one whit behind anybody in our admiration of their efforts in behalf of true temperance. What we deprecate is the fact that they have thought to enlarge their sphere of usefulness to the extent of bringing about the millennium by National Reform methods. We have no notion of detailing in this place the evils that must result from any union of Church and State; what we want to emphasize is the fact that those evils will be none the less because the proposed union will in large measure be the work of so good people as the ladies of the W. C. T. U. If a child in its innocent play draws the live coals from the grate and scatters them upon the carpet, the effect will be just the same as though the coals were scattered by a malicious incendiary. So these good people may think that "a virtual theocracy" will be the best thing for this country, but that will not lessen the evil. We cherish the hope that some of them, at least, may see whither they are drifting, and may recover themselves. But, in view of the position of the leader of the powerful organization known as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, will anyone who knows the evils of Church and State union, dare say that we are sounding an unnecessary alarm?

E. J. W.

"Church and State" *American Sentinel* 2, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

EDITORS SENTINEL: In your last number I saw an article headed "Church and State," copied from the San Francisco *Chronicle*. I thought it erroneous as well as incorrect in its statements, and therefore wrote a short article to the *Chronicle* in reply. It was thrown into Mr. DeYoung's waste-basket. I am thankful to be assured by you that a brief and similar writing will not share the same fate by the editors of the SENTINEL. My statements must be brief, so I hope they will be accurate.

1. I have been familiar with the National Reform movement from its first inception, and I think its object is not the union of Church and State either in form or in fact. No member of the association says it is; not one man in the association desires it; and the movement has no tendency towards it.

2. If the movement and the National Reform Association are approved and indorsed by the Women's Christian Temperance Union as well as by leading ministers of most of "the evangelical denominations," as the "prominent clergyman," the informant of the *Chronicle* reporter, says, the movement is not presumably very dangerous. Miss Willard is not a very dangerous woman except in the estimation of the saloonists and such like. Neither she nor the ministers of the evangelical de-nominations desire a union of Church and State; and if the movement tends to it, surely they have sense enough to see it. The presumption, therefore, is that the SENTINEL'S fears are groundless.

3. It is true that the National Reformers are opposed to the secular theory of Government, but it is not true that their avowed intention is to afford a basis of organic law "for the general enforcement of Sunday observance." The Reformers do not differ from the great mass of Protestant Christians all the world over. They all hold that in Christian lands the civil law should protect the people in their right to rest on the Christian Sabbath and to worship God without molestation by others. Neither National Reformers nor others dream of compelling men to observe the Sabbath religiously. They all believe, however, that the State should be the conservator of morals; and they assume that the law of the fourth commandment is a moral law. And who that believes in Christianity at all does not know that if the Christian Sabbath should be abolished there would soon be neither religion nor Christian morality. Moral anarchy and chaos would result. The friends of the Sabbath, therefore, are the best friends of the nation and of the people.

4. The "prominent clergyman" who answered the *Chronicle* reporter's question, "Which one of the religious denominations takes the lead in this movement" shows that he knows little about it. He should post himself before he presumes to post others through the secular press. Rev. Dr. Gibson of San Francisco, is not to be one of the vice-presidents. I presume he never was at a National Reform meeting, and never spoke in public or preached in favor of it. He does not even take the *Christian Statesman*, the organ of the association. And the statement that it is Dr. Gibson's "intention, on his return from Europe, to

organize a state branch in California," etc., will, no doubt, be news to himself. Indeed, I do not know that there is a minister in San Francisco, and almost none in Oakland, who has ever written or spoken a word in favor of the special object of the National Reform Association. So that manifestly the *Chronicle's* "prominent clergyman" is an alarmist who himself needs to be instructed. And I am sorry that the SENTINEL borrows trouble from the *Chronicle*.

5. That a wine and liquor paper, such as the San Francisco *Chronicle*, should like to make capital against the Prohibition party by arraying them with the National Reform movement, might be expected. But that the SENTINEL should endorse the *Chronicle* in such an effort seems strange to one who knows that the editors of the SENTINEL are the fast friends of temperance, and presumably of prohibition also.

6. General Grant never opposed National Reform nor the Amendment advocated. In his Des Moines speech he spoke what may have displeased Roman Catholics, who influence in the State he feared; but it is unfair to array him and Sumner and Andrews as opposed to the Reform so feared by the SENTINEL. On the contrary, Senator Charles Sumner, in the early years of the movement gave public testimony in favor of it. That they all opposed a union of Church and State is presumed, but it does not follow that they opposed National Reform. So far as they knew the value of Christianity, so far they knew that "righteousness exalts a nation."

A REFORMER.

The above communication is from one for whom we entertain sincere respect, and for this reason, as well as because the SENTINEL can afford to be more than fair, we give it a place in our columns. We have no desire except for truth; and if anything that anyone could write would overthrow any of the positions which the SENTINEL has taken, we would publish it as willingly as we did those positions. But although we have unbounded confidence in our correspondent's honesty, we think he is not so well informed on the question of National Reform as we are, and we shall therefore review his statements *seriatim*.

1. Positive argument would be much more conclusive than our friend's modest disclaimer. He thinks that the object of National Reform is not the union of Church and State; we *know* that its object is the union of Church and State, to the fullest extent that such a union ever existed. We say we know this, and so we do, if we may believe the statements of those who seem to be at the head of the movement. It is true that no member of the association says that a union of Church and State is the object of the movement; on the contrary, they emphatically declare that it is not; but at the same time they most urgently demand a condition of things which would be nothing else. It is possible that they do not know what would constitute a union of Church and State, and imagine that if they give some other name to that which

69

they are working for, no evil results will follow. But we care not for names; the mere name of Church and State union can do no harm, but the thing itself can, by whatever name it is called.

To show that we have reason for saying that we *know* that the National Reform movement does design a practical union of Church and State, we re-quote the following specimen statements made by prominent National Reformers, and published in the official organs of that association:-

In the *Christian Statesman*, in March, 1884, Rev. J. W. Foster said, among other things:-

"According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for and to serve the purpose of the church;" and again he affirms that in the ideal National Reform State, "The expenses of the church in carrying on her public, aggressive work, it meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury." This means the taxation of the people to support the church as a branch of the government. How a more complete union of Church and State could be made, we cannot imagine. And right in harmony with Mr. Foster's statements, but far more explicit, is the following from the *Christian Nation*, July 14, 1886:-

"It is the duty of civil rulers, in subordination to Christ, to recognize the church, its ordinances, and its laws. It is not merely that the existence of such an organization is owned and tolerated, but a statutory arrangement, confessing the divine origin of the church, and the divine obligation resting on the nation to accept its doctrine and order, and engaging to regulate their administration in conformity with its constitution and object."

In the same article we read:-

"Civil rulers owe it to their supreme Lord and to society to encourage and to stimulate the church in its work of faith and labor of love, and, when it may be necessary, to give pecuniary aid to its ministers, that the gospel may be preached in every part of their dominions, and to all classes without respect of persons."

And then the writer proceeds to say that there would be no injustice, but that it would be perfectly right, "to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of the community are conscientiously opposed." That is, it is right according to the National Reform idea of right, which idea seems to be that everything that the majority may do is right, if the majority chance to be National Reformers, and that the minority have no rights of any kind.

These statements were not made in the heat of debate, but are part of a sermon written by Wm. Sommerville, of Nova Scotia, and after his death edited from the original manuscript by Rev. R. M. Sommerville, of New York, and then published in one of the organs of the National Reform Association. So we must take them as the sentiments of that association.

We might multiply quotations to the same effect, from leading National Reformers, but it is not necessary in this connection. If National Reformers do not believe in nor desire a union of Church and State, and if they wish to set themselves right in this matter, they may publish in the columns of the SENTINEL a repudiation of these and other quotations which we have made from their leading men. So long as such sentiments are expressed, however, it is useless for them to say that they do not want a union of Church and State.

2. It does not necessarily follow that because there are good and able men in the National Reform Association, and because the movement is indorsed by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, it cannot be dangerous. Our correspondent would evidently have us believe that a good or an honest man, or even a wise man, cannot be mistaken or blinded by feeling or prejudice. We are perfectly willing to admit that very many (we cannot include all) National Reformers are sincere in their motives, and desire only good for the people of this country; but that by no means proves that they have chosen the true way to accomplish the good that they desire. Whether or not Miss Willard is a dangerous woman, depends upon how she uses her vast influence. If she uses it to help the majority to put a yoke upon the consciences of the minority, then she is dangerous, no matter how upright her intentions may be. A little child is not a very dangerous creature, nevertheless a match which it may ignite in its innocent play, may cause as great a conflagration as a match in the hands of a hardened incendiary. Honesty of purpose may secure to a person immunity from punishment for an imprudent act, but it cannot ward off the evil consequences of such an act.

3. When our friend says, "It is true that the National Reformers are opposed to the secular theory of government," he virtually admits that they do desire a union of Church and State. The opposite of the secular theory of government is the ecclesiastical theory, which National Reformers favor. So then his disclaimer amounts to this: National Reformers do not desire a union of Church and State; they simply want an ecclesiastical government.

It is mere nonsense to say or to imply that what the National Reformers want is that "the civil law should protect the people in their right to rest on the 'Christian Sabbath,' and to worship God without molestation of others," for the civil law does that already. There is no law in the United States that would compel a man to work on Sunday, or that would for a moment uphold any man or any set of men in attempting to force anyone to do so. More than this, the laws do protect all religious bodies in their right to worship God without molestation by others. If any religious congregation in any city in the United States should be molested in their worship, whether on Sunday or any other day of the week, the intruder would be landed in jail as soon as a policeman could be summoned, and he would be very fortunate if he did not receive the severest penalty. Our laws do at the present time protect *all* people in their worship; but they do not compel those who have no religious convictions to conform to the practice of those who do, and they will not do so until National Reform principles shall prevail.

Again our friend says: "They all believe that the State should be the conservator of morals." "They" may believe it, but we do not. The person who thinks that the State can act as the conservator of morals has either a supremely exalted idea of the power of the State, or an extremely low standard of morality, or else he has not really given the subject any careful thought. It will not be questioned but that the ten commandments contain the sum of all moral duties. Then if the State is the conservator of morals, it must see that every one of the ten commandments is obeyed by its citizens. As a matter of fact, however, the

State can do nothing of the kind, no matter how virtuous its law-makers are, nor how just its judges. Let us consider an instance or two.

The tenth commandment says, "Thou shalt not covet." Will any National Reformer claim that it is the duty of the State to keep a man from being covetous? or that it is within the province of the State to punish a man for covetousness? The thing is an impossibility. The State has no power, in the first place, even to determine whether or not a man is covetous. But covetousness is immoral; therefore in this respect the State cannot be a conservator of morals.

Again, the Bible tells us that "covetousness is idolatry." Now while the State has the power, although not the right, to restrain men from falling down before images, it cannot prevent their being at heart the grossest kind of idolaters. And who shall say that in the eyes of the only Judge of morals, the ignorant image worshiper is more immoral than the scheming, covetous Pharisee?

Take for instance those commandments in regard to which the State has a certain duty. The sixth commandment says, "Thou shalt not kill." It is the duty of the State to prevent murder as far as possible, by executing severe penalties upon those who take human life. But we are told in the Scriptures that he who gives way to unreasoning anger, or who secretly cherishes hatred and envy in his heart, is a murderer. With this, the State can do nothing. Is the man who takes the life of another in the heat of passion, and possibly after great provocation, any more immoral than the one who for days and perhaps years cherishes murder in his heart, perhaps longing for a chance to commit it, and only deterred by lack of opportunity? Everybody will answer in the negative. Yet the State executes the first and pays no attention to the second. Why? Because the first has interfered with the rights of society, while the second, although probably more depraved, has injured no one but himself. The first has committed an uncivil act, which is also immoral, and comes in collision with the civil law, which punishes him, not for his immorality, and comes in collision with the civil law, which punishes him, not for his immorality, but for his uncivility; while the second, although basely immoral, and violated

70

no civil law, and is therefore not answerable to the State.

The seventh commandment says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." It is within the province of the State to punish the man who openly commits adultery with his neighbor's wife; yet that man may not be half so corrupt as another one whose every thought is impure, and whose soul is rotten with meditated vice which he has not the power or the courage to openly practice, yet upon whom the State can lay no hand, because he has invaded no household. Then let no one say that the State is or ever can be the conservator of morals. All it can do, and all it is appointed to do, is to punish those whose unrestrained vices interfere with the rights of society.

The very expressions "civil laws" and "civil government" define the extent of the State's jurisdiction. As to the morals of the people, it is impossible for it to take cognizance of them, even if the right to do so were given it. The State may overstep her prerogatives, and enforce the customs and ceremonies of religion, but in so doing it will be making hypocrites, and will seriously interfere with the

work of the gospel, by making men believe themselves to be moral, and in no need of conversion, although they may be, in reality, as corrupt as the inhabitants of Sodom.

4. As to Dr. Gibson, it is a matter of very small moment whether he is personally connected with the National Reform Association or not. If the *Chronicle* reporter was misinformed, that ends that matter, but does not affect the main question in the least.

5. The SENTINEL has never sought to make capital against the W. C. T. U. or the Prohibition party by arraying them with the National Reform movement, although we are sure, as our correspondent tacitly admits, that it is to their discredit that they are so arrayed. It should be understood that the SENTINEL deals first, last, and all the time with the National Reform Association, and has no crusade to make against any other association. As a matter of fact, the SENTINEL is heartily in favor of the W. C. T. U. as far as it adheres to its legitimate temperance work, and we have mentioned that organization only to show how rapidly the current is setting toward National Reform principles. We regard it as a great calamity that an organization with such power for good as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union should lend itself, however innocently, to the furtherance of National Reform designs. When the W. C. T. U. does this, then to that extent it necessarily brings itself into the same condemnation as the National Reform Association.

6. We have not the data at hand to verify or disprove the statement made concerning the attitude of Grant, Sumner, and Andrews toward National Reform, and it is of little consequence anyway. It matters not how certain men, no matter how great, have regarded this question. We are discussing the case on its own merits, and if the National Reform movement is intrinsically wrong, as we believe it is, it cannot be bettered by the adherence of any number of eminent men. We do not borrow trouble from the *Chronicle* nor from any other source. There will be no necessity for any lover of justice to borrow trouble so long as the National Reform Association exists. We speak the things which we know, and do not take our information at second hand. We consider it our duty, however, to let our readers know how other journals regard the movement which the SENTINEL is combating; but in giving their opinions we do not necessarily become responsible for all their statements. That the SENTINEL'S charges against the movement are incontrovertible is evidenced, we think, to some extent by the fact that not a single National Reformer has ever attempted to demonstrate the fallacy of one of them. E. J. W.

October 1887

"Not 'A Daniel Come to Judgment'" *American Sentinel* 2, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

The State of Louisiana has, in common with many other States, been doctoring its Sunday laws, and now has a law requiring that, with certain exceptions, all places of business shall be closed from 12 o'clock on Saturday

night until 12 o'clock on Sunday night. A case recently came before the Supreme Court of Louisiana, in which the law was claimed to be unconstitutional. The court held the law to be valid, and the following is a portion of the opinion delivered by the Judge:-

"We take occasion promptly to say that if the object of the law were to compel the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, we would not hesitate to declare it to be violative of the above constitutional prohibition. It would violate equally the religious liberty of the Christian, the Jew, and the infidel, none of whom can be compelled by law to comply with any merely religious observance whether it accords with his faith and conscience or not. With rare exceptions, the American authorities concur in this view. . . . The statute is to be judged of precisely as if it had selected for the day of rest any day of the week, other than Sunday; and its validity is not to be questioned, because in the exercise of a wise discretion, it has chosen that day which a majority of the inhabitants of this State, under the sanctions of their religious faith, already voluntarily observe as a day of rest."

The New York *Independent* quotes this, and adds the following words of approval:-

"This is an exceeding lucid statement of the theory which underlies all legislation that requires the suspension of ordinary labor on Sunday. The object is not to enforce religious observances of any kind, but simply to establish a uniform day of rest for the general good of the whole people; and this is no interference with the religious rights of anybody."

It may seem very presumptuous for a non-professional man to criticise the opinion of so great a person as a Judge of a Supreme Court, but nevertheless we have no hesitation in saying that the opinion quoted is nothing but sophistry, and such sophistry as could be dealt out only by an adept in the art. This we think can easily be made apparent; and it is the more necessary that this should be done, because the Sunday-law mania has now become quite prevalent, and just such sophistical arguments as those quoted above will be relied on in securing the enactment of those laws. These arguments will be used for the reason that they are the best that can be offered in favor of an unjust law, and also simply because they have been used before. Even the Louisiana judge himself did not pretend to originate them, but contented himself with giving the view in which nearly all "American authorities concur." If American legal business were not becoming more a matter of precedent than of common sense, Sunday laws could never be enacted; but the idea seems to be that whatever has been done ought to be done; and precedents for oppressing people under the guise of charity are not wanting.

The claim is made that the Sunday law does not compel the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, and that therefore it cannot be contrary to a Constitution which forbids religious tests for office or citizenship. But the fact is, Sunday is primarily a religious institution, and its observance cannot be enforced except as such. It cannot be separated from its religious (not sacred) character for the purpose of special legislation concerning it. It matters not what such

legislation is called, whether a police regulation, or a law in the interests of the workingman, it is legislation concerning an institution of the church.

To make it evident that Sunday laws are laws in behalf of religion, three things only need to be borne in mind: 1. Sunday rest originated in the church. Catholics universally claim the church as the sole authority for Sunday observance, and many Protestants agree with them in this. The *Christian at Work* says: "We rest the designation of Sunday solely on the church having set it apart of its own authority." But if the claims of those who say that Christ and the apostles set the day apart as a day of rest, were true, that would make it emphatically a church institution. 2. The observance of Sunday is generally considered by church people as the essence of religion. In the Sunday-law contest in California five years ago, the *Christian Advocate* spoke of Sunday as "the foundation of our holy religion." Regarding Sunday rest as the memorial of the resurrection of Christ, they think that without it there would be no evidence of the truth of the gospel. 3. The churches and the churches alone are at the bottom of all Sunday legislation. No one ever heard of such a thing as 1 Sunday law being proposed by anybody except a zealous churchman or a deputation of ministers. It is true that, by pretending that Sunday laws are in the interest of labor, they are inducing labor and socialistic organizations to clamor for such laws, but these organizations come in only as allies to the church. Everyone who knows anything of the history of Sunday legislation, knows that it is always instigated by the churches.

Now in the face of these things, to say that Sunday laws do not compel men to observe Sunday as a religious institution, is not only sophistry, but it is positive untruth. Since the day as a day of rest is nothing else but a religious institution, how can it be enforced as anything else but a religious institution? It cannot be enforced as something which it is not. True, it is said that when the State enforces the observance of Sunday,

76

it makes it a civil institution, merely a legal holiday. Well, nobody contends that the State law makes Sunday a religious institution; it is that already. We freely admit that the State law in its behalf is only a civil ordinance, for the State could make nothing else but a civil ordinance; but, mark it well, what we do claim, and what all candid minds must admit to be the truth, is that a State Sunday law is a civil ordinance enforcing the observance of a religious institution.

Some years ago the city of San Francisco had a notorious mayor, who engaged in certain transactions that were inconsistent with his official position. His defense was that he did those things as an ordinary citizen, and not as mayor. It requires no argument to show the absurdity of such a statement. The man was mayor, and he could not separate himself from his office within the time for which he was elected. But this is just on a par with the argument that Sunday legislation is not the enforcement of a religious institution. If the friends of so-called National Reform admit such a plea, they must be prepared to see it carried out to its legitimate conclusion. They must expect to see the vilest fakes elected to office in their model government, under the plea that they are not bad citizens, but are simply bad men.

If anything further were needed to show the flimsy character of the arguments by which Sunday-law advocates attempt to make it appear that they are not working for an ecclesiastical establishment, it may be found in the last sentence of the judicial opinion first quoted. Said the judge:-

"The statute is to be judged of precisely as if it had selected for the day of rest any day of the week, other than Sunday; and its validity is not to be questioned because, in the exercise of a wise discretion, it has chosen that day which a majority of the inhabitants of this State, under the sanctions of their religious faith, already voluntarily observe as a day of rest."

"A wise discretion," indeed! The State has chosen the day which a large majority of its inhabitants, under the sanctions of their religious; faith, voluntarily observe as a day of rest, and, at the instigation of that majority, has undertaken to enforce its observance as a day of rest, and yet this is no more in the interest of religion than if Monday or Thursday had been chosen! Such a monstrous assertion needs but to be quoted to be refuted. A man must be sadly blinded to put such a statement forth as a sober legal argument; and men must be pre-determined to have Sunday laws, or they could not be deceived by it. Suppose that the State had, in the exercise of its "wise discretion," chosen Saturday instead of Sunday; would there not have been protests without number? Indeed there would. People would call it a law in the interests of the Jews and other Sabbatarians, and no argument could convince them to the contrary. "But" says one, "such a law would really be unjust to the great majority who observe Sunday as a day of religious rest." Indeed! Then by the same token a law enforcing Sunday observance is unjust to those who observe Saturday, or who do not choose to observe any set day. The discriminating reader can see that it is the word "majority" which catches the judicial fancy. It seems to be the idea that Sunday legislation cannot be wrong, because the majority favor it. As much as to say that a thing is necessarily right if it is proposed by a majority of the people. But no majorities can ever make a wrong right, and State laws in behalf of an establishment of religion are always wrong. The question whether or not Sunday ought to be observed as a day of rest, does not enter into the case at all. We believe in the God of the Bible, as the majority of people in this country profess to do, but we should emphatically protest against a State law to compel all people to recognize him as such.

Here is a point that should not be lost sight of: If Sunday laws are not for the purpose of compelling the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, for what purpose are they? The claim is that they are in the interest of humanity, so that laboring men may have the rest which their physical nature imperatively demands. Very well, then we suppose it will be admitted that it is within the province of the State to compel men to observe the laws of their being. Now it is just as certain that man's physical nature requires that he should take a definite amount of sleep every twenty-four hours, far more imperatively than it demands that he shall rest one day in seven. Will our Sunday-law friends admit that the State has any right to decide how many hours a man ought to sleep, and to enact a law compelling every man to sleep at least seven hours out of every twenty-four? Unless they are ready to advocate such a measure as this, let them say

nothing more about enforcing Sunday rest on the basis of the necessity of man's physical nature. We have presented this view of the case before, but we do not expect ever to see Sunday-law advocates attempt to meet it.

Now one word concerning the *Independent's* statement that Sunday legislation "is no interference with the religious rights of anybody." We say that it is a positive and unjust interference with the religious rights of everybody who conscientiously observes any day other than Sunday. Here are laboring men who believe that when the fourth commandment says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," it means just what it says. They are conscientious in their observance of the seventh day of the week; and the needs of their families demand that they should spend the other six days in labor, as the commandment allows. According to the fourth commandment, it is their religious privilege to labor six days of the week, just as much as it is their religious duty to rest on the seventh. Therefore if the State steps in and compels them to rest on another day also, no matter on what grounds the rest is enforced, their religious rights are interfered with. And if those men shall be punished for continuing to make Sunday one of their six working days, their punishment will be an act of religious persecution. No assertions to the contrary can change the trust of this.

From the very nature of the case, Sunday legislation must interfere with the religious rights of some. For, Sunday as a day of rest is beyond dispute a religious institution; legislation enforcing its observance is legislation enforcing an establishment of religion; and when any religious tenet is enforced, the religious rights of all who do not hold that tenet must be interfered with, and oppression must result.

We hope that the people in those States that still allow full liberty of conscience, will take the time and trouble now to become well informed concerning the arguments used in behalf of Sunday laws, and will learn how to expose their fallacy, so that when the Sunday-law mania shall seize their State, as it surely will, they will not allow their liberty to be taken away without making a well-directed intelligent protest. E. J. W.

November 1887

"The Bible in the Public Schools" *American Sentinel* 2, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

In the June number of the SENTINEL there was an article in which the following sentence occurred: "To shut the Bible and religious instruction out of the public school seems, to some people, to be a sacrilegious proceeding; but to maintain them in the public schools is not only very difficult, but very hazardous." To this statement a good friend of the SENTINEL, took exception, thinking that it argued a lack of appreciation of the Bible. Although our private explanation of the matter was satisfactory to him, we propose to consider the subject somewhat in detail, for the benefit of others who may think that loyalty to the word of God demands that its study be maintained in the public schools.

In the first place we will say that we yield to none in reverence for the Bible. We believe it to be the inspired word of God, and that it is "true from the beginning." As an educator it is invaluable. We believe that if the Bible is rightly studied, a man can get a better education from it alone than from any other book that was ever printed. He would have a better disciplined mind and would be better fitted for society and business, than he could be by studying any other book ever written. Take all the eulogies of the Bible that have ever been written or spoken, and it may still be said that "the half has not been told." And still we hold that it is a great mistake for Christians to insist upon the Bible being used as a text-book in the public schools. Our reasons are these:-

The Bible is not an ordinary text-book. It is not a book to be studied as an arithmetic, beginning at the first page and mastering it point by point until the end is reached. It is not a book of logic, nor a book of science, although it is logical, and is scientifically exact, and is the basis of all true science: But it is primarily and solely a book of morals. It is true that there is no other book in the world the study of which will so admirably discipline the mind as will the Bible; and it is for this reason that many think the Bible should be used as a text-book in the public schools. But such ones forget that the disciplinary effects of the Bible are not obtained when it is studied for that purpose alone, as people study geometry or read the orations of Cicero, but that the discipline of mind from the study of the Bible comes only when it is studied with a view of carrying out its precepts in the daily life.

Proof of this is found in the following texts: Ps. 111:10: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; a good understanding have all they that do his commandments." Deut. 4:5, 6: "Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. *Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations*, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people." The Bible is like no other book that was ever written. Its language is

84

simple and may be understood by the common people, yet it withholds its treasure from the most learned if they do not study it with reverent hearts. The one who studies it with no thought of its value as an educator of the mind, but solely to know what is the will of God, will find his mind expanded so that he can better comprehend affairs of every-day life; while the one who attempts to study it in the same manner and with the same spirit as he would study some secular author, will not derive any material benefit.

The sum of all this is, that the Bible is a book whose sole object is to teach men the true religion, the religion of Jesus Christ. Now what is the public school? It is an invitation of the State and all those connected with the public-school system are in the employ of the civil government. They are, if you please, officers of the State. Therefore if the Bible be taught in the public schools, it will be simply the State teaching religion. The State will have to determine what views of the Bible shall be taught; for, let it be remembered, the Bible is not like mathematics, which is a fixed science, and concerning which there cannot possibly be a

difference of opinion; but it affords opportunity for much variety of opinion. This is not because the Bible is so obscure that people cannot see alike, but because God has ordained that man shall be a free agent in matters of morals. And here is where the danger comes in, for if the Bible be taught in the public schools, it must be taught in accordance with some system, and whatever theories may be taught, somebody's conscience is sure to be outraged.

For example, there are many sincere Christians who believe that immersion is the only true baptism, while others conscientiously hold that sprinkling is baptism, and that infants should receive the ordinance. Most people believe that man has the principle of immortality by nature, while many believe that immortality is given only to those who believe in Christ, and they hold that any contrary teaching robs Christ of his chief glory. One person believes in the perpetuity and universal obligation of the ten commandments, while another believes that they were only for the Jews, and are now abolished. One man is a Unitarian and his neighbor is a Trinitarian, and so on. It is not within our province to say which of these views are right and which are wrong. It is sufficient that each one believes his own view to be the correct one, and does not wish to have his children taught a contrary view; neither does he wish to have the money which he pays as taxes to support the school, used in propagating doctrines which he holds to be vital errors.

So we say that Christians themselves should not merely refrain from insisting that the Bible be used in the public schools, but should rather insist that it be kept out. There is indeed danger in having it placed there, for when that is done somebody's religious convictions are sure to be trampled upon. It is of the very essence of Church and State union to have the Bible taught in the public schools, for that would be nothing else but the State teaching religion; and the standard of the religion taught would be the opinions of the majority. Let each professed Christian who thinks that it is little less than sacrilege to say that the Bible ought not to be taught in the public schools, consider the matter seriously. He will find that what he wants and expects is that his views of the Bible shall be taught. But he has no warrant that this will be the case. It will not be the case unless he chances to be among the majority, and in that case he is helping to outrage the conscience of some other man. The simple fact is this: If the State adopts the Bible as a text-book in its schools, then it must decide how it shall be taught, or, in other words, must fix a standard of religion.

But suppose that all Christians were agreed concerning the principal points of Bible doctrines; they are not the ones who are to be considered. The public schools are for the public, and among the people there will be many who do not accept the Bible at all. What shall be done in their case? Here is the answer that Pastor Joshua Denovan gives in an article on, "The Bible in the Public Schools," which appeared in the *Faithful Witness*, of Toronto, Canada:-

"Some advanced champions for freedom of conscience and the rights of man, in Britain and the United States, can't be accommodated. In this category must be classed agnostics, atheists, and scientific infidels. For my part, without hesitation or apology, I deny such men any reasonable claim to conscientious convictions and privileges at all."

And again, speaking of the consciences of such men, he says: "Such consciences are peculiar-abnormally unique-and their owners must suffer for conscience' sake."

The *Christian Statesman* of July 7, 1887, contains a reprint of the article in which these words occur, and the editor called special attention to it as a "masterly article." Such sentiments are in keeping with National Reform ideas of the gospel, but they are as different from the gospel of Jesus Christ as night is from day. The gospel knows nothing of compulsion; "*Whosoever will*, let him come," is its gracious call. The use of force in connection with matters of religion was conceived and is fostered only by the prince of darkness, "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." An infidel is a man, and, as such, he is entitled to the same rights and privileges in a human ("belonging to man or mankind") government that his Christian neighbor is, who is only a man. He may be and should be invited and urged to accept the Bible as the revealed will of his Creator, but so long as it would be wrong to compel a Christian to help support schools which should teach views of the Bible which he cannot conscientiously adopt, so long will it be wrong to compel unbelievers to support schools for the teaching of religion.

How, then, can the youth of Christian parents receive the Biblical instruction which their parents desire them to have? Let their parents instruct them at home, as is their duty. To the parent, and to the parent alone, has God instructed the moral and religious instruction of children. The divine command is: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." Deut. 6:5-7.

If any number of parents who are of the same faith wish to send their children to a school where they can study the Bible to better advantage than they can at home, they may combine and form a denominational school, which is independent of State patronage, and to the support of which none need contribute except those who believe in the principles taught. Such schools are on the same footing as the various religious denominations themselves. The religious instruction is private, because it is supported by the private, voluntary contributions of those who favor the views taught by any given denomination; it is public only in the sense that anybody who wishes is privileged to come. This is all that anybody should desire; whatsoever is more than this, cometh of evil.

E. J. W.

December 1887

"An Examine of Principles" *American Sentinel* 2, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

The columns of the AMERICAN SENTINEL have often contained quotations from the speeches and writings of National Reformers, which have thrown light

upon the aims of the National Reform Association. Although none of the statements quoted, some of which are very damaging to the claim for innocence and piety which the Association makes, have been disavowed by the organs of that Association, it is possible that some may think that the persons giving utterance to them are not qualified to speak for the Association. Accordingly we have concluded to go to the fountain-head of authority, and set before our readers just what National Reform, so-called, is, as set forth in its own constitution. Following is the preamble:-

"Believing that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Ruler of Nations, and that the revealed Will of God is of Supreme authority in civil affairs;

"Remembering that this country was settled by Christian men with Christian ends in view, and that they gave a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established;

"Perceiving the subtle and persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our Public Schools, to overthrow our Sabbath laws, to corrupt the Family, to abolish the Oath, Prayer in our National and State Legislatures, Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving and other Christian features of our institutions, and so to divorce the American Government from all connection with the Christian religion;

"Viewing with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, the legal sanction of the Liquor Traffic, and the disregard of moral and religious character in those who are exalted to high places in the nation;

"Believing that a written Constitution ought to contain explicit evidence of the Christian character and purpose of the nation which frames it, and perceiving that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government;

"We, citizens of the United States, do associate ourselves," etc.

The *object* of the Association is given in the second article of the Constitution as follows"-

"The object of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed Reforms in the action of the Government; touching the Sabbath, the institution of the Family, the religious element in Education, the Oath, and Public Morality as affected by the Liquor Traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

This preamble and constitution stands in every issue of the Statesman, and is the document to which National Reformers point with pride as showing the justness of the work in which they are engaged. We propose to examine these articles in detail:-

1. The first statement, namely, "that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government," may be true or false according as it is interpreted. If it be interpreted to mean that God has ordained that there be civil government among men, or that he himself exercises overruling power, or, as Daniel says, "removeth kings and setteth up kings," we accept it as true. But if it be interpreted to mean that all civil authority comes direct from God, and that he himself directs and controls civil government, then it is manifestly untrue. Every nation on the earth has a civil government, but there is no nation on earth of which God is direct ruler, nor has there been any such nation since the children of Israel rejected God by choosing a king for themselves. It is a fact, as Paul says, that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" but it should be remembered that this does not mean that they are necessarily ordained as God's deputies in the moral government of the world, but that it means simply that government in general is in accordance with God's design. Proof of this is found in the fact that when Paul wrote these words, pagan Rome was mistress of the world, and the Emperor Nero, who represented that greatest of all earthly Governments, was the very embodiment of wickedness and cruelty. Yet even the Roman Empire governed by the infamous Nero, was better than anarchy.

If it were true that God is the civil governor of this world, then there would be only one form of government. But the statement that "the powers that be are ordained of God" is universally true. It is as true of the Government of England as of that of the United States, and of the Government of Germany and Russia as of that of either of the other countries. All civil authority comes from God; that is, neither emperors, kings, presidents, or councils would have any authority to execute penalty upon the evil-doer, if God had not ordained that civil government

90

should exist among men. But the very statement that God "is the source of all power and authority in civil government," even though given the broadest construction that National Reformers can put upon it, shows that the authority of the officers of the State is limited to civil affairs. The word "civil" is from the Latin *civis*, a citizen, and has reference solely to the relations *to one another*, of citizens of a State. Civil government is simply the guiding and regulating of the relations of men to one another, and has no reference to their special duties to God. It is charged with the duty of seeing that, so far as outward acts are concerned, men obey the injunction, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Beyond this it has no right nor power.

2. With the second statement, namely, that "the Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations," we take direct issue. We have no hesitation whatever in pronouncing this to be false, because it is contrary to the Scriptures. Out of the abundance of scriptural proof on this point, we shall at present refer to only the following:-

(a) Christ is now acting as priest and not as king. Heb. 8:1. He is sitting at the right hand of God, but it is as "a priest upon his throne." Zech. 6: 13. His work now is that of an intercessor (Heb. 7:25; 9:24), and he has no other office.

(b) Christ himself likened his going to Heaven and returning again, to a nobleman that "went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to

return," and who after a time "returned having received the kingdom." Luke 19:11-15.

(c) God the Father is represented by the prophet David as saying to Christ, "Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Ps. 110: 1. And Peter (Acts 2:34-36) makes application of this to the present time, when Christ is sitting at the right hand of God. If he were now the ruler of nations, he would not expect anybody else to make his foes his footstool. They would either be his footstool already, or else he would reduce them by his own power.

It is true that Jesus said, just before he ascended to Heaven, "All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18); but the next statement, which follows this as a conclusion, shows that it was not civil power that was given to him. Let us read the entire passage: "All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28:18-20.

Note the following points: 1. These words were spoken, not to civil rulers, but to private individuals whose sole office was that of "ambassadors for Christ," to beg (not force) men to be reconciled to God. 2 Cor. 5:20. 2. The statement made by Christ, namely, that all power was given unto him in Heaven and in earth, was for the sole purpose of encouraging the apostles in their work of teaching the people the truths which Christ had taught them. Said he, "All power is given unto me,"-"Go ye *therefore*, and *teach*." The power to which he referred was his power as "Mediator between God and men." It is not all civil power, but all spiritual power.

Note also the following point: If our National Reform friends persist in the claim that all civil power was given to him, then they must admit that his ministers have also civil power, and that by virtue of their civil power they are to teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This is self-evident, for it is by virtue of the power that was given to Christ, that the apostles were commissioned to preach the gospel. We know that this claim has actually been made by prominent National Reform advocates. But such a claim is nothing less than a claim for the union of Church and State; indeed, it is a direct claim that the church and the State are one.

(d) Christ does not receive his kingdom until just before he returns to this earth, and he receives it not from men but from the Father. See Dan. 7:13, 14; 12:1. The first of these passages, with the context, unmistakably refers to the last great Judgment, and it is at the close of this that Christ appears before the Father to receive "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." The latter text speaks of the standing up of Michael, who is Christ. Now the standing up of a king is an expression used in Scripture to indicate the taking of the reins of government. See Dan. 11:2. But the prophet says that when Michael shall stand up, that is, take his kingdom, there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time, and at that time every one of God's people shall be delivered. This time is yet in the future.

(e) The Father himself says to the Son, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Ps. 2:8. And the next verse states that when he thus becomes the ruler of nations he shall "break them with a rod of iron," and "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." This dashing and breaking of the nations will constitute the time of trouble such as never was.

(f) In harmony with the texts quoted above, we read that under the sounding of the seventh trumpet, during which time the nations become angry, the dead are judged, the reward is given to the saints, and the wrath of God is manifested in the destruction of them which corrupt the earth, great voices are heard 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." Rev. 11:15-18. In Rev. 19:11-21 we have a prophetic description of the smiting of the nations and the ruling of them with a rod of iron, with the statement that then Christ bears the title, "King of kings, and Lord of lords." And Christ himself (Matt. 25:31-46) states that when the final separation between the righteous and the wicked shall take place, when the wicked shall be sent into everlasting punishment and the righteous shall be called to eternal life, it is when he shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, and that *then* "he will sit upon the throne of his glory."

All these texts, which constitute but a small part of the argument, show most conclusively that Christ is not now ruler of nations until he receives the kingdom from his fore his Father just before his second coming, in power and great glory; that when he receives it he will smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and slay the wicked with the breath of his lips, and will call the righteous to inherit his kingdom with him. Therefore, for any individual to say that Christ is now ruler of nations, is to deny the plainest declarations and of Scripture; and to make the claim, as many National Reformers have done and still do, that man can have any part in giving the kingdom to Christ, is nothing less than blasphemous presumption.

Next month we shall continue this examination of the National Reform Constitution. E. J. W.

American Sentinel, Vol. 3 (1888)

January 1888

"An Examination of Principles. (Concluded.)" *American Sentinel* 3, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

3. With the statement that "the revealed will of God is of supreme authority in civil affairs," we also take direct issue. That the union of Church and State is a pernicious thing, is so generally conceded that National Reformers themselves are careful always to deny that their movement tends toward any such result; nevertheless the statement which we have just quoted contains the whole substance of Church and State union. For the Bible, not a part, simply, but the whole, is the revealed will of God, and is the whole of the revealed will of God;

and it must be admitted that the Bible is a religious book. It was given to men for the sole purpose of teaching them the true religion. But religion and the true church are inseparable. There may be a church and not religion, but there cannot be religion and not the church. In a word, the revealed will of God is the true religion, and is the standard of the true church. Therefore, if that will should be recognized as of supreme authority in civil government, that government would be an ecclesiastical government; in other words, it would be a union of Church and State.

Men may assume to take the revealed will of God as of supreme authority in civil affairs, and to oblige all men to conform to it, but in reality such a thing is impossible. For to make all men conform to the will of God would be nothing less than to make them all perfect, not only in outward actions, but in thought. The will of God, which is the law of God, requires that men shall not be angry, that they shall not indulge in the least degree of hatred or envy, that they shall not be covetous; and it declares that the harboring of such evil thoughts is just the same as the commission of outbreking sin. Now when it is stated that any document is of authority in civil affairs, it is implied that the power to enforce the provisions of that document, and to punish those who violate it, rests with the men at the head of civil affairs. But there is no man, or set of men, who has the power to determine whether or not a man is covetous, or whether he is cherishing hatred or other evil in his heart; therefore we say that it is utterly impossible that the revealed will of God should be the authority in civil affairs. Civil government is for the purpose of keeping men civil, and not of making them moral. When it attempts to interfere in the matter of morals, it assumes prerogatives that belong to God alone.

We might cite another instance which shows that to take the revealed will of God as the supreme authority in civil affairs, would be to unite Church and State. The Bible, which teaches the revealed will of God, says that it is the duty of men to believe on Christ and to be baptized. Now if National Reform ideas should be adopted, the Government would not only have the right, but it would be under obligation, to require every citizen and everyone who desired to be a citizen, to be baptized. In other words, baptism would be the evidence of naturalization, just as it is the evidence of church membership, and so the Church and the State would be identical. But it needs no argument to show that such a state of affairs would simply make hypocrites of more than ninety-nine-one-hundredths of the people.

Again, the apostle Paul says: "In everything give thanks; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you." 1 Thess. 5:18. It is manifestly the duty, as it is declared to be the will, of God, for everybody to give thanks for the blessings which they daily receive. Now if the revealed will of God is to be of supreme authority in civil affairs, then civil rulers must enforce that will, and compel every man in the nation to give thanks. Of course they could not compel people to give thanks privately, and that shows the folly of their claim, but they could force them to church to offer thanks nominally, or by proxy, just as people now celebrate Thanksgiving day. But such enforced thanksgiving would be mockery, and it is

not the will of God that people should thank him with their lips, while their hearts are far from him.

4. The second paragraph of the preamble contains a bit of sophistry and an assumption which is entirely at variance with the golden rule. It assumes that because the people who came over in the *Mayflower*, for the National Reformers do not go back of that date, were professed Christians, and because the founders of the early colonies made church membership a test of citizenship, and subjected those who differed with them in belief to the same persecutions to which they had been subjected as dissenters from the ecclesiastical organization of the Old World, therefore this Government ought to be professedly a Christian Government. But when they make this argument, which is a standard plea with them, we ask them, Who was here first? Long before the arrival of the *Mayflower*, or the voyage of Columbus, this country was inhabited by powerful tribes of Indians, all of whom were pagans. Therefore if the National Reform argument were good for anything it would prove that the religion of this country should be paganism. But the argument does not amount to anything.

Notice further that the assumption is that the people who first settle a country, or who are in the majority in any country, have the right to determine what religion shall be tolerated. The National Reform constitution assumes that Governments must recognize some religion, and that such State religion must of course be the religion of the majority, and that no other religion can be tolerated. According to their claim for this country, the established religion of China or India ought to be Buddhism, and that of Turkey ought to be Mohammedanism; and the rulers of those countries ought to say to the missionaries who go there from England and America: "If you do not like our institutions, and cannot conform to them, you can return to your own land; you must not think to bring your foreign customs here." If this were done, what a howl of indignation would be raised, and the National Reformers would be the very first ones to raise the cry of "persecution." We agree that it would be persecution, and unjust persecution, too; but, if the National Reform theory of majority rule be true, it is just what ought to be done. If such a course would be wrong in Turkey, how can it be right in the United States? To state the question differently, does an act which is wicked and unjust when done by a Mohammedan, become virtuous and just when done by a professed Christian?

National Reformers seem to be blind to the fact that if their scheme should prevail, and they should carry it out as they propose, making a profession of Christianity the basis of citizenship, and declaring indifference to Christ to be treason to the State, they would run directly counter to many things which they now profess to desire. For instance, they profess to be staunch friends to the native Indians, and to the Chinese who are here. They declaim loudly against the injustice that is done to both of these races, and yet if their ideas were carried out, both the Indians and the Chinese would be outlaws, and both would be subject to persecutions, by the side of which all that they have had to suffer would be considered pleasure.

5. Our Government has no Christian features. The Constitution of the United States expressly forbids any religious test of any kind being required as a

qualification for office or citizenship. Thus the National Reform preamble is self-contradictory, in that it speaks of the Christian features of our institutions, and the Government's connection with the Christian religion, while at the same time it admits the fact that the Constitution, which is the basis of the Government, is utterly silent concerning Christianity, or any other religion.

4

Yet it is said that the object of this National Reform movement is "to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government." These Christian features are declared to be the reading of the Bible in our public schools, prayer in our National and State Legislatures, days of fasting and thanksgiving, etc. But the reading of the Bible in the public schools is not a feature of our Government, for there is no law requiring it; whenever it is done, it is a merely voluntary exercise. We will not here discuss the propriety of requiring the Bible to be read in the public schools, but simply call attention to the fact that it is not an existing feature of our Government, as the National Reformers claim.

The same may be said of prayer in our National and State Legislatures; there is nothing obligatory in the matter, and it is only a matter of form, as anyone can testify who has ever witnessed the opening of one of these assemblies. We believe in prayer; we believe that the divine injunction to "pray without ceasing" ought to be obeyed by all men, by members of Legislatures as well as ministers of the gospel; but we do not believe that anybody ought to be forced to pray, or to listen to prayers. And we can see no more reason for opening the State Legislatures with prayer than for merchants to open their stores with prayer. To be sure, it would be a very proper thing for the merchant to do; but he ought not to be forced to do it. But there is as yet no law requiring public prayer on any occasion, and so this is not an existing feature of our Government.

6. We affirm most positively that the object of the National Reform Association, as set forth in its constitution, is not merely erroneous, but is unchristian and directly opposed to the spirit of the gospel. Its object is to amend the Constitution of the United States so that it will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of "the moral laws of the Christian religion," whatever they may be. This means, in plain language, that the Constitution is to be so amended that the officers of this Government may compel everyone who desires to be a citizen to profess Christianity, and to disfranchise all others. If it does not mean this, it does not mean anything. We have the statement of National Reformers themselves that this is just what it does mean. But the Christian religion knows nothing of any such coercive measures as this. The gospel call is, "Whosoever will, let him come." The implied permission is that whosoever will not come may stay away. The ministers of Christ are simply ambassadors whose duty it is to entreat people to become reconciled to God, but who have no authority to compel any. Therefore we say that the day that sees the consummation of the National Reform designs will mark the blotting out of Christianity in this country, except among the few who will dare to dissent from such an iniquitous form of government. That national Christianity, so-called, is the enthronement of antichrist, is proved by the Dark Ages, which followed

immediately upon the professed conversion of Constantine, and the lifting of Christianity to the throne of the world.

We also view with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, and the immorality not only of those who are exalted to high places in the nation, but of the nation itself; but we know that politics cannot be purified nor immorality checked by legal enactment. There is only one remedy for immorality and corruption, and that is the gospel of Jesus Christ. By this alone can men be saved either from the guilt of sin or the love of it. We do not say that the preaching of the gospel will purify politics by making politicians and all others moral men; for the Bible nowhere holds forth the hope that all men will ever repent, and it expressly declares that the righteous will ever be few in number as compared with the wicked, and that "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse." See 2 Tim. 3:13, Matt. 7:13, 14; 24:37-39; Luke 17:26-30, etc. But we do say that whatever of purification is ever accomplished must be solely by the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Therefore we conclude, from the very constitution of the National Reform Association, that while a large majority of its advocates may honestly desire to see a reform brought about in this country, the means by which they propose to secure it are both impolite and unscriptural, and such as would soon rid the country of what little morality it now possesses.

E.J.W.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

There is no question that is growing faster in the United States to-day than is the Sunday question. It is coming nearer and nearer to the point where it will be an essential factor in the political field. And the Christian Nation announces the intention of it all, thus:-

"Let those who will remember the Sabbath to keep it holy from motives of love and obedience; the remnant must be made to do so through fear of law. We have no option."-*Christian Nation, September 28, 1887.*

This is the National Reform version of the fourth commandment.

A good many people imagine that they love law and order, when they do not. It is a fact that many, indeed the great majority of men, are perfectly indifferent as to whether or not the laws are enforced, so long as they themselves do not suffer by their violation. Laws are enforced in this country principally from selfish motives, and not from a love of justice. There is not an abhorrence of evil because it is evil. Men will make an outcry against a crime which involves their interest, and will excuse the same if they are in no way concerned.

On Sunday, October 23, the corner-stone of a Catholic college was laid in Oakland. After the ceremony, Rev. Joseph Sasia, of the Jesuit college in San Francisco, delivered a sermon on education, in which, as a matter of course, he referred to the fact that Catholic schools and churches are taxed, and that the Government does not give Catholic schools a share of the public money, and then said: "We earnestly believe that, by the blessing of Providence, our

grievances will be redressed, and our just claims shall justly prevail." If the obsequiousness with which the Catholic Church is treated by the press, both political and religious, is any just indication, we may well believe that the priest will not have to wait long to see his desire fulfilled.

In this number of the Sentinel we have shown how the representative California preachers proposed to secure from the Legislature the passage of a "civil" Sunday law. We confess that it does not present them in a very enviable light, but we can't help that, it is a simple statement of the facts in the case. Yet these men are no worse than the representative ministers in any other State in the Union. We have, for instance, the minutes of the Preachers' Convention, held for the same purpose precisely, in Elgin, Ill., last November, and they reach their point in the same way. The thing is fast becoming universal, and the methods are all of a piece. The trouble is that in this they are all working for legislation upon a matter that is wholly religious, and which every argument that they make proves to be wholly religious, while they try to cover it all up with the word "civil;" but the covering is too narrow for them to wrap themselves in it.

The National Reformers indignantly deny the charge that they are laboring for a union of Church and State, but insist that what they want is a union of Religion and the State. The Rev. Josiah Strong, D.D., General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, and author of the well-known book, "Our Country," has expressed himself to the same effect. He, with the National Reformers, wants not Church and State, but Religion and State. Says Dr. Strong, "I distinguish, as some apparently do not, between Church and Religion."

Now we think we know enough about mathematics to work out so simple a problem as is here presented. The three terms are these, the State, the Church, and Religion. They say that they design to keep Church and State forever separate and distinct, but that Religion and State must be closely united. The result of our calculation is that if they succeed in their design they will necessarily have to divorce the Church and Religion. If this solution is not correct, we should be glad if someone would point out the defect in our calculation. We verily believe that when the National Reformers, and their many friends who do not go by that name, shall have accomplished their purpose, no one of acute perception will have any difficulty in distinguishing between Church and Religion. There may be a form of Religion but the power will have fled forever.

"What Does it Mean?" *American Sentinel* 3, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

What means this almost universal uprising over the question of "How shall our American Christian civil Sunday sabbath be preserved?" Large Conventions of ecclesiastics are held solely to discuss this question. The W.C.T.U. works it up all over the United States. Prohibition Conventions put it in their platforms. The leading preachers and lecturers of the Nation discuss it from pulpit and platform. Legislatures, both State and National, from beginning to end of their sessions, are petitioned for the enactment of stringent laws in its behalf. The religious papers of the country lift up one united cry that it must and shall be preserved.

Knights of Labor, and workingmen's unions, and socialists, call loudly for laws enforcing its observance. Political Conventions are "worked" and Legislatures are "lobbied" in the interests of the Christian Sunday. Saloon-keepers enforce laws for its observance. Only a few years ago there was no sign of any such thing, and even those who now make the most of it, then insisted that it was one of the least of the questions that concerned religion. But now, instead of its being the least and most incidental of the questions of religion, it is by their own confession the greatest and most urgent of all. Now, instead of the question of how to reach the masses with the gospel being the greater, that question must take a back seat, while there comes to the front the universal demand for stringent Sunday laws strictly enforced, that by this means the masses may be reached. Now instead of the questions of infidelity and atheism taking the far greater precedence, it has come to this, that if you don't favor Sunday laws you are an infidel, and if you oppose them you are an atheist. Now, instead of the questions of infidelity and atheism taking precedence, it has come to pass that the question of the Sunday sabbath is made the test of fidelity and theism. Yet in "demanding" laws to compel everybody to observe the day, and submit to the test, they will gravely argue that the movement is entirely civil, and that there is nothing religious about it.

What, then, does all this mean? It means that, through this question of compulsory Sunday observance, the civil power is to be subordinated to the ecclesiastical in these United States. We know that this statement will be pooh-poohed by many, and especially by those who are working for it, but in making the statement we but speak forth the words of truth and soberness. This is precisely the way in which the civil power was subordinated to the religious, in the fourth century, out of which came the tyranny of the Papacy; and both time and events will shortly demonstrate that we state the exact truth. Therefore, without hesitation, we lift up our voice against the whole scheme. To laugh at the fears of the Sentinel will not avert the evil. To despise its warnings is only to rivet your own chains. In perfect sincerity the American Sentinel adopts the memorable words, "I am in earnest-I will not equivocate-I will not excuse-I will not retreat a single inch-and *I will be heard.*"

February 1888

"What We Are Opposed To" *American Sentinel* 3, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

At various times the Reformed Presbyterian Church has been referred to in the columns of the Sentinel, and the statement has been made that the principles of the National Reform Association are those of that church, and that if the National Reform movement becomes a success, the Government of the United States will virtually be a Reformed Presbyterian Government. A worthy member of the Reformed Presbyterian Church has taken exception to this statement, and thinks that we are doing an injustice to that church, by making such statements. Certainly no injustice was intended, and the Sentinel has never designed to cast

any reflections on that church. The statements were made simply for the purpose of showing that the success of the National Reform movement will effect a virtual union of Church and State.

These statements were not made at random, nor were they unfortified by proofs. For proof that National Reform and Reformed Presbyterianism are the same in principle, we have the following explicit declaration of Rev. James Wallace, in the *Reformed Presbyterian* of January, 1870.

"The principles of National Reform are our principles, and its work is our work. *National Reform is simply the practical application of the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church for the reformation of the Nation.*"

The italics are Mr. Wallace's. Now we submit to the candid reader that we cannot justly be accused of false witness in saying that National Reform is nothing but Reformed Presbyterianism, when we but quote the words of a minister of that denomination, as published in the church organ. Other evidence has been given to the same effect, but this is sufficient. Until the Reformed Presbyterian Synod shall declare that Rev. James Wallace did not correctly represent that church, in the *Reformed Presbyterian* of January, 1870, we cannot retract anything on that score.

Now as to the statement that the Covenanter or Reformed Presbyterian Church was founded upon the principles of Church and State union. The "Encyclopedia Britannica" says:-

"Covenanters, in Scottish history, the name applied to a party, embracing the great majority of the people, who, during the seventeenth century, bound themselves to establish and maintain the Presbyterian doctrine and polity as the sole religion of the country, to the exclusion of prelacy and popery."

But there is still stronger testimony, namely, that of the Covenanters themselves. Before giving it, we will quote, as an introduction, the following brief statements of history:-

"In 1581 the General Assembly of Scotland adopted a confession of faith, or national covenant drawn up by John Craig, condemning episcopal government, under the name of hierarchy. This covenant was signed by James I., and enjoined on all his subjects. It was again subscribed in 1590 and 1596. The subscription was renewed in 1638, and the subscribers engaged by oath to maintain religion in the same state in which it existed in 1580, and to reject all innovations introduced since that time. This oath annexed to the confession of faith of 1581, received the name of the National Covenant."-*Art. Covenanters.*

Now read the following act which was passed with reference to the above-mentioned National Covenant:-

"Assembly at Edinburg, August 30, 1639, Sess. 23.

"Act Ordaining, by Ecclesiastical Authority, the Subscription of the Confession of Faith and Covenant with the Assembly's Declaration.

"The General Assembly considering the great happiness which may flow from a full and perfect union of this kirk and kingdom, by joining of all in one and the same covenant with God, with the King's Majesty, and amongst ourselves; having, by our great oath, declared the uprightness and loyalty of our intentions in all our proceedings; and having withal supplicated his Majesty's High

Commissioner, and the lords of his Majesty's honorable Privy Council, to enjoin, by act of Council, all the lieges in time coming to subscribe the Confession of Faith and Covenant; which, as a testimony of our fidelity to God, and loyalty to our king, we have subscribed: And seeing his Majesty's High Commissioner, and the lords of his Majesty's honorable Privy Council, have granted the desire of our supplication, ordaining, by civil authority, all his Majesty's lieges, in time coming, to subscribe the foresaid Covenant: *that our union may be the more full and perfect*, we, by our act and constitution ecclesiastical, do approve the foresaid Covenant in all the heads and clauses thereof; and ordain of new, under all ecclesiastical censure, That all the masters of universities, colleges, and schools, all scholars at the passing of their degrees, all persons suspected of Papistry, *or any other error*; and finally, all the members of this kirk and kingdom, subscribe the same, with these words prefixed to their subscription, 'The Article of this Covenant, which was at the first subscription referred to the determination of the General Assembly, being determined; and thereby the five articles of Perth, the government of the kirk by bishops, the civil places and power of kirkmen, upon the reasons and grounds contained in the acts of the General Assembly, declared to be unlawful within this kirk; we subscribe according to the determination foresaid.' And ordain the Covenant, with this declaration, to be inserted in the registers of the Assemblies of this kirk, general, provincial, and presbyterial, *ad perpetuam rei memoriam*. And in all humility supplicate his Majesty's High Commissioner, and the honorable Estates of Parliament, by their authority, to ratify and enjoin the same, under all civil pains; which will tend to the glory of God, preservation of religion, the King's Majesty's honor, and perfect peace of this kirk and kingdom."

This will suffice to show that we have not erred in saying that the principles of National Reform and those of Reformed Presbyterianism are the same, that Reformed Presbyterianism was founded upon the principles of Church and State union, and that as a consequence the real end of the National Reform movement must be a union of Church and State. And this is the sole object that we had in view. Our reference to the Reformed Presbyterian Church was only incidental to the argument that National Reform success must be Church and State union. In nothing that has been said in these columns has there been any design to cast reflections upon the Reformed Presbyterian Church. The Sentinel has no quarrel with any religious body; it is no part of

11

its work to oppose even what seem to be errors of doctrine. It has no time nor space to devote to the discussion of creeds and confessions of faith. Its sole object is to oppose "anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact," and to work for the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious,-including the rights of infidels as well as of Christians, realizing that both are human.

This being the case, it would manifestly be turning aside from our legitimate work to discuss denominational matters. The Sentinel freely grants that the Reformed Presbyterian Church has been active in reforms in this country. We believe the members of that church to be as pious and God-fearing as those of

any other; and for those whose intimate acquaintance we have formed, we have the most sincere respect. But this does not in the least abate our opposition to its principles being incorporated into this Government.

The Covenanters did indeed protest against union of Church and State, but it was only the union of the State with the Catholic Church. They, honestly enough, supposed that the evils of Church and State union arose from the corruption of the church which was a party to that union, and that if the church were only pure, and its polity correct, no evil, but only good, could come from its union with the State. They did not perceive that union of Church and State to any degree whatever is in itself an evil, no matter how pure the church may be, and that, in fact, a union of the purest church with the State, must, if long continued, result in the deterioration of that church; but such is the case.

Moreover such union cannot but result in the oppression of those who dissent from the principles of the church. This oppression is not due to the fact that those who are instrumental in bringing it about are worse than other people, but from the necessities of the situation. In fact, men who are personally upright are more apt than any other class to start such oppression, for they are the ones who are zealous for the enforcement of the law. Now when ecclesiastical usages are enjoined by civil law, and those usages are disregarded, such disregard becomes a crime, and the offenders must be punished. Thus religious persecution is started simply from a desire to see the Government honored by the enforcement of its laws. If the offenders would at once submit, there would be no persecution, and the good men (and women) who seek to enforce such laws, do not design that there shall be any. But the trouble is, many of these dissenters will be so stubborn as to persist in disregarding the ecclesiastico-civil laws, and so more severe measures than were at first contemplated are found necessary, and there will be enough "lewd fellows of the baser sort" to carry out through innate malice, what was conscientiously begun. And no matter how severely the persecution may rage, it will be only the simple execution of the laws.

For the benefit of any who may think that our opposition to National Reform is due to antagonism to religion, we will say that the editors of the Sentinel are all members of an evangelical church, but if there should arise a species of National Reform proposing to enforce the usages of their church, they would oppose it as strenuously as they do the present movement. We honor Christ as the divine Word by whom the worlds were made, and the Redeemer of mankind; but we would oppose a movement to make such an acknowledgement a test of citizenship, just as strongly as we would oppose a law enjoining a belief in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, or making auricular confession obligatory. In short, we are opposed to any union of the State with a corrupt church, because such union would result in religious persecution; and we are opposed to any union with a pure church, because in addition to religious persecution there would result a corruption of the church.

E.J.W.

"Some 'Clashing Voices'" *American Sentinel* 3, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

At the celebration of the Centennial of the Constitution of the United States, in Philadelphia, President Cleveland said:-

"Does anyone doubt to-day that the Constitution of one hundred years ago was well made, and that the work was well done?"

Against this, Mr. Gault, whose special *forte* seem to be to come in conflict with everything that is reasonable and true, makes his voice to clash as follows:-

"We not only doubt, but in the light of past history we are sure that work was not well done. At least two very serious mistakes our fathers made in that Constitution. One was the enslavement of one-sixth of our population, because they had black skin. The other was the substitution of the popular will for the will of God. At the cost of the civil war we have corrected the first, and the signs of the times indicate that we may be compelled to correct the second at even a dearer price."

One would expect that a man occupying so prominent a position as Mr. Gault does in an association whose sole object is to patch up the Constitution of the United States, would be well acquainted with that document; but we have never seen any evidence that he has ever read it. If he can find in that document, as it was adopted in 1787, anything favoring the enslavement of anybody, he will find what the framers of it could not.

But a little thing like that amounts to nothing in comparison with the cool manner in which this representative of National Reform declares the expectations of that association to plunge this country into a war greater than our civil war, if their ideas are not complied with otherwise. We don't suppose that they have the power to do anything of the kind, but that they have the will is evident enough. And yet they have the assurance to try to make us believe that if they once got the Constitution and laws fixed to suit themselves, they would not persecute any who might not agree with them. If they are willing to stir up a civil war involving the Nation, in order to secure their religious amendment, would they tolerate opposition by a handful of men after it was secured? The question answers itself.

In the same number of the *Statesman*, that of December 22, 1887, there is the following statement by Wm. Smith, a lawyer of Janesville, Wis.:-

"By putting a 'God in the Constitution' plank in the Prohibition platform, you rule me out of that party. I am not opposed to prohibition, but I am opposed to God in the Constitution."

With this Mr. Gault makes his voice to clash in the following strain:

"How can you be an honest prohibitionist when you want a law with only the fallible, changing, conflicting will of the people behind it, in preference to a law having behind it, first, divine authority, next human, next the fear of hell. That is the only kind of a law that will bind the conscience. Prohibition legislation, or any other legislation, will have little force until we base it on a law that is the will of an unchanging Law-giver."

Well, what next? "Upon what meat hath this our CÆsar fed, that he hath grown so great?" We have heard of some pretty rigid enforcement of the

prohibitory laws of Iowa and Kansas, that have behind them "only the fallible, changing, conflicting will of the people;" but such enforcement will not satisfy National Reformers. Nothing will do but they must have laws that will send a man to hell if he violates them! This is just what Mr. Gault's language implies; for how could there be "the fear of hell" behind a law, if that law did not threaten to send its violators to hell? Mr. Gault doesn't say who he expects will execute this penalty in the National Reform Government; but since the makers of a law have the power to execute, we suppose that the National Reformers themselves will consider themselves the duly appointed ministers of divine wrath. And yet they tell us that they never could think of persecuting anybody.

Perhaps someone may think that we are extravagant in our conclusions. We know that we are not. It may be that Mr. Gault is an irresponsible person, not competent to speak for National Reformers as a class; if so we hope the Statesman will let us know, and we will never again pay the slightest attention to any statement that he may make. But leaving Mr. Gault out of the question, National Reform teaching does actually place in the hands of the rulers of

14

the proposed National Reform Government, the power, not only to kill the body, but to consign the soul to hell. Here is the proof.

They claim that the triumph of their movement, will be the setting up of the kingdom of Christ on earth. They apply the Scriptures that speak of the glorious reign of Christ over his enemies, to the time when God is acknowledged in the Constitution. They do not expect that Christ will come and reign personally, and in that case the men at the head of affairs will be his vicegerents. Thus we shall have an American Papacy, and everybody knows, that the Pope of Rome claims power to open and shut Heaven, and to consign souls to hell.

Whether they expect Christ to reign personally or not, the result will be the same. We have already quoted from the *Statesman* the statement that the time is coming when those who will not have Christ to rule over them shall be slain before him; and this statement was made with direct reference to those who refuse to accept the National Reform *regime*. We say in all seriousness the day that marks the success of the National Reform movement, will mark the inauguration of a period of grievous persecution. We may be called alarmists. That is all right; it is just what we are. It is the sentinel's duty to sound an alarm when danger is near. If people will only prepare to meet the danger, we care not by what name we may be called.

E.J.W.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

About two months ago we made the statement and proved it that the National Reform Association is running in its list of Vice-Presidents the names of men who are dead and who have been dead for years. Since writing that we have received additional evidence in proof of this statement. We have these proofs in writing and signed by disinterested and authoritative persons. But, anything at all to win, is the principle upon which these National "Reformers" work.

It is with pain that the *Congregationalist* notices an increasing tendency to disregard the sanctity of Sunday. It cites "for example" an account of "a great train load of the Grand Army which drew out of one of the Chicago stations on a Sunday morning, on its way to St. Louis;" and then says:-

"Doubtless there was a considerable sprinkling of church members among these Sunday travelers, whose consciences were not quite at ease over what they were doing."

Yes, "doubtless" that is so. Therefore, by all means, let the civil authority of the Nation come to the rescue, and entirely ease the consciences of these Sunday Christians by the enforcement of a rigid, uncompromising Sunday law, that shall compel these church members to do, as church members, what they have not conscience enough to do otherwise. Only let the civil law supply the place of conscience in all these people, then they will all serve the Lord.

Let it be understood that it is not the man who talks the most about honoring Christ, who really does honor him. Said Jesus, to some who were profuse in their professions, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord and do not the things which I say?" A humble life of self-denial, patterned after the divine model, and filled, like his, with good deeds, is the only way that Christ can be honored. When Christ was on earth, he resisted every attempt to bestow upon him political honors; and he is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." Those who loudly proclaim their loyalty to Christ, and long for power to cut off those who do not acknowledge him, are in the same condition that Peter was on the night when he cut off the ear of the high priest's servant, or of the two disciples who wished to call down fire from Heaven upon the Samaritans. Our desire for them is that, like those disciples, they may see the manner of spirit that they are of, and may become true followers of Jesus.

Speaking of that political preachers' committee that was lately appointed in New York, the *Christian Nation* says that "Archbishop Corrigan will be invited to serve on it." We can inform the Christian Nation now and even at this distance that Archbishop Corrigan will not "serve" on the committee. Catholic Archbishops don't serve Protestants in any capacity whatever. In fact they don't serve anything or anybody but the Cardinals and the Pope. They may get archbishop Corrigan to rule on the committee, but it is a settled thing that he will never serve there. There is another reason for this too. No Catholic Archbishop in Christendom would ever consent to receive, from Protestant preachers, instruction or guidance in political workings; and this for the simple reason that there is not one of them who does not know more on that subject than all the Protestant preachers, together ever knew. There is not a Catholic priest in New York City who could not at a moment's notice give those preachers more "pointers" in their political scheme than they ever dreamed of. The Archbishop may consent to help them along, but it is certain that he will never do it in the form of a servant.

"Protestant Praise of Catholicism" *American Sentinel* 3, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

The New York *Independent*, one of the most well-known and influential religious journals in the world, gushes after the following style over the Pope's Jubilee:-

"To Joachim Vincent Pecci, Bishop of Rome, and Pope of the Catholic Apostolic and Roman Catholic Church, health and an evangelical benediction! A priest of blameless life for fifty years, wise, moderate, successful as priest, governor, archbishop, nuncio, cardinal, Pope, we send him our Christian salutation. Prelates, priests, and peoples of his own communion, gladly pay him homage. We simply offer him kindly greetings in the name of Christ, to whom both Pope and Protestant bow in reverent adoration. Gifts and congratulations pour in upon him from Christian, Turk, and pagan, in honor of the jubilee of his priesthood. . . The time was when Popes hurled their unapostolic anathemas against followers of Christ, and Protestants hurled them back with access of intensity, if possible. But Leo XIII. is a kindly Christian gentleman, who loves light and peace and purity and progress. *Lumen in Coelo* is his motto; and that his reign will be as a light in the Catholic heavens, is in no wise improbable. He has been Pope just ten years, and these years have been so many years of progress for his church. . . He has made peace with France and Germany and Switzerland; he has brought about an era of better feeling in Italy, he has reformed many abuses, raised the tone of the church, and gained a strong influence in the councils of Europe. . . And so we wish Pope Leo, of that name the thirteenth, continued health, a long reign, and God-speed in his liberalizing policy."

Can our readers believe that the above, and considerable more of the same, is from a professedly Protestant journal? Where is the Protestantism? What is said about the prosperity of the church, and the progress of its influence, under Leo XIII., is all true; but is that something to rejoice over? If in time of war, a leader on one side should report with every appearance of joy, that since General X had taken command of the enemy's forces, they had made rapid and continual progress, would he not be considered as harboring traitorous feelings toward his own country? Let it be remembered that the liberties of the people have never ruled, and that the triumph of Catholicism always means death to civil and religious liberty.

We have no fear that the Pope will ever be regarded in this country as he is in Europe, or that the Catholic Church, as such, will ever gain the supremacy in the United States; but what we do fear, and with good reason, is that Protestantism will become so saturated with the principles of Catholicism as to overthrow the liberties of the American people. We do not mean that Protestantism will ever pray to the virgin Mary, or adopt the confessional, or any other Romish dogma that it has not now, but that it will become intoxicated with the lust for power, which is the distinguishing characteristic of Romanism. Catholicism, stripped of its belief that the church should be recognized as supreme in politics, as well as in religion, would be nothing to be feared. If there is to be a union of religion and State, as the National Reformers now put it, we would just as willingly see the Catholic religion elevated to that position as the Protestant. The American people do well to look out for the encroachments of the Papacy; but we fear lest while

they are watching the enemy that is approaching from Rome, degenerate Protestantism will steal a march on them and gain the citadel of their liberties.

March 1888

"Another Sign of the Times" *American Sentinel* 3, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

Under this heading, the *Christian Union* of January 26 has an article about the Pope's jubilee, from which we make the following extracts:-

"Nothing shows more clearly the decay of old religious animosities than the fact that so little has been heard of late of the old anti-Popery cry. . . The old and somewhat panicky feeling which Protestants used to entertain toward the Pope and the church has evidently passed away. If evidence of this were needed, it would be found in the fact that the President's gift of a copy of the Constitution of the United States to the Pope has for the most part passed unchallenged-has, indeed, been commended as an act of courtesy, and as a sensible way of discharging what was, under the circumstances, a matter of national obligation; for as the author of 'Religio Medici' long ago suggested, the Pope is a temporal prince, and the amenities which are paid to princes are due to him. . . In England, where the anti-Popery feeling has been even more rabid than in this country, an English nobleman of the highest rank has recently conveyed to the Pope the personal sympathy and good-will of the Queen, and was instructed 'to give expression to her feeling of deep respect for the elevated character and Christian wisdom' which the Supreme Pontiff has displayed in his high position. 'The temperate sagacity,' said the envoy, 'with which your Holiness has corrected errors and differences, from which much evil might otherwise have arisen, inspires her Majesty with the earnest hope that life and health may long be granted to you, and that your beneficent actions may long be continued.'"

After mentioning the events connected with the Pope's jubilee, and the brilliancy of the pontifical mass in St. Peter's, the editorial continues:-

"Among the almost countless congratulations that were received from all parts of the world, Protestant good wishes and congratulations mingled with those from Catholic sources. This is as it should be, and marks the coming of the better age in which the bitter and unchristian animosities of the past are disappearing as the shadows at the dawn.

"One may hold Protestant convictions as resolutely as his fathers held them, and may op-pose the Catholic propaganda in Church and State with the greatest zeal and earnestness, and still preserve toward this church that attitude of Christian courtesy which ought to be, although it never yet has been, the characteristic of Christian peoples. It is not impossible that the time may come when the old antagonism of the Catholic and the Protestant may appear insignificant in view of the deeper antagonisms which shall make them essentially one. Thomas Carlyle declared that the real struggle in every age is between the believer and the unbeliever, and it has seemed at times of late as if this phrase might soon describe the practical issue of certain tendencies in

modern society. For anarchism and social disorder of the radical kind have their roots in atheism, and it is quite possible that the time may come when the real issue will be between the theist and the atheist; the man who believes in God, and order, and freedom, and rights of person, and property on the one side, and the man who disbelieves in all these on the other side. Whenever that time comes, the Protestant and the Catholic will stand side by side in a common defense of those common beliefs which have been their mutual possessions these many centuries. Stranger things have happened in history than such a change of attitude as would be involved in the fellowship of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant; and it is well to remember in any event that the only Christian way to hold one's convictions is to hold them with charity and courtesy."

Can anybody give a reason for this change in the feeling of Protestants toward Catholicism? Was it all just a senseless "panicky feeling," when the Waldenses and Albigenses used to tremble at the approach of the minions of the Pope? Was Luther's feeling toward the Pope nothing but jealousy? Did Huss and Herome, and tens of thousands of others whom we call martyrs, -did they commit suicide? Was it foolish superstition on the part of the Lollards, when they used every means in their power to conceal their Bibles, so that the agents of the Pope might not burn them? In short, must we say that the Reformation was a mistake, and that the men who stood so firmly for principle were nothing but cranks? If not, why should there be any change in feeling towards Rome? She has not changed at all. Leo XIII. believes every dogma that the church has ever put forth, and he believes that every one of his predecessors in the Papal chair was infallible, and could not do wrong. What is it, then, but that he would do the same things if circumstances seemed to make it necessary, and he had the power?

22

When we remember the record which Rome has made, it is startling to read in an influential Protestant journal that "the Pope is a temporal prince, and the amenities which are paid to princes are due to him." And it is still more startling to learn that almost every Nation is giving practical evidence of its belief in this statement. Someone may say, "Oh, it is not because they favor Catholicism; they do it simply from political motives." Of course; nations and their rulers never take any steps except from political motives; and the Roman Catholic Church is simply a vast political machine, and therein lies the danger from it. We have no fears that Protestant America will ever turn Catholic in name; but when Protestants cease to protest, they might as well be Catholics. We hold that Protestantism to-day ought to stand in the same relation to Catholicism that it did in the days of the Reformation. That does not mean that we should hate Catholics, or that we should have any feelings towards them other than those of Christian charity and courtesy; but it does mean that we should protest against the principles and practices of the Church of Rome, and not be dazzled by its display of wealth and power.

We said above that 'it is startling to read in an influential Protestant journal that the Pope is a temporal prince, and the amenities which are paid to princes are due to him.' "But we don't read such language in a Protestant journal. Protestant journals do not contemplate a union of Protestantism and Catholicism.

The *Christian Union* is not a Protestant journal; and the fact that it is an influential journal, and that other professedly Protestant journals, as the *New York Independent*, and *Christian at Work*, stand in the same position, is evidence to us that there is very little Protestantism nowadays.

Let the reader read carefully the last paragraph of the *Christian Union's* article. Note the following sentences: "It is not impossible that the time may come when the old antagonism of the Catholic and the Protestant may appear insignificant in view of the deeper antagonism which shall make them essentially one." "Stranger things have happened in history than such a change in attitude as would be involved in the fellowship of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant." Stranger things have happened, and no doubt this will happen; but the man who can calmly contemplate such an event, has not read the history of the middle ages, or has read it to little purpose. But what can be said of the one who can deliberately bid for such a union with Roman Catholicism?

The nations of the Old World are nearly all now virtually at the feet of the Pope. They have been brought there through policy. Germany repealed the May Laws, and made friends with the Pope, in order to secure his help in the struggle with the socialists. Russia wants his help to settle her internal dissensions; and England must have him as mediator in the trouble with Ireland. We have not the slightest doubt but that in a few years Protestantism and Catholicism will be virtually one in crushing out "atheism." And who will be classed among the atheists? The *Christian Statesman* has already told us,-every man who opposes the National Reform attempt to enforce the observance of Sunday. He may believe in God, in Jesus Christ, and the gospel, and in the Bible, but if he keeps the fourth commandment just as it reads, instead of keeping it as interpreted by the church, he will be counted an atheist. In short, every man who insists upon the right of private judgment in matters of religion, will be classed among the atheists.

And this is what is actually coming to pass in this country. The spirit of it is everywhere. We wish to again emphasize the fact that the *Sentinel* is uncompromisingly opposed to everything like a union of Church and State; whether in name or in fact. We do not stand opposed simply to the so-called National Reform movement. Those who are looking at that alone, will be terribly surprised some day. We warn the people of America that degenerate Protestantism, which comprises nearly all the Protestantism that now exists, is about to sell their liberty to the Church of Rome. Let every true man keep his eyes open to discern the signs of the times.

E.J.W.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

The *American Sentinel* is, as everybody can see, only an eight-page paper, and is issued only once a month. It is evident, therefore, that we cannot publish everything, nor can we print in one number everything that comes within our province. When people send us communications, or extracts from papers, they

must have patience if they do not appear at once. "All things come 'round to him who will but wait."

"Friend, please stop the American Sentinel," was the word that came post haste from Kansas a few days ago. We have not the slightest doubt but that there are many who would like to have us stop the Sentinel, but we cannot gratify them, because there are so very many who write of the Sentinel in a strain similar to the following from a prominent judge in a Southern State: "I read each number that comes, and I think with increasing interest." The Sentinel will not stop.

The Sentinel has not space to waste in personalities. It is opposed not to National Reformers, but to national Reform. Our friend N.R. Johnston enters a grievous complaint against us in the last number of the Statesman, because a certain article of his was not published in the Sentinel. As he says, we have published one or two articles from him. We went so far as to agree to publish them, before we saw them, because we felt sure that he would confine himself to the main points. So when he again asked for space, we again assented; but when we found that the most of one of the articles needed no reply, and was not really upon National Reform, we informed him that we had not space for it. We would have published one; but as he insisted that it must be both or none, we returned both. At the same time we informed him that whenever he would furnish us with straight National Reform matter, we would publish it. This he does not tell the readers of the *Statesman*.

We make this note of explanation simply that all may know that the Sentinel does not intend to shut out free and fair discussion of National Reform principles from its columns. Nothing would please us better than to receive for every number, from any representative National Reformer, short, pithy articles on National Reform, telling our readers just what National Reform is, and what it wants. This doesn't mean, though, that we propose to resign the editorial management of the Sentinel into the hands of the National Reformers.

The November (1887) number of the Sentinel contained some of the questions and answers given at the Lakeside National Reform Convention. Among them was one by Dr. McAllister, in which he was reported as saying, in answer to the question if the success of National Reform would not result in persecution: "False religion will be persecuted, and the State will be the persecutor." Mr. McAllister says that what he did say was that "a false religion will persecute." We very gladly make the correction, for we have no design to misrepresent anybody. The truth about the National Reform Association is more damaging to it than any erroneous statement could be. When we have more space than we have in this number, we shall notice Mr. McAllister's statement more at length.

"District" Secretary, Rev. M.A. Gault, in a report in the Christian Statesman of August 11, tells of his attendance at a Prohibition convention at Lake Side Rink, Racine, Wis., at which he "had the privilege of presenting the cause of God in Government here on the same platform with Colonel Bain, and Governor St. John." Speaking further of Colonel Bain he says:-

"He shook my hand warmly as I left the plat-form, saying how much he sympathized with the National Reform movement. He said he had received a letter some time ago from the editor of the American Sentinel in California, telling him how much mischief there was in our movement, and asking him to write some articles for the Sentinel."

We are most happy to inform Mr. Bain that he is most prodigiously mistaken. We know that Mr. Bain never received a letter from the editor of the American Sentinel, because we happen to know that the editor of the Sentinel never sent him a letter. Nor did the editor of the American Sentinel, nor any person authorized by the editor of the Sentinel, ever ask Colonel Bain to write a single article, much less "some articles for the Sentinel." We would suggest that the excellent Colonel read his letters a little more carefully.

Further Mr. Gault says of him:-

"He wrote in reply [to the letter that he didn't get from the editor of the Sentinel] that our country had been drifting devilward long enough, and he was disposed to sympathize with any movement to help it. Godward."

Mr. Bain may have written such a letter to somebody; he may have written it to the editor of the Sentinel; but that no such letter was ever received by us is certain. If we had received it we might have said to him that it is true enough that our country has been, and is, "drifting devilward," but whereas now it is only "drifting," the effect of National Reform will be but to set it full-sail in that direction.

Hitherto the Sentinel has used the phrase "union of Church and State" in calling attention to the rapid encroachments of the ecclesiastical upon the civil power in this country and in making known our opposition to it. But those who are zealously working for the union of Church and State here, constantly seek to dodge, and to deaden as far as possible, the force of the Sentinel's arguments, by the sophistical plea that they are "all thoroughly opposed to any union of Church and State," while at the same time they are all just as thoroughly in favor of a union of Religion and the State. "Church and State," say they, "is always an unmixed evil. But Religion and State is another thing. That is a good thing,-and that is what we aim to make a feature of our institutions, and we are going to have it."

Now the Sentinel does not propose to work at cross purposes, neither does it intend to spend any time in drawing hair-splitting distinctions between terms, therefore let it be forever understood that the American Sentinel is uncompromisingly opposed to any union of Religion and the State. For such a union can end only in the worst of all tyrannies-the tyranny of a religious despotism. In reality there is no difference, of course, between a union of Church and State and a union of Religion and the State, but as those who favor the wicked thing, endeavor to disguise it under the apparently mellow term "Religion and State," we, likewise, in exposing it, shall hereafter use that term rather than the phrase "Church and State." This, not because we admit for a moment that there is any difference at all, but solely to prevent them from dodging our arguments. But let it be understood that our opposition to so-called Religion and the State, is due solely to our love for true religion and the individual.

April 1888

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

"And he said unto them, Render therefore unto CÆsar the things which be CÆsar's, and unto God the things which be God's."

The New York *Independent* notes and comments as follows:-

"'The present worthless school system,' is what the *Freeman's Journal* calls our scheme of public education. If the Roman Catholics insist on destroying this system, they will have to destroy the Nation to succeed."

Oh, no, they will not! All they will have to do to succeed is to wait a little while till the National Reform Association shall have gained the support and the influence of a few more Protestant leaders, and then to accept the persistently proffered alliance of the Association, and the work will be done; the system will then soon and easily be destroyed. But then, having succeeded, the Nation will soon be destroyed. The *Independent* is right as to results; it had only misplaced the items. They will not have to destroy the Nation to succeed in destroying our public-school system. But having succeeded in destroying our public-school system, the destruction of the Nation will soon follow.

Mr. "Sam" Small has acquired a national reputation, and a very extensive influence, as a religious worker. Against this in itself, or in its legitimate exercise, we have not a word to say. But when he essays to use his influence in the line of things set forth in the following proposition, then we most decidedly object. Says Mr. Small:-

"I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, national, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it and enact it into laws."

And that will be but the Papacy over again. From the way things are now going we have no doubt that Mr. Small as well as the rest of us will see that day come. And when it does come it will be the most woeful day the Nation will have ever seen; and the utter ruin of the whole national fabric will then be but a question of a little while.

"National Reform Ideas of Right" *American Sentinel* 3, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

The following extract is National Reform doctrine in its purest form, from the pen of one of its best representatives:-

"A Christian people, adopting and administering a government that we would call Christian, might legislate about religion as well as about morals or education or temperance. To do so would not unite Church with State. Illustrations will be in place here. A Christian people might enact that any man who would blaspheme or curse God should be punished. If all the people of the United States were Christians, and they should be, they would do right in passing a law, Congressional or State or municipal, that no one, even a foreigner, pagan, or

otherwise, should be permitted to erect a pagan temple and set up and worship idols therein. This would be a lawful, civil act, and would not unite Church and State."

This is a fair specimen of National Reform logic. Let us analyze it. "If all the people of the United States were Christians," they would have a right to pass a law prohibiting the erection of pagan temples, and the worshipping of idols. Upon this we would note the following three points:

1. If all the people of the United States were Christians, such a law would not be necessary, for Christians do not erect heathen temples, nor do they worship idols. If they were all Christians, we cannot see why any such laws could be called for, unless the Christians were of the class who believe that they ought to do a certain thing, but haven't enough conscience in the matter to do it without being compelled. We have heard people say, "I believe Sunday ought to be kept, and if there was a law compelling everybody to keep it, I would keep it." Such ones are on a par with those who want a law forbidding Sunday railroad travel, so that they will not be tempted to patronize the railroads on Sunday, or to get up Sunday excursions to camp-meetings.

2. But we will not find very much fault with our friend's statement. Although it would seem

29

like a bit of foolishness for a lot of people who are already Christians to get together and pass a law forbidding any one of them to erect a heathen temple, we would have no objection to their amusing themselves in that way if they wanted to. And right here we will say that if the National Reformers will wait until the people of the United States are all Christians, not in name simply, but in fact, before they press their measures, we will join with them. But even in that case we would not admit that they would have any right to say what should be done by those who might not be Christians, or, to prohibit anybody from giving up his Christianity, and adopting any other form of worship. In the case supposed, the people of the country would form one large church, and might, just as any church now may, pass laws regulating their conduct as church-members; and whenever anyone did not wish to abide by those laws, he would simply lose his church membership, but not his citizenship. Anything intended to affect those not Christians, and not church-members, would be religious legislation, and would unite Church and State. The facts, in short, are these: Any organization has a right to make laws regulating the actions of members of that society, so long as they remain members, and no longer. The Odd Fellows have rules for their order, which must be observed by everyone who wishes to retain his membership in that order. But if the State should pass a law requiring every citizen to observe those rules, then we would say that Odd Fellowship and State were united. So also with the church.

3. "If all the people of the United States were Christians, . . . they would do right in passing a law, . . . that no one. . . should be permitted to erect a pagan temple, and set up and worship idols therein." This statement is a virtual admission that they would not do right in passing such a law, if all were not Christians. And that is exactly the case. Nobody has a right to say what, or how,

or when, anybody else shall worship. To say that if all the people of the United States were Christians, they would do right in passing a law that not even a pagan should erect a heathen temple, is simply nonsense; for if there were a single pagan here the people would not all be Christians. But we affirm that if all the people of the United States were Christians, with only one exception, they would not have the slightest right to say what that one should or should not worship.

Here, as before, we wish to emphasize the fact that if all were Christians, they would have a right to pass laws against idolatry, which should affect themselves as Christians, and none others. But they would have no right to say that nobody should come to this country, unless he believed just as they did. Here again is shown the inconsistency of National Reformers. They raise a great hue and cry against the injustice of limiting Chinese immigration, yet they hold to views that would not only exclude the greater portion of foreign immigration, but would expatriate many who are loyal citizens. This is bigotry of the worse kind. It virtually says, "Every thing that we do is right, no matter how wrong it may be in others." We affirm the absolute right of every man to live wherever he pleases on this earth, and to believe what he pleases.

But many who would assent to this, might hesitate to say that the Government has no right to prohibit blasphemy. The third commandment is the touch-stone. If civil governments have a right to enforce the moral law, then they must prohibit blasphemy; if they have the right and power to prohibit blasphemy, then they have the right and the power to legislate on any other matters of morality and religion. In short, the whole matter of the right of the State to legislate on matters of religion, must stand or fall with the right to legislate against blasphemy. We think the following propositions will demonstrate that the State has no right to inflict any penalty, for violation of the third commandment.

If a man has a right, so far as men and human governments are concerned, to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, he has an equal right not to worship him at all. That religion is to be a matter of free choice with every individual, is evident from the gospel call, "Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." If whosoever will, may come, then whosoever will not, may stay away. Man's free agency is everywhere recognized in the Bible. To be sure, certain penalties are announced as sure to be visited upon those who do not accept the gospel; but these penalties are visited, not for refusal to accept the gospel, but for the sins which they have committed, from which they would have been freed by accepting the gospel, but which, since they do not come to Christ, remain upon them. The truth is, that every man is just as free to reject the gospel as he is to accept it. So far as men are concerned, he has as much right to believe nothing as he has to believe in God and the Bible.

2. If no man has a right to compel another to worship God, then men have no right to compel such an one to show reverence for God; for reverence is worship. The man who reverences God, worships him; and the man who does not reverence and worship God, violates the third commandment, even though he does not openly blaspheme.

1. If it be claimed that refraining from taking God's name in vain is not an act of worship, and does not indicate reverence for him, then the same thing must be true with reference to heathen gods. And then if the heathen were in a majority in this country, or if we were in a heathen country, they would have a right to compel us to refrain from speaking against their gods. For,

2. Blasphemy is not simply the use of profane oaths, but speaking against God. Last year a man was convicted of blasphemy, in New Jersey, yet there was no evidence that he had sworn. The only thing for which he was convicted, was for speaking most disrespectfully of God; the Bible, and religion. When our missionaries go to foreign lands, they blaspheme the gods of the heathen. Paul was at Ephesus, he declared that "they be no gods which are made with hands." Now if the National Reform idea that the majority ought to rule in matters of religion, be true, then Paul ought not to have said anything against those heathen gods.

1. The ten commandments comprise the sum of all morality. The perfect keeping of them is perfect religion. To conscientiously and truly refrain from taking God's name in vain; that is, to reverence the name of God, is an act of religion. Therefore, if obedience to the third commandment may be enforced by the State, then the State may enforce religion upon all. The germ of all religious legislation lies in the enactment of laws against blasphemy.

But it may be said that our God is the true God, and that the Christian religion is the true religion, and that therefore people ought to worship our God, and adhere to our religion; that the gods of the heathen are no gods at all, and that we alone have a right to enforce laws concerning religion. Then we set ourselves up as the only ones who have the right of choice in matters of religion. And then the question might well be asked by the heathen, Who gave you a right to choose your religion and ours too? Have we not equal rights with you?

Let our National Reform friends turn their whole attention to making men Christians, in accordance with gospel methods. When they have done that, so that this is in fact a Christian Nation, and all the people without exception, are Christians, and of one mind, then it will be time enough to talk about making laws prescribing the forms of religion.

E.J.W.

"Mr. Gault Speaks" *American Sentinel* 3, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Sentinel* of December, 1887, in answer to the Christian Statesman's inquiry, we wrote this-

"The *Sentinel* espouses the Christian theory of government; the theory enunciated by Christ, that men shall render to CÆsar the things that are CÆsar's, and to God the things which are God's; the theory that so far as man or civil government is concerned, the heathen, or the infidel, or the atheist, has just as much right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, as the Christian has."

With this Mr. I.A. Gault makes his voice to clash after this sort:-

"There are two difficulties about the Sentinel's theory of government, one is its readers don't understand it, and the other is it don't understand itself. If it would only reason a moment it might discover that in our Government CÊsar represents the people, and among the things we must render to CÊsar is one day's rest in seven, and the security of the family relation, the security of life, liberty and property."

The great trouble with Mr. Gault is that he measures other people's understanding by his own; and because he doesn't understand a thing, he at once decides that nobody else does. The

30

gentleman greatly mistakes; the readers of the Sentinel do understand it, and the Sentinel thoroughly understands itself. As for Mr. Gault the Sentinel can only repeat to him the answer that Dr. Johnson once gave to one who said that he "didn't understand:" "I give you reasons, sir; I cannot give you an understanding, sir."

Then he informs us that if we should reason a moment we might discover that "among the things we must render to CÊsar is one day's rest in seven." Well, let us reason a moment. Christ commanded: "Render to CÊsar the things which are CÊsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Now how did CÊsar ever come into possession of one day's rest in seven? The truth is he never came into possession of such a thing at all. The word of God says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath [rest] of the Lord thy God." The Sabbath is God's. He called it "My holy day" It is "the Lord's day." And the Lord has never resigned to CÊsar the possession of this day. Now as we are to render to CÊsar only that which is CÊsar's, and as the Sabbath is wholly the Lord's, therefore there never can be any obligation upon any soul to render to CÊsar any such thing as the Sabbath or one day's rest in seven. CÊsar has no proprietorship whatever in the Sabbath, and he has no right to any. And whenever he attempts to assert any such thing, he obtrudes himself upon the rights and prerogatives of God; puts himself in the place of God; and demands the obedience which is due to God alone. And that is the principle of all Sabbath laws, and of Sunday laws, enforced by the civil power. And the Sentinel is going to tell the people so.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

In his revival services in Kansas City, last January, "Sam" Jones said one day:-

"One reason why I favor woman suffrage is because we would have more Christian voters if the women were allowed to vote."

True enough, but would we not have more un-Christian voters too? If not, why not? Not all of the women in the United States are Christians, by any means. The truth is, that there are a great many more women in the United States who are not Christians, than there are who are Christians. And although it is true that to give women the ballot, will give more Christian voters, it is equally true that there will be more un-Christian voters also, and in the end the matter would not be

helped at all. History does not present women-politicians in any better light than it does men-politicians.

In a sermon at Kansas City, January 22, "Sam" Small, in speaking of our country said:-

"From Maine and Massachusetts, to Georgia, all along the coast, the characters of the settlements gave it as one of their objects to glorify God, and forward his kingdom. . . Then the heresy of hell took hold of a handful of people, and they made a Constitution, and left God entirely out of it."

We had thought to make some comments on this, but to brand as "the heresy of hell," the action of George Washington, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and the other noble makers of the United States Constitution, is sufficient of itself to render infamous the whole complaint which the speaker makes against the Constitution. Mr. Small is an evangelist and a great revivalist; now here is a conundrum: If the religion which he inculcates is compatible with such defamation as the above, then how much better off would this Nation be, if such religion should become National? We give it up.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Marion County, Missouri, in convention assembled at Palmyra, in that State, "resolved" that,-

"We believe the very same condemnation and punishment should be visited upon man as upon woman for violation of the moral law."

So do we, and more than that, we know that it will be, for the Author of the moral law has said that "there is no respect of persons with God." What could have led these excellent Christian women to think that the same condemnation and punishment might *not* be visited upon man as upon woman for violation of the moral law, when the word of God is so plain on the subject?

Do they suppose the Lord is going to prove recreant, and that it is therefore necessary for them to remind him of his duty? We suspect, however, that they have fallen into the dangerous error of believing that it is within the province of civil government to punish violation of the moral law, and they are contemplating the taking of God's work into their own hands

In the February Sentinel, it will be remembered that we asked Mr. W.T. McConnell "to show any commandment of God for keeping Sunday." We do not intend for a moment to convey the idea that we would not be opposed to civil laws enforcing its observance, even though it were commanded by the law of God. This was simply an *argumentum ad hominem*. We would be just as much opposed to civil laws enforcing the observance of Sunday, or any other day, even though it were commanded by the law of God, as we are as it is. Our opposition to Sunday laws is from principle and not from partisanship. The principle is that the civil power has no right to enforce the observance of any religious institution, of any kind whatever; nor to enforce any duty as a commandment of God. Yet, as against this principle, the Sunday institution is doubly weak: First it is wholly an ecclesiastical institution, and secondly, there is no commandment of God for it. And as the National Reformers propose to enforce the keeping of Sunday as a commandment of God, of course it is perfectly in order for us to call for the commandment, while at the same time we would oppose civil laws enforcing it, even though there were a commandment of God for it.

"Not a Christian Nation" *American Sentinel* 3, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

It would be difficult to use language in a looser way than by calling this "a Christian Nation." In all the Nation there is not a single town, nor a village even, in which the people are all Christians. A single family in which all are Christians is seldom found; and individual Christians are not abundant, We do not say these things to find fault; we are simply stating the facts in the case, as every person knows who looks at things as they are. Let any person anywhere in the land honestly ask himself the question, and honestly answer it, How many of my immediate neighbors and acquaintances actually show in the works of a godly life that they are real, consistent Christians? In the face of facts as they are, the answer only can be, Very few. How many are really separate from the world, and conformed to the will of Christ?

Take even the churches themselves, and everybody knows, and the churches themselves confess, that many of their members will not bear the test of the precepts of Christ. Many, of them love the opera or the circus more than they love the prayer-meetings; and the excursion more than the services of the church; and the newspaper more than the sermon; and pleasure more than God; and the world more than Christ. Then, while it is thus with the church, where is the sense of calling the Nation, Christian? and while the church is so nearly half full of worldlings, what is the use of talking about this being a Christian Nation? The trouble is that they put upon the term "Christian" a construction so loose that there is scarcely any discernible distinction between many of those who bear it and those who don't, and then spread the term over the whole mass, and thus they have a "Christian" Nation. But so long as the term "Christian" means what the word of God means-so long as it means strict conformity to the precepts of Christ-just so long it will be that this is not, and cannot be, a Christian Nation, except by each individual's becoming a Christian by an abiding, working faith in Christ.

May 1888

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The military authorities of France have recently issued stringent orders regarding the observance of Sunday, and an officer who called out his men to practice on that day, was sentenced to the penal colony of New Caledonia. This the *Christian Nation* uses as an example which it would be wise for these United States to follow. That is to say that the United States should adopt the principles of the Papacy to the extent that France carries them forth. It will probably be done.

Since the Elgin Sunday-law Convention, the Illinois preachers have been enlarging their field of operations. They have issued four petitions: One to the United States Senate, one to the House of Representatives, one each to the

railroad and the telegraph companies in the United States, asking for their co-operation. One of their circulars says:-

"God's trumpet-call to every minister of the gospel, to every Christian and patriotic man and woman, and the public press in these United States, is that they 'advance along the line' against this giant sin of Sabbath [Sunday] desecration, which is sapping the foundations of our republican institutions."

If there is anything in this world that is sapping the foundations of our republican institutions more than is this movement of the churches to wield the power of the State, then we wish somebody would name it. There ought to be a million copies of the March Sentinel distributed at once in Illinois, and ten millions throughout the country besides; it shows what these Illinois preachers are up to, and what will come of it.

"The California Church and State Convention" *American Sentinel* 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The California State Prohibition Convention was held in San Francisco the first week in April. The first words of its platform were these:-

"The Prohibition party of the State of California in convention assembled, reverently recognize Almighty God as the supreme ruler, to whose laws all human laws should conform."

The seventh plank in its platform is this:-

"We declare that Sunday is an institution so interwoven into our laws, our customs, our civilization, and the very structure of our Government, so intricately and beneficently connected with our social, business, and moral life, that we cannot dispense with it without sacrificing the very best interests of the country and the highest welfare of the whole people. And so believing, we demand the enactment and enforcement of an intelligent and rational Sunday law."

The discussion of these two parts of the platform is of interest to those who are watching the growth of religion as a power in politics. We quote from the published report:-

"The first section being read, about twenty delegates jumped to their feet for recognition. One clerical gentleman, with long gray hair, and wearing glasses, made a long address in which he mixed up religion and politics, declaring that the party ought to recognize the Young Men's Christian Association and the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and that pre-eminently the convention ought to adopt the reverential section addressed to the Almighty.

"Mr. Robinson, of Sonoma County, wanted to stop and calmly consider the fact that the gentlemen of the Republican party did not lug religion into their platform. It was unwise to do anything to bring about a conflict of religious opinion. He believed that God Almighty cared little for compliments to him passed by a Prohibition convention. The speaker objected to bringing in the Church and State.

"Before he could proceed further the speaker was greeted by shouts of, 'No, no!' yells and hisses.

"The chairman shouted, 'Time, time!' and hit the desk vigorously with his gavel.

"Mr. Robinson, having by this time caught his second wind, made a motion to strike out the section recognizing God in the platform.

"Another howl of indignation arose from the opposition, who were greatly in the majority, while amendments and amendments to those again were offered, and the matter became so twisted up that the convention hardly knew where it stood. The original question being finally put, the entire first section, with the objectionable recognition of the Deity, was carried, there being only two or three opposing votes."

"When the seventh section was read Dr. Yarnell, of Los Angeles, moved to amend by striking out the word 'Sunday' and substituting 'Sabbath.'

"Mr. Robinson, of Sonoma, who seemed to have as clear an idea of business and dispatch as any member of the convention, again bobbed up and said that the motion was only recurring on the question of Church and State. He moved to strike out everything relating to Sunday.

"Dr. Calhoun, of San Jose, threw himself into the breach and declared that Sunday was not an institution, while the Sabbath was. By using that term you used none that was objectionable to anyone. The reverend gentleman then went back 1,800 years and began an argument on religion in general.

"Miller, of Los Angeles, moved to lay the amendments on the table. After argument had been going on for ten minutes the chair ruled the question was not debatable.

"Judge Bourne, of San Bernardino, cut the Gordian knot by offering an amendment that nothing in the platform interfere with the religious observance of Sabbath by Christians if so disposed.

"One member objected to the motion because it would cut off Hebrews.

"Henry French, of San Jose, declared that he wanted to put himself on record right here, and say that he would not live in a country where there was no Sunday; he'd rather go to the Fiji Islands first. Shut up the saloons from Saturday night until Monday morning and they would soon be compelled to close up entirely.

"Judge Elliot, of Stockton, said that if the party went into the campaign with the Sunday plank in the platform, they would have to pass half the time in convincing the people that it was not a religious movement.

"After half an hour of debate, Judge Bourne's amendment was lost by a vote of 73 to 84.

"The original resolution as presented in the platform originally was adopted."

This we insert not so much for comment at this time, as for the purpose of setting before our readers a view of the rising of the evil tide which the Sentinel has been pointing out now for nearly three years. When opposition to Church and State is met in a Prohibition or any other sort of a convention with, "No, no, yells and hisses," then such convention ought to be condemned by every man who has any regard for civil and religious liberty, for human right, or for purity in either politics or religion. This is more than "a straw" showing which way the religio-

political wind is blowing. The Church and State party is now the proper name for the Prohibition party of California.

"An Alarm Needed" *American Sentinel* 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

In the March Sentinel we made an extended quotation from the Christian Union, of which the following is the most important portion:

"It is not impossible that the time may come when the old antagonism of the Catholic and the Protestant may appear insignificant in view of the deeper antagonisms which shall make them essentially one. . . It is quite possible that the time may come when the real issue will be between the theist and atheist; the man who believe in God, and order, and freedom, and rights of person and property, on the one side, and the man who disbelieves in all these, on the other side. Whenever that time comes the Protestant and the Catholic will stand side by side in a common defense of those common beliefs which have been their mutual possessions these many centuries. Stranger things have happened in history than such a change of attitude as would be involved in the fellowship of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant."

This quotation is only one of many similar utterances, and as we showed in that number of the Sentinel is nothing but the preparation for Church and State union, because that is the one distinctive feature of the Roman Catholic Church.

But the Christian Union does not profess to follow denominational lines very closely, and therefore it may be thought that its utterance does not in any degree represent the drift of modern Protestantism. Accordingly we present another statement very similar to the above. The Rev. Dr. Henry M. Field, editor of the New York Evangelist (Presbyterian) said in a recent issue of his paper:-

"The late President Hitchcock often said to us, when we discussed the dangers to society from socialists and communists, that we might yet come to look upon the Roman Catholic Church as the most conservative power in the country, if, by its influence over the Irish, it should keep them from running into the excesses by which so many of the French and Germans were carried away. It is conservative also in preserving the name of Christendom against the great flood of infidelity which is sweeping over the land. Here is a tremendous power exercised by the Roman Catholic Church over millions of our countrymen, and it is the height of folly and

38

fanaticism to alienate it from us by standing always in an attitude of antagonism."

And an Episcopalian clergyman of Central New York wrote as follows to Dr. Field:-

"I do want to thank you for what you say about the treatment of Roman Catholics. How vastly better than infidelity is that church, and what a check it is to the same! Surely God is in it."

Such an expression from a representative of the Episcopal Church ought not to occasion any surprise, for there are many prominent members of that denomination who are desirous that it should be known as the American Catholic Church; but when so prominent a Presbyterian as Dr. Field comes out in favor of

an alliance with Roman Catholicism, it is very significant. And what Dr. Field says is but an echo of the opinions held by Dr. Hitchcock, of the Union Theological Seminary, and Drs. Hodge and Patton, of Princeton College, both strongholds of Presbyterianism.

From a report in the Congregationalist of April 5, we take the following, which is perhaps even more significant than the statements above quoted; it appeared in that paper under the heading, "Observance of Holy Week."-

"Probably more Congregational Churches than ever before, marked the eventful days of last week, either at their regular services, or with special meetings.

"In Lowell, the John Street Church was open every afternoon, and Rev. H.T. Rose gave a brief address, many coming from other churches to listen, and to share in the worship. The churches of Salem united on Good Friday in a communion service at the Crombie Street Church, Rev. L.B. Voorhees preaching.

"A remarkable series of discourses was given in Worcester at the union meetings of the Central Church and St. John Episcopal, each house of worship being alternately used. The preachers were Drs. Merriman, Tucker, Herrick, and Phillips Brooks. These union meetings continuing through Lent, have fostered the spirit of unity, and desire for aggressive work.

"As last year, union services were held in Pittsfield every noon, for half an hour, in the First Church, only one clergyman being in the pulpit, and the exercises consisting of prayer, hymns, a scripture reading covering the incidents of the day, and a few fitting words. The congregation united in the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer. On Good Friday the service, 'The Watch on the Cross,' was held at St. Stephen's Church from twelve till three o'clock, being conducted by Rector W.W. Newton. Each of the other evangelical clergymen of the town spoke briefly on one of the seven words of the cross. The services have had a meditative and strength-giving character, and the yearly observance of the week is now a settled thing.

"The observance was more general than ever in Hartford. The Asylum Hill and South Churches each held daily services at 5 p.m. The Center, Park, and Pearl Street churches held union services for five evenings. At the Fourth Church the annual week-night communion service was held. Dr. Stainer's 'Passion Music' was rendered at the Good Friday service in the South Church."

These things show a strong and increasing tendency among the professed Protestants to obliterate all seeming differences between them and the Catholic Church, so that there may be complete "Christian union." Perhaps some may not have thought of the fact, but it is a fact, that this is off from the same piece as National Reform. We have often stated, and wish to emphasize the statement, that the American Sentinel is not simply opposing what is known as the National Reform Association, but is uncompromisingly opposed to everything tending toward a union of Church and State, or to a curtailment of civil or religious freedom. We do not believe that the National Reform Association alone could in a hundred years so influence public sentiment as to secure the ends which it seeks; but that Association is only one of the many agencies at work to destroy all that is distinctive about Protestantism. The regular National Reformers have

already committed themselves to union with Roman Catholics, by stating that in a world's Christian convention many countries could be represented only by Catholics, and that they would have no objection to having the Catholic Bible and Catholic instruction in the public schools where Catholics are in the majority. The Prohibition party in many States is fully committed to laws enforcing religion; the Women's Christian Temperance Union has indorsed the work of the National Reform Association; the Catholic Church exists in the foundation of Church and State; and the Protestant churches are courting the Catholic Church. Surely there is need enough for an alarm to be sounded.

E.J.W.

"Sunday-Law Fallacies Exposed" *American Sentinel* 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette* of March 10 makes some good points against the advocates of civil statutes to enforce the observance of Sunday, or, as they call it, Sabbath. The article is too long to print entire, but we insert the main points, that expose the sophistry of those political religionists who propose to enforce religious observances under cover of civil statutes; and who propose to carry civil government into the realm of morals, or rather propose to reduce the moral law to a level with civil statutes, and to give to the law of God the sanction of civil enactments.

"Separated from the Creator's seventh day of rest, the Sabbath commandment would be separated from its foundation and meaning. Has Jehovah repealed the seventh-day commandment? If so, let the repealing word be shown. Can man repeal it? Can man shift Jehovah's law from the seventh to the first day? Can he say that the story of the six days' work of creation is a myth of an ignorant people, and that God did no corporal work, and was not tired, and that creation may have been evolution through millions of years, and that the essence of the commandment is that one day in seven, or one-seventh of the time, shall be a day of cessation from the ordinary vocations?

"A letter in the *Commercial Gazette* of the 6th, laying down the standards of the Presbyterian Church, and warning this paper against 'leaving the sphere of the secular and entering the arena of the religious,' shows that that church has repealed the seventh-day commandment, and has re-enacted it for the first day, whereby it has created the sin of Sabbath-breaking on the first day. No prudent person can wish to enter the 'religious arena' to deny that the Presbyterian Church can repeal the law of God, and can enact a law to create new sins. But such repeal and enactment are binding only on Presbyterians, and cannot be made the ground of State statutes. As to the 'religious arena,' the newspaper province extends over all that concerns mankind. It recognizes no taboo.

"The consciousness that the separation of the commandment from its foundation in the Creator's rest day, abandons all foundation for a day of holy time, and all foundation for a moral or civil code which makes sins of things on one day which are not sins on other days, is that which makes good people cling to a part of the commandment, and try to enforce it on Sunday, after they have

abolished it as to the Sabbath day. In this they fly from the commandment to the argument of man's welfare-which cuts loose from the commandment-and then they fly from the argument of man's liberty in his welfare, to the commandment of holy time which they have repealed.

"The matter of inhibition from work, for the relief of the toilers, is one thing. The Sabbath commandment of Jehovah's holy day is another thing. The argument of man's welfare makes man free to adapt the inhibition to his welfare. But man may not adapt Jehovah's seventh-day Sabbath law to his idea of his own welfare. If that commandment stands, it is for the day it commands. It is a law or it is not. It is no fast-and-loose law. . .

"They declare Sunday the moral ruin of the people. They prove it by alleged statistics of criminal prosecutions to show that more crimes of violence are committed on Sunday than on all other days of the week. Why is this? Because the saloons are open? They are open on other days. This reduces them to the sole reason that it is because it is a day of idleness.

"Their argument is absolutely destructive to the beneficence of the custom of a rest day. They continually affirm that a Sabbath day is the very foundation of religion, morals, and society, and they incessantly declare that the custom of Sunday cessation from work in the cities has made it a day of moral ruin. What is their recourse from the destruction which they charge upon the day of idleness? To make statutes more stringent to enforce idleness. Arguing that idleness on that day leads mankind to moral ruin, they call for a more rigid enforcement of idleness, to lead mankind to the ways of salvation.

"Surely there is need to revise their basis in season before they can proceed rationally in legislation. Selling beer is no more a sin on Sun-day than on other days. The reason why more crimes of violence are done on Sunday than on other days-if that is a fact-is not that the saloons are open, but that men are idle. The good of a day of rest for the toilers has to be taken with the drawback of this unavoidable evil from idleness and indulgence of the appetites. The cause is the cessation of vocations. The attempt to close the saloons is a diversion from the true cause, and is a vain attempt to deal with one of the effects.

"Moral laws must have a foundation of truth, or they will make no headway. The attempt to found Sunday laws or Sunday observance on the Sabbath commandment is to give them a false bottom. The affirmation of the Sabbath law as binding on the conscience on Sunday, as a reason for Sunday statutes, while disclaiming any desire to enforce religious observance by statute, is crooked. The pretense that the saloons are the cause of the crimes of the day of idleness, is not true. Still, there is an eternal power in truth, which will bring to naught all statutes and moral causes which reject truth from the foundation, and try to build upon false assumptions."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

It is reported in the religious press that a great revival is progressing in Tokio, Japan, with no fewer than five hundred conversions in a single month. One

religious journal, in noting the wonderful revival, and how recently the country was wholly pagan, says: "Everybody is interested in Christianity, and nobody speaks against it." Well, then, we fear that Christianity is in a bad condition in Japan. Christ said: "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets." When the Christians were only "a sect" that was everywhere spoken against, Christianity was pure and undefiled; but when Constantine elevated Christianity to the throne of the world, and nobody spoke against it, but men found that they gained popularity by accepting it, then real Christianity fled, and "that wicked" took its place. We do not believe Christ's words have any less application to-day than they had eighteen hundred years ago.

Not long ago the religious journals of New York were very active in working for the Saturday half-holiday. Now the bank superintendent of the State, in his report to the Legislature, has recommended that the law be so amended as to be limited in its operations to July and August, during which months business in the cities is usually suspended on Saturday afternoons; and the Independent says that "a better recommendation would have been a total repeal of the law altogether." It truthfully adds:-

"The truth is, that the law is really of no service to anybody. The design of the Legislature in passing it was simply to humbug the working people, by seeming to do something for them, when in fact doing nothing except to their injury."

And that is just the case with all Sunday legislation. If the workingmen allow the Sunday-law advocates to humbug them into thinking that the object of Sunday laws is to benefit them, they will find out the contrary to their sorrow when it is too late to remedy the matter.

In a recent address before the Young Women's Christian Temperance Union in Oakland, Rev. Dr. Horton stated that he had been credibly in-formed that during this Lenten season there were many families which gave their children wine in the place of meat, and said that teachers in certain schools complained that those children became utterly unmanageable in consequence. Was there ever a worse exhibition of straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel? We believe Lent is a period of time devoted to the mortification of the flesh! "The church" forbids the use of meat during that time, so that the body may be kept under; and these people, who would think it almost a mortal sin to disobey the church in this regard, give their children (and undoubtedly themselves also) wine, which is ten times worse than meat could be. This is a fair sample of the working of a religion that is fixed by law; formalism at the expense of piety must always be the result.

We have received from the editor of the *Herold der Wahrheit* a translation of a part of the remarks of the prosecuting attorney of the city of Cassel, Germany, in the case of the Rev. Thummel, who was indicted for attacking the Papacy and calling the Pope antichrist. In moving for nine months' imprisonment for Thummel, and two months' imprisonment for the publisher of the article, the prosecuting attorney said, among other things:-

"The defendant refers (or appeals) to Dr. M. Luther. First, it must be considered that Luther lived three hundred years ago, and that mean-while the

customs, the tone, and tastes, etc., have changed. If Luther lived to-day, and should say and write the same things that he did then, he would undoubtedly, by reason of section 166 of the Penal Code, be condemned."

Undoubtedly; and this is in a city where the majority of the churches to-day are Lutheran. If a man should be condemned now for using language similar to that which Luther used three hundred years ago, then he ought to have been condemned then, for it is Rome's boast that she never changes. If Luther were alive to-day he would undoubtedly say the same things about the Catholic Church that he said in the days of Leo X., and would include many professed Protestants in his remarks. Fortunately there are some still who are animated by the same spirit that Luther was, and who do not flatter the Pope simply because his power is increasing.

"A Deserved Rebuke" *American Sentinel* 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

In the latter part of March, the Methodist Episcopal Conference of Kansas adopted resolutions refusing to support any political party that will not agree to play into their hands. The *Interior* (Presbyterian) administers a just and deserved rebuke, which we here insert, not only for the good in the matter itself, but also as another evidence of the rapid growth of Church and State ideas. We ask, for the weighty words of the *Interior*, the careful consideration that is their due.

"The Methodist conference for Kansas, at its meeting in Topeka last week, passed resolutions demanding national prohibition and refusing to support any political party which does not stand squarely upon their platform. They demanded: 1. That the United States shall not issue permits to sell liquor in any State unless the same be countersigned by the State authorities. 2. Prohibition in the District of Columbia, the Territories, etc. 3. The importation of liquors in-to any State to be by the consent of the State. 4. A prohibitory amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Just what the practical effect of these provisions might be, it is not safe to undertake in advance to determine. But the purpose of these brethren was to put down the liquor traffic, and therefore it was a righteous purpose. But we would not like to have our presbytery or assembly pledge our church to the defeat of any political party not committed to these particular measures. We would not like to have our church committed to a war of extermination upon the Republican party or the Democratic party. As the clause in our Confession forbidding the church to meddle with civil affairs is now under scrutiny, the action of the Methodist conference affords a very good illustration.

"Let us suppose, now, that the Methodist Episcopal Church, which at the North, we may say, is pretty nearly solidly Republican, should receive and obey a mandate from its general conference to vote against the Republican party-that would defeat that party. There are over 100,000 offices and over a thousand millions of treasure dependent upon that stake. Can a church have the awarding of such political spoils to one or another political party and remain morally pure? No reasonable man will believe it. Nothing has yet been seen in history in the

way of ecclesiastical corruption that would compare with the horrible mixture of cant and rascality that would follow. This shows that, however attractive from a moral standpoint ecclesiastico-political action may be, it is in the highest degree perilous. In forbidding it our Confession of Faith deals with principles of religion and morality that are unchangeable and decisive."

It is stated that Colorado has great hopes of becoming the tobacco-producing district of this country, careful experiments having determined that many varieties of tobacco will yield enormous crops upon its soil. The *Oakland Times* says:-

"If Colorado cannot produce the requisite soil and climate, it could certainly be found in California. With our vast domain it is ridiculous that we should still be spending eight to ten millions of dollars per year in buying the weed from Cuba and Sumatra."

We should say that if Californians must use eight to ten million dollars' worth of tobacco every year, it will be vastly cheaper to import it than to ruin good land in producing it. It is well known that there is nothing that grows that exhausts the soil so much as tobacco. Much good land in Connecticut and Virginia has been rendered unfit for use, because it has been devoted to tobacco-raising. Tobacco has only one mission, and that is, to kill, and it does that effectually, whether applied to the land, to men, or to pestiferous vermin.

June 1888

"Catholic Schools" *American Sentinel* 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

Two men in West Chester, Pa., William S. Bowen and Philip Maguire, members of the Catholic Church, withdrew their children from the parochial school, and sent them to the public school. On Sunday, April 27, they were publicly excommunicated by the priest, he "announcing from the altar that William S. Bowen, Assistant Manager of the West Chester Gas Company, and Philip Maguire, one of the editors of the Daily News, would hereafter be forbidden a seat in the church, and that they would be refused the sacraments, living or dead."

The priest gave his reasons for this, as follows:-

"These gentlemen were excommunicated on my own authority and the authority of the arch-bishop, with whom I had consulted in the matter. I took their pews from them because I do not propose that anyone shall hold a pew in this church who is in open rebellion against its laws, when there are faithful and obedient members who are willing to occupy them. Mr. Bowen had the audacity to apply for communion on last Easter morning, and was publicly refused. I had consulted with the archbishop months before in reference to this matter, and it was on the strength of this, and of a letter from his grace, that the refusal was made."

Mr. Maguire gave his reasons for taking his child from the Catholic school, and sending him to the public school, as follows:-

"The reverend gentleman saw fit to use my name in connection with my refusal to send my child to the parochial school, and also notified those of his congregation present that I was formally excommunicated for this refusal, but he wisely took good care not to state the reason for my refusal to have the boy longer educated at the parish school. I took the boy away because, in my judgment, the school was far inferior to the public schools of West Chester, and because the penalty for missing a lesson in catechism was a severe whipping. When I inquired, through a letter, about the severity of the lesson and the punishment inflicted, I received, in reply, a letter from his reverence telling me to mind my own business, and that he would not tolerate interference from me. I replied in a letter, which was answered with a notice that my boy was turned out of the Sunday-school because I would not send him to the parish school, and, later on, the priest met me on the street, and in the most overbearing way threatened that he would deny the child the sacraments of the church. Nine-tenths of the parents sending their children to the parish school do so rather from a sense of fear than an understanding that it is good for them to do so. Many of them have told me of their troubles, and of the bad discipline in the school, and of the poor progress that their children make. There is a great deal of smothered dissatisfaction here, and Rev. Samuel B. Spaulding knows it, deny it as he will."

This is a fair specimen of the foul dealing of the Roman Catholic Church in the matter of schools and schooling. And this is the sort of instruction which the National Reform Association proposes to establish in the public schools wherever the Roman Catholics are in the majority. This is the church to which the National Reform Association proposes to give the control of the public schools wherever the Catholics are in the majority. We seriously think that if there is in this world an organization more iniquitous than the Roman Catholic Church, it must be the National Reform Association.

"An Alarming Proposition" *American Sentinel* 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

And still they travel the road to Rome. We have frequently of late given in these columns instances of the way in which Catholicism is absorbing Protestantism, or, rather, the way in which Protestantism is plunging headlong into Catholicism, and now we have another step to record. In the *Christian at Work* of April 12, Prof. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., of Union Theological Seminary, New York, had an article which was continued in the *Christian at Work* of April 19. The article was entitled, "Is Rome an Ally, an Enemy, or Both?" Starting out with the assertion that "the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant churches are agreed in nine-tenths or more of the contents of Christianity," Doctor Briggs makes some statements concerning the Reformation, and then says:-

"We are agreed as to the essentials of Christianity. Our common faith is based on the so-called Apostles' Creed, and worship on the Lord's prayer, our morals upon the ten commandments and the sermon on the mount. Who will venture to say that the Roman Catholic Church is not as faithful to these foundations of our common religion as Protestants? Taking our stand on the

apostles' creed, we must add to the articles of faith on which we are agreed, all the doctrinal achievements of the church for fifteen centuries, the doctrine of the unity of God, the person and work of Jesus Christ, the holy Trinity, original sin and human depravity, salvation by divine grace, the absolute need of the atonement of Jesus Christ. On all these great doctrines of our religion Romanism and Protestantism are one. Here we are allies, and it is our common task to proclaim these doctrines to the heathen world, and to overcome by them all forms of irreligion and infidelity in Christian lands. And differences about justification by faith, and salvation by the divine grace alone, and the authority of the church as regards the determination of the canon of Scripture, and its interpretation, ought not to prevent our co-operation and alliance in the great work of indicating and proclaiming the common faith. Our conflict over the doctrines in which we differ would be more fruitful in good results if our contest should be based upon concord and alliance in the common faith. If our contest could be narrowed to the real points of difference, and that contest could be conducted in a brave, chivalrous, and loving manner, the results would be more fruitful.

"Taking our stand upon the Lord's prayer, we observe that as to the greater part of Christian worship we are agreed. We worship God in common, in morning and evening assemblies, by prayer, songs of praise, the reading and preaching of the Scriptures, and the celebration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper. All this is common. Furthermore, we take the liberty of affirming that the matter of all this worship is for the most part common in both these great bodies of Christians. I have heard sermons in Roman Catholic Churches of Europe which were more evangelical and less objectionable than many sermons I have heard in leading Protestant Churches in Berlin, London, and New York. It is well known that the Protestant books of liturgy contain a considerable amount of material derived from the old massbooks, and they are all the more valuable for that. Roman Catholic baptism has many superstitions connected with it, but the essentials of baptism are there in the baptism by the minister in the name of the holy Trinity. Roman Catholic observance of the Lord's Supper is connected with the worship of the materials of the supper under the doctrine that they are really the body and blood of the divine Lord, but who can deny that pious souls by faith really partake of the body and blood of Christ in this holy sacrament, notwithstanding the errors in which it is enveloped? If we look with eyes of Christian charity upon the Lutheran and Zwinglian views, which are regarded as serious errors by the standards of the reformed churches, and would not deny to the participants real communion with Christ, why should we deny such communion to pious Roman Catholics?

"In all matters of worship we are in essential concord with Roman Catholics, and we ought not to hesitate to make an alliance with them so far as possible to maintain the sanctity of the Sabbath as a day of worship, and to proclaim to the world the necessity of worshiping God in his house, and of becoming members of his church by baptism, and of seeking union and communion with the Saviour by Christian worship, the study of the Scripture, and the observance of the Lord's Supper. With this recognition of concord, Protestants can then debate with

Romanists in a friendly manner, and seek to overcome their errors, remove the excrescences they have heaped upon the simple worship in the spirit and in truth which seems to us more in accordance with the Scripture and the wishes of our Saviour.

"We should also note that in the great constituent parts of prayer,-invocation, adoration, thanksgiving, confession of sin, petition, inter-cession, and consecration, Roman Catholic and Protestant worship are agreed, and consequently the matter of prayer is essentially the same, the differences are less than most people imagine. In Christian song the differences are still less. If our hymn-books were stripped of hymns from the ancient and medieval church, and from modern Roman Catholics, they would be bare indeed. Looking now at the sphere of morals we take our common stand on the ten commandments and the sermon on the mount. As to the vast majority of all questions of morals, Romanism and Protestantism are agreed. It is true there is a great deal of immorality in the Roman Catholic Church in some countries, and we think it may be shown that as a rule Protestantism is productive of better morals than Romanism; but this, after all, is a question of more or less, and to say

44

the least, Protestantism has little to boast of. On all these questions it is of the highest importance that the Roman Catholic Church and Protestant churches should make an alliance. Their joint efforts would have an influence upon public and private morals such as the world has not yet witnessed. We may agree to differ and debate on all questions of morals where there is discord. But when we are agreed on the vast majority of questions that come before the public it is sheer folly for us to waste our energies in antagonism when co-operation and alliance would be productive of vast good.

"We hold, therefore, that the Roman Catholics and the Protestants ought not to hesitate to ally themselves for the maintenance and the preparation of those great principles of Christian doctrine, Christian worship, and Christian morals that they hold in common."

We think that no apology is needed for this long quotation. The proposed alliance with Rome, the necessity for which Doctor Briggs reiterates so often, is a noteworthy sign of the times, and we could not ignore it and be true to our name. The Doctor seems to base his plea for an alliance quite largely upon the fact that Protestantism is about as bad as Catholicism. He says above that Protestantism has little to boast of over Roman Catholicism, in the way of morality, and elsewhere in the same article he says:-

"Why should we complain of the persecutions that our ancestors suffered from Rome, when we have to lament that others of our ancestors were merciless to Roman Catholics? Roman Catholic intolerance and bigotry may be matched by Protestant intolerance and bigotry. I doubt whether God looks with any more favor upon these detestable vices in the one than in the other."

Now all that we can say about this is, "Pity 'tis, 'tis true." It is, no doubt, a valid reason why Protestantism and Roman Catholicism should join, for when Protestantism becomes as bad as Catholicism, we can see no necessity for maintaining a separate existence. For ourselves we think that there is yet quite a

difference between the two bodies; but when a prominent professor in one of the leading theological seminaries in the land can see no difference between the Lord's Supper as celebrated according to the divine command, and the Roman Catholic mass, and when he indorses "all the doctrinal work of the [Catholic] Church for fifteen centuries," the point of perfect union cannot be far off.

What an array of names we now have in favor of Protestant union with Catholicism,-Doctors Hodge, Hitchcock, Schaff, Patton, Briggs, Field, etc. But who has heard or read of a Catholic priest clamoring for Catholic union with Protestantism? Nobody. Why not? Would not the Catholic Church be willing to enter into such an alliance as these Protestant Doctors of Divinity propose? Most certainly it would be, but the movement must all be made by the Protestants. The Catholic Church will gladly receive the Protestant churches to her bosom,-she will accept their aid in the furtherance of her peculiar schemes,-but she can afford to wait till they come of their own accord, for if they make the proposals, she can dictate the terms.

One more thought. What must we conclude will be the effect of an alliance between Protestantism and Catholicism, when we remember that one of the strongest pleas for such an alliance is-not that Catholicism is as good as Protestantism-but, that Protestantism is nearly, if not quite, as bad as Catholicism? Those who know anything of Rome's peculiarities, do not need to have an answer given them.

Some may say that we are alarmists. Indeed we are; and we think that anyone who sees such danger approaching and does not sound an alarm, deserves to suffer all the ill that may follow. Our only wish is that we might sound the alarm so loud that it would awaken the thousands who seem to be asleep, and who are in danger of being taken in the snare.

E.J.W.

"Congress and Sunday Legislation" *American Sentinel* 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

We have before referred to the petitions to Congress which were being circulated by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking the National Legislature to pass laws stopping Sunday trains, Sunday mails, and Sunday parades in the army and navy. The following from the Union Signal, of May 3, is the latest information that we have on this subject:-

"The Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Blair chairman, gave a hearing to the friends of the Sabbath, on April 6, from ten to twelve. Mrs. J.C. Bateham, our national superintendent of this department, presented the opening paper-a statement of the legislation asked for by the million and more petitioners, with the reasons thereof, basing these on humanitarian grounds, in behalf of the half million laborers deprived of Sabbath rest directly or indirectly by Government work, and because the observance of a rest-day is for the best good of the Government, the people, and our free institutions. Rev. W.F. Crafts then gave a forcible and exhaustive argument for the Sabbath, which will soon appear in Our Day. Able addresses followed: by Dr. T. A. Fernley, secretary of the

Philadelphia Sabbath Association; Rev. M.P. Nice, secretary of the Maryland Sabbath Association; Rev. Yates Hickey, secretary of the International Sabbath Association, and Rev. Dr. Elliott, author of "The Abiding Sabbath." The attendance was large, and the attention most courteous. Senator Blair will now draft and present a bill for us."

This same question was, in the same way, brought before the United States Senate in 1828-29, and the Senate Committee to whom the subject was referred, made a report, which we herewith reproduce entire. It is of double importance just now, first, because of the soundness of the principles which it enunciates, and secondly, as a standard by which to try the position of the United States Senate as now composed. The report will amply repay careful study. We have italicized certain portions, not only as worthy of special note, but also to render them easier for future reference; because we shall yet have abundant occasion to refer to the report. It is as follows:-

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT - TRANSPORTATION OF THE MAIL ON THE SABBATH.

"The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the following report and resolution, presented by Mr. Johnson, with which the Senate concurred:-

"The committee to whom were referred the several petitions, on the subject of mails on the Sabbath, or first day of the week, report,-

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

"We are aware that a variety of sentiment exists among the good citizens of this Nation, on the subject of the Sabbath day; and our Government is designed for the protection of one as much as another. The Jews, who in this country are as free as Christians, and entitled to the same protection from the laws, derive their obligation to keep the Sabbath day from the fourth commandment of their decalogue, and in conformity with that injunction pay religious homage to the seventh day of the week, which we call Saturday. One denomination of Christians among us, justly celebrated for their piety, and certainly as good citizens as any other class, agree with the Jews in the moral obligation of the Sabbath, and observe the same day. There are, also, many Christians among us who derive not their obligation to observe the Sabbath from the decalogue, but regard the Jewish Sabbath as abrogated. From the example of the apostles of

Christ, they have chosen the first day of the week instead of that day set apart in the decalogue, for their religious devotions. These have generally regarded the observance of the day as a devotional exercise, and would not more readily, enforce it upon others than they would enforce secret prayer or devout meditations.

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

45

against its earliest indication. With these different religious views, the committee are of opinion that Congress cannot interfere. *It is not the legitimate province of the Legislature to determine what religion is true, or what false.*

"*Our Government is a civil, and not a religious institution.* Our Constitution recognizes in every person the right to choose his own religion, and to enjoy it freely, without molestation. Whatever may be the religious sentiments of citizens, and however variant, they are alike entitled to protection from the Government, so long as they do not invade the rights of others. The transportation of the mail on the first day of the week, it is believed, does not interfere with the rights of conscience. *The petitioners for its discontinuance appear to be actuated by a religious zeal, which may be commendable if confined to its proper sphere; but they assume a position better suited to an ecclesiastical than to a civil institution.* They appear in many instances to lay it down as an axiom, that the practice is a violation of the law of God. Should Congress in legislative capacity adopt the sentiment, it would establish the principle that the Legislature is a proper tribunal to determine what are the laws of God. It would involve a legislative decision on a religious controversy, and on a point in which good citizens may honestly differ in opinion, without disturbing the peace of society or endangering its liberties. If this principle is once introduced, it will be impossible to define its bounds.

"*Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God.* To prevent a similar train of evils in this country, the Constitution has wisely withheld from our Government the power of defining the divine law. It is a right reserved to each citizen; and while he respects the rights of others, he cannot be held amenable to any human tribunal for his conclusions. *Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object, are, in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous.* This first effort of the kind

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

"Under the present regulations of the Post-office Department, the rights of conscience are not invaded. Every agent enters voluntarily, and it is presumed conscientiously, into the discharge of his duties, without intermeddling with the conscience of another. Post-offices are so regulated that but a small proportion of the first day of the week is required to be occupied in official business. In the transportation of the mail on that day, no one agent is employed many hours. Religious persons enter into the business without violating their own consciences or imposing any restraints upon others. Passengers in the mail stages are free to rest during the first day of the week, or to pursue their journeys at their own pleasure. While the mail is transported on Saturday, the Jew and the Sabbatarian may abstain from any agency in carrying it, on conscientious scruples. While it is transported on the first day of the week, another class may abstain, from the same religious scruples. The obligation of Government is the same on both these classes; and the committee can discover no principle on which the claims of one should be more respected than those of the other; unless it be admitted that the consciences of the minority are less sacred than those of the majority.

"It is the opinion of the committee that the subject should be regarded simply as a question of expediency, irrespective of its religious bearing. In this light it has hitherto been considered. Congress has never legislated upon the subject. It rests, as it ever has done, in the legal discretion of the Postmaster-General, under the repeated refusals of Congress to discontinue the Sabbath mails. His knowledge and judgment in all the concerns of that department, will not be questioned. His intense labors and assiduity have resulted in the highest improvement of every branch of his department. It is practiced only on the great leading mail routes, and such others as are necessary to maintain their connections. To prevent this, would, in the opinion of the committee, be productive of immense injury, both in its commercial and political, and also its moral bearings. The various departments of government require, frequently in peace, always in war, the speediest intercourse with the remotest parts of the country; and one important object of the mail establishment is to furnish the greatest and most economical facilities for such intercourse. The delay of the mails one whole day in seven would require the employment of special expresses, at great expense, and sometimes with great uncertainty.

"The commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural interests of the country are so intimately connected as to require a constant and most expeditious correspondence betwixt all our seaports, and betwixt them and the most interior settlements. The delay of the mails during the Sunday would give occasion for

the employment of private expresses, to such an amount that probably ten riders would be employed where one mail stage would be running on that day, thus diverting the revenue of that department in-to another channel, and sinking the establishment into a state of pusillanimity incompatible with the dignity of the Government of which it is a department.

"Passengers in the mail stages, if the mails are not permitted to proceed on Sunday, will be expected to spend that day at a tavern upon the road, generally under circumstances not friendly to devotion, and at an expense which many are but poorly able to encounter. To obviate these difficulties, many will employ extra carriages for their conveyance, and become the bearers of correspondence, as more expeditious than the mail. The stage proprietors will themselves often furnish the travelers with those means of conveyance; so that the effect will ultimately be only to stop the mail, while the vehicle which conveys it will continue, and its passengers become the special messengers for conveying a considerable portion of what otherwise constitutes the contents of the mail. Nor can the committee discover where the system could consistently end. If the observance of a holiday becomes incorporated in our institutions, shall we not forbid the movement of an army; prohibit an assault in time of war; and lay an injunction upon our naval officers to lie in the wind while upon the ocean on that day? Consistency would seem to require it. Nor is it certain that we should stop here. *If the principle is once established, that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum.* We shall, if consistent, provide for the erection of edifices for worship of the Creator, and for the support of Christian ministers, if we believe such measures will promote the interests of Christianity. It is the settled conviction of the committee, that the only method of avoiding these consequences, with their attendant train of evils, is to adhere strictly to the spirit of the Constitution, which regards the general Government in no other light than that of a civil institution, wholly destitute of religious authority. *What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which Government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotic power may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them.*

"Let the National Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid, for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World.

"Our Constitution recognizes no other power than that of persuasion, for enforcing religious observances. Let the professors of Christianity recommend their religion by deeds of benevolence, by Christian meekness, by lives of temperance and holiness. Let them combine their efforts to instruct the ignorant, to relieve the widow and the orphan, to promulgate to the world the gospel of their Saviour, recommending its precepts by their habitual example; Government will find its legitimate object in protecting them. It cannot oppose them, and they will not need its aid. *Their moral influence will then do infinitely more to advance*

the true interests of religion, than any measure which they may call on Congress to enact. The petitioners do not complain of any infringement upon their own rights. They enjoy all that Christians ought to ask at the hands of any Government-protection from all molestation in the exercise of their religious sentiments.

"Resolved, That the committee be discharged from any further consideration of the subject."

E. J. Waggoner., "Another 'Open Letter'" *American Sentinel* 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

It will be remembered that in the February Sentinel we replied to an "open letter" to us from Rev. W. T. McConnell, of Youngstown, Ohio. In the *Christian Nation* of February 29, Mr. McConnell wrote to us another open letter, which we have not till now had the opportunity to notice. As in his first "open letter" he started out with the stock argument of the National Reformers-that of classing with infidels, atheists, liquor leagues, liberal leagues, etc., etc., every opponent, whoever he may be or whatever may be the grounds of his opposition-so in this "open letter" the first thing he does is to enter upon a long defense of it. But he need not have done that at all; we did not mention it with the object of having it enter as an element into the controversy between us and the National Reformers. As Mr. McConnell was a new champion in the lists, we simply called his attention to this point to see whether we might not be able to get from him some sort of an argument upon the merits of the controversy between us. But our effort was in vain. Mr. McConnell proves to be as destitute of argument on the merits of the controversy as are all the rest of the National Reformers.

From the beginning we have invited the National Reformers, both as individuals and by their organs, to show wherein our opposition to the National Reform movement is not based upon sound principles. We have asked them repeatedly to show wherein our arguments against it are faulty, or wherein our conclusions are illogical. We have offered them our own columns in which to show this. But with a single exception-Rev. Robert White, of Steubenville-the principal, the first, the leading reply, has always been to call us names and to class us with all the elements of wickedness that they can think of. But we do not care for that. We know that "it is only in the absence of argument that recourse is had to ridicule; and that the chair of the scoffer is never filled until that of the logician is vacated." Therefore, as the National Reformers are destitute of arguments against us, we couldn't have the heart to deprive them of their only recourse-that of calling us names. We are not what they call us; and we know that their calling us bad names does not make us what they call us.

In his first "open letter" it will be remembered that Mr. McConnell likened the National Reform movement to an express train which is fairly to knock into Hinders everybody who does not get off the track. In reply we freely confessed that "the National Reform movement is nothing but a Satanic car of Juggernaut that proposes relentlessly to crush every person who chooses to think for himself." This sets Mr. McConnell's imagination all aglow, and he says:-

"Now, neighbor, let us step one side and take a look at this 'Satanic car'. . . There is the venerable Mr. Brunot holding the lines [yes, he is], while Doctors Stevenson, Barr, and McAllister urge on the high-spirited district secretaries, who are straining every nerve to in-crease its speed [yes, they are]. Then notice the

47

material of which the 'car' is composed. Its wheels and axles, its panels and arches, its furniture and adornments, are the names of men."

The "names of men!" Yes, that is true, and a goodly number of those names are the names of dead men; others are the names of men who are decidedly opposed to the whole National Reform movement; others are the names of men who are not in the United States at all, and do not belong to the United States; others are names of men as living in certain places, while those men are not only not in those places but are not known there at all. Yes, sir, Mr. McConnell, that is a happy hit that you make, in saying that these were the names of men. We personally know that what we have here said is true. We know that the National Reform Association's Executive Committee in its very latest published list of vice-presidents has printed the names of men who have been dead for years.

Then Mr, McConnell makes great ado, because we confessed his destructive express to be a Satanic car.

To this we have just a word to say. Doctor Philip Schaff says:-

"Secular power has proved a Satanic gift to the church."-*Church and State in the United States, page 11.*

Now secular power is precisely what the National Reform Association proposes to give to the church; therefore the National Reform Association proposes to make a Satanic gift to the church. And as Mr. McConnell proposes that this Satanic gift shall be in the form of an express car upon which the church shall ride in her course of tyranny and destruction, then it is demonstrated by Doctor Schaff's sound principle, and by Mr. McConnell's sounding proposition, that that car is a Satanic car.

"National Reform in the Public Schools" *American Sentinel* 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

It will be remembered that last summer the Saratoga National Reform Convention announced its willingness to put the Catholic Bible, Catholic instruction, and Catholic worship, into the public schools wherever the Catholics are in the majority, if the Catholics would help the Protestants to put the Bible and religious instruction and worship in the public schools. It will also be remembered that the convention commissioned Secretary T. P. Stevenson to secure if possible the co-operation of the Roman Catholic authorities upon this basis. We showed at the time that if the Romish Church should accept this proposition, and the scheme should carry, it would at once place the public schools of ten States and four Territories bodily in the hands of the Catholic Church. We showed that two of these States are Minnesota and Wisconsin. The following from a late number of the New York *Evening Post* shows that in those States Rome is pushing the matter on her own account:-

"The Roman Catholics of the Northwest appear to be making a carefully planned war upon the public-school system, and they are meeting with enough success in isolated cases to arouse general interest in the question. In one district in the town of Barton, Wis., the Catholics rallied in force at the annual meeting last year, and *carried a resolution that no public school should be maintained during the year; and none was held.* This year the contest was renewed, but the Catholics took advantage of the new law giving women the right to vote at school elections, to bring out all their women, and carried the same resolution again. At Melrose, Minn., the Catholic priests engineered a movement to *shorten the school year of the public schools, in order to compel children to attend a parochial school.* Throughout Stearns County, Minn., the *Roman Catechism* is said to be *taught openly in the public schools, and either the opening or the closing hours of the session are devoted to religious instruction given by the priest,* all this being in direct violation of the State constitution, and especially of an amendment adopted in 1877, to meet this very condition. Most of this work has been done so quietly as not to attract wide attention, but the evidences of a determined assault upon the public-school system are now so clear that its friends are becoming aroused to the necessity of action."

This piece of news will doubtless greatly encourage Mr. Stevenson and his constituents. And, at the same time, it ought to arouse every lover of American institutions-every lover of civil and religious liberty-to the most vigilant watchfulness in every State in the Union. But will it?

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

Doctor Crafts says of the Sunday in politics:-

"Its enemies have already attacked it on the field of politics."

But "its enemies" never attacked it on the field of politics until its friends attempted to sustain it on the field of politics. The first advances into the field of politics were by the Sunday-law forces, the gauntlet was by them first thrown down upon the political field, and if "its enemies" accepted the challenge, its friends have but themselves to blame.

In the matter between England and Ireland the Pope has spoken, and has spoken in favor of England, as was the foregone conclusion, because on the side of England is power, and it is official recognition by the power of England which just now the Pope wants more than any other imaginable thing. Besides this, the Pope knows that Catholic Ireland is forever secure to the Papacy whatever he may do, and therefore he can afford to traffic with England at Ireland's expense to any extent that the necessities of the case may demand. If consistency were an attribute of the Papacy, then consistency would demand that the Pope should have decided this question just as he did, because it was the Pope who first gave Ireland to England. But the question of consistency never enters into any action of the Papacy; the sole question always is, What will advance the interests of the Papacy? And as now the supreme consideration is to secure the recognition of the Pope as a sovereign, England must be favored.

In his argument before the Senate Committee in behalf of National Sunday legislation, Dr. Crafts started out with the statement that,-

"A national evil requires a national remedy."

Well, that depends. If it be meant by this that any evil that is as widespread as is the Nation, must be met by a remedy that is as widespread as is the Nation; or if it be meant that an evil done by the national power, should be remedied by the national power-then, very good, that is only to say that the plaster must cover the sore, and is self-evident. But if it be meant that any evil that is as widespread as is the Nation must be met by a remedy applied by national power, then no proposition can be more fallacious. It might very properly be said that covetousness and selfish greed is a national evil, but no remedy that could ever be applied by national power could effect anything at all toward curing the evil. Sin might be said to be a national evil-it is as much so as many of the things which Mr. Crafts mentions-but no remedy that can ever be applied by national power can affect sin in any way but to increase it. From Mr. Crafts's whole argument, it is evident that it is in this latter sense that his proposition is to be understood. But a moment's thought shows that the proposition as meant is to be taken with decided limitations. National evils require national remedies only when those evils are such as to be within the just province of civil government; and such the Sunday question is not in any of its forms.

Passing by a cigar stand the other day, we saw in bold letters the following free advice: "Smoke Sanitary Cigars!" and straightway we began to wonder what kind of cigars sanitary cigars could be. We could not think of anything that could make cigars healthful except the absence of tobacco, and that evidently was not what the enterprising cigar vender meant to suggest. Finally we concluded that sanitary cigars are just the ordinary vile compounds that we meet on the cars and the ferry-boats, and that their sanitary property is the same as that of certain "disinfectants,"-they smell so bad that people are forced to open the windows, and so they get a little fresh air. Even with that view, we think that "sanitary cigars" are a failure, for they usually smell bad enough to vitiate all the air in the neighborhood. Ordinary air stands no show in the presence of a dozen men with cigars.

The Christian Union's Chicago correspondent, commenting on the fact that Dr. Fulton was not allowed by the city authorities to fill his appointment to lecture on the topic, "Is Popery in the Way?" because they feared a riot, thinks that refusal was unnecessary, and adds: "It surely is a dishonor to the Catholic Church if it is supposed that bloodshed would result if ever so violent addresses were made against it." Indeed it is a dishonor to that church, and a dishonor which it has brought upon itself many times. The Catholic Church has had about fourteen centuries of such dishonor, for everybody who knows anything about that church knows that when it has had the power it has never hesitated to shed the blood of those who spoke against it. No man's life would be safe if he should go into any community in the United States, where the Catholics are numerous, and should openly tell the truth concerning that church. A false religion has no other argument at its command but violence.

The following item from the Michigan Christian Advocate, which came to our notice just after the above was written, is a very good comment on the Christian Union's statement that the Catholic Church is too good to cause blood to flow in consequence of addresses made against it:

"Michael Welch was telling a Gladwin audience why he left the Catholic Church, when a party of men entered the room, and informing him that they were after blood, began throwing bottles at his head."

An apparently specious argument in favor of Sunday legislation, and one eminently satisfactory to those who make it, is this:-

"The liberty of rest for each demands a law of rest for all."

Here are some kindred propositions: The liberty of worship for each demands a law of worship for all. The liberty of prayer for each demands a law of prayer for all. The liberty of singing psalms for each demands a law of singing psalms for all. The liberty of going to church for each demands a law of going to church for all. And thus we might extend such propositions to an in-finite length, every one of them being just as sound as is the one set forth by those Sunday-law advocates. The truth is that the liberty of rest for each demands nothing at all, unless it be that each shall be allowed to exercise his liberty or not, just as he in his liberty chooses. The proposition that "the liberty of rest for each demands a law of rest for all," is a palpable absurdity. What these Sunday-law advocates mean to say is about as follows: We, in the exercise of our liberty of rest, demand a law that shall compel everybody else to rest just as we do. They will probably get their law in the end, but they will never accomplish their purpose with it, even though they do get it.

Not long since in the town of Livermore, California, a Catholic boy named Michael Hartigan went to a base-ball game instead of going to Catholic Church one Sunday. In the afternoon of the same day the boy met the Catholic priest in the road, when the priest took him severely to task in the way of a tongue-lashing, and finished it off by beating him with a cane. It is into the hands of such religious worthies as this, that the Sunday-law advocates want to put the power to prosecute everybody who does not choose to keep Sunday as they shall dictate. We are happy to announce that the priest was convicted of battery. But when everybody's actions on Sunday shall, by law, be made subject to the officious surveillance of such religious meddlers as this, then what protection, what security, will there be for anybody?

July 1888

"A Sensible Letter" *American Sentinel* 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

In a recent letter from a town in Northern California ordering the Sentinel for a public reading-room, the writer, evidently a gentleman of intelligence, takes the occasion to thus express himself in reference to our work:-

"I think your arguments are unanswerable, and the position you take in reference to the union of Church and State is the only safe one. It is for the best interests of all the people, and of all religious denominations as well.

"There is no doubt in my mind that some of the leaders of the W.C.T.U. favor the designs of the National Reformers, but the great majority of the members do not understand the matter at all. I am a Prohibitionist, and I am satisfied that the National Reform Association would like to use the Prohibition party in the furtherance of their designs; but I am fully convinced that there are very few Prohibitionists that are aware of the fact.

"I am decidedly opposed to the Prohibition party's adopting a Sunday-law plank; (1) because it can do no good religiously, and (2) because it is a great mistake politically. The Prohibition party was organized to close the saloons seven days in the week, and on this Prohibitionists are agreed, but on the Sunday-law question they are not agreed, nor can they be. The adoption of that as a party measure would, in my judgment, divide the party and render success impossible.

"I wish that the Sentinel could be placed in the hands of Prohibitionists everywhere; and especially that it could be read by the editors of all Prohibition papers."

Our correspondent has expressed the thing exactly. The National Reform Association intends to make use of the Prohibition party, but Prohibitionists are not generally aware of that fact. In this very ignorance lies the danger. We propose to show them the danger, so that those who are really desirous of reform may not be used to further a movement which will have the semblance of all reforms, and lack the substance of any.

"The Entering Wedge" *American Sentinel* 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

Through the courtesy of the introducer, Senator Blair, we have copies of a bill and a resolution which have recently been introduced into the United States Senate, which will interest the readers of the Sentinel, and should arouse the attention of every person in the country. We think it of the utmost importance that these be thoroughly studied, and so we print them in full. The first which we present is a "Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religion and free public schools." The Resolution is dated May 25, and has been read twice, and ordered to lie on the table. It reads thus:-

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-third of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:-

ARTICLE

Section 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Sec. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonies, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonies, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.

Sec. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve governments republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.

Sec. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary.

We find no fault with this Resolution save in one particular, and that is the provision that free public schools, established and maintained by the State, shall be established and maintained "for the education of all the children living therein. . . in the principles of the Christian religion." We have no idea that the amendment proposed will ever be adopted, for it too strongly maintains the necessity of the public schools being free from denominational control, and of the denominational school being deprived of State patronage, to suit the Catholics, and no political measure which the Catholics oppose can carry in this country. But while this is so, there is great danger that by means of the introduction of such resolutions, our legislators will become so familiarized with the idea of religious legislation that it will not appear to be the unrighteous thing that it is.

It is as Christians as well as American citizens, that we stand opposed to any proposition for the State to maintain public schools wherein children shall be taught "the principles of the Christian religion." We think that it calls for opposition from Christians more strongly than from any other people. We have so often set forth the principles which condemn such legislation, and those principles are so simple, that it should be unnecessary to repeat them; but often things that are simple are overlooked because of their very simplicity, so we note the following points which should be applied by every citizen, not only to this resolution, but to every one of a similar nature.

The resolution is directly opposed to the first amendment to the Constitution, which says that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof." If it be said that the resolution does not mention an establishment of religion, we reply that for the State to teach Christianity would be most emphatically to effect an establishment of religion; for Christianity is nothing if it is not religion. If it is not religion, what is it? The plain

intent of that amendment is that Congress shall do nothing whatever that will tend to influence any man's religious belief or practice, whether he be Christian, Jew, Pagan, or infidel. In short, it was designed to set forth the truth that with religion the State has nothing whatever to do.

What are the principles of the Christian religion? Some will reply that they are the principles of common morality; that the design in requiring the principles of the Christian religion to be taught in the public schools, is to have the

50

rising generation imbued with the principles of honesty, kindness, and courtesy. But this is not the case; the very language of the resolution shows this. It requires that the children shall be instructed "in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion." It will be seen that the fact is recognized that the principles of the Christian religion are something distinct from the principles of common virtue and morality.

The Christian religion is the gospel of Jesus Christ. The gospel of Jesus Christ is, as the apostle Paul says, "the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth." In other words, it is the remedy which God has devised to save men from the guilt, the love, and the consequences of sin, and it accomplishes this salvation only for those who exercise personal faith in Christ. Now the very statement that the gospel is a *remedy*, is an acknowledgement that something existed before it did, which called for a remedy. That something was sin. But sin is immorality, the violation of God's moral law. Therefore it is as clear as noonday, that the principles of virtue and morality are older than the Christian religion. If those principles had from the beginning been strictly followed, the Christian religion would never have been introduced, because there would have been no sin from which to save men. Those principles are to a greater or less extent known and inculcated in all nations, and by all systems of religion. They are a part of the legacy which all men have inherited from their common parent, Adam.

That children should always and everywhere be impressed with the importance of honesty, truthfulness, courtesy, and kindness to one another, there is no one who will deny. No one will question the right and the duty of the public schools to teach these principles. This it may do and not teach religion, although these are necessary to religion. But to teach "the principles of the Christian religion," in the public schools, means that just such instruction should be given in those schools as is given in the Sabbath-schools of the land. It means that the children should be instructed in the nature of the sacrifice of Christ, which is so simple that any child may understand it, and should be taught the necessity of personal faith in him, and should also be instructed in regard to those ordinances which Christ instituted as media for the manifestation of faith, namely, Christian baptism and the Lord's Supper. This, and this alone, is instruction in the principles of the Christian religion.

Well, isn't it right that children should be so instructed? We say, Yes; it is right, and most necessary; but *not in the public schools*. Personally we earnestly wish that every child in the land could be brought directly under the influence of Christian teaching, but we would have it done in a way befitting Christianity. The

gospel knows nothing of force. Christ never forced him-self upon anybody. When the Gadarenes besought him to depart out of their coasts, he went immediately. Why? Was it because he was not as intensely interested in them as in the inhabitants of Galilee? Not at all; but because he recognized their right to reject him and his teachings if they chose. When he sent out his disciples, he gave them instruction to the same effect. If any should refuse to receive them, they were to leave them, and allow the day of Judgment to settle with them for their willful rejection of the gospel. We repeat, The gospel knows nothing of force; its cry is, "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." The privilege of every man to freely accept the provisions of God's grace, implies the equal privilege of every man to reject them. Religion that is not voluntary is of no value.

But when religion is taught in the public schools, it ceases to be a voluntary thing. The State then uses its power to force the gospel upon people. It gathers all the children into the schools, and then preaches the gospel to them. But under such circumstances it is not the gospel that is received; it is only a semblance of the gospel. Nothing is pure gospel except that which is truly Christ-like, and Christ never forced people to listen to him. The same power which drove the money-changers in abject terror from the temple, could as well have gathered all people regularly into the temple, or the synagogues, and compelled them to listen to his teaching. The fact that the great Author of Christianity employed nothing like force in the introduction of Christianity, shows that none of his professed followers have any right to use force in maintaining it. The disciple is not greater than his Lord. It is right to have zeal for God, and to be anxious that all men should hear the gospel; but that zeal should be according to knowledge. It should not lead to the adoption of methods which Christ condemned. To say that if the State does not use its power to cause people to be instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, it is evidence of indifference as to their eternal welfare, is equivalent to saying that Christ was indifferent, because he did not use his greater power for the same purpose.

We trust that every reader can see that our opposition to the teaching of the Christian religion in the public schools, is not simply on the ground that it is unconstitutional,-that it discriminates between the believer and the unbeliever, not allowing the unbeliever equal rights with the believer. We do oppose it on that ground. To compel the infidel against his will to have his children instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, just because his Christian neighbor wants his children to be so instructed, is to say that the infidel has not as much right in this country as the Christian has, and that is to make the rights of citizenship dependent upon one's belief. Surely this is reason enough for opposing it; but we have a higher reason still, and that is that such a course is antichristian as well as un-American.

We use the term "antichristian" advisedly. We have already shown that all enforced teaching of the gospel is contrary to the example and precept of Christ. History is full of illustrations of the antichristian effect of enforced religious teaching. When Charlemagne conquered the Saxons, their lives were spared on condition that they would receive baptism. Says Guizot, "For three years Charlemagne had to redouble his efforts to accomplish in Saxony, at the cost of

Frankish as well as Saxon blood, his work of conquest and conversion. 'Saxony,' he often repeated, 'must be Christianized or wiped out.'" Now does anybody suppose that there was any Christianity involved in the enforced baptism of the Saxons? Does not everybody know that it was by just such processes that the Papacy, the human embodiment of antichrist, was established? The illustration on page 215 of the first volume of Guizot's "History of France" (Estes and Lauriat's edition), is well named "Charlemagne inflicting baptism upon the Saxons."

The difference between this enforced acceptance of Christianity, and the teaching of "the principles of the Christian religion" in the public schools of the United States, is one of degree only, and not one of kind. The principle is the same. When instruction in the principles of religion becomes a matter of compulsion, then Christianity itself will take its leave. We submit that Christ knew how to propagate Christianity better than any man can. His gentle methods were the best and the only right way. And so it is because of our love for pure Christianity, as well as our love for equal rights to all men, that we oppose the propagation of religion by the State. E.J.W.

"The Church and State Bill" *American Sentinel* 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

The "bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship," was introduced into the Senate May 21, was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, where it was championed by Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts and others. It reads as follows:-

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person, or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.

Sec. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal-route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: *Provided,* That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the postmaster-general

shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter, and shall make regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: And provided further, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week.

Sec. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation who shall willfully violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.

Sec. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord's day.

Sec. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered or for labor performed or for the transportation of persons or of property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.

Sec. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and ex-posed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory into another State, district, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day.

We are at a loss to know how to arouse the people to a proper appreciation of the evil of allowing such a bill to become a law. The American people have become so thoroughly imbued with the idea that this is a free country, that the

blessings of liberty were forever secured to us by the founders of this Government,-that it seems impossible to make them believe that they can by any possibility be deprived of that liberty. So they will sit at ease while the cords are being drawn around them, which will hold them in a bondage as great as that which compelled the Pilgrim Fathers to flee from their native land.

We wish it distinctly understood that we do not charge anybody with intentional wrong; that is not our business. We are willing to allow that the framers, the introducer, and the champions of this bill acted in good faith, to the best of their knowledge. But the evil will be none the less, because those who establish it think that they are acting for the best good of the country. If the bill were entitled, "A Bill to Unite Church and State in the United States," it would only declare on its face just what it really is.

How can it need any argument to convince any thoughtful person that this bill is directly in favor of an establishment of religion, and does therefore really prohibit the free exercise thereof? We verily believe that the only reason the Senate Committee on Education and Labor has not been overwhelmed with protests against this bill, is because the people are ignorant of its provisions. It does not seem possible that people could, without protest, allow it to come so near being put upon its final passage, if they knew what it is.

We do not need to argue that this bill contemplates a law respecting an establishment of religion, for it makes an express declaration to that effect. It is to promote the observance of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of religious worship. If the passage of such a law would not mark the consummation of the union between Church and State, we should like to have some of the wise men tell us what would. If it would not, then there never was such a thing. The so-called National Reformers will tell us that a union of Church and State can be brought about only by the State bestowing its patronage upon, and elevating some particular denomination; and they say that they do not want this. Of course they don't; and if that is the only thing that constitutes Church and State union, then there never was any such union, and we must find some other name by which to designate the condition of things that existed in Europe from the days of Constantine till the Reformation, and in some portions of Europe till now. Constantine elevated, not a sect, but Christianity to the throne of the world. The church stands for religion. Religion and the church are inseparably connected. There cannot be one without the other, although the religion may be grossly corrupt, or wholly perverted. And so when religion and religious practices are upheld by the State, there is a complete union of Church and State.

Take our public schools as an illustration. It is rightly held that our common-school system is a part of our Government. Why? Because the State protects and upholds the schools and education. In our Government, education and the State are inseparable. It is held that whatever influence works to undermine our schools, is working to the same degree to undermine our Government, for a republican form of government cannot exist where the rank and file of the people - the real governors-are ignorant. Now the National Reformers claim that without some such law as is proposed by the bill,-a law to establish religion and religious

observances, this country cannot long continue. Thus they claim that religion must be as closely connected with this Government as is the cause of education.

Some will doubtless question our statement that the provisions of this bill not only contemplate an establishment of religion, but the prohibition of the free exercise thereof. But whenever a law is made respecting an establishment of religion, somebody's free exercise thereof must of necessity be interfered with, except in the unsupposable case that all believe exactly alike. Now take the bearing of this law upon those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the only Lord's day, and who as conscientiously regard the first day of the week as an ordinary working day. It will be said that the bill does not prohibit them from keeping holy the seventh day, and therefore does not interfere with their religion, but this is only a one-sided view. Let us briefly consider the whole matter.

Those who observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, do so in obedience to the strict letter of the fourth commandment, which says, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, 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." Ex. 20:8-10. In this commandment the Lord expressly claims the seventh day as his day, so that the first day of the week, "commonly called the Lord's day," is not the Lord's day at all. He also commands that the seventh day shall be kept holy to him, but freely gives to man the other six days as working days. Now whether all admit that the fourth commandment limits the Sabbath to the seventh day of the week, or whether they hold that it sanctifies any seventh part of time that men choose to keep, all must admit that it gives men the privilege of working six days. That is, men have the same authority for working on six days of the week that they have for resting on the seventh.

Suppose now that this bill becomes a law, and those who conscientiously keep the seventh day are required to keep the first also. Then we say that they are interfered with in the free exercise of their religion. So far as this argument is concerned, it makes no difference whether they are right or wrong in their interpretation of the commandment. Their religion requires them to keep the seventh day; the law of God allows them six days in which to labor, and their necessities require them to devote the whole six days to labor. To force them to keep the first day would be not only to interfere with their God-given privilege of working six days, but also, by taking advantage of their necessities, to compel them to

52

labor on the seventh day, thus doing violence to their consciences. That is, providing they yielded obedience to the law. Surely this would be to prohibit the free exercise of religion. And when the penalty of the law should be inflicted upon those who should rest on the seventh day and labor on the first, it would be punishment inflicted because of their religious belief, and that is religious persecution. So surely as this bill becomes a law, religious persecution will disgrace this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Again, some will say that the same plea could with equal propriety be made in behalf of the Mormons, when they are indicted for practicing polygamy. We say,

No. The cases are not parallel to the slightest extent. Polygamy is a sin against society. It inflicts cruel wrongs upon thousands of people. The Judgment-day alone will reveal the murders that have been committed, and the hearts that have been broken, as the direct result of polygamy. Many a loving and trusting wife has died of a broken heart, or has been transformed into a demon of hate, because another was brought in to occupy the place sacred to her alone. Polygamy interferes with the inalienable rights of every creature, of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Therefore it should be extirpated as a crime.

But the keeping of the seventh day and the secularization of the first is nothing of the kind. The man who works on the first day of the week does not hinder anybody else from resting. Of course it is understood that such work shall not disturb any religious assembly. But a law protecting religious and all other assemblies already exists, so that a Sunday law is not needed on that score. That Sunday work by seventh-day people does not interfere with Sunday rest by others is shown by the fact that there are over fifty thousand people in this country who religiously and sacredly keep the seventh day of the week, in spite of the fact that over fifty millions of their fellows are laboring on that day. Yet we never heard a complaint by a Sabbatarian, nor a request for a law to secure to him his Sabbath.

It is said that the workingmen must have a day of rest secured to them. The workingmen can have a day of rest if they want to take it. Those who keep the seventh day are nearly all workingmen, but nobody compels them to labor on Saturday. If the workingmen of this country didn't want to work on Sunday, there is no power that could compel them to. If they should individually and collectively declare that they want Sunday as a rest day, and are determined not to labor on that day, the problem would settle itself.

But they don't care for the rest. The ones who are clamoring for the Sunday law are not the workingmen but the ministers. Read the bill carefully, and you will see that it is worded so as to specially guard the hours of worship. When it becomes absolutely necessary to handle the mails on Sunday it must be during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience, and *least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest.*" The bill is in behalf not simply of an establishment of religion, but of the churches. And if it should become a law, and it should be found, as it certainly would be, that the churches were not filled in consequence, the next thing would be a law to compel these indifferent ones to attend church. And this law would be declared to be a law in behalf of the workingmen, and not at all in behalf of religion. Some may think that nobody would have the boldness to ask for such a law; but if they are countenanced in asking for a law requiring that children, many of whom attend Sabbath-school and receive religious instruction at home, should be instructed in the principles of the Christian religion at school, they would certainly be warranted in asking that the man who toils all the week without opportunity for moral or mental culture, should be required, for his own good, to listen to such instruction for an hour in the week.

We might go on much farther with this subject, but lack of space forbids. Compared with its merits, this is a very brief presentation of the case. We may

have more to say upon it next month. But we earnestly hope that those who love liberty and pure Christianity will arouse to a sense of the danger, and not let these bills become laws without at least a strong protest. The time to act is now.

E.J.W.

"Religion in Japan" *American Sentinel* 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

It is well known that much missionary work has been done in Japan, and that Christianity has been looked upon with favor by those high in authority; and it has been declared highly probable that the empire will ere long become officially "Christian." The emperor is expected, like Constantine of old, to declare Christianity to be the religion. This step has been looked for with a great deal of anxiety by those interested in foreign missions, as a wonderful victory for Christianity. We have before expressed our opinion on the subject, that if such a step is taken, it will be the worst thing that could possibly happen for real Christianity in Japan. The Christianity that would be adopted would be a formal religion, a matter of policy alone, and it would put an effectual stop to the growth of vital godliness. The empire would no longer be missionary ground, and the labors of devoted missionaries would soon cease. Those who accepted the State religion in obedience to the imperial edict, would be forever content with the form of religion, and so the last state of the empire would be worse than the first. We have no faith in charms, and we don't think that the name of Christianity will make a man or a nation any better than will the name or the reality of paganism.

54

To show that our statement of the case is correct we copy the following London dispatch to the San Francisco Chronicle of June 10:

"The Japan *Weekly Mail* in a recent issue summarizes the discussion now being carried on in Japan by several eminent publicists respecting the advisability of the people of that country embracing Christian religion. A movement, started by some very prominent persons, is on foot to give an impetus to the spread of Christianity by laying stress on the secondary benefits its acceptance insures. Those connected with the movement say that Christian dogmas are a bitter pill to swallow, but advise that it be swallowed promptly for the sake of the after effects. Fuka-Zawa, a well-known writer, urges this course, although he says he takes no personal interest whatever in religion, and knows nothing of the teachings of Christianity, but he sees that it is the creed of highly civilized nations. To him religion is only a garment to be put on or taken off for pleasure, but he thinks it prudent that Japan assume the same dress as that of her neighbors, with whom she desires to stand well.

Professor Toyma, of the Imperial University, has published a work to support this view. He holds that Chinese ethics must be replaced by Christian ethics, and that the benefits to be derived from the introduction of Christianity are: (1) The improvement of the mind; (2) a unit of sentiment and feeling leading to harmonious co-operation; (3) furnishing a medium of intercourse between men and women. Kabolat, president of the Imperial University, who says that religion is not needed for the educated, and confesses his dislike to all religion, urges the

introduction of religious teachings in the Government schools on the ground that the unlearned in Japan have their faith in the old moral standards shaken, and that there is now a serious lack of moral sentiment among the masses."

And that is just as high as the standard of religion would be in this country if Christianity were declared to be the national religion. A State religion never was and never will be adopted except from selfish motives.

"Very Gracious" *American Sentinel* 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

In an address to the National Reform Convention recently held in Philadelphia, Rev. J. A. Wylie said of the proposed Sunday law:-

"It is true we meet with the plea that the rights of those who do not wish to observe the Sabbath, are violated by such legislation as we claim, but these laws bind all alike, no discrimination is made in favor of any. Like the pressure of the atmosphere on the human body, no injury is produced, because all parts are affected alike. In regard to those who observe some other than the first day of the week as a day of sacred rest, the law should not prohibit this, and if their consciences require they should observe a different day, they may thank the law which secures to them an additional Sabbath every week."

The *Review and Herald*, of Battle Creek, Mich., is the organ of a large body of people who observe the seventh day as the Sabbath, and the following from that paper shows how they regard the "gracious" utterance of Mr. Wylie:-

"Isn't this very liberal and beneficent! After keeping the true and only Sabbath according to the commandment of God, and the dictates of conscience, seventh-day observers '*may thank the law which secures to them an additional Sabbath.*' Yes! thank the law which deprives them of one-sixth of their means of support! thank the law which would oblige them to pay a tax of sixteen and two-thirds per cent of their entire income to a hostile religious system! thank the law which steps in and unceremoniously takes from them one-sixth of the privilege and duty granted them alike by God and nature, of healthful and often necessary six days' labor! thank the law which compels them to pay honor to an institution which they know is founded in falsehood, and antagonizes the law of the great Jehovah! The doctor of divinity who represents this view of the matter may think seventh-day people are such phenomenal fools that they will rush up and in the ecstasy of their gratitude hug and kiss an old Moloch like this. But we think we know them better.

"Let us test the matter in a clearly supposable case: Suppose Mr. Wylie, who formulates this proposition, is called upon to go as a missionary to some heathen land. They have their false gods; he worships the true. Let us suppose further, that the heathen are found so bigoted as to enforce by law the worship of some one of their chief gods upon all the people. Mr. Wylie objects on the ground that his conscience requires him to worship the true God alone. They reply, 'We do not prohibit this. If your conscience requires you to worship that God, that is your privilege; but, having done this, you may *thank our law*, Mr. Wylie, *which secures to you an Additional God!* And, remember, this law is binding on all alike; there is

no discrimination made in favor of any. Like the pressure of the atmosphere on the human body, *no injury is produced, because all parts are affected alike!*" How would Mr. Wylie fancy that situation, and that way of reasoning to support it?"

We are very sure that Mr. Wylie would write most pathetic and indignant letters about the religious intolerance of that country. It makes a great deal of difference whose ox is gored. The proposed law will not incommode Mr. Wylie, and so what reason has anybody to complain? The colossal selfishness and impudence of the man are greater than words can express.

It is evident that Mr. Wylie forgot his illustration of the equal pressure of the air, just as soon as he used it. It is true that there is perfect ease so long as the air presses equally on every part; but just let one portion of the body be subjected to double pressure, and there will be a continual sense of discomfort. And this equal pressure on every part is just what it is proposed to change. To one who should complain because he was subjected to double pressure, the National Reformers would say, "You ought rather to thank the man who has secured to you twice as much air as other people have." He would doubtless fail to appreciate the kindness, and would prefer to take his air just as the Lord provided it for him, without having it tampered with by man. So long as men have Sabbath laws as God fixed them, there is no unequal pressure; but when they attempt to improve upon his plans they make trouble.

"A Word of Warning" *American Sentinel* 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

Under the above heading, George W. Colles of Morristown, N. J., makes a vigorous protest in the *Christian Union*, of May 31, against the growing tendency of the churches not only to accept but to seek aid from the State. It was drawn out by a previous article concerning the grasping nature of Romanism. Some may think his words too strong, but nothing but strong words will arouse anybody to the danger. Here are his words, and our readers can judge of them for themselves:-

"I would like the writer as well as the readers of 'Breakers Ahead,' in your issue of May 17, to consider also how the Roman conspiracy against our liberties is assisted by Protestant short-sighted grasping of public funds for the support of their institutions. All ecclesiastics are alike, be they Romish, Protestant, Jewish, or pagan, in this: that they grasp at power, and, to get it, will put their feet through the Charter of Human Rights. The non-Romish institutions who yearly accept a share (however small) in the annual steal out of the public taxes know perfectly well that it is a steal, and that it shuts their mouths from saying a word to oppose the Romanists' grab, and that the priests throw them the sop for this very purpose; yet the dollars are hard enough to dispel their scruples, as well as to show what is their sincerity in adherence to American principles. The Church of Rome is by no means the only one which has no faith in human liberty; they *all* want to make the Government draw their individual loads. The most advanced Protestants are determined, if they can, to ecclesiasticize our Constitution and laws, and to destroy the equality before the law of all shades of thought, belief,

and non-belief. When Protestant Christians acquire a deep-rooted and passionate love for the principle of absolute and entire separation of church from civil rule and from force, then, and not till then, can they as a unit oppose the hostile approaches of humanity's greatest enemy, the Roman conspiracy. This deep-rooted and passionate love for a high and absolutely vital principle does not now exist among Protestant churches as such; for they accept with smiles gifts and advantages that will in the end prove their own destruction.

"History repeats itself. Just what we now are, enjoying a large measure of freedom, just so was Europe at one time. Just as Rome begins here now, she began in Europe-in Italy and in Spain. Just what Spain is to-day, we may be in a hundred years. Religion is one thing; its priests are quite another-merely men; at first animated with love for souls, and in their zeal seeing but a little way before them, and but one thing at a time, and pushing to their aim over every merely temporal object. Afterward, they or their successors, less pure in motive, or exchanging the true worship for the worship of an institution, become the despots who are perpetually arising to overturn that liberty which they abuse. Grasping at public money is only one form of grasping at temporal power, just as grasping at

55

the schools is another. It can only be on a righteous principle, faithfully adhered to by the patriotism of our Protestant bodies, acting as Americans, that the encroachments of Rome can be successfully withstood."

"Woman Suffrage" *American Sentinel* 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

America is an excellent journal printed in Chicago. The *Dexter Gazette*, of Maine, asked America why it did not give itself "to the advocacy of the enfranchisement of the wives and daughters of the white race native of this country that have reached the years of understanding." In reply America gives some points which are worthy of careful consideration. Here they are:-

"There is no call to discuss, much less to advocate, the enfranchisement of women throughout the republic. When that subject really presses to the front for solution, if it ever does, America will discuss it upon its merits. It will not permit any of that worshipful regard and admirable courtesy toward women, which is the honorable attitude of true Americans, to interfere with its view of the injurious effect the grant of the suffrage would have both upon the women themselves and the republic. It would take the position that nature has placed an insuperable barrier to equality of the sexes; that as the defense of the nation must ever devolve upon the men, the whole responsibility for the Government must always be intrusted to them. And if ever the question shall come squarely before the people, it will contend that not only the republic, but women and humanity, have nothing to gain at all commensurate with what they would lose through the obliteration of the line which makes man the responsible party in public affairs, as he must be in the family. Only cranks and sentimentalists talk about the practicability of leaving men at home to rock the cradles and manage the cook, while women go forth to canvass the ward and run the political machine.

When any newspaper advocates the enfranchisement of white native-born women only, it exposes what is the fallacy underlying the whole woman-suffrage movement, to wit, the possibility of discriminating between the wise and the foolish, the educated and the ignorant, the virtuous and the vicious, the white and the black. When it comes to enfranchising women, they will all have to be taken together. There can be no separating the sheep from the goats. It will have to be another case of fifteenth amendment. The right to vote will have to be extended to all women, unabridged by any condition on account of sex, character, color, or previous condition of disfranchisement.

All advocacy of women suffrage is based on the theory that the exclusion of good women from the exercise of the franchise is detrimental not only to them but to the best interests of the republic. Common sense and experience teach that the influence of good women is decreased by the grant of the ballot, because they fail to avail themselves of it, while bad women and those under the control of depraved and ignorant men, are bold to seize upon the advantage for evil it affords. According to the United States census, the percentage of illiteracy is greater among females than among males, and if illiteracy were construed to include ignorance of principles of government and justice, the disparity would be almost beyond estimation. That there are many women better fitted mentally and morally to vote than millions of men must be conceded. But this begs the question. Until it can be shown that all women are equally equipped for the suffrage with all men, and that the virtuous among them would attend to their political duties more faith-fully than the majority of the men in their sphere in life do, where is the reason or expediency of the extension.

"The question of extending the franchise to women will have to be discussed and settled not according to what a few women think, but upon broad principles as to the fitness, wisdom, and expediency of the revolution, for such it will be, as it affects the sexes, the propagation of species, and the permanence of the American home and the American republic. Such joint resolutions as that introduced in the House of Representatives, 'by request,' by Congressman Mason, providing for a woman's suffrage amendment to the Constitution, are the sheerest buncombe. Not one intelligent woman in ten wants to be enfranchised, and scarcely one respectable woman in a hundred would use the ballot if placed in her hands."

In the late Democratic Convention there was an excellent example of "national Christianity," such as we shall have when the National Reformers succeed in their efforts. There were present the usual horde of hungry office-seekers in addition to the delegates. According to the published reports, the most of them were distinguished for their ability to swallow champagne. Probably not one in ten of those present ever uttered the name of the Deity except in blasphemy. But this is a "Christian country," therefore the proceedings must be opened each morning by prayer! And so the mob of howling politicians actually quieted down and listened to a prayer? Not much. They cared no more for the prayer than does the average Congress, or State Legislature; and for all the influence Bishop Granberry's prayer had upon the Convention, it might better have been delivered in his closet. His lips were seen to move, by those who took

the trouble to look at him, but "his words were heard only by the official stenographer below and the listening angels above." But nevertheless prayer was offered, and so the country is safe, because the Convention was conducted in a Christian manner.

To us such scenes are disgusting and irreverent. But, according to the statements of National Reformers, that is just the thing that they want to have perpetuated. All they want is to fix the Constitution so that there will be no possibility of dispensing with prayer on such occasions as political conventions, possibly so that it will be necessary for the ward caucus to be opened with prayer, and then this will be "in name as well as in fact, a Christian country." Heaven save the mark! What a travesty on Christianity that will be. That friends of the Christian religion should be anxious to see it so trampled in the dust, is almost beyond the possibility of belief.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

The National Prohibition Convention introduced into its platform the same Church and State ideas that the California Prohibition Convention did. The Prohibition party everywhere may now very properly be called the Church and State party.

It is stated that through the efforts of Mrs. Bateham in the unions, over a million signatures have been secured to the petition to Congress asking it to enact a national Sunday law. The Sentinel has not a big list of names to present to Congress, but it can present some facts that are consistent with justice and liberty.

We had a very pleasant talk on National Reform last month, with Prof. J. L. McCartney, of Beaver Falls, Penn., who was visiting in Oakland. The Professor delivered a sermon on National Reform, upon which we made some comments for this number of the Sentinel; but after our review was in type, other matter came in, and it was crowded out. It will appear next month.

In 1829 the United States Senate told the Sunday-law petitioners that they then already enjoyed "all that Christians ought to ask at the hands of any Government-protection from all molestation in the exercise of their religious sentiments." This is just as true now as it was then. It is also true of these, and now, as it was of those political bishops of the fourth century, that they seek "not protection for themselves, but power against their opponents."

According to the speech by Dr. Crafts before the Senate Committee, the churches are going to be content with nothing short of a monopoly of all Sunday action. This, say the leaders, is to protect the workingman from the greed of the grinding monopoly of wealth. But when the churches shall have succeeded in thus protecting him from that monopoly, then we want to know who or what is going to protect us all from the far worse monopoly thus secured to the churches?

The Chicago *Advance* says that churches and labor organizations East and West are adopting the following resolution:-

"*Resolved*, That we indorse the petition to Congress, asking it to stop Sunday work in its mail and military service, and in interstate commerce."

The *Advance* says that the latest indorsements to this resolution are those of "the Central Labor Union and the Carriers' Association of New York City, the Knights of Labor Council of Chicago and vicinity, the Presbyterian General Assembly, and the State Sunday-school Associations of Missouri and Kansas." "The Congregational ministers' meeting of Chicago has recommended that all Congregational Churches take action in this matter either by resolution or petition." What are the friends of freedom of conscience doing to offset this pressure that is being brought to bear upon Congress? If there are any such who don't know what to do, we will tell them: Give the American Sentinel a tenfold larger circulation.

Let those who are so zealous to have "the principles of Christianity" taught in the public schools, remember that in many of the public schools in our cities the teachers are Roman Catholics. What kind of Christianity will they teach? Nobody needs to be told that they will teach only the principles of Catholicism. If such a step as is proposed should be taken, thousands of children of Protestants would at once be placed under Roman Catholic instruction. How the Pope must rejoice as he sees professed Protestants playing into his hands!

The Sentinel goes to press as the Republican National Convention is organizing, so we cannot tell how it will treat the various petitions sent to it, but we state as a straw which shows the way the wind blows, the fact that a petition indorsed by the Missouri and Kansas State Sunday-school Conventions, and by thousands of individuals, is in circulation, asking the Republican Convention to insert in its labor blank, a declaration against Sunday labor and trade. The way it is stated is, "against the encroachments upon the workingman's Sunday rest by toil or trade." Notice that it is the Sunday-schools, and not the workingmen, who ask this.

The *Union Signal* says that Rev. W. F. Crafts is working in Chicago in the interest of what is known as the Blair Sunday Bill. It says:-

"He met representatives of the labor organizations, and secured their co-operation in the effort to secure national laws against Sunday mails and Sunday trains. Thus these great organizations in New York City and Chicago are now working unitedly with the W.C.T.U. and the churches to secure a Christian Sabbath."

But we thought it was only a chance for the workingman to rest, that they want. That's what they say sometimes; but what they want is the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest and worship. Mr. Crafts secured many hundred signatures to the petitions to Congress.

The *Occident* in noting the Papal rescript against Ireland says:-

"The hope is that a combined effort among the friends of Home Rule may have the decree revoked. But how can an infallible Pope revoke a decree made ex-Cathedra?"

How? Why, easy enough. All that he has to do is to revoke it. That is all. The power to issue contradictory decrees and decisions is the highest, the very crucial, proof of the supreme infallibility of the Pope. That is one of the points in

which the Pope is above the Almighty. The Lord, the Creator of heaven and earth, cannot enact contradictory laws, nor issue contradictory decrees, nor render contradictory decisions. His infallibility does not reach so far as that. "He cannot deny himself." But the Pope can do all these things. He has done them time and again through all the dismal history of the Papal Church, and yet has retained all the infallibility that he ever had, and yet more loudly than ever asserts all the infallibility that he ever claimed. Any sovereign, fallible or infallible, can issue consistent decrees; but no sovereign in Heaven or on earth, except the infallible Pope, can issue inconsistent and contradictory decrees, and yet remain infallible. That is the supreme test of his supreme infallibility, and, therefore, he is "that man of sin, . . .the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped." 2 Thess. 2:3, 4.

We heartily welcome to our table the *American Constitutional Vidette*, published monthly by the Mississippi Valley Publishing Company, Beauregard, Miss. We all the more heartily welcome it because it works in the same line as does the American Sentinel-"the defense of the Constitution as it is, and to battle earnestly for civil and religious liberty." It also is "uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact, let it come from whatever source it may." Here is our neighbor, we are not a bit jealous; would to God they were all prophets.

August 1888

"National Reform in the South" *American Sentinel* 3, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

In the late National Reform Convention, the reports from the South showed that the South is "solid" for National Reform, as well as in some other respects. One preacher said he had been preaching National Reform principles for twenty years. Another said he thought the South would lead in this "reform," and "it would be a shame to the South if it did not." While we are sure that it would be everything else but a shame to her if she did not, we must confess that it would be perfectly in keeping with her efforts on more than one occasion in the past, if she should take a leading part in the National Reform movement. Twenty-seven years ago last spring the South started out in a scheme of "National Reform." That too was, in a measure, in the direct line of what is now called the National Reform movement. The preamble of the Confederate Constitution, thus ordained and established, reads as follows:-

"We, the people of the Confederate States, each State acting in its sovereign and independent character, in order to form a permanent federal Government, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity-invoking the favor and guidance of Almighty God-ordain and establish this Constitution of the Confederate States of America."

That so far as it goes is strictly a National Reform Constitution. It contains the name of Almighty God. In it the people invoked "the favor and guidance of Almighty God." According to National Reform principles that Constitution was

"imbued with a divine life," and the nation confederated under it should have lived forever. But it didn't live forever worth a cent. Nor will this coming National Reform government live forever any more than that one did.

No, we do not doubt in the least that "the South will lead in this reform;" it is directly in her line of things.

It is not religion which we oppose but irreligion; we are combatting not Christianity but hypocrisy, for enforced religion is nothing else but enforced hypocrisy.

"A Calm View of National Reform" *American Sentinel* 3, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

The above heading exactly describes a National Reform sermon to which we listened Sunday forenoon, June 4. The sermon was delivered by Dr. J. L. McCartney, of Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Penn., a man who is a gentleman in every sense of the word, and with whom we formed a very pleasant acquaintance in the few interviews we had with him. We are the more pleased that we had the privilege of listening to his sermon, because, while the Professor is a National Reformer by birth and education, as well as from principle, his presentation of the subject was a calm, dispassionate one, entirely free from that bigoted, boastful spirit so characteristic of those who make them-selves (and National Reform) so conspicuous in the *Christian Statesman*. While Professor McCartney is not a professional exponent of National Reform, he is undoubtedly one of its best representatives.

As a text for his discourse, and the warrant for the National Reform movement in the United States, the Professor read Deut. 17:18, 19. That text reads as follows:-

"And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites; and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life; that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them."

As the reader will at once conclude, these verses are a part of the directions concerning the duty of the king of Israel. But before it can be decided whether or not they form a warrant for the National Reform movement in this country, we must know something of the context, and accordingly, we quote verses 14 and 15 of the same chapter:-

"When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee; thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother."

The statement, "Thou shalt in any wise set him over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose," takes the text away from the National Reformers, by showing that there is no analogy between the nation of Israel and the United States of

America. That nation was under the direct supervision and leadership of God. It never was a democracy in any sense of the word. The Lord himself selected the family which should furnish the priests; with his own voice he called Moses, who was leader of the people for forty years; and he also designated Joshua as his successor. The people had no voice in the matter. All they had to do was to render obedience to the commands of the leader whom God himself set over them. And so it was through the time of the judges. Although the Lord did not always select the ruler in the same way that he did Moses and Joshua, everybody who is acquainted with Jewish history knows that the people did not choose the one who was to judge them. The case of Gideon is a sample. He had been chosen by the Lord to deliver Israel from their oppressors. When the proper time came, the Spirit of the Lord came upon him, and he gave the people evidence that he was the one whom God had chosen, and they followed him. When the people became restless, and wanted a king, it was the Lord still who set the king over them. The people had nothing to do with the selection of their ruler. Now, unless the National Reformers are willing to make the claim that this Government should be conducted on the same plan that the Government of Israel was, the people having no voice in the choice of their rulers, they have no right to use the instructions given to Jewish rulers as a guide for the official conduct of the Governors of States, or the President of the United States.

The Government of Israel was a true theocracy; a perfect union of Church and State; the Church and the State were one. National Reformers profess that they want nothing of the kind; we think, indeed, that none of them contemplate giving up the right of franchise, and having the Lord appoint the chief ruler of their country, without the ceremony of conventions and general elections. In fact, it is our firm opinion that the great majority of them would refuse to acknowledge such a ruler as the Lord would select. Then if they do not want such a state of things,-if they really deprecate the idea of Church and State union,-they have no business to quote from the directions given to ancient Israel, as a precedent for their proposed changes in the Government of the United States.

It matters not how much they try to make this Government correspond to that of ancient Israel, they can never make it actually a parallel to that. In that Government God was the actual ruler, he chose that nation out of all the nations of earth, as the depository of his law, designing that it

58

should hold up the standard of divine truth, so that all people who should be inclined to accept the truth might flock to it, and become enrolled among the citizens of Israel. But when the Jews proved recreant to their trust, and, instead of letting the light of truth shine from them to the nations, extinguished that light by their heathenish practices, God cast them off. Since that time he has claimed no special nation as his own. He still has a people called Israel; but they are those in every nation who humbly walk in the way of truth. Their only badge of citizenship is the possession of the Spirit of Christ; and often they are unknown to all except God. Therefore since God has and claims no distinct nation or people as his own, it follows that any attempt to model a Government after that of Israel

would be simply to establish a theocracy with human power substituted for that of God. This would be a model, not of ancient Israel, but of the Papacy.

The Professor enumerated various things which he termed the Christian features of our Government. Chief among these were: (1) The exemption of church property from taxation; (2) the right of Christian ministers to solemnize marriage; (3) the administration of judicial oaths; (4) the appointment of chaplains in the army and navy; (5) the appointment of fast and thanksgiving-days; (6) the use of the Bible in the public schools; and (7) laws concerning a civil Sabbath, and suppressing such things as tend to hinder people in their worship on the first day of the week. In addition to these, he cited the recognition of the Christian religion by the early colonies, and the mention of "the great Governor of the world," by those who met to ratify the Articles of Confederation. These things, it was claimed, mark this country as a Christian nation, and therefore the organic laws of the nation should contain a declaration of this fact, thus making this a Christian nation in name as well as in fact. The idea that the existence of any or all of these forms makes this a Christian nation,-that we are a Christian nation because the Catholic Church, like some vast railroad corporations, gets along without contributing its share towards the support of the Government; because the clerks in our police courts mumble over oaths to indifferent witnesses who grunt out an assent; because the Government pays certain men a salary to go through, in a perfunctory manner, a form of service every Sunday to men who listen because the regulations require them to,-we say that the idea that any or all of these things make this a Christian nation, is as absurd as was Tertullian's idea that birds and beasts pray. Said he:-

"Every creature prays; cattle and wild beasts pray and bend the knees; and when they issue from their layers and lairs, they look up heaven-ward with no idle mouth, making their breath vibrate after their own manner. Nay, the birds, too, rising out of the nest, upraise themselves heavenward, and instead of hands, expand the cross of their wings, and say somewhat to seem like prayer."-*Tertullian on Prayer, chap. 29.*

If the things that Professor McCartney mentions do or can make this a Christian nation, then we can also adopt Tertullian's opinion concerning beasts and birds, and we shall have not only a Christian nation, but a Christian universe.

But the Professor complained that there has been, in this country, a gradual elimination of everything that is Christian. For instance, Thomas Jefferson refused to issue a proclamation for a day of thanksgiving, on the ground that it was unconstitutional. Now, here is a plain question: If Grover Cleveland should neglect or refuse to appoint any thanksgiving-day this year, would the country be any worse off? Would it be any less Christian than it now is? The answer can be nothing else but, No. Will people who live wholly selfish lives, remember their Creator any the more because the President calls upon them to return thanks to him? Not a particle. He cannot make the people one iota more grateful than they would be if he made no thanksgiving proclamation. So far as any practical good is concerned, he might as well call upon everybody to ask a blessing upon every meal they eat. Those who feel thankful will return thanks no matter if a day is not appointed for thanksgiving; and for those who do not feel thankful, to go through

the form is mockery. So we think that it is well that it is unconstitutional to appoint thanksgiving-days, and it would be better if our officials would conform to the Constitution in this respect; for them there would be less caricature of sacred things. The day when the Constitution is so changed as to make the requirement of religious forms constitutional, will mark the beginning of an era of national, enforced hypocrisy.

Concerning the exclusion of the Bible from the public schools, Professor McCartney said: "Has it come to this, that the teacher must refrain from telling the child that God made him, and that Christ saves him, lest he should offend to the quick some unbelieving soul?" Well, why shouldn't it come to this? The infidel pays as much money for the support of the school as his believing neighbor does, and therefore has as much right as the other. The Professor would not think of forcing himself into an infidel's house, in order to teach his children concerning Christ. But the school-house is the property of the infidel as much as of the Christian, and his wishes are as much to be respected. It is not a matter of sentiment but of right. To be sure, it is pitiful that children should be allowed to come up ignorant of the great truths of the Bible; but so long as this is a free country, and there are men who are opposed to the Bible, we can't see how it can be avoided. There is ample provision for all who wish to be instructed in the Bible, and to have their children so instructed; and when a man is commissioned to preach the gospel, he should do so faithfully, no matter whom he offends. But the public school-teacher has no such commission.

It is strange that men will be so blind in regard to this question of the Bible in the public schools. Strange that they cannot see that it must either result in endless controversies, or else to the teaching of the Bible with its truths so emasculated that it will be but hollow mockery. There are a great many different theories held by those who regard the Bible as sacred. The Unitarian would not want his child taught that Christ is God; the Universalist would not want his child taught that they who reject Christ will be doomed to writhe in eternal torment; and there are differences on scores of points among the more orthodox. Of course each individual who clamors for the Bible in the public schools, expects that his particular belief will be taught; he doesn't propose to have his child taught what he regards as heresy. So in order to avoid offense to anybody, the real, vital truths of the Bible will not be taught; and when the Bible is not taught in a way to convert the soul, its teachings amount to nothing. We have too much reverence for the Bible to wish to see it lowered to the standard of a mere text-book, divested of its spiritual power.

The Professor made the usual disclaimer of any intention on the part of National Reformers to unite Church and State. Said he: "Making a religious State does not establish a State religion. There is no proposal to recognize one denomination more than another." Thus they make an arbitrary definition of Church and State union, and then say that they are opposed to that. The Professor's statement is an admission that the recognition of any one denomination by the State would be a union of Church and State. Then will he tell us what name he would give to the recognition of all of them? Surely if one would be a union of Church and State, the other would be seventy and seven

fold such a union. Nobody will deny that there was a union of Church and State in all Europe in the Middle Ages. But there was as much difference between the various orders of Catholic monks as there is now among the various denominations of Protestants. Sometimes one order would be specially recognized, and sometimes another, yet Catholicism was all the time supreme. So for this Government to recognize Christianity in any form, would be just as much a union of Church and State as that was. No matter what form of Christianity is patronized by the State, it will be only a form; the real principle always leaves as soon as the Church coquets with the State.

Here is one of the Professor's significant sentences: "We are the farthest possible from proposing a union of Church and State; and yet, my friends, there are worse things than that." Undoubtedly; but this world has never yet seen a worse thing.

Again, he said that "many good men in Scotland have been tempted to go back from the Free Church into the Established Church, simply because there is so great a tendency toward secularism, and the Established Church stands as a bulwark against infidelity." Why did they ever leave the Established Church? Simply because it was only a religious shell. It was the conservator

59

of a form of religion, but was destitute of converting power. Now, frightened at the flood of iniquity, which the Saviour himself, and also his apostles, said should increase, and imagining that the world must all be "converted," they choose a form of godliness for all, rather than real godliness for a few. In the above statement of the Professor's is seen the real hollowness of the National Reform movement.

The speaker cited the Scripture mottoes which he saw on the drinking fountains in Scotland, the Corn Exchange and other buildings in London, and statues, pictures, etc., in Germany, and said: "All this to me was very beautiful, as indicating the character of those who reigned." "I felt that religion was an element that pervaded society." Perhaps the Professor is more susceptible to religious influences than we are, but we care more for deeds than for words. The actions of those who reign, and of the common people, are to us a better indication of the quality of the religion that pervades society, than any inscriptions can be. We remember that the high priest who sat in judgment on our Saviour, had the name of God bound upon his forehead; and texts of Scripture were worn on the foreheads and forearms of the very men who shouted, "Crucify him." True religion shows itself in something besides inscriptions and phylacteries. We cannot understand how men so strict personally as the Reformed Presbyterians are, can look with complacency upon a national religion that is only an empty shell. They seem to be infatuated with the name of "national religion."

We can notice only one more statement, and it is a very suggestive one. Speaking of Sunday laws, he remarked that some "complications" have arisen in their enforcement, but that most States have now an exemption clause in favor of those who observe the seventh day. Said he: "There are fears on the part of such [observers of the seventh day] that National Reform may result in persecution. Whatever may be the result, there is nothing further from the hearts of those who

are in this movement." We were sorry that he left the matter in this unsettled state. "Whatever may be the result," they do not intend to persecute anybody. We believe that, at least so far as Professor McCartney is concerned; but we would like to have had him tell the people his opinion as to what the result might be. With the disgraceful record of Arkansas and Tennessee so fresh, it is easy to conjecture what the result may be. The Professor doesn't think there will be any persecution, because, as we learned in private conversation, he thinks that those who keep the seventh day will obey Sunday laws out of deference to the majority. The record of the past shows that in this he is mistaken.

We do not see how such men as the Professor can satisfy their conscience by saying that "whatever may be the result," they don't mean to harm anybody, when they must know, and do know, that the success of their movement can result in nothing else but persecution to dissenters. Here is the picture: A boy is standing on the top of a cliff, with a huge rock just balanced on the edge; below there are a great many people; just before he gives the rock a shove, he calls out: "You folks down there seem to be greatly afraid that this rock will hurt some of you; but I want you to understand that whatever the result may be, I have no evil designs toward any of you; I am going to roll this rock down the cliff merely to gratify myself, and not for the purpose of injuring you; it won't hurt you unless you happen to be in its way." Very consoling isn't it? Cannot our friends, the National Reformers, see themselves somewhere in the above picture? E.J.W.

"Let There Be No Alliance with Rome" *American Sentinel* 3, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

The Presbyterian Union of New York City is composed of the Presbyterian ministers of that city. In their meeting February 28, the discussion turned on the question, "How far is the Roman Catholic Church our ally, and how far our enemy?" From a report of the proceedings we take the following points of interest:-

Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., the ecclesiastical historian and professor in Union Theological Seminary, opened the discussion. He said that the origin of the Roman Catholic Church was involved in obscurity. It may have originated on the day of pentecost; it may have originated at Corinth, or it may have originated much later. In any event the precise time could not be fixed. He claimed that the Pope, but not the church, is antichrist. That the Pope and the church are not one, and that Second Thessalonians refers to the Pope alone, claiming that this was the view held by Calvin, Melancthon, and Luther. He said that the Roman Catholic Church must hold to all the cardinal doctrines, such as the Trinity, divinity of Christ, justification, sanctification, good works, and others. He emphasized the historic character of the church and that under its claim of infallibility it could not abandon one of the cardinal doctrines and live; that it was the largest church of Christendom, with its 200,000,000 members, and should be the ally of Protestantism.

62

Rev. Dr. John Hall, pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, was the next speaker. Each point that Dr. Schaff raised Dr. Hall answered, and when he

said that he could not realize how so learned a man, a professor in the chair of church history in a Presbyterian theological seminary, could advocate an alliance with the historic enemy of truth, justice, and morality, he was enthusiastically applauded.

He held to his clear and logical style of argumentation, but his deep interest and earnest convictions upon this important subject, led him into such bursts of eloquence that he carried his audience before him with irresistible force.

Dr. Hall said that he had lived among Catholics; had preached in a parish where there were three Roman Catholics to one Protestant; he had been to Rome and met the cardinals, to whom he had been introduced. He knew Romanists and Romanism, priesthood and laity, better, probably, than any person present. He said the Pope was the church and the church was the Pope, and that both are antichrist, "so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." The Pope and Romanism stand and fall together. Paul denounced this antichrist, this son of perdition, as the workman of Satan; that Satan who had over-come the first Adam, and with all the subtlety of his nature endeavored to overcome the second Adam, but had failed. Satan had endeavored to overcome Christ by offers of that temporal power which the Church of Rome now holds out, and the offer was made by the same arch conspirator.

Moses's fight was continually against apostasy. Satan does not ask the people at first to become atheists, but he asks them to place alongside of the true God other gods also. This is what the Roman Catholic Church asks and does. Satan was satisfied when the Jewish kings set up the temple of the living God, provided they had Baal and Ashtaroth in their groves. As to the origin of the Roman Church, a careful reading of history showed that it was from Constantine, who was a shrewd statesman, a politician and murderer, that it had sprung. Out of heathenism, Judaism, and Christianity, were taken those portions of their several services that would appeal to the sensualism of man, and with these playing upon the inborn sentiment of natural religion, Christ was kept out of the heart.

Dr. Schaff had referred to the decrees of the Council of Trent, acknowledging the divinity, kingship, and priestly offices of Christ. Dr. Hall said that it was true, but it was not fair to quote a portion and not the whole of the decrees. Read them through and in their logical connection, and you would find that they were completely Romish; the doctrine of justification is ignored, Christ's office as a Saviour is rendered wholly void; and every leading doctrine of the religion of Christ had been manipulated until it was of none effect.

The decrees of the Council of Trent claimed ten virtues for the priesthood, traditions, penances, purgatory, indulgences, and in Mariolatry, to one in the atonement of Christ. Christ's divinity was merged in the infallibility of the Pope, the influence of the Holy Ghost merged in the confessional interferences of the priesthood, and instead of bowing to the kingship of Christ, the devotees of the Roman system kissed the toe of St. Peter's statue. No Catholic is permitted by the decrees of the church to be "justified freely by His grace through the

redemption that is in Christ Jesus," and his soul goes blindly into purgatory in order that the church may receive money for saying masses for his soul.

As to the church's influence, no devotee of heathenism in Japan but lives a freer life than does the slave of Romanism. There is no truth of the decalogue that it has not broken, no truth of Christianity that it has not assailed.

It is claimed that the marriage relationship has been defended by the Romish Church, and yet there has been no greater insult offered to that holy relationship than celibacy and monasticism and their attendant evils.

It is said that Romanism educates. It does so in places where it has no other way to carry on its aggressive work, and when it does educate, it does so always at your expense; but where it can get along without it, it does not educate.

It is claimed that the Roman Church holds in check the turbulent spirits that have caused our strikes, and that we should join hands with it to keep this power under restraint. That 60,000,000 of people should conciliate 8,000,000 of enemies to their liberties in order to keep in check a small portion of our body politic! No; a thousand times better that these misguided people should strike, and strike, until they learn how to appreciate the laws of our land and their own good, rather than that the iron band of superstition and spiritual death should be riveted about their arms and souls until they could not move.

The Presbyterian Church should not form such an unholy alliance. It was our duty to magnify Protestantism, the Christianity of the Bible, and not make an unholy alliance with error. He had no word against the individuals of the Church of Rome, but against that church he should always raise his voice.

When Dr. Hall had concluded, the Rev. Howard Crosby, D.D., pastor of the Fourth Avenue Presbyterian Church, arose and commenced his address with the question, "Why should we not join with the Roman Catholic Church in the fight against infidelity?" He paused and deliberately said, "Because the Roman Catholic Church makes infidelity." The answer was electrical. The audience cheered and applauded for several minutes. Dr. Crosby continued: "The Roman Catholic Church has been called an historic church, and we are asked to make it an ally because it is such. Look at Mohammedism, Buddhism; they, too, are historic. Shall we join with them on account of their antiquity?"

"When does an apple get so rotten that it ceases to be an apple?" said the doctor. "Let us not be deceived by the virtues of those who are superior to their religion, into fellowship with that which is unfriendly to our every interest."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

The Pope has secured a convention with the Government of Colombia, South America, by which there is secured to the Papacy the protection of Catholicism as the State religion, the exemption of religious buildings from taxation, and the exemption of the clergy from military service. The clergy will have entire control of the Government schools and universities.

The Rev. T. L. Cuyler, D.D., is a man of such standing that he can be allowed to say with freedom what would be called rank heresy in others. Speaking of the

votes which were cast for Miss Willard, in the Methodist General Conference, as editor of the New York *Christian Advocate*, he said in the New York Evangelist of June 14:-

"Miss Willard is a lady of rare gifts and graces, yet she is in danger of exchanging her lofty position as a Christian philanthropist, for that of a political wire-puller. Woman in yonder missionary meetings is beautiful; but woman in a political caucus or committee, is hardly an object for angels to admire."

To all of which we heartily say, Amen.

We are opposed to the so-called National Reform movement, not because if it succeeds our position as dissenters might be made uncomfortable, but because it is in no sense a reform. It is a step backward, and a long step too. It is a return to the policy of the Dark Ages—a substitution of the shell of Christianity for the kernel. Some may think that it is better to have even the *form* of Christianity without the substance, if we cannot have the reality; but we do not think so. Empty shells are of no earthly use except to take up valuable room. And so the empty shell of Christianity, which "National Reform" would give us, would serve simply to crowd out vital Christianity. As Christians we are opposed to the National Reform movement; and everyone who loves real, vital Christianity ought to be arrayed against it.

The *Christian Statesman* of June 28 has an editorial strongly condemning the late National Republican Convention for its "lack of Christian character and purpose," which closes with the following words:-

"The convention illustrates accurately the irreligious character of our political system, in which infidels like Ingersoll, and Presbyterian elders like Harrison, of Indiana, sit together in the same councils, having agreed beforehand that differences in religion shall be no hindrance to their fellowship."

Well, why should differences in religion be a hindrance to their fellowship in civil and political councils? Is not the proper administration of government of just as much importance to an infidel as it is to a Presbyterian elder? Are not an infidel's rights just the same, and just as sacred, under civil government as are those of a Presbyterian elder, or anybody else, and *vice versa*? If not, why not? Is it not the truth that "all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"? And is it not to secure these ends that Governments are instituted among men? Every person who has any regard for the Declaration of Independence must answer, Yes. Well, then, again we ask, Why should differences in religion be any hindrance to their fellowship in securing to themselves life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? But such a political system doesn't suit the *Christian Statesman* at all. It wants a political system established in which agreement in religion shall be the sole basis of civil fellowship; a political system in which every citizen's religion shall be put to the test in every campaign. And that will be but the Papacy over again.

"A Congressman's Opinion" *American Sentinel* 3, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

A correspondent of the Sentinel, in Washington City, obtained an interview with Congressman Mason, of Illinois, and sent us the following report. It reached us in June but too late for publication in the July Sentinel. We gladly give it place. Its points are well taken. Mr. Mason said:-

"The bill is remarkable in many ways, and I cannot now, for want of time, discuss the same as fully as I would like. But I am surprised that a man of Mr. Blair's opportunities should wholly ignore a class of citizens who worship on the seventh day instead of on Sunday. In the first place, the constitutional right to worship would be imposed, in my opinion, by this bill. And to say that a person who keeps Saturday instead of Sunday shall not be allowed to work on any other particular day of the week, is, in my opinion, a deprivation of the rights of property, and a substantial violation of that part of the Constitution which says that a citizen shall not be deprived of his life, liberty or property, without due process of law."

It is simply childish for Senator Blair to provide that such a citizen may not do any work on Sunday "to the disturbance of others." He knows if he is familiar with history, and knows anything about the natural bent of the human mind, that any labor, however simple, or however retired, would be "to the disturbance of others," if the "others" were strongly of the belief, as many are, that Sunday should be a legal day of rest.

There are people in this world who are "disturbed" if your dress does not suit them, and the Senator might as well prescribe the fashion to dress as to say that those who worship on Saturday *shall* worship on Sunday.

I wish to be understood as saying that I do not believe in disturbance of public or private worship on Sunday or Saturday, but what I wish to say is that this bill or any bill seeking to fix a day of worship, by law, against the conscience or judgment of a large class of our citizens, is thoroughly unconstitutional, un-American, and, in my humble judgment, un-Christian.

I am informed that under State Sunday laws, members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and the Seventh-day Baptist Church, have been tried and convicted for performing their ordinary duties in a peaceful way, on Sunday, after having observed Saturday as their day of worship, and those persons have been committed to prisons.

Such action is certainly unconstitutional. Suppose for instance, the Sunday Bill is passed, and, in 1889, two-thirds are converted to the belief that we should worship on the seventh day. Then the law would be changed to fit the demands of the majority-religious liberty becomes a political football-the Church and State would be united, and the most sacred article of our Constitution, which protects the inherent rights of the minority, would be destroyed.

The *Interior* says:-

"When George Washington was presented with his little hatchet, his fingers ached to cut something with it. It is admitted that George was a good little boy, and meant no harm by chop-ping down the cherry tree. It has been so ever since. When power is put into an American *parvenu's* hands-and we are all parvenus in this country, more or less-his fingers burn to exercise it, and if there is no useful work in sight he is sure to do mischief-and is very liable to anyway. If

he has the self-confidence of combined egotism and inexperience, he is irrepressible in his ugliness of purpose."

This is just the position we take with reference to the National Reformers. There are very many good people among them. There are many well-meaning persons who are anxious to see laws enacted for the better observance of Sunday. They say that they do not wish to infringe in the least upon the rights of others. But they don't know what they would do if they had the power. As the boy who has a brand new, sharp knife, cannot rest content until he has tried its edge, so the man who comes into the possession of power to which he is unaccustomed, must needs test his new thy to see how it works. He may not mean any harm, but power is a very dangerous tool in the hands of an inexperienced person. If you would have religious liberty, keep out of the hands of even the best of men every semblance of power to persecute for conscience' sake.

September 1888

"Civil Sabbath" *American Sentinel* 3, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* has sent us a circular giving reasons why that paper is to be commended. One of these reasons is:-

"Because it advocates a civil as well as a church Sabbath."

But there is no such thing as a civil Sabbath. The original, supreme, and only Sabbath law-the fourth commandment-says explicitly of the Sabbath, that it is "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." It is not the Sabbath of any civil government, it is the Sabbath of the Lord. He calls it, "My holy day.' Christ has commanded us to render to God that which is God's, while we render to CÊsar that which is CÊsar's. The Sabbath being the Lord's day, it is to be rendered to him and not to CÊsar. Civil government can never of right have anything to do with directing the observance of the Sabbath. Whenever it undertakes to do so, it puts itself in the place of God, and usurps the authority of God, both in such legislation, and by invading the sacred precincts of the conscience. The Lord alone "is the Author and Lord of conscience, and no power on earth has a right to stand between God and the conscience. A violation of this divine law written in the heart is an assault upon the majesty of God and the image of God in man."

"Bad Institutions and Good Men" *American Sentinel* 3, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

The American Sentinel has often called attention to the rapid spread of National Reform ideas, while the great majority of those who love real liberty seem to be asleep. The National Reform Association itself is a comparatively insignificant affair, and if the issue depended on its efforts alone, there would not be much to fear. Its organs, the *Christian Statesman* and the *Christian Nation*, have long ago ceased to publish distinctively National Reform articles, and seem to exist chiefly in order that the association's "secretaries," who sacrifice

themselves in the cause of reform for one hundred dollars a month and expenses, may have a place in which to tell of their exploits. But the success of that which is misnamed National Reform does not depend on their efforts. There is just one thing that this so-called National Reform really stands for, and that is the passage and enforcement of strict Sunday laws, and for this many are working who are not known as National Reformers.

As an example of how the great object of the National Reform Association is gaining ground, take the Blair Sunday Bill. By request of certain influential persons in the church, Senator Blair introduced the bill, and it passed its second reading in the Senate almost before it had been heard of by anybody outside of the "ring" which had started it. Then the Rev. Dr. Crafts devoted his whole attention to it, and has already succeeded in working up large petitions in favor of it. He has got the churches, the Sunday-school Associations, and many trades-unions and Knights of Labor clubs to take hold of the matter, so that when the bill comes to its final passage, the legislators will be confronted with documents setting forth that the people of the country are almost unanimous in desiring the measure.

But besides all this, there is the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which is now married, as the *Statesman* claims, to the National Reform Association. A more correct statement would be that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has adopted the National Reform Association, and is nursing its principles into stalwart proportions. Whichever way it is put, however, the fact remains that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, with its vast influence, is wholly committed to the principles of the National Reform Association, and 1892 is set as the date for its triumph. Judging from the vast host of names of men and women both dead and alive that are arrayed in favor of the movement, we cannot see much presumption in the claim that it will succeed in four years. Think of it, you who have recently celebrated another anniversary of our country's independence, and are swelling with pride at the thought that this is the freest country on earth-only four years to elapse before liberty in this country will be dead! only four years until laws shall be passed which will inaugurate a system of espionage upon those who think differently from the majority, and who have the courage of their convictions, which will be worse than any that ever existed in Russia! Is it a pleasant prospect? If not, what are you going to do about it? Do you say that if it is going to come it will come, and that you will not let it swerve you from the right when it does come? That will not do; for if through your indifference any who might have been warned of the danger, and put on their guard, are taken unawares and overcome by the speciousness or the force of the oppressor, their blood will be upon your head. It is time for somebody to be awake, for there is just before us a struggle between right and wrong such as the world has never yet seen. It will be a struggle between error entrenched in law, and having the cloak of righteousness, and truth under ban of law, and covered with reproach and stigmatized as blasphemy. He who stands firm for truth at that time will need much of the grace of God. There will yet be greater need for the martyr spirit than ever before in the history of the world.

Right here, however, we are met with the charge of inconsistency. "How can it be possible," it is asked, "that such evils should result from a movement that is in the hands of so many good people." Our friends of the opposition tell us that the very arguments which we bring forward to show the strength of the National Reform movement, are strong arguments to show its righteousness. Indeed, it often puzzles many people who are really opposed to the principles of the association, to know how any harm can come from anything which is introduced by the good folks of the churches and the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. We will explain by a brief reference to the history of the past. And we will quote, first, as a text, a passage from the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, of May, 1844, written by Rev. Ralph Emerson, D.D., at that time Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Andover Theological Seminary. It is this:-

"Few things can be so pernicious to the church as a general belief that no very bad measure was ever introduced by good men or with a great and good purpose. Then will they look at the character of the men, and at the object proposed, instead of scrutinizing the means by which it is to be effected; and the work is done before its character is suspected. Nearly all the bad institutions in the church-Jesuitism among the rest-have been by apparently good men, and for a professedly good purpose."

This is a point that is given too little attention. When we portray the essential wickedness of the National Reform movement, we do not impugn the character nor the motives of its abettors. We are convinced that many of them are conscientious men; but we never yet saw a good man who could not make a mistake, nor one whose advocacy of a bad institution could make that institution good.

We will take, for example, the system of slavery as it existed years ago in this country.

69

That it was a wicked institution few will now have the hardihood to deny. Even the people where it flourished, and who reaped all the benefit that was to be reaped from it, are glad that it is abolished. And yet thousands of good men upheld the institution, and held slaves. It cannot be denied that there were people who held slaves, who were personally as upright, and as conscientious Christians, as any who opposed the institution. It is no doubt true that very many slaves were actually in better circumstances than many colored people are now in a state of freedom. But these are not the things by which we judge slavery. Even if the vast majority of slave-holders had been humane men, that would not have made the system right. The fact is that under that system which was upheld by so many good men, a bad man could expend upon his slaves all the hellish brutality of his nature, and the law would uphold him in it. The principle of the system was, in the first place, opposed to the golden rule, and all the good men in the world could not, by their advocacy of it, make it right. The system must be judged by the injustice which it allowed men to do.

So must we judge of the National Reform system. When a universal rigid Sunday law is once passed, all the good intentions of the men who are working to secure it, and the humane feeling of the good women of the Woman's Christian

Temperance Union, cannot prevent the law from being used as an instrument of cruelty upon persons who conscientiously differ with the majority.

The methods which are used to advance the movement should convince anybody that there is something essentially wrong about it. We have already spoken of the great lists of names which Rev. Mr. Crafts is securing to petitions in favor of the Blair Sunday Bill. But it would take too long, and would involve too much labor, to circulate these petitions throughout all the country, for individual signatures. So a scheme has been devised by which a great deal more influence can be secured for it, with much less trouble. The matter is to be presented, not to individuals, but to churches, and a vote taken on it. If the vote is favorable, as it will usually be, then the entire membership of the church will be counted as favorable. Let us illustrate. Here is a church of five hundred members. At one of its meetings, when there is an average attendance of perhaps three hundred members, a vote is taken on the Sunday bill, and no one votes against it. Then by the vote of less than three hundred people, the influence of five hundred is secured in favor of the bill, although many of the five hundred may be opposed to the bill. Even though a few of the three hundred present vote against the bill, their votes are not counted out, and so opposition is by this ledgerdmain turned into advocacy. Anything which uses such methods must be inherently wrong.

Before we close we must refer to a little circumstance that happened years ago, for the express benefit of those who think that no harm can come from a movement that is in the hands of such good women as the leaders of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Some men named Paul and Barnabas were preaching the doctrines of a sect that was everywhere spoken against. They were doing this, notwithstanding the fact that their preaching had been condemned by the established church, and was utterly out of harmony with the belief of the majority of church members. At Antioch, in Pisidia, they had been so active that "the word of the Lord was published throughout all the region," much to the disgust of the general public. So the record says:-

"But the Jews stirred up the devout and honorable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts." Acts 13:50.

Here is something for our friends to consider. If it had not been for the influence of the "devout and honorable women," Paul and Barnabas might have continued preaching in Antioch. The heathen did not persecute them, but on the contrary rejoiced to hear the word; it was the good people of the church, "the chief men of the city," and the "devout and honorable women,"-the eminently respectable and moral people,-that persecuted Paul and Barnabas, and drove them from the country. And who shall say that a similar thing may not happen again? We bring no charges against the worthy women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. We are willing to grant that they are all "devout and honorable," but we remember that just such women once persecuted the preachers of the gospel, and were no less "devout and honorable" when they got through than when they begun. When error is upheld by law, then the law-abiding people must prosecute those who stand for truth and against error; and in such a

case prosecution becomes persecution.
E.J.W.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

Doctor Crafts reports that between three and four million names have already been secured to the petitions in behalf of the National Sunday law.

The names of seventeen hundred new sub-scribers have been added to the Sentinel list within the last thirty days. The reason of existence of the Sentinel is becoming every day more and more a living issue, and we are glad to know that the Sentinel grows in favor with the people accordingly.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Prohibition party have become so entirely National Reform organizations that the regular National Reform organizers have ceased to organize local National Reform clubs as such, but work through these to spread the National Reform ideas. So says District Secretary M.A. Gault in the American, June 27, 1888.

Thousands of people are signing petitions for the National Sunday law, without a thought of harm to themselves or anybody else. Yet only harm to thousands of people can ever come from the enactment of such a law. Many of those who are signing the petitions would not do so if they knew the danger that there is in the enactment of the law. The Sentinel clearly points out the danger. Therefore the Sentinel should be placed in the hands of every person in the land. Are you doing your part to see that this shall be done

The *Christian at Work* says:-

"The Spanish Constitution guarantees equal religious liberty to all. But that did not prevent two Protestant citizens of Madrid from being arrested, tried, and condemned, the other day, to six months' imprisonment for refusing to kneel before the Viaticum. We do not know if the offenders were Englishmen or Americans, or of what nationality-perhaps they were Spaniards. But some action should be taken that will secure to Protestants in Spain their just constitutional rights. They must spell liberty in a queer way in the Andalusian country."

Oh, no, they don't! They spell it just as it is spelled in New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, and just as they are fast learning to spell it all over this country. Spain has a national religion; it is Catholicism; and refusing to kneel before the Viaticum "disturbs" the devotees of the national religion. Such "disturbance" must not be allowed, hence these prosecutions; precisely as the New York law punishes those who "disturb" the Sunday worshipers by working on Sunday, and as Senator Blair's proposed Sunday law will punish men all over the country. The American method of spelling liberty has descended almost to a level with the Andalusian.

Communications have been addressed to the Sentinel asking its influence in favor of a certain party or candidate. We have but one reply that we can make to all communications of this kind, viz.: The Sentinel cannot lend its influence to any party or candidate as such. The Sentinel is not in politics in that sense. It is not partisan in any sense. The Sentinel is devoted to the defense of the National

Constitution as it is, so far as religion is concerned; and in this is devoted to the defense of the civil and religious rights and liberties of every person in the nation, regardless of party or creed. And now that the National Constitution is attacked at this very point, and by a United States Senator at that, this question ought to take precedence of every other in National affairs. With the Sentinel this question does take precedence of everything else, therefore the Sentinel cannot be partisan in any sense.

The latter part of July, "Sam" Jones, the great revivalist, preached in Windsor, Canada, to an audience composed mostly of Americans, who went over there to hear him. One of his devout, elegantly refined, and intensely instructive passages was this:-

"Now I'll tell you, I think we are running the last political combat on the lines we have been running them on. It is between the Republicans And Democrats, this contest, and it is the last the Republicans will make in America. The Democrats are going in overwhelmingly. Four years from now the Prohibition element will break the solid South. The issue then will be God or no God, drunkenness or sobriety, Sabbath or no Sabbath, Heaven or hell. That will be the issue. Then we will wipe up the ground with the Democratic party, and let God rule America from that time on."

And this the Christian Statesman inserts under the heading, "The National Reform Movement!" It is very appropriately placed. It is a worthy addition to the literature of the National Reform movement. But what consummate mountebanks many of those popular "revivalists" do make of themselves!

In the *Christian Statesman* of August 9, Rev. R. C. Wylie praises Senator Blair's proposed constitutional amendment, because it would, if adopted, give the National Reformers many ad-vantages which they have not now. He says:-

"We would then have a vantage-ground we have not now. The leading objection that has been urged against us will have lost its power. That objection, which has such a tender regard for the infidel conscience, will have spent its force against this amendment, and will be no more fit for use against us."

That is to say: The charge of invading the rights of conscience has, so far, lain against the National Reformers; but now, if this amendment is carried, this charge will lie against the amendment, and will spend itself there, while the National Reformers escape. This charge is justly made against the National Reformers; for they distinctly affirm that the civil power has the right to compel the consciences of men. And the admission that if the amendment were adopted the charge would then lie against that, is a confession that the proposed amendment, if adopted, will invade the rights of conscience. And that is the truth. It will surely do so. If it would not, it would not be so heartily indorsed by the National Reformers.

Rev. R. C. Wylie says the National Reformers should advocate Senator Blair's religious amendment to the Constitution,-

"Because of the aid it will give us in discussing National Reform principles. Some of these are clearly embodied in the amendment. Senator Blair's amendment marks an epoch in our history. . . The pulpit and the platform should herald the truths it teaches, from ocean to ocean."

Yes, the amendment will not only aid in discussing National Reform principles, it will also, if adopted, most materially aid the National Reformers in carrying those principles into practice by the civil power, and in satisfying their in-tense longing to tolerate dissenters as lunatics and conspirators are tolerated.

As was to be expected, the National Reformers are delighted with Senator Blair's religious amendment to the Constitution. It is in substance just what they have been working for all these years. The *Christian Statesman* of July 12 says the amendment "should receive the strenuous support of all American Christians." In its issue of July 19 the *Statesman* says:-

"Senator Blair's proposed constitutional amendment furnishes an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people."

Then, after mentioning "Christianity, the religion of the Nation," and "The Bible, the textbook of our common Christianity, in all the schools," it says:-

"These have been our watch-words in the discussions of a quarter of a century. And now these ideas are actually pending before the Senate of the United States in the form of a joint resolution proposing their adoption as a part of the Constitution of the United States. Here is a great opportunity. Shall we boldly and wisely improve it?"

We are afraid that the iniquitous scheme will actually carry.

October 1888

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

Thousands of people are signing petitions for the National Sunday law, without a thought of harm to themselves or anybody else. Yet only harm to thousands of people can ever come from the enactment of such a law. Many of those who are signing the petitions would not do so if they knew the danger that there is in the enactment of the law. The *Sentinel* clearly points out the danger. Therefore the *Sentinel* should be placed in the hands of every person in the land. Are you doing your part to see that this shall be done?

Not long since a Prohibition Convention was held in Visalia, Cal. The preachers were very active and enthusiastic in it; and they succeeded in arousing a good deal of enthusiasm in the body of the convention. After the convention had dispersed the following question was put to two of the preachers: "I suppose the object of this is, in the long run, to work it into a Sunday law?" And the answer was this:-

"That is what it is; but we are not saying anything about that now, till we get the thing in running order-then we will bring that in." That is precisely the scheme which the preachers are working through the third-party-Prohibition movement, and that is just the way that they are working it. Under cover of Prohibition and temperance legislation they are working for the establishment of a religious despotism.

Recently a preacher in Selma, Cal., delivered a sermon in which he said:-

"We have laws to punish the man who steals our property; but we have no law to prevent people from working on Sunday. It is right that the thief be punished; but I have more sympathy for that man than I have for him that works on that day."

This is directly in the line of things promised by the Prohibition party. Whenever any party sets itself up as the protector of the Lord, and legislates upon things pertaining to God, then offenses, or supposed offenses, against God take precedence of all things else. Heresy becomes the highest crime. Then the thief will be let run, and receive sympathy, while the man who quietly works at his lawful and honest calling is prosecuted, fined, and imprisoned. And Senator Blair's proposed amendment and Sunday law open the way for such men as this to carry their views into effect, by the civil power.

"The National Sunday Bill" *American Sentinel* 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

The National Sunday Bill, introduced into the United States Senate by Senator Blair, is a queer piece of legislation for this enlightened age and country, in more senses than one. We have referred to it in our columns before; but as the legislation itself is the first step taken in an endless controversy, this is ample excuse for referring to it again. But besides this there is sufficient material in the bill itself to justify a long discussion, and even continuous repetition, until the people shall see the danger there is threatening their cherished liberties and dearest rights.

We propose to notice it section by section, and call attention, briefly, to some of the moral and civil delinquencies that show themselves in the bill.

The first section embodies legislation in regard to "the Lord's day," and is as follows:-

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person, or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section."

This is contrary to the word of Christ. Christ said: "Render therefore unto C sar the things that are C sar's; and unto God the things that are God's." By these words it is clear that that which is the Lord's is not to be rendered to C sar, but to the Lord. C sar is civil government; therefore, we are not to render to civil government that which is the Lord's; with what is the Lord's C sar has nothing to do. Senator Blair's bill, in legislating upon that which pertains to the Lord, plainly sets itself against the word of Christ, and is, therefore, antichristian.

Again, this section declares that no person shall do any work, "nor engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof." This leaves it entirely with the other man, or with judge or jury, to say whether that which has been done was a disturbance; and that is only to make every man's action on Sunday subject to the whim or caprice of his neighbor. But "any condition of the law which allows the test of criminality to depend on the whim or caprice of judge or juror, savors of tyranny." The doctrine embodied in this section of the Blair bill is subversive of liberty. It attacks; not only the inherent rights, but the constitutional rights, of every American citizen. For a sound judicial decision upon this principle of this section see the article entitled, "The Savor of Tyranny," in another column of this paper.

Section two is as follows:-

"Sec. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal-route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: *Provided*, That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the postmaster-general shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter, and shall make regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: *And provided further*, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week."

The object of this section is to stop the carrying of the mails on Sunday; but yet any letter that relates to a work of necessity or mercy, or the health, life, or death of any person, which has the fact plainly stated upon the face of the envelope, shall be delivered on the first day of the week.

Section 3 is as follows:-

"Sec. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation who shall willfully violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same."

This section embodies the same principle as the first in regard to the disturbance of others, and sets a heavy penalty upon conduct lacking in the

essential element of criminality. Upon what principle except that of religious intolerance can it

74

ever be made to appear that an act which is not only perfectly innocent but entirely laudable when performed on any other day of the week, becomes so intensely criminal when performed on the first day of the week as to deserve a penalty of a thousand dollars fine?

Section 4 reads:-

"Sec. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord's day."

So far as anything in this section is in itself concerned there is nothing particularly to be noticed except that it is directly in the line of Constantine's Sunday legislation. He, however, went a step further and caused his soldiers to parade expressly for worship, and wrote out a prayer which he had them all repeat at a given signal. Something like this may fairly be expected to follow should this bill become a law; because, as religious observance and religious worship are the objects of the bill, why should not the soldiers be required to pray on Sunday as well as to religiously observe the day? It may be said that the *religious* observance of the day is not required; but when we come to section six, it will be seen that it is.

Section 5 reads thus:-

"Sec. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered or for labor performed or for the transportation of persons or property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same."

This section provides that if any person works for any other person on Sunday, and receives payment for it at any time, then any person in the wide world, except the parties concerned, can enter suit, and recover the money so paid. If you work for me on Sunday, and I ever pay you for it, then the first man that finds it out can sue you and get the money. That is what the bill says. The bill says that when wages are paid for Sunday work, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same. "Whoever," is a universal term. Therefore, this bill deliberately proposes that when any man who is subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, receives payment for work done on Sunday, except of necessity or mercy, he may be sued for that money by whoever first learns that he has received it, and that person shall get the money.

To think that any such legislation as is embodied in this section should ever be thought of by any sane person, is sufficiently astonishing; but that it should not only have been thought of, but should have been thought of and embodied in a bill, and introduced into the United States Senate by a United States Senator,

and that it should have passed two readings in that body without a dissenting voice, is simply astounding. It almost surpasses belief. But here are the facts which demonstrate that such things have been done in this land of liberty, in the National Legislature, in this year of the nineteenth century. When United States Senators will employ their time in such legislation as that, then whose liberties are safe? Senator Blair is a Prohibitionist of National reputation. He may justly be considered a representative Prohibitionist, and the legislation proposed in this bill, and in this section of the bill, may justly be considered a representative piece of Prohibitionist legislation.

But if that be so, then the fewer Prohibitionists who ever, as such, secure legislative power, the better will it be for the people. And when such legislation as is here proposed can be introduced, and read twice in the United States Senate, without a dissenting voice, then it is high time that the American people were awaking to that eternal vigilance which only is the price of liberty.

The last section of the bill is as follows:-

"Sec. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory into another State, district, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day."

This section is simply provisory, and requires no comment, except the last few lines, which show the object of the entire bill; and that is, "to secure to the whole people rest, . . . and the religious observance of the Sabbath day." No one, therefore, need attempt to evade the force of objections against this bill by saying that it is not the religious, but the *civil*, observance of the day that is required; because here it is plainly declared in the bill itself, that it is not only to secure rest to all the people, but that it is also to secure the *religious* observance of the Sabbath day. There is not a single reference in the bill to any such thing as the civil observance of the day. The word "civil" is not used in the bill. It is a religious bill wholly. The first section defines the Lord's day; the second section refers to the day as one of worship and rest; section three refers to it as a day of religious worship; section four refers to its observance as that of religious worship; and section six plainly declares what is apparent throughout, that the object of the whole bill is "to secure to the whole people rest *and religious* observance of the Sabbath day," on the first day of the week.

It is religious legislation, and that only; but as the present Constitution forbids religious legislation, it was necessary to follow the presentation of this bill by a proposed amendment to the Constitution establishing the Christian religion. Thus the two go hand in hand. They belong together; either necessitates the other. Let either be adopted, and in the language of the United States Senate in 1829, it will

"involve a legislative decision on a religious controversy, and on a point in which good citizens may honestly differ in opinion, without disturbing the peace of society, or endangering its liberties. If this principle is once introduced it will be impossible to define its bounds. . . If admitted it may be justly apprehended that the future measures of the Government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence. All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it, and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequences. . . If the principle is once established that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts we must pursue it to its *ultimatum*. . . Let the National Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid, for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World."

The Blair Sunday Bill and its accompanying constitutional amendment bear in them, or in either of them, this desolating scourge, and if adopted will spread that scourge over all this fair land. Therefore we are eternally opposed to this bill or anything like it. We oppose it as human beings who have respect for human rights; we oppose it as American citizens who believe in the rights and liberties asserted for mankind by the Declaration of Independence, and maintained for all by the American Constitution as it is, and which inhere in the genius of American institutions. We oppose it as men who fear God, and respect the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, or, so far as civil government is concerned, not to worship him at all if he chooses; we oppose it as Christians who love Christ and endeavor sincerely to do his will, and who, at the same time, maintain that, under civil government, every other man is entitled to all the rights to which the Christian is entitled; and we would have every soul in the United States inspired with the spirit, and, we hope, with the deathless endurance, with which our own opposition is inspired.

"The National Establishment of the Christian Religion" *American Sentinel* 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

A JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, RESPECTING ESTABLISHMENTS OF RELIGION AND FREE SCHOOLS.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:-

ARTICLE

Section 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Sec. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.

Sec. 3. To the end that each State, the United

75

States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve government republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.

Sec. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary.

This amendment to the National Constitution has been offered by Senator Blair, and is now pending in Congress. It is a singular sort of a document, though hardly any more so than was to be expected in the promotion of the scheme which underlies it, *i.e.*, the establishment of a National religion. The proposed amendment is just about as flatly self-contradictory as any proposition could be. Section 1 reads as follows:-

"No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The first sentence of section 2 reads as follows:-

"Each State in this Union *shall establish and maintain* a system of free public schools adequate to the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and *the principles of Christian religion.*"

That is to say, No State shall ever make or maintain a law respecting an establishment of religion; but every State in this Union shall make and maintain laws establishing the principles of the Christian religion. And to make assurance doubly sure, section 3 declares that

"The United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided."

And that is to say that the United States Government pledges itself that every State shall establish and maintain the principles of the Christian religion. This proposed amendment therefore, at one stroke, establishes Christianity as the

National religion, *because* it declares that every State shall maintain the principles of the Christian religion in the public schools, and the Nation is pledged to see that this is done. Therefore there must be a National decision of some kind declaring just what are the principles of the Christian religion. Then when that decision shall have been made, every State will have to receive from the Nation just those principles of religion which the Nation shall have declared to be the principles of the Christian religion, and which the Nation will have pledged itself shall be taught in the public schools of every State. In other words, the people of the United States will then have to receive their religion from the Government of the United States. Therefore, if Senator Blair's proposed amendment to the National Constitution does not provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National religion, then no religion was ever established or maintained in this world.

But how shall this National decision be made as to what are the principles of the Christian religion? It would seem that the second sentence of section 2 makes provision for this. It declares that no "instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools."

As therefore no religious tenets, doctrines, or beliefs can be taught in the schools, except such as are common to all denominations of the Christian religion, it will follow inevitably that there shall be officially called a National council of the churches to decide what are the principles common to all, and to establish a National creed, which shall be enforced and inculcated by National power in all the public schools in the United States. And that will be but the establishment of a National religion. And that is exactly what Senator Blair's constitutional amendment assures, so surely as it or anything similar to it shall ever be adopted. And that is what the National Reformers intend shall be.

It was in this way precisely that the thing was worked in the fourth century. Constantine made Christianity the recognized religion of the Roman Empire. Then it became at once necessary that there should be an imperial decision as to what form of Christianity should be the imperial religion. To effect this an imperial council was necessary to formulate that phase of Christianity which was common to all. The Council of Nice was convened by imperial command, and an imperial creed was established, which was enforced by imperial power. That establishment of an imperial religion ended only in the imperious despotism of the Papacy.

As surely as the complete establishment of the Papacy followed, and grew out of, that imperial recognition of Christianity in the fourth century, just so surely will the complete establishment of a religious despotism after the living likeness of the Papacy, follow, and grow out of, this National recognition of Christianity provided for in the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator Blair, and which is now pending in Congress.

The Savor of Tyranny

Senator Blair's National Sunday Bill declares that no person shall "engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, *to the disturbance of others* on the first day of the week, commonly called the Lord's day, or during any part thereof." Some of the States already have the same sort of Sunday laws as this. California has no Sunday law, much less one of this kind. But not long ago the city of San Francisco had, on another subject, an ordinance of the same nature as this passage in the National Sunday Bill. San Francisco has no such ordinance now, however; the merit of the ordinance came up before the Supreme Court, and the whole thing was treated with the contempt which all such statutes only deserve.

The ordinance read as follows:-

"No person shall in any place indulge in conduct having a tendency to annoy persons passing or being upon the public highway or upon adjacent premises."

A man by the name of Ferdinand Pape was distributing some circulars on the street, which had "a tendency to annoy" somebody; he was arrested. He applied to the Superior Court for a writ of *habeas corpus*, claiming that the offense charged against him did not constitute a crime, and that the ordinance making such action an offense was invalid and void, because it was unreasonable and uncertain. The report of the case says:-

"The writ was made returnable before Judge Sullivan, and argued by Henry Hutton in behalf of the imprisoned offender. Disposing of the question, the Judge gave quite a lengthy written opinion, in which he passed a somewhat severe criticism upon the absurdity of the contested ordinance, and discharged Pape from custody. Said the Judge:-

"If the order be law, enforceable by fine and imprisonment, it is a crime to indulge in any conduct, however innocent and harmless in it-self, and however unconsciously done, which has a tendency to annoy other persons. The rival tradesman who passes one's store with an observant eye as to the volume of business is guilty of a crime, because the very thought of rivalry and reduction of business has a tendency to annoy. The passing of the most lenient creditor has a tendency to annoy, because it is a reminder of obligations unfulfilled. The passing of a well-clad, industrious citizen, bearing about him the evidence of thrift, has a tendency to annoy the vagabond, whose laziness reduces him to a condition of poverty and discontent. The importunities of the newsboy who endeavors with such persistent energy to dispose of his stock, has a tendency to annoy the prominent citizen who has already read the papers, or who expects to find them at his door as he reaches home. He who has been foiled in an attempted wrong upon the person or property of another, finds a tendency to annoy in the very passing presence of the person whose honesty or ingenuity has circumvented him. And so instances might be multiplied indefinitely in which the most harmless and inoffensive conduct has a tendency to annoy others. If the language of the ordinance defines a criminal offense, it sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality.

"But it may be said that courts and juries will not use the instrumentality of this language to set the seal of condemnation on unoffending citizens, and to

unjustly deprive them of their liberty and brand them as criminals. The law countenances no such dangerous doctrine, countenances no

76

principle so subversive of liberty as that the life or liberty of a subject should be made to depend upon the whim or caprice of judge or jury, by exercising a discretion in determining that certain conduct does or does not come within the inhibition of a criminal action. The law should be engraved so plainly and distinctly on the legislative tables that it can be discerned alike by all subjects of the commonwealth, whether judge upon the bench, juror in the box, or prisoner at the bar. Any condition of the law which allows the test of criminality to depend on the whim or caprice of judge or juror savors of tyranny. The language employed is broad enough to cover conduct which is clearly within the constitutional rights of the citizen. It designates no border-line which divides the criminal from the non-criminal conduct. Its terms are too vague and uncertain to lay down a rule of conduct. In my judgment the portion of the ordinance here involved is uncertain and unreasonable."

This decision applies with full force to Senator-Blair's proposed National Sunday law. Under that law all that would be necessary to subject any person to a criminal prosecution, would be for him to engage in any sort of play, or game, or amusement, or recreation, on Sunday, because there are many of those rigid National Reformers who would be very much "disturbed" by any such amusement or recreation, however innocent it might be in itself. And it is left entirely to the whim or the caprice of the "disturbed" one, or of the judge or jury, to say whether the action has really disturbed him or not.

The California decision is, that such a statute "sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality." California courts "countenance no such dangerous doctrine, countenance no principle so subversive of liberty," or which so "savors of tyranny." It is very likely that should Senator Blair's bill be enacted into a law, the United States courts would decide in the same way as did the Superior Court of California. But it is an exceedingly ominous sign, and one most startling in the danger which it displays, when a bill which so "savors of tyranny," and which embodies a "principle so subversive of liberty," can be introduced into the National Legislature, can be received and reported favorably, can pass two readings, can be spread broadcast throughout the land, and only one single voice-that of the American Sentinel-be raised against it.

The American people have so long enjoyed the liberty which has been justly their boast, that they seem, from appearances, to think that now they can lie down safely and hibernate undisturbed for all time to come. We wonder what can ever awaken them. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty;" but "corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves."

"The National Reform Association" *American Sentinel* 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

The National Reform Association is an organization composed of representative men of all "evangelical" denominations, and its object is to secure

an amendment to the National Constitution, making Christianity the National religion. Among its vice-presidents are: Joseph Cook, President Seelye, Bishop Huntington of New York, George W. Bain of Kentucky, Miss Frances E. Willard, Mrs. Josephine Bateham, Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge, Mrs. Hoffman, Mrs. Lathrop, and others of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, besides such a number of Reverends, D. Ds., LL. Ds., that we cannot take the time to name them, but which number in all about one hundred and twenty. All these are simply the vice-presidents of the Association. This Association, we have said, was organized to secure an amendment to the National Constitution, recognizing the Christian religion as the religion of this country, and enforcing its precepts upon all who live under the Government. The proposed constitutional amendment introduced by Senator Blair, which we print in another column, is just the kind of an amendment which they seek to have adopted, and with this amendment they are intensely pleased. The *Christian Statesman* is the organ of that Association, and in its issue of July 18, 1888, it indorses this amendment as furnishing an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people, and as embodying principles which have been advocated by the Association for a quarter of a century. In the same paper, of September 6, Mr. John Alexander, father of the Association, urges without delay the circulation of petitions favoring the amendment in such numbers, and signed by so many people, that it will require a procession of wheel-barrows to trundle the mighty mass into the presence of the representatives of the Nation, in the Houses of Congress. Other such commendations might be given, but these are sufficient to show how entirely the Blair amendment meets the mind of the managers of the National Reform Association.

Now we propose to give a few items showing what the National Reformers wish to do when they get that which the Blair Amendment embodies.

The *Christian Statesman*, of October 2, 1884, said:-

"Give all men to understand that this is a Christian Nation, and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain, by all right means, our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution. . . Enforce upon all who come among us the laws of Christian morality."

"Enforce," according to Webster, is "to force, to constrain, to compel, to execute with vigor." Therefore the proposition of the National Reformers is to force, to compel, all to keep the laws of Christian morality; to execute with vigor upon all the laws of Christian morality.

It will be seen at once that this will be but to invade the rights of conscience, and this, one of the vice-presidents of the Association declares, civil power has a right to do. Rev. David Gregg, D.D., now pastor of Park Street Church, Boston, a vice-president of the National Reform Association, plainly declared, in the *Christian Statesman*, of June 5, 1884, that the civil power "has the right to command the consciences of men."

Rev. M.A. Gault, a district secretary, and a leading worker, of the Association says:-

"Our remedy for all these malific influences is to have the Government simply set up the moral law, and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hands on any religion that does not conform to it."

Rev. E. B. Graham, also a vice-president of the Association, in an address delivered at York, Nebraska, reported in the *Christian Statesman* of May 21, 1885, said:-

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

In a speech in a National Reform Convention held in New York City, in February, 1873, Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D.D., named atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Christians, and summed them all up under the head of atheists, and said:-

"These all are. . . as far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together. . . The first-named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry. It is his class. . . The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him. They must be treated, as for this question, one party."

Then he tells how they propose to deal with these people when they get what the Blair amendment supplies. He says:-

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would a poor lunatic, for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man. . . Tolerate atheism, sir! There is nothing out of hell I would not tolerate as soon. . . Atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They cannot dwell together on the same continent."

As though this were not enough, and as though their tolerant intentions were not sincere enough, they propose in addition to all this to join hands with the Catholic Church and enlist her efforts in their work. The *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884, said:-

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

These are the men, and this is the Association, which rejoices and is glad at the prospect opened before us by Senator Blair's proposed amendment to the National Constitution. This is how they propose to use the power that will be bestowed upon them if that amendment is adopted. This is the Association that is filling the country with petitions to be signed by the people asking that that amendment be adopted. With this Association both the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Prohibition party are allied.

Fellow-citizens, these petitions you will be asked to sign. By these presents you know who it is that is asking you to sign them. You know what they propose to do under the amendment if they succeed in securing it. What are you going to do? Will you sign the petitions and thus lend your influence to establish such a

religious despotism as is here shadowed forth? or will you refuse to sign, and tell your neighbor about the wicked scheme, that he may refuse to sign? The danger is upon us, will you awake to the occasion? Do not delay your answer, but act promptly and energetically we beg of you.

"The Woman's Christian Temperance Union" *American Sentinel* 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

The Sentinel has had occasion frequently to criticise some of the workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Upon the part of those who favor the establishment of a religious instead of a *civil* government here, this fact has been made the means of an attempt to create prejudice at the expense of the Sentinel. They try to make it appear that the American Sentinel is opposed to temperance. We propose to make plain our attitude toward temperance in general and toward the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in particular.

The American Sentinel is thoroughly and consistently devoted to the genuine principles of temperance. And what the Sentinel considers to be the genuine principles of temperance can be stated in this single sentence, viz.: *Total abstinence from all stimulants and narcotics of whatever kind or nature or degree.* More than this, it is out of allegiance to Christian principle that the Sentinel is devoted to this principle of temperance. It is thorough-going Christian temperance in which the Sentinel thoroughly believes. It is because allegiance to Christ demands that we shall be temperate in all things, that we advocate the principle of temperance. Both of the editors of the Sentinel are doing their very best to act strictly in accordance with this principle of temperance. It must therefore be manifest to every soul that the American Sentinel is decidedly in favor of temperance, and *Christian* temperance at that. And in this it must likewise be manifest to everybody that whatever criticisms we have ever made, or shall ever make, upon the workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, are not in any sense in opposition to the purest principles of Christian temperance.

Although we are decidedly in favor of Christian temperance, and endeavor personally to practice it, and to persuade others to practice it, we are not in favor of using the civil power to compel anybody either to favor or to practice it. And when the Woman's Christian Temperance Union attempts, as it does, to use the civil power to compel people to conform to the principles of Christian temperance, it goes beyond its legitimate province, it acts contrary both to civil polity and Christian principle, and therefore we oppose it. Christian principle knows no such thing as outward force; it never seeks either the support or the control of the civil power.

77

Christian principle knows only the force of conscientious conviction, aroused to action by persuasive reason, under the blessed influence of the Spirit of God. Christian principle knows no power but the power of God as manifested in the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Believing this with all our heart, although we are decidedly in favor of *temperance*, of *Christian* temperance, of woman's Christian temperance, and even of woman's Christian temperance *union*, we are just as

decidedly opposed to the political aspirations of *the* Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish a theocracy in this country, and to that end demands that the ballot shall be put into the hands of women. Proof:-

"A true theocracy is yet to come;. . .hence I pray devoutly, as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women, and rejoice that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union has so long championed this cause."- *W.C.T.U. Monthly Reading for September, 1886.*

Now the establishment of a man-made, or a woman-made, theocracy will be but a repetition of the establishment and working of the hideous principles of the Papacy, if not the establishment of the Papacy itself, in this country. The Papacy is a theocracy. Its workings throughout history have been but the practice of the principles of a man-made theocracy-such a theocracy as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish here by the ballot. The rule of such a theocracy is the wickedest rule that the world has known or can know.

It puts man in the place of God, and deifies human passions; and such a *regime* is but one remove from that of Satan himself. Therefore, as such a theocracy is such a wicked thing, as it is such an utter perversion of every principle of government, we are entirely and everlastingly opposed to it. And as the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union is pledged to the establishment of such a theocracy, and rejoices that it has so long championed such a cause, we are entirely and everlastingly opposed to *that part* of the aims and workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. And why should we be blamed for it?

In order to the establishment of this theocracy here, they "pray devoutly for the ballot in the hands of women." But whenever the ballot is put into the hands of women, for any such purpose as that, then the ballot will be the worst thing that was ever put into the hands of a woman.

Again; the Sentinel is first, last, and all the time, opposed to the aims of the National Reform Association. That Association likewise proposes to turn this Government into a theocracy, ruled by the "leaders and teachers in the churches." It declares that dissenters from National Reform opinions "cannot dwell together on the same continent" with the National Reformed Christianity; and that "there is nothing out of hell" that should not be "tolerated" as soon as these. In Senator Blair's proposed National Sunday law and constitutional amendment, both of which are now pending in the United States Senate, the National Reformers see taken the first steps towards making effective their "tolerant" intentions. Now the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is the closest ally, and the most powerful support, that the National Reform Association has in this Nation to-day. Many of the officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union are also vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. It was the Woman's Christian Temperance Union that first started the petitions for this National Sunday law, which pleases the National Reformers so well, and which so fitly plays into their hands; and the Union went before the Senate Committee with the names of one and a half million petitioners, and more to

follow, in favor of that law which, in more than one of its provisions, is subversive of liberty, and which savors all over of tyranny. It is perfectly safe to say that from the position which she occupies, the present president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, herself alone, is doing more to spread National Reform ideas and principles than are all the National Reform "District Secretaries" put together. And there are other leaders of the Union who are not much behind her in this bad accomplishment.

Therefore, as we are totally opposed to the aims of the National Reform Association, and as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is the most powerful support of that Association, we are, consequently, totally opposed to that part of the workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. And why should we not be?

Nor is this all. We view with grave apprehensions the encroachments of the Papal power, on its own part, upon the civil institutions of this Government. Everybody knows that the Papacy has never wearied of condemning our public schools because they are not made the medium of religious instruction. The National Reform Association and its allies now echo the Papal condemnation, and seek to remove the cause of it, by the pending amendment to the National Constitution, in which the National power is pledged to see that every State "shall establish and maintain" a system of religious public schools. Now to secure this and the co-operation of the Papacy at the same time, the National Reform Association agrees that the Catholic Bible, and Catholic instruction, shall be established in the public schools wherever "Roman Catholics are in the majority." And also in securing and enforcing the pending National Sunday law, the National Reformers pledge themselves to "gladly join hands" with the Roman Catholics, and to make repeated advances to secure the co-operation of the Roman Catholics "in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it." Therefore the two points,-the National Sunday law, and religion in the public schools,-upon which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is diligently working to secure National religious legislation, are the very points upon which the National Reform Association stands pledged to unite with the Papacy.

Now the Woman's Christian Temperance Union supports the National Reform Association. The National Reform Association is pledged to Rome. Rome stands pledged forever to the subversion of every principle of liberty. Therefore, as we are forever opposed to the encroachments of Rome, so we are forever opposed to that part of the working of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union which supports the National Reform Association, which is pledged to Rome. And why should we not be opposed to it? And why should not everybody else be opposed to it?

We know that there are many of the women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union who do not favor the political, nor the theocratical, nor the National Reform, aspirations of the leaders of the Union. We know a number of women who have separated themselves from the workings of the Union because of the very things which we have here pointed out. They joined the Union to work for Christian temperance upon Christian principles, and to secure the practice of Christian temperance by Christian means. But when they saw that by the

leadership of the Union, political efforts and means were supplanting the Christian principles, efforts, and means, they left it. They did well to leave it. And so will every other woman do well to leave it, who does not want to be sold into the hands of Rome through the political, theocratical, and National Reform aspirations of the present leadership of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

We only pray that the whole body of the Union, leadership and all, may awake to the danger of their position before they shall have delivered the civil power, and themselves and us all with it, into the hands of a religious despotism.

"The Prohibition Party" *American Sentinel* 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

Not long since one of the editors of the *Sentinel* made a speech in San Diego, Cal., on religious legislation in general, and Senator Blair's proposed National Sunday law and religious amendment to the Constitution in particular. We gave a sketch of the theocratical workings of the church, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the Prohibition party, with the National Reform Association, and the aim of the National Reformers to hand over the whole thing to the Papacy as soon as the Papacy is ready. The *San Diego Sun* stated that in this we "assumed what every member of these organizations will promptly deny." We do not think that the statement of facts can rightly be considered assumption. As to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, we give our position in regard to that elsewhere in this paper. We wish now to show that when we name the Prohibition party in the same category we *assume* nothing.

It cannot be denied that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association are pledged to the establishment of a theocracy in this country. Nor can it be denied that the Prohibition party is inseparably connected with both the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union demands the ballot in the hands of women, in order to establish a theocracy; the Prohibition party is pledged to secure the ballot in the hands of women; therefore the Prohibition party is pledged to the establishment of this woman-made theocracy. In order to establish a theocracy, the National Reform Association demands a constitutional amendment empowering Congress to legislate in religious things; a leading Prohibitionist-Senator Blair-proposes in Congress just such an amendment, accompanied by a bill legislating upon things pertaining to God; and the *Lever*, in commending the "*moral* element," in the make-up of the Prohibition party, "the foundation" for which is laid in the recognition of "Almighty God as the source of all power in government," says:-

"At this point the Prohibition party stands out in bold contrast with the old parties. It recognizes the authority of God in human government, and proposes that all legislation shall be in harmony with Christian morality."

This is precisely what the National Reform Association has in view, therefore the aim of the Prohibition party and the aim of the National Reform Association

are identical. And besides this the National Reformers have pledged themselves to join hands with the Catholic Church as soon as *she* is ready.

More than this, this is only that at which the Papacy itself is aiming in this country. Pope Leo XIII commands that,-

"All Catholics should do all in their power to

78

cause the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church."

Senator Blair's constitutional amendment and religious legislation are modeled exactly "on the principles of the true church;" and the Prohibition party is pledged to such legislation; therefore the aim of the Prohibition party and the aim of the Catholic Church, so far as religious legislation is concerned, are identical. *And they are working together to secure it.* At the county Prohibition convention for Tulare County, Cal., held in Tulare City not long ago, a Catholic priest was introduced by a Methodist minister, and made a strong speech and offered the Catholic Church free to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at any time, to hold their Prohibition unions in. About the same time a Catholic priest spoke in a Prohibition convention in Los Angeles, in which he made most prominent the necessity for religious legislation, particularly in regard to enforcing the observance of "the Lord's day," as Senator Blair's Sunday Bill provides. These things greatly please the Prohibition party, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the-Catholic Church.

Now we would like for some Prohibitionist to tell just about how much any advocacy of Prohibition by the Catholic Church is worth, while everybody knows that there is not a saloon keeper in all the land who cannot keep a saloon and be a member of the Catholic Church as long as he lives, and (if he pays money enough) go straight through purgatory without even getting scorched, when he dies. We can tell what it is worth, and that is, just what influence and support the Catholic Church can get out of the Prohibitionists in accomplishing the Papal scheme of causing "the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church."

That is what it is worth, and that is all it is worth. But if the Prohibitionists think that a safe investment, they have vastly more confidence in the wheedling charms of the Papacy than we have. For we never can forget the truth of Macaulay's words, that-

"The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved that polity [of Rome] to such perfection that, among the contrivances for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place."-*Essays Von Ranke.*

"Rev." "Sam" Small, the associate revivalist with "Sam" Jones, was secretary of the National Prohibition Convention, held at Indianapolis. And what he wants to see, as stated in his own words at Kansas City last winter, is this:-

"I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, National, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it and enact it into laws."

Was ever the Papacy more than that? Did ever the Papacy *ask* more than that? *Could* it ask more?

From these evidences it is plain that the Prohibition party, as it is, is set for the establishment of a religious despotism of which the Papacy shall be at least a part. And whoever works for, or votes, the Prohibition ticket, works and votes for the establishment of such a despotism.

The following letter, from a prominent Prohibitionist in an Eastern State, but who does not work for the Prohibition party as at present constituted, is sound and to the point:-

"The church may adopt any form of government for itself that it chooses, but must keep hands off the civil government. The worst despotism the world ever experienced was under a theocracy. The church party, misnamed Prohibition party, seeks to proselyte and carry on a religious crusade under the guise of a so-called political party. Put that party in power, and the priest and minister would supersede the judge, the jury would disappear, civil courts would give place to ecclesiastical courts, the public court-room to the star chamber, the ordinary jail to the inquisition.

"My vote, and my voice, shall ever be for a free, civil, enlightened, and progressive Government.

"I am a dyed-in-the-wool Prohibitionist, and daily practice what I preach, but do not belong to the clerical party."

This letter exactly expresses the views of the Sentinel. The American Sentinel is entirely and consistently in favor of Prohibition; but it is not in any sense in favor of religious legislation. What we here say is not against Prohibition, but against the religious legislation element, the Church and State element, in the Prohibition party and in the Prohibition platform. Opposition to Church and State was hissed and yelled down in the California State Prohibition Convention of 1888. And a consistent Prohibitionist told the Prohibition party in that same convention, that if they went into the campaign with the platform as it is, "they would have to pass half the time in convincing the people that it was not a religious movement." The Prohibition party, both State and National, have gone into the campaign with that very platform, and that party may spend *all* the time in the endeavor, but it can never convince any thinking person that it is not a religious movement. The Prohibition movement as it is now manifested in the Prohibition party, and under its present platform, is nothing else than a religious movement; and that is only what the majority of the preachers, whether Protestant or Catholic, have in view who are making themselves so prominent in behalf of Prohibition-they are only making Prohibition the stepping-stone to religious legislation, and the establishment of their own power by it. And in view of the ecclesiastical engineering of the Prohibition party, Dean Milman's weighty words are of living importance to every American citizen: "In proportion as ecclesiastics become co-legislators, heresies become civil crimes, and liable to civil punishments."

The American Sentinel is in favor of Prohibition everywhere and all the time; but it is not in favor of religious legislation anywhere at any time. We would shut the saloon everywhere and forever, not because it is irreligious nor because it is

violative of the law of God, for with such reasons the civil power can have nothing to do, but because it is uncivil. If the saloon were only irreligious, or were only violative of the law of God, the State would have no right to interfere with it to any extent whatever. But as it is essentially uncivil, the State can and ought to abolish it entirely, yet never with any question as to whether or not it is irreligious or violative of the law of God. We would shut the saloon for the same reason that we prohibit the carrying of concealed weapons.

We know there are many Prohibitionists who, like the correspondent whose words we have quoted, are as much opposed to religious legislation, or priests in politics, or churches in civil affairs, as we are; we know that in the California State Prohibition Convention there were powerful speeches made against the Church and State element in the Prohibition party; but that element carried the day, and that element rules in the so-called Prohibition party; and whoever would not help forward the union of Church and State, and the establishment of a religious despotism in this Nation, should be as far as the East is from the West from voting the present Prohibition ticket, or working in any way for the Prohibition party as it is.

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Christian Statesman* of September 6 M.A. Gault says:-

"I had a long talk with Hon. T. C. Richmond leader of the Prohibition party in Wisconsin. He is a popular speaker and a logical reasoner. He is almost constantly in the field addressing large audiences, endeavoring to convince the people that the Prohibition party should drop every other issue but Prohibition."

Mr. Richmond's idea is correct. If Prohibition is what the Prohibitionists want, why are they not willing to work for that alone? If Prohibition is what they want, why are they not willing to secure the help of every element that can be enlisted in favor of Prohibition? The very fact that the so-called Prohibition party will not work for Prohibition alone, is proof that the religio-political managers of that party are only using the Prohibition issue as a stepping-stone to the establishment of their power, and the subordination of the civil to the ecclesiastical power.

"Oakland Lawyers on the Blair Bills" *American Sentinel* 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

Public interest has recently been so directed to the two measures proposed by Senator Blair namely, "a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United State respecting establishments of religion and free schools," and the "bill is secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship," that the *Tribune* of this city deemed the matter of sufficient importance to call for the opinions of the Oakland bar upon the proposed legislation. Accordingly a reporter of that paper submitted copies of the Blair bills to number of attorneys and asked for an expression of opinion on them, with the following result:-

H. L. Adams-I gave my opinions through the columns of the Tribune last week, but will repeat sufficiently to say that while I was formerly of the opinion that the first day should be general; enjoined by statute, a careful study of the question has led me to change my views in that regard, and I now believe that any law which compels the observance of one day of the week upon all classes of people without regard to their religious belief constrains them of their liberty and is in violation of the form of thought and religious worship guaranteed by the inventors of this Government in the present Federal Constitution.

J. R. Glascock-It is an infringement upon the personal liberty of the people. It is a step back ward and not forward. If carried to its legitimate result it would relegate us to the days of Connecticut blue laws. Church and State should be kept as far apart as possible. Let our schools teach knowledge and not religion.

In this opinion Mr. Glascock recognizes the fact that religious legislation of any description whatever is a virtual union of Church and State whether that legislation be in the interests of one denomination or of many. The next opinion likewise covers both the bill and the amendment:-

79

A. L. Frick-I am opposed to teaching the principles of the Christian religion or any other religion in the schools. Religious education should be left to the church and the home. The Sunday bill in my opinion is unjust and unwise. I believe in Sunday regulations only in so far as necessary to protect persons in the uninterrupted observance of worship, and this matter should be left to the several States as distinguished from the Federal Government.

This opinion might seem to favor State regulation of Sunday observance, but a careful reading of it will reveal the fact that it does nothing of the sort. Every State now has wholesome and just laws protecting from disturbance all religious assemblies, as indeed all lawful assemblies, and so all that is indicated by Mr. Frick as a duty of the State with regard to Sunday is already secured without Sunday laws.

S. F. Daniels, ex-Police Judge-I am not in favor of this resolution. I think that the teaching of religion should be kept entirely out of our free schools. I do not see how it could be beneficial in any way. I am opposed to Christian religion or any other religion being taught in our schools. With regard to the Sunday law, I am opposed to it. We had a Sunday law in the State at one time, and as Police Judge I had to enforce it, but I did not think it was right, being an injustice to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week. Neither do I believe in prohibiting persons from observing any day they choose to. I think that should be left entirely with the conscience.

J. M. Poston, ex-City Attorney of Oakland-I think the amendment of the Constitution is impracticable, inasmuch as it involves the union of Church and State, to which I am positively opposed. As to the Blair Sunday Bill, I think some parts of that are impracticable, and interfere with the rights of the State, and I think it is the work of a crank anyway. I think that the matter of educational system belongs to the State.

Here again the idea that the proposed amendment involves a union of Church and State is made prominent.

J. K. Piersol-I am not in favor of having any law for the establishment of religion in the school. I am in favor of education and the teaching of morality, but not the teaching of any religion. I am in favor of all classes of people refraining from work one day in the week, but that their conscience should be their guide as to which day they observe as a rest day. I think the penalty clause of the Blair bill is useless.

George M. Shaw-I do not think it would be advisable to amend the Constitution. I think the inventors of the Constitution understood that matter. I think that is going too far with the Sunday law. Any regulation of that question would be a serious disturbance to the country, and I am not in favor of interfering with a person's religious belief.

L. N. Church-I think that religion in the schools is all right so far as morality and virtue are concerned; but I could not indorse the sentiment of the bill as it reads, as no one should be restricted in his religious belief.

Bernard McFadden-I do not think that religion should be taught in the public schools. Thomas H. Smith-I am not in favor of the principles of Christian religion in schools, for this reason, that they have no right to teach one religion to the exclusion of all others. In regard to the Sunday bill, I am in favor of the observance of the first day; but I believe that every man should have the privilege of worshiping Almighty God whenever he wants to do so without the interference of others. I think more can be done by moral suasion than by the State.

E. C. Robinson-I am opposed to any union of Church and State. I believe there should be no work done on the day set apart for rest; but I think every man should have the privilege of worshiping according to the dictates of his own conscience.

A. M. Church-Keep Church and State separate forever. Morality is all well enough, but the "principles of Christian religion" should be left out. We had better let the Constitution entirely alone so far as it relates to the rights of a man's conscience.

Judge F. B. Ogden-If you strike out that portion that relates to the Christian religion being taught in the schools it would be all right. I think religion should be taught at home and in the churches. Such a law as that would inaugurate a union of Church and State. I do not like the Blair Sunday Bill for this reason-I believe that each State should set apart one day for rest, but I do not believe in prohibiting innocent pleasure.

Judge Ogden is the only one expressing himself unreservedly in favor of even State Sunday laws, and even he recognizes in the Blair bills an attempt to unite Church and State.

E. C. Chapman-I believe in the principles of morality, but I do not believe that States should have the right to legislate on these things at all. I do not believe in teaching religion of any kind in the public schools. I am not in favor of any law that would force people to observe any particular day.

J. W. Harris-I indorse the statement of Mr. Chapman.

A. C. Lawson-If the principles of virtue and morality be taught, I think that is all that is necessary. With regard to the Sunday bill, I believe that any measure to set apart any particular day as a day for religious worship is in opposition to the

Constitution of the United States, and whenever the Government projects to put the religious element under its wing it is wrong. I am a believer in the first day of the week as a day of worship, but I am not in favor of forcing it upon anyone else.

S. B. McKee-I should not favor the teaching of any particular religion in the schools. In reference to the Blair Sunday Bill, I understand that the foundation of our Government was religious liberty for all classes. The courts have held the observance of Sunday, but I think it is impractical from a business standpoint, and against the policy of the country.

Robert L. McKee-I am decidedly opposed to any instruction in Christianity in our free public-school system.

William Lair Hill, of the firm of Davis & Hill-In regard to these matters I am a Baptist, and therefore, of course, I am positively of the opinion that religion should be taught in churches and not in public schools. I see no reason for legislating the Christian religion into the State, which (under the principles of our Government, and the only true principles of any civil Government), would not apply with equal force in favor of legislating Mohammedanism and Buddhism and Confucianism into those countries where these religions have already the majority of the people.

Thus it is seen that the *consensus* of opinions among the lawyers of Oakland is that Sunday laws are subversive of religious liberty, that they are religious legislation, and that the success of the Blair bills would unite Church and State in this country. But it is to just such measures as this that the National Reform Association, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the Prohibition party stand pledged.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

Doctor Crafts reports that between three and four million names have already been secured to the petitions in behalf of the National Sunday law.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Prohibition party have become so entirely National Reform organizations that the regular National Reform organizers have ceased to organize local National Reform clubs as such, but work through these to spread the National Reform ideas. So says District Secretary M.A. Gault in the *American*, June 27, 1888.

The Executive Committee of the National Reform Association held a meeting in Pittsburg September 14; and one of its recommendations is this:-

"That Secretary Weir be appointed especially to press the cause of National Reform upon the attention of political parties, during the next four years, and to enlist, as far as possible, in this endeavor the influence of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union."

The National Reform Association is circulating for signatures petitions to Congress asking that Senator Blair's proposed religious amendment to the Constitution may be passed by Congress and submitted to the States for their approval. One of these petitions was presented to the Prohibition County Convention of Wood County, Ohio, August 8. It was unanimously indorsed, and a

copy of a resolution to that effect was sent to Senator Blair, together with the respects of the convention.

John Alexander, of Philadelphia, is the father of the National Reform Association, as such, and in the *Christian Statesman* of September 6 he congratulates the Association on the introduction of the Blair religious amendment to the Constitution; declares "the National Reform Association ought to spare no pains and omit no effort which may promise to secure its adoption;" and further says:-

"Let us begin without delay the circulation of petitions (to be furnished in proper form by the Association), and let an opportunity be given to all parts of the country to make up a roll of petitions so great that it will require a procession of wheelbarrows to trundle the mighty mass into the presence of the representatives of the Nation in the Houses of Congress." And "let a mass convention of the friends of the cause be held in Washington, when the Blair resolution shall be under discussion, to accompany with its influence the presentation of the petitions, and to take such other action as may be deemed best to arouse the Nation to a genuine enthusiasm in behalf of our National Christianity."

Isn't it about time that somebody was arousing to a genuine sense of the danger to civil and religious liberty that inheres in this scheme?

The *California Christian Advocate* some weeks ago gravely informed its readers that "Congressman Plumb, of Kansas, has offered an amendment to the Sunday Civil Bill providing an appropriation for the building of a public drinking fountain in the Capitol." Of course the bill to which the Kansas Congressman has offered an amendment is the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill; but in these days of proposed Sunday legislation it is perhaps not strange that the friends of Sunday laws fail to discern what to them seem so small a difference. The time may come, however, when even the Sundry Appropriation Bill may contain clauses relative to Sunday, and then it will indeed be literally the "Sunday Civil Bill."

Rev. R.C. Wylie says the National Reformers should advocate Senator Blair's religious amendment to the Constitution,

"Because of the aid it will give us in discussing National Reform principles. Some of these are clearly embodied in the amendment. Senator Blair's amendment marks an epoch in our history. . . The pulpit and the platform should herald the truths it teaches, from ocean to ocean."

Yes, the amendment will not only aid in discussing National Reform principles, it will also, if adopted, most materially aid the National Reformers in carrying those principles into practice by the civil power, and in satisfying their intense longing to tolerate dissenters as lunatics and conspirators are tolerated.

The *Tribune* of this city thinks that we are needlessly alarmed about the Blair Sunday Bill. The *Tribune* evidently does not understand the situation. The bill in question may fail to become a law, but that does not prove by any means that the serious consideration of such a measure is not a menace to religious liberty in this country.

The systematic and persistent efforts which are being made by hundreds of thousands of people banded together in various churches, associations, and

societies throughout our land to secure religious legislation in this country, should arouse every liberty-loving citizen to a sense of danger, and set him to work to enlighten others in regard to National Reform designs and practices.

Senator Blair may be, as the *Tribune* intimates, a harmless "crank," but there are many thousands afflicted with the same religious-legislation mania, and there is a dangerous method in their madness. We cannot afford to settle down in fancied security when such measures are being seriously proposed in the Senate of the United States.

The latter part of July, "Sam" Jones, the great revivalist, preached in Windsor, Canada, to an audience composed mostly of Americans, who went over there to hear him. One of his devout, elegantly refined, and intensely instructive passages was this:-

"Now I'll tell you, I think we are running the last political combat on the lines we have been running them on. It is between the Republicans and Democrats, this contest, and it is the last the Republicans will make in America. The Democrats are going in overwhelmingly. Four years from now the Prohibition element will break the solid South. The issue then will be, God or no God, drunkenness or sobriety, Sabbath or no Sabbath, Heaven or hell. That will be the issue. Then we will wipe up the ground with the Democratic party, and let God rule America from that time on."

And this the *Christian Statesman* inserts under the heading, "The National Reform Movement!" It is very appropriately placed. It is a worthy addition to the literature of the National Reform movement. But what consummate mountebanks many of those popular "revivalists" do make of themselves!

As was to be expected, the National Reformers are delighted with Senator Blair's religious amendment to the Constitution. It is in substance just what they have been working for all these years. The *Christian Statesman* of July 12 says the amendment "should receive the strenuous support of all American Christians." In its issue of July 19 the Statesman says:-

"Senator Blair's proposed constitutional amendment furnishes an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people."

Then, after mentioning "Christianity, the religion of the Nation," and "the Bible, the text-book of our common Christianity, in all the schools," it says:-

"These have been our watch-words in the discussions of a quarter of a century. And now these ideas are actually pending before the Senate of the United States in the form of a joint resolution proposing their adoption as a part of the Constitution of the United States. Here is a great opportunity. Shall we boldly and wisely improve it?"

We are afraid that the iniquitous scheme will ultimately carry.

In the *Christian Statesman* of August 9, Rev. R.C. Wylie praises Senator Blair's proposed constitutional amendment, because it would, if adopted, give the National Reformers many advantages which they have not now. He says:-

"We would then have a vantage-ground we have not now. The leading objection that has been urged against us will have lost its power. That objection,

which has such a tender regard for the infidel conscience, will have spent its force against this amendment, and will be no more fit for use against us."

That is to say: The charge of invading the rights of conscience has, so far, lain against the National Reformers; but now, if this amendment is carried, this charge will lie against the amendment, and will spend itself there while the National Reformers escape. This charge is justly made against the National Reformers; for they distinctly affirm that the civil power has the right to compel the consciences of men. And the admission that if the amendment were adopted the charge would then lie against that, is a confession that the proposed amendment, if adopted, will invade the rights of conscience. And that is the truth. It will surely do so. If it would not, it would not be so heartily indorsed by the National Reformers.

November 1888

"Jonathan Edwards's Speech" *American Sentinel* 3, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

[This speech was delivered at the National Convention of the National Reform Association, held in New York City, February 26, 27, 1873. It is part of the published proceedings of that convention, and, together with the other speeches, is circulated to this very day, as representative National Reform literature. Although extracts have previously been made from it in the Sentinel, we publish a large portion of it at the present time, in order that our readers may feel fully assured that there is necessity for just such work as the Sentinel is doing; and that in opposing what is miscalled National Reform, we are opposing nothing but a scheme of wicked selfishness. The few comments that we make will be found in brackets. E.J.W.]

We want State and Religion-and we are going to have it. It shall be that so far as the affairs of State require Religion, it shall be revealed Religion, the Religion of Jesus Christ. The Christian oath and Christian morality shall have in this land "an undeniable legal basis." We use the word Religion in its proper sense, as meaning a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God. .

[What is Christian morality? It is simple Christianity. As Mr. Edwards says, it is "a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God." And this takes in not simply outward acts, but the thoughts and intents of the heart. This is what Mr. Edwards and the National Reform Association want to see placed on "an undeniable legal basis." That is, the Christian religion and Christian morality shall be enforced by law. A man's personal relation to God, in matters of faith and obedience, is to be interfered with by the law of the land. In reality, the National Reform Association proposes that no man shall have any direct, personal relation with God, but that he shall approach God only through the medium of the State, controlled by "the Church." In other words, the State Church is to be to the individual in the place of God. And what will that be but another Papacy, or an exact copy of the present one? Nothing else in the world.

But it will be asked, "How will it be possible for the State to deal with Christian morality, since it has to do with the thoughts of the heart, and the faith which one holds? How can the laws take cognizance of a man's thoughts and personal belief?" In the very same way that the Papacy did, in whose steps the National Reform Association is following, and after which it is modeled. By means of the inquisition the church forced the mass of people to believe just what it wanted them to believe. Whenever a man was suspected of heresy, he was dragged into the secret chamber, and was stretched upon the rack. In most cases that succeeded in making him an obedient child of the church. Yes, the church will have ample power to deal with heretics when it has its dogmas fixed on an "undeniable legal basis." The rack, the thumbscrew, and the stake are wonderful promoters of "orthodoxy." To say that the National Reform theocracy when formed would not follow the Papacy in this respect just as much as in the formation of a man-made theocracy, is to say that men are now made of different material from what they were three hundred years ago. Religious persecution will be the necessary result of the success of the National Reform Association.]

Now, we are warned that to engraft this doctrine upon the Constitution will be found oppressive; that it will infringe the rights of conscience; and we are told that there are atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Baptists who would be sufferers under it. I accept it as a compliment that we are called upon to consider objections of this sort, if there be any ground for them. We are the conscience party, the free conscience party. We are the very people to be held responsible if we trespass upon the conscience of others. And it will be found that we do not intend to do this, and that we do not do it in fact. . .

The atheist is a man who denies the being of a God and a future life. To him mind and matter are the same, and time is the be-all and the end-all of consciousness and of character.

The deist admits God, but denies that he has any such personal control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he ever manifests himself and his will in a revelation.

The Jew admits God, providence, and revelation, but rejects the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ as sheer imagination, or, worse, sheer imposture.

The Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.

These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry—the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party. Now look at it—look at this controversy. The question is not between opinions that differ,

but opinions that are opposite, that are contradictory, that mutually exclude each other. It is between Christianity and infidelity. It is between theism and atheism, between the acknowledgement of a God and the denial that there is any God. We cannot too seriously ponder this, since the rights of conscience are held to be involved. The atheist does not believe in the soul; he denies that there is any such thing as conscience; yet he comes to those who confess both to insist upon his rights of conscience! I have a few plain, earnest words about all this.

I do not believe that every man is an atheist who says he is one. I distinguish between minds that doubt or deny the existence of God, and those who doubt or deny the sufficiency of the logic usually employed to prove it. And I love to think genuine atheism impossible to the human soul. But now bring forward your atheist, your man who confesses to neither God, angel, nor Spirit, your man who believes in all unbelief, and in nothing else, and I know at once what his position is. His religion is irreligion; his morals are only natural morals-the morals of the body, the animal in man, which, in his view, is all there is of man. His speculations do not rove or float among the dreams of philosophy, but they run into the concrete forms of politics-into the plat-forms of parties and the enactments of Legislatures. Atheism is always political. What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic, for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man. He not only rejects and opposes my faith, but he aims to overturn every institution, and to dissolve every relationship growing out of my faith. He would destroy the very foundations, pull down everything, and build up nothing. But he shall be tolerated. He may live and go free, hold his lands and enjoy his home, he may even vote, but for any higher, more advanced citizen-ship, he is, as I hold, utterly disqualified. And we are aiming, not to increase, but to render definite his disqualification; to give to our Government and all our free institutions a guarantee that he shall never have control over them.

[In the above declarations, we have religious persecution defended as plainly as words can do so. Notice: The man who believes in God, the Bible, and the gospel of Jesus Christ, but who differs with the mass of professed Christians solely upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as the Sabbath, is declared to be an atheist. The man who observes the seventh day of the week, instead of the first, is declared by this representative of the National Reform Association, to be an atheist, although he implicitly believes in God and the Bible, and trusts in Jesus Christ as his Saviour. He conscientiously observes the seventh day as a religious duty, and does it as an act of worship to the God who created "the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that in them is," yet he is to be treated as an atheist. And what sort of treatment is the atheist to receive? He is to be treated as a conspirator or a lunatic. That is, he is to be kept underground, and shut up. If he has the courage of his convictions, and attempts to teach others what he believes to be a matter of solemn obligation to God, he is "raving," and must be shut up as a dangerous man. One would suppose

that Ignatius Loyola must be the patron saint of the National Reform Association. Whatever plea its leaders make, they invariably run into religious persecution. That is the logic of National religion.]

Yes, to this extent I will tolerate the atheist, but no more. Why should I? The atheist does not tolerate me. He does not smile either in pity or in scorn upon my faith. He hates my faith, and he hates me for my faith. He is bent on exterminating me and my faith altogether. "Crush the wretch!" said Voltaire of my Saviour and his cause. And this is still the atheist's motto and his aim. I have received letters and tracts which show this very clearly. Were I to read to you the shocking blasphemies, the words of hate and of murder, which they contain, you would shudder in horror. He means to make all these words good among us as soon as he can. And I am asked to accord rights of conscience to a man who says to me, "Come, let me show you how I can use the knife with which I purpose one day to cut your throat." "Come, let me explain to you the force of some nitroglycerine which I have prepared to blow you up!" I can be as calm and as willing in the one case as in the other. And I am asked to tolerate the atheist's creed under peril of violating the rights of conscience. And this tolerating of atheism means, I suppose, that our Constitution and laws shall be so framed as to imply that there is as much of truth, probability, and good in atheism as in Christianity! Tolerate atheism in this sense, sir? Never, never! We know what atheism is, and what atheism does. We know what it builds, and how it operates with its "Natural Morals," its "Death an Eternal Sleep," its "Liberty. Equality, Fraternity." Twice, at least, in the world's history has it shown what it is capable of doing. Twice across the plains of gay and sunny France has it driven its car of progress, and the whole track has been rapine, and blasphemy, and blood.

[If this is a true specimen of National Reform Christianity, may we be delivered from it. That it is a fair representation, cannot be denied. Few, however, are so incautious as Mr. Edwards, in revealing the true inwardness of the scheme. The argument is, "The atheist does not tolerate me, therefore I will not tolerate him. He does not love me, therefore I will not love him." Christ says: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven." Matt. 5:44, 45. But the National Reform idea of Christianity is just the opposite of this. It is to hate those that hate you, and to set them an example in hating, and to give them cause for hatred by hating them first. Therefore it is as plain as anything can be that National Reform religion is antichristian. How could it be anything else? It is modeled after the Papacy, and the Papacy is antichrist. While there are many good people who are indifferent now, or are even in the ranks of the National Reformers, because of imperfect knowledge, the time will soon come when no man can be a Christian—that is, a real follower of Christ—unless he actively opposes the work of what is called National Reform. National Reformers accuse us of joining hands with infidels in opposing their work. We oppose it because we are Christians, and because we want the pure religion of Christ to have free course].

I can tolerate difference and discussion; I can tolerate heresy and false religion; I can debate the use of the Bible in our common schools, the taxation of

church property, the propriety of chaplaincies and the like, but there are some questions past debate. Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon. The atheist may live, as I said, but, God helping us, the taint of his destructive creed shall not defile any of the civil institutions of all this fair land! Let us repeat, atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They cannot dwell together on the same continent. And let us note that this atheism among us is busy. It is aggressive, with societies, with organs, with agents, with their papers and their preachers. But recently they have imported a man, the papers say, at a salary of \$15,000, to go through the land lecturing and organizing, telling us how to Germanize and un-Americanize our country. Their organizations raise money, issue publications, form public sentiment, and secure votes against our Sunday laws, our blasphemy laws, our temperance laws, our cruelty laws, our laws for social purity and home sanctity, our oath-sealed guaranty for truth and fidelity, and to bring us all down to mere natural morals. We, too, must organize and make effort. "The Lord of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge!"

Another anticipated difficulty which is urged against us is to determine what Bible to recognize. This difficulty is but imaginary. There is but one Bible. What is called the Catholic or the Protestant Bible is but the Catholic or the Protestant version of the one original Bible. And with every strong conviction that the Protestant version is the better one, I am free to say that any Bible is better than no Bible.

And yet another objection is that the laws of Moses will have to be re-enacted and enforced among us, and that these laws are not at all fitted to our times, our freedom, our civilization. I confess that I am not at all afraid of Moses. I find among his institutions the germs of our own glorious republic, and the provisions and the spirit of our best laws. But the objectors do not seem to have read the Bible enough to see what a self-interpreting book it is. It records a prophecy, and afterwards records its fulfillment. It records a promise, and afterwards states when and how the bestowment was effected. It records a ritual, and afterwards records what abrogated it and took its place. It gives of itself the clue to distinguish what is of enduring value and moral obligation from what is local, typical, transitory. Now, if there be anything in the laws of Moses which the coming of Christ and the subsequent overthrow of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be pointed out-there cannot be many of them-and we are prepared to accept them and have them re-enacted. Thus much as to objections and objectors. . .

[Nothing more is needed than to ask the reader to stop a minute and consider the un-paralleled presumption of this statement. Could anything more clearly show the spirit of the Papacy? The apostle Paul described the Pope as "that man of sin," "the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2:3, 4. And what position does the National Reform Association occupy? It proposes to occupy the very same position. If there is anything in the Old Testament that has not passed away,-that was not transitory and local, and that has not expired by statute of limitation,-they

propose to re-enact it when they set up their theocracy. That is to say, that none of the laws of God will be valid until they have set to them the seal of their approval. What more could they say to show that by their proposed scheme of government they oppose and exalt themselves above all that is called God?]

It will not do to say, We had better leave things as they now are. Things are in a state of change, of transition; they will not stay as they now are. It will not do to say, Let us trust the voice of a Christian people for the perpetuity of Christian principles and usages among us; for, in despite of their voice and their influence, the moulding, over-riding force of our national Constitution has more and more eliminated the notion of God and of moral character from our recent State Constitutions and from the decisions of our courts. If we do not carry this measure, we take the side of atheism. You are called upon, fellow-citizens, to make your election between Christianity and atheism. "Under which king, Bezonian?" You cannot be too soon in making your response. I cannot doubt what your decision will be.

[We would that we could be assured that the great majority of the people would decide against such a scheme of iniquity as this. But we have no such hope. Our greatest hope and desire are to arouse those who still have the spirit of true Protestantism in their hearts. It matters not how many fine speeches National Reformers may make, nor what good professions they may make, it is by such utterances as those that we have been considering that the thing must be judged. To all who read this, we say, You are called upon to make your decision between the religion of Christ and that of antichrist. Which will you choose? You cannot be too soon in making your response.]

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* says:-

"The *American Sentinel* is gradually defining its position, and American Christians will know exactly where to find it."

Yes, we intend that "American Christians" and everybody else shall know exactly where to find the *Sentinel*.

National Reform petitions in favor of Senator Blair's constitutional amendment, are being circulated for signatures. They will be presented to you before long, and when they are, you want to bear in mind that that amendment provides for the establishment of a National religion, and a consequent religious despotism.

The Executive Committee of the National Reform Association held a meeting in Pittsburgh September 14; and one of its recommendations is this:-

"That Secretary Weir be appointed especially to press the cause of National Reform upon the attention of political parties, during the next four years, and to enlist, as far as possible, in this endeavor the influence of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union."

In 1596, when James VI. of Scotland (I. of England), was attempting to force Episcopacy upon Scotland, a number of the Scottish clergy had an interview with

the king, and when his Majesty accused them of holding seditious meetings (for so he characterized the meetings of the church for its own purposes), and of alarming the country without reason, one of them, Andrew Melville, thus answered him:-

"Sir, as divers times before I have told you, so now again I must tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: there is King James, the head of this commonwealth, and there is Christ Jesus, the king of the church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. . . We will yield to you your place, and give you all due obedience; but again I say, You are not the head of the church; you cannot give us that eternal life which we seek for even in this world, and you cannot deprive us of it. Permit us then freely to meet in the name of Christ, and to attend to the interests of that church of which you are the chief member."

Which was equivalent to saying that they recognized the king's authority in civil matters, but that in matters of religion they acknowledged no sovereign but Christ. And that is just what the Lord himself taught when he said: "Render therefore unto C sar the things that are C sar's; and unto God the things that are God's." It is to be regretted that all men have not as clear views of the true relation of Church and State as were expressed by Andrew Melville to King James.

In the *Christian Statesman* of September 6, M.A. Gault says:-

"I had a long talk with Hon. T. C. Richmond, leader of the Prohibition party in Wisconsin. He is a popular speaker and a logical reasoner. He is almost constantly in the field addressing large audiences, endeavoring to convince the people that the Prohibition party should drop every other issue but Prohibition."

Mr. Richmond's idea is correct. If Prohibition is what the Prohibitionists want, why are they not willing to work for that alone? If Prohibition is what they want, why are they not willing to secure the help of every element that can be enlisted in favor of Prohibition? The very fact that the so-called Prohibition party will not work for Prohibition alone, is proof that the religio-political managers of that party are only using the Prohibition issue as a stepping-stone to the establishment of their power, and the subordination of the civil to the ecclesiastical power.

A short time ago a preacher in Selma, Cal., delivered a sermon on Temperance, Prohibition, etc., in which he said:-

"We have laws to punish the man who steals our property; but we have no law to prevent people from working on Sunday. It is right that the thief be punished; but I have more sympathy for that man than I have for him that works on that day."

This is directly in the line of things promised by the Prohibition party. Whenever any party sets itself up as the protector of the Lord, and legislates upon things pertaining to God, then offenses, or supposed offenses, against God take precedence of all things else. Heresy becomes the highest crime. Then the thief will be let run, and receive sympathy, while the man who quietly works at his lawful and honest calling is prosecuted, fined, and imprisoned. And Senator Blair's proposed amendment and Sunday law open the way for such men as this to carry their views into effect, by the civil power.

The *Tribune* of this city thinks that we are needlessly alarmed about the Blair Sunday Bill. The *Tribune* evidently does not understand the situation. The bill in question may fail to become a law, but that does not prove by any means that the serious consideration of such a measure is not a menace to religious liberty in this country.

The systematic and persistent efforts which are being made by hundreds of thousands of people banded together in various churches, associations, and societies throughout our land to secure religious legislation in this country, should arouse every liberty-loving citizen to a sense of danger, and set him to work to enlighten others in regard to National Reform designs and practices.

Senator Blair may be, as the *Tribune* intimates, a harmless "crank," but there are many thousands afflicted with the same religious-legislation mania, and there is a dangerous method in their madness. We cannot afford to settle down in fancied security when such measures are being seriously proposed in the Senate of the United States.

The *California Christian Advocate* some weeks ago gravely informed its readers that "Congressman Plumb, of Kansas, has offered an amendment to the Sunday Civil Bill providing an appropriation for the building of a public drinking fountain in the Capitol." Of course the bill to which the Kansas Congressman has offered an amendment is the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill; but in these days of proposed Sunday legislation it is perhaps not strange that the friends of Sunday laws fail to discern what to them seems so small a difference. The time may come, however, when even the Sundry Appropriation Bill may contain clauses relative to Sunday, and then it will indeed be literally the "Sunday Civil Bill."

Not long since a Prohibition Convention was held in Visalia, Cal. The preachers were very active and enthusiastic in it; and they succeeded in arousing a good deal of enthusiasm in the body of the convention. After the convention had dispersed the following question was put to two of the preachers: "I suppose the object of this is, in the long run, to work it into a Sunday law?" And the answer was this:-

"That is what it is; but we are not saying anything about that now, till we get the thing in running order-then we will bring that in."

That is precisely the scheme which the preachers are working through the third-party-Prohibition movement, and that is just the way that they are working it. Under cover of Prohibition and temperance legislation they are working for the establishment of a religious depotism.

In a speech in Boston on "The Prospects of Catholicism in the United States," Dr. Daniel Dorchester (Methodist) said:-

"Some people have been very anxious lest the Pope should come to this country. But I say, Let him come; it is the best thing that could be done. And I really think I would attempt to raise money to buy 10,000 acres of the best land in the United States, and make him a present of it for the seat of his Government. But when he comes here, he will be a great deal less of a man than he is at Rome."

No, he would not. If the Pope should come here, with the politicians, and the Protestant ecclesiastics ambitious of civil power, he would soon be the head of

the Nation in all matters of advice and arbitration-he would virtually soon be the dictator. See the influence of Cardinal Gibbons. But if it is thus with only a Cardinal, what would it not be with the Pope? No, indeed; let not the Pope ever set foot in the United States.

December 1888

"The Papacy in Germany" *American Sentinel* 3, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

There was a Catholic Congress lately held in Freiburg, Germany, which showed the determination of the Papacy to push every claim to its utmost limit. The Congress demanded the return of all the orders of the church into Germany, with permission for all of them to labor there without hindrance. It demanded also that the State give up the sole control of the schools, and give to the church a share in their supervision and direction. It further formulated a demand for the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. The *Germania*, the leading Catholic periodical of Germany, backs up the work of the Congress with the following:-

"That which the shameless monk of Wittenberg inaugurated three hundred and fifty years ago is no longer looked upon as a reformation. No; it was a rushing into a bottomless pit. It is the most flagrant, the most radical, the most wicked revolution which the world has ever seen. It was a revolution in the churchly, the religious, the moral, the political, the social, the economic, the learned, the historical worlds. The foundation of the so-called Evangelical Church has long since been understood by intelligent men. According to these, Protestantism is nothing but a mere rejection of all and everything that is supernatural; it explains everything on the basis of the law of nature, of natural development, and not even the smallest nook is left open for the God of revelation. Its foundations are the purest godlessness and religious nihilism; and on such a foundation only hate and empty words, only decay and destruction, in time and eternity, can be built."

All this only goes to show the determination of the Papacy to re-establish her power everywhere by every means. And this evil leaven is working in the United States as well as in Europe.

"One Pope or Many?" *American Sentinel* 3, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

A friendly critic, who is a diligent reader of the *Sentinel*, and who has often written both criticisingly and approvingly, writes us a letter in which he says:-

"Don't be too sure that Protestant censorship of moral education in our schools will be 'scarcely less bearable' than Catholic censorship. Dr. Schaff includes the 'laymen' in his committee. I can stand a censor of my own choosing. I am willing to accept a censor chosen by the people. I can stand the tyranny of the people, but not the tyranny of the Pope or king. The tyranny of the latter is life-long; that of the people is soon corrected."

"I agree with you on the main issue against Joseph Cook and his Reform Association. But we must waive some of our preferences in the education of our children, for the sake of unity and homogeneity, the same as we waive some of our natural liberty for the sake of good order and good government.

"The consent of the governed'-that is the jewel that must be preserved. Consent is the foundation of Protestant censorship. Dictation is the foundation of Catholic censorship. The judgment of every man has a voice in the former. The selfish judgment of one man controls the latter. These facts should ever be kept in view in the examination of Papal education and Protestant education. The supreme question is, Shall the people be sovereign over morals and religion? or shall the Pope?

"I am for putting the Bible into the schools if thereby we can strengthen the sovereignty of the people."

This language is the more significant from the fact that our friend declares himself to be an infidel. That such sentiments should be held by an avowed infidel, who is an intelligent, thinking man, a lawyer, is exceedingly suggestive of the case with which National Reform, falsely so called, may some day count among its defenders those who claim to be the champions of liberty and "free thought." From other letters that we have received, as well as from utterances through the press, we are confident that there are many professed infidels who are preparing, perhaps unconsciously to themselves, to fall in with National Reform ideas.

We are more than ever convinced that the only true liberty, and the only real freedom of thought and action, are found in the religion of Jesus Christ, as proclaimed by the great Teacher himself. There can be no free man except the one whom the truth makes free,-the truth as it is in Christ. We would have all men know that the true religion of Christ stands for the most perfect liberty; that it is the only real champion of human liberty. To be a Christian is to be free,

91

and to be an earnest laborer for the fullest freedom of every individual. And no other man than the Christian can be in the fullest sense a champion of liberty. Hence it is that we do not rejoice so greatly as some others do at the opposition of infidels to National Reform. Knowing that they do not oppose it from the proper standpoint, we feel assured that those who do not become converted to Jesus Christ, will ere long be zealous champions of that which they now imagine that they despise.

Tyranny is tyranny, no matter who exercises it. For our part, if we must be slaves, we think it would be far preferable to be the slaves of one man than the slaves of a million men. But we protest against being enslaved at all. Freedom is more than life; without it life is nothing. Thousands of martyrs have testified to this with their blood. Slavery, whether of body or soul, is abhorrent to every principle of Christianity; and slavery of the soul and the conscience is so much worse than slavery of the body, that the latter is not to be named in connection with the former, except as a very feeble comparison. Thousands of slaves toiling in the fields or the galleys under the lash, and in chains, have been free men-ininitely freer than their brutal masters. The man who is "holden with the cords of his

sins," or whose conscience is in the keeping of another or of thousands of others, is an abject slave. The man to whom God has given intellect, who will allow any other, or others, to do his thinking for him, or to dictate to him in matters of faith and conscience, has no right to call himself a free man.

And the evil is not lessened, but rather augmented, when that slavery is voluntary. "The consent of the governed" is a fine phrase, but it may stand for the most degraded slavery as well as the most perfect liberty. Is a woman's shame any the less because she consents to be the slave of lust? If she willingly sells or gives away her chastity, is not her slavery the more deplorable? The slave who groans in unwilling bondage is next door to liberty; but what hope is there for the one who forges the shackles for his own limbs, and willingly consents and even begs to have placed upon him the badge of servitude?

No man has a right to consent to waive his judgment in matters that pertain to conscience. God has delegated to no man on earth the right to demand that another shall give assent to a thing which he believes to be wrong. And what is not delegated to any man on earth, certainly cannot be held by a million. This is not anarchy, but, on the contrary, is in most perfect harmony with strict obedience to law; for our friend is mistaken in supposing that good order and good government require that we should waive a particle of our natural liberty. Perfect liberty is found in a state where each individual is careful not to injure his neighbor, and it is not consonant with any other state. When any man goes beyond and defrauds his neighbor, the imprisonment which he suffers upon conviction by the civil law, is only the outward manifestation of the bondage in which he placed himself by the commission of his crime, long before the law placed its hand upon him. Perfect liberty is perfect conformity to perfect law; and the law which demands that the humblest citizen should waive any of his God-given rights in order to conform to it, is an unjust law; and perfect conformity to an unjust law is slavery, -slavery on the part of the majority who conform to it because they have made it, and it suits their inclinations, even more than on the part of the one who is forced to it against his will.

We love unity and peace; but we hope that God may ever give us strength to fight against unity and peace that are secured by coercing a single individual to give up an inalienable right.

The supreme question is not, Shall the people be sovereign over morals and religion? or shall the Pope? That question means simply this: Shall the majority have power to dictate to the minority what they shall believe, and what shall constitute their religion? It means, Shall we have many popes or one Pope? The supreme question is, Shall God be recognized as sovereign over morals and religion? The American Sentinel's answer to this question is, Yes; and it will never recognize any other sovereign. Its highest ambition is to be instrumental in bringing many others to make the same acknowledgement.

It is true that the proposed Protestant censor-ship includes laymen; but a pope is a pope even though he be uncrowned. We would as soon be dictated to in matters of conscience by priests and ministers as by laymen. We wish it distinctly understood that what we protest against is not the arrogation of power

in matters of morals and religion by a particular class of men, but against the assumption of such power by anybody whatever.

Our fight is not against a certain individual's wielding the lash, but against the wielding of the lash by anybody.

It may not be amiss to note that laymen have ever been used as tools by a bigoted and Pharisaic priesthood. When the laity depends upon the ministry to tell them what they should believe, what possible difference can there be between being dictated to by a layman and being dictated to by a priest?

Finally, in noting the last sentence of our friend's letter, we declare that we are against the teaching of the Bible in the public schools, for the simple reason that thereby the sovereignty of faith and morals will be placed in the hands of the majority, and the few will be deprived of their God-given liberty; because such a proceeding will put man in the place of God, and thus the only object of studying the Bible will be defeated. In short, we are unalterably opposed to unchristian methods of spreading Christianity, because when the result has been accomplished by such methods, we have the equivalent of the Papacy, and not true Christianity.

E.J.W.

"Prohibition Blasphemy" *American Sentinel* 3, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

The following article we clipped from the *Free Press*, Mankato, Minn., of October 12, 1888. The election is past, and the contest for the present is decided, but so far as we are concerned the matter here given is worth as much now as it was before election, as it is with principles that we have to do and not with parties as such. We heartily indorse every word of the *Free Press* in its rebuke of this piece of blasphemy. This exploit of the Wisconsin Prohibitionist is a sample of the kind of political contest that is, and will be, carried on by that party which Miss Willard declares is to be "the party of God." Whoever has any respect for God or for himself had better separate himself as far as possible from the religious Prohibition party, its methods and its aims. The *Press* says:-

"There are no doubt many conscientious and estimable people in the Prohibition party, whose moral convictions prompt them to vote with that party as the best way to express their disapproval of intemperance. Such of these as still believe they are not misrepresented and disgraced by the methods of fanatical leaders and workers, we would ask to read the following stupid and blasphemous production, which belongs and should be credited to the Wisconsin Prohibitionist, in which it was published as a prominent editorial on September 27. It is alleged to be a quotation from the 'Bishop's Book of Common Prayer,' and is given to ridicule the declaration of Bishop Newman, of the M. E. Church, that he considers that 'the supreme duty is to place the Government in the hands of Harrison and Morton,' and that 'I vote as I pray and pray as I vote.' This Wisconsin organ of a party which is always lauding itself as the friend of 'God and home,' and repeatedly exhorts its members to vote as they pray, blasphemes

God and disgraces itself by ridiculing the sacredness of prayer, and publishes the following as uttered by Bishop Newman:-

"O Lord, thou knowest that I have had about as much attention from the Republican party as it is the good lot of any Methodist minister to receive; and thou knowest also that no man who has enjoyed these privileges can leave the party without being called a sorehead, a traitor, and a sniveling hypocrite; and yet it does look tough for a man of my standing to vote the same ticket with tens of thousands of saloon thugs and bloody brewers and distillers. It does look hard, as I before remarked, to see a Methodist bishop voting with such low-down and vicious pluguglies, thugs, and guttersnipes, to continue a traffic that pulls more men down to hell in one day than I ever converted in all my life. And yet, O Lord, thou knowest the fix I am in. Help me to make the people to truly see that both I, and Sheridan Shook, and Benjamin Harrison, and Peter Iler, and Capt. Pabst, and Buffalo Miller, and "Bloody Corner" Cox, and Schlitz, and Val Blatz, and Boss Quay, and tens of thousands of other whisky men, and several other good people, do heartily sympathize with all wise and well-directed efforts for the promotion of temperance and morality; and to Harrison and the Republican party be all the glory, forever. Amen!"

"We submit that among the lowest ranks of journalism there is still enough respect for religion and the teachings of Christ to prevent them from becoming the subjects of unnecessary jest and ridicule. It was left for an organ of the great 'morality' party to descend to the lowest depths, and insult all decency and outward respect for the sacredness of religion by an abortive attempt to secure weapons to defend the party it disgraces. It is about time for self-respecting, thinking men who have connection with the Prohibition political party to sever their ties to an organization which develops such disgraceful, uncalled-for methods as this clipping discloses."

Amen and Amen, say we.

"The Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Politics" *American Sentinel* 3, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

The Sentinel has sometimes been accused of antagonizing the good work of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and of turning aside from its legitimate work to fight that body. This charge we most emphatically deny. With the good work of the W.C.T.U., we are most heartily in accord; but just to the extent that it allies itself with so-called National Reform, and belies its name by becoming a political union, to that extent we are opposed to it. That is, we are opposed to it only when it neglects its own work. But in order that criticism may be turned from us, we publish the following from one of the most talented leaders in the National W.C.T.U. No words of ours have ever equaled it in scathing criticism, although it is justly deserved. The article is from the pen of Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, in the *Independent*, of November 1:-

Permit a brief recital of the position of the W.C.T.U. on the much debated question of politics. The essential elements of religious truth upon which this

organization is based are total abstinence, and Christian unity in advocating it. The leading characteristics of this movement have been the education of individuals as to personal duty, and the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors by legal enactments. This second phase of the question (work for prohibition) is not an end but a means to an end. This means is, however, so closely related to the end as to be sometimes substituted for it.

Brought into prominence by reason of more manifest connection with the duties of citizenship, the political phases of the question have very largely absorbed the vital forces of the movement. During the last few years an effort has even been made to bend all these forces into the line of party action alone. The doctrine has been boldly announced that effort, unless made by a party, was valueless for good, and all agitation and discussion on these lines has had its bias set in a party mould. A frenzy seems to have possessed the souls of men, and nothing of good or beauty is seen in anything but the work of partisanship with all its attendant curses. Doctrines subversive of the duties of citizens have been freely taught, and lessons which logically result in anarchy and discord have been readily set. The most willing students of these lessons have been the women of the W.C.T.U. Their zeal has outrun that of their brothers; it has had less of knowledge and more of religious fervor, and consequently been far more dangerous. It has made direct assaults upon the Christian character and political integrity of its own protesting membership, and has weakened its own hold upon the Christian public. The W.C.T.U. of to-day differs widely from the inspirational movement of the crusade or the early years which immediately followed.

We do not claim that lines of Christian effort have been abandoned. The children are still gathered in the Bands of Hope, and taught the truth of total abstinence; prisons are still visited with words of blessing, anointed with flowers and tears; daughters are still taught the charm of social abstinence, and mothers are admonished of the obligations and the possibilities of the home. In all the forty departments work still goes on, but these all are overshadowed by the turbid smoke of party frenzy, and the malarial mists of party Jesuitism.

No woman enjoys the official patronage who publicly antagonizes the political policy of the Union; no evangelist is sent out who is not in sympathy with the party work; no one is indorsed as a national organizer who declares her opposition to this policy. The official organ is a pronounced partisan paper. Like other partisan papers, it reports news and facts so as to make for their side. The paper for the work among foreign-born citizens is a party campaign paper during this year. The edition of the *Union Signal* for State and county fair work was made to bristle with arguments in favor of Prohibition party work.

The blight of partisanship is upon everything, and women who expect to purify politics lend themselves to insinuations and half statements of truth for party effect as readily as the veriest demagogues in the old political parties which they condemn.

This course has driven the women to great inconsistencies and many illogical positions. They talk about opposing "sweet reasonableness to severe epithet;" they make "gentle and dignified denial of any wrong intent toward any of our number," and then proceed to adopt with applause, charges (evidence of which is

withheld) against the personal integrity of a sister whom they profess to love and honor. They formally declare the most slanderous-insinuations of their willing press to be characterized by "Christian courtesy." Their president commended to her followers as "spicy reading," an open letter containing a most brutal attack upon a Christian minister, and which also contained insinuations against the character of a "beloved sister." Against such treatment there is no redress, since the code of Christian courtesy has swept away the ancient rule, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.

They indulge in tumultuous applause at the name and presence of third-party candidates, but their president declares that sooner than support Warner Miller in his present candidacy in New York, "Let the minions of that accursed business (saloon) elect their candidates and so fill up the measure of their wrath." To-day those same minions know that the influence of this Christian organization in the vital issues to be settled on November 6 will strengthen the opposition to the man who has answered the challenge of the saloons by saying he preferred defeat to success due to saloon influence.

The question is often asked: "Is not the minority as intensely partisan as the majority? Is not Mrs. Foster, an active Republican, as earnest in her platform advocacy of Republican doctrines, and as trusted in the counsels of party managers, and as responsible for Republican methods in dealing with the temperance question, as is Miss Willard for the third party?"

To this we reply: "Mrs. Foster is earnest in her belief and advocacy of Republicanism; possibly as trusted in the temperance counsels of Republicans, and she willingly shares the responsibility of the general trend of Republicanism on the temperance question. The difference between her position and that of Miss Willard is, that her Republican party work is done as an individual; she does not attempt to coerce the opinion or the influence of the organization to these party ends." Miss Willard does, in her official capacity, support the third party; she goes in person to local conventions, and pleads for this party alliance; she gives official approbation to representation of the W.C.T.U. in third party political conventions; she is herself, by vote of the National W.C.T.U. Convention, a "consulting member" of the National Prohibition Committee; she uses the platform of the W.C.T.U. Convention in personal advocacy of the third party and its candidates; she herself introduces these gentlemen as the candidates of "our party." This Mrs. Foster has never done. In Iowa, where the Republican party has warranted the largest approbation of temperance women, and where, if anywhere, the society would be justified in promising allegiance, there the W.C.T.U. has never given it; and Mrs. Foster has time and again declared it never could be done with her approval.

To fail to see the difference between official action and individual action, reveals a lamentable condition of mental or moral obloquy. In the conflicts of modern civilization it argues pitiful imbecility not to possess political convictions, and it argues mental or moral cowardice not to advocate them. This is as true of women as of men, but the political immorality of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union consists in its appropriation of the political influence of the

minority against their protest. That influence was given to the organization to keep and to use, but not to assign to any political party.

In civil courts to obtain money under false pretenses is "embezzlement," and to divert funds from their assigned and constitutional uses is "fraud." This is what the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has done; the difference in honor being in favor of the embezzler; the grand larceny committed by this Christian organization being of heart and soul and home "influence," while the embezzler merely steals material value.

In the time of the Woman's Temperance Crusade, through the prayers and Christian fortitude of these brave, devout women, there were reported scores of genuine conversions to Christ. We should like very much to see a report of the number of conversions effected through the political workings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

"The Church and State, alias the Prohibition Party" *American Sentinel* 3, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

The election is over, but since the third party Prohibition managers say that the Prohibition campaign has but just begun, the following incident showing the character of the so-called Prohibition movement, is as timely now as ever.

The evening before election one of the editors of the Sentinel was with several others in a business office in Minneapolis, when a well-dressed and intelligent looking gentleman came in, and, after noting how many voters were present, laid upon the desk as many sealed envelopes, addressed, "To the voters." As the gentleman turned to go out, someone handed him a printed notice of a lecture that was to be delivered that evening on "Church and State." He took in the contents of the handbill at a glance, and, hastily assuming from the most prominent words upon it, that the lecture was to favor the union of Church and State, said: "Church and State; that means Prohibition; we're with you on that."

The Prohibition politician was gone before anybody could disabuse his mind as to the nature of the proposed lecture on Church and State; but those who remained received a better idea of the real object of the so-called Prohibition party, than could have been gained by a week's talk. The remark that Church and State is synonymous with Prohibition was so spontaneous and so hearty that it could not fail to convince all who heard it. We wished that thousands of Sentinel readers could have heard it for themselves, but this is an exact statement of the matter.

Let everybody be assured that work done for party Prohibition is work done to promote the union of Church and State, and to bind the citizens of the United States in a worse slavery than was ever suffered by the negroes. We cannot any longer in good conscience call the third party the Prohibition party, for temperance is by no means its main issue. Chairman Dickie himself declared that all the saloons and intemperance in the land are not so great a curse as the disfranchisement of women. So we are justified in saying that no one who has the cause of temperance and real liberty at heart, can train with the third party. It

is not a Prohibition party, but a Church and State party, and strong opposition to it is perfectly consistent with the greatest devotion to true temperance and prohibition.

There is a good suggestion in the following: "When a man sets about an undertaking, he should first have settled these four things-what he wants to do, why he wants to do it, whether he has the right to do it, and how it can best be done."

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 3, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

Read the Sentinel this month from beginning to end, if you never did before. You cannot afford to lose any of it.

There are many things which we find on our table, which should be noticed this month, but lack of time and space forbid. Questions have been sent that should have immediate answer in the Sentinel, but which must be deferred until next month. The field is widening, and we could easily fill two Sentinels every month.

The next National Convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is to be held in San Francisco, in October, 1889. It is expected that five hundred delegates will be present. We shall be much interested to see how far they have progressed during the year, in the line of party politics and National Reform.

For the benefit of several who have made inquiries, we will state that Senator Blair is from New Hampshire, and is a Republican. It is also true that he, like many other Republicans, and Democrats also, is a prohibitionist. That is, he believes in prohibiting the liquor traffic, but does not, as yet, believe in separate party action for that purpose. His introduction of the Sunday bill was an individual matter, and cannot be considered as committing his party to any such policy.

We have received several very appreciative letters lately, which are a source of great encouragement to us. Some of these have been from men professing to be infidels. We are sure that there are scores and hundreds of infidels to-day who were made so by false teaching concerning the Scriptures, and by being made to feel, by the actions of professed Christians, that the Bible sanctions injustice. The mission of the Sentinel is to uphold perfect liberty, and to show that true liberty can be found nowhere else excepting in the Bible and Christianity. In consequence of this, we expect to see many avowed infidels renounce their opposition to the Bible, and become free men indeed. That men might know the truth and be made free by it, is our most earnest desire.

In his report to the *Christian Statesman* of November 15, Secretary Weir says:-

"It was my privilege to speak, October 9, to the R.P. Presbytery of Pittsburg, on their invitation. The subject treated was the latest development of the National Reform movement, viz., in the line of practical politics, pressing its principles upon the various political parties for adoption."

"October 11 the Pennsylvania W.C.T.U. gave opportunity to briefly speak on the same phase of the movement, and to ask their help. It was one of the

experiences indeed to speak before a thousand Christian women. They unanimously adopted a resolution affirming National Reform principles as applicable to civil and political affairs, asking the women of their Unions to urge them on the various political parties.

"To give effect to this, and to forward our principles in general, they created a new department-that of National Reform. This of course means a State superintendent for it, and county and local officers, just as in other departments. What opportunities will this give for mutual co-operation, distributing our literature, arranging for lectures or sermons, conventions, etc., as well as carrying the discussion of our principles just where it is so grievously needed, before the political parties."

Facts speak for themselves. It does not need a prophet to tell just what the W.C.T.U. of Pennsylvania, at least, is running into.

The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to make Christ "this world's king; yea, verily this world's king in its realm of cause and effect; king of its courts, its camps, its commerce; king of its colleges and cloisters; king of its customs and its constitutions." But Christ himself declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." Therefore it follows that the kingdom which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish in this world is not the kingdom of Christ at all, but if established will be but a counterfeit of it, and that will be only a likeness of the Papacy. Christ says, "My kingdom is not of this world;" the Woman's Christian Temperance Union says, "Christ shall be this world's king;" therefore the word of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is flatly against the word of Christ, and therefore that part of the work of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, is antichristian.

The *Christian Statesman* doubtless rejoices to be able to print the following:-

"The Eighth District Woman's Christian Temperance Union Convention, at Augusta, Wis., October 2, 3 and 4, passed this resolution:-

"Whereas, God would have all men honor the Son, even as they honor the Father; and,

Whereas, The civil law which Christ gave from Sinai is the only perfect law that will secure the rights of all classes; therefore,

Resolved, That civil government should recognize Christ as the moral Governor, and his law as the standard of legislation."

Comment seems almost unnecessary, and all we will say at this time is that the above is of the low view of the law of God that is held, and must of necessity be held, by National Reformers. The law given from Sinai was not a civil law. If it were a civil law, why would it require to be administered by a moral governor? If the law of God could be the standard in civil legislation, then it would cease to be the wonderful law that it is. But the thing which we wish to have remembered is the adoption of National Reform principles by the W.C.T.U.

About a year ago the School Board of Pittsburg, Pa., made a Catholic priest principal of one of the city schools; but as there was much stir made about it, the priest retired from the position. It appears now, however, that he only let go to get a better hold; for the Catholics have now established a parochial school in the same public-school building. The dispatches say that the Protestants protest; but

they cannot consistently protest for two reasons: 1. They demand that religion shall be taught in the public schools, and that is what the Catholics are teaching in that school-it seems to be a fact also that the children in that ward are almost wholly Catholic. 2. Christianity is the established religion of the State of Pennsylvania, and as even Protestants admit that the Catholic Church is a part of Christianity, that church has a right to claim the help of the State in teaching the State religion. There is a real need that there should be some Protestants in Pennsylvania who should protest, but whenever it is done, the protest will have to be against Protestantism itself as well as against Catholicism.

The following, from the November number of *Our Day*, Joseph Cook editor-in-chief, should be noted by those who think that Church and State union is not possible in this country:-

"Five million signatures to a petition to Congress for laws promoting a better observance of Sunday have now been obtained. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union Convention have voted to make the advancement of this petition a special and urgent work. The most influential indorsement which the petition against Sunday work in the mail and military service and in interstate commerce has yet received was given unanimously and enthusiastically on October 18, at Richmond, Va., by the International Convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, after two hours' thorough consideration of the subject, under the lead of the editor of our department of Church Work [Rev. W. F. Crafts]. Let all labor organizations, large and small, and all churches, do likewise speedily, and the desired law will not be long in coming. Churches and labor unions combined are politically irresistible."

But let it be borne in mind that when churches become politically irresistible, they are spiritually powerless, for they never seek political strength until they become conscious of diminishing moral force.

American Sentinel, Vol. 4 (1889)

January 1889

"Principles Not Parties" *American Sentinel* 4, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

From a gentleman in the State of New York, a minister of the gospel, we have received a letter inquiring into the political affiliations of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. The letter is too long to be published entire, but we will give enough of it so that the reader may have a good idea of its contents. After stating that in his section the extra SENTINEL was circulated by Republicans, as campaign literature against the Prohibition party, he says:-

"With the SENTINEL, I am uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward union of Church and State either in name or in fact. My pen and voice have been and still will be against it. I have recently lectured against the encroachments of Rome, and opposed also the legislation that fined and imprisoned your people for quietly and lawfully working on Sunday.

"But your articles in the SENTINEL, as far as I have been able to see, would lead one to infer that you are not alarmed in regard to Republicans, and their attitude on the Sunday question, but are fully awake to the tendency of Prohibitionists to link in the question with that of temperance. . . .

"Dr. Carroll, editor of the N. Y. *Independent*, in a speech in favor of his party (anti-saloon Republican) declared that all legislation for the better observance of Sunday had come from the Republican party; and intimated that such would be the case in the future. In your article against such legislation, you say much about Senator Blair's bill, styling him a Prohibitionist, etc.

"Senator Blair is a staunch Republican, sent to the Senate by Republicans. His hope of passing his bills, and securing Sunday legislation, is in the attitude of a Republican Congress. From a Republican Congress and a Republican President, he hopes to secure what you and I denounce as a menace to religious liberty. He has no hopes of doing this inside of any other party, for he does not believe a third party can obtain control of the Government. Republicans in Congress are working together to secure legislation in the interests of Rome. Protestant Republicans are the men who to-day are the greatest plotters against religious freedom. Why, then, are you so much against Prohibitionists, but fail to say much, if anything, against the Republican party, to which Carroll, Blair, and company look for future Sunday legislation?"

We have quoted the principal part of the letter. From a perusal of the whole, it seems to us that our brother is moved quite as much by hatred of the Republican party as by desire to see justice done to the Prohibition party. As for the SENTINEL, we can say with truth that it is strictly non-partisan. It deals only with principles, and with facts as they illustrate or stand in opposition to those principles. And here we will say that the greatest fault that we have seen in the Prohibition party is the intense, bitter, and almost unreasoning partisan spirit manifested by its leaders. In the late campaign we listened to several speeches by prominent Prohibitionists, and their whole animus seemed to be hatred of the two old parties. The Prohibition journals were the same. Their whole campaign stock seemed to be vituperation and abuse of Republicans and Democrats. We are no apologist for either of the old parties, and are not claiming that much that was said against them was not true; but such political methods seem to use decidedly out of place in a party which professes to be the party of moral ideas.

3

Our friend charges all the alliance with Romanism upon the Republican party. This seems to us a little strange, since the Democratic party has been proverbial for years as the party that was dominated by the Catholics. President Cleveland's obsequious attention to Cardinal Gibbons is well known to all our readers; and who has forgotten the insult which his administration gave to the whole American nation, when it sent a Government vessel to meet the emissaries of the Pope, when they came on a church mission, and how the Papal flag was hoisted above the stars and stripes?

The fact of the matter is that both the old parties are like the Prohibition party, in that they favor whatever will bring them the most votes at any particular time. No man is warranted in saying that any particular party will be the party that will

offer the greatest menace to religious liberty. It is highly probable that some entirely new party will be instrumental in consummating that work. We have nothing to do with parties as such. The SENTINEL has no fight against any political party. But when it sees movements on foot that tend most directly to overthrow religious liberty, it will vigorously oppose them, no matter by whom they are championed. To show that this is true, we need only say that six years ago, when the matter of a Sunday law was the only issue between the two great parties in California, we circulated hundreds of thousands of papers opposing the stand taken by the Republican party, and it was said that the work done by the publishers of the SENTINEL contributed in no small degree to the defeat of that party. When the party dropped that issue, there was no longer any necessity for opposing its work. It is not true that the Blair Bill is a Republican measure, for we know of a surety that the most vigorous opposition that it will meet in the House will be from Republicans. Moreover, we have seen Mr. Harrison's statement, signed with his own hand, to the effect that he does not favor such legislation as is proposed by Senator Blair.

We well know that Senator Blair is a Republican, but we have no evidence that his measure is a Republican measure. The readers of the SENTINEL can testify that Senator Blair's Republicanism has not prevented us from opposing his work; and we think that our action in the past is ample proof that we should pursue a like course in regard to the Republican party as a whole, if it should endorse Senator Blair's bills.

And now for a few facts to show that the Prohibition party is pre-eminently the party that is devoted to religious legislation.

1. Chairman Dickie said in answer to a question, that the disfranchisement of woman is a greater curse than all the saloons in the country. And Sam Small, secretary of the National Prohibition Convention, said: "One reason why I favor woman suffrage is because we would have more Christian voters if the women were allowed to vote." Thus it appears from the highest authority that the Prohibition party is not primarily a temperance party, but is a woman suffrage party, and *that* for the purpose of advancing its religio-political designs.

2. In a speech in Kansas City, Sam Small, who is one of the Prohibition party leaders, said:-

"I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, national, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it and enact it into laws."

Talk about the encroachments of Rome! How much better would this be? Not a bit better, but rather worse, because it would include the Catholic Church, and so to its despotism would be added that of all the other churches. For ourselves we can say that we shall never cease to antagonize any effort tending in that direction, no matter how highly "moral" the party making them may profess to be.

3. Speaking about the morality of the Prohibition party reminds us of what the *Lever* said some time ago:-

"At this point the Prohibition party stands out in bold contrast with the old parties. It recognizes the authority of God in human government, and proposes that all legislation shall be in harmony with Christian morality."

Here we see that the religious character of the Prohibition party is set forth as its great point of superiority over the old parties.

4. In the *Christian Statesman* of November 22, 1888, there appeared an editorial entitled, "Have We a Christian Party?" in which, after saying that "no one will claim that either one of the dominant parties in American politics is a Christian party," and that the character of the Prohibition party in this respect has not yet been definitely settled, it says of it:-

"We acknowledge with cheerful thankfulness the religious utterances which from time to time have appeared in its platforms. It has definitely acknowledged almighty God as the source of all power in civil Government. It has declared for the maintenance of the Christian Sabbath. Some of its State platforms have avowed the purpose of the party to be to apply the principles of the Christian religion to our whole political life, and several county platforms have made express acknowledgment of Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations. These are new utterances in American politics. They have no precedent and no parallel in the history of parties among us. They have awakened the brightest hopes among those who feel that the question of all questions, of which the temperance question itself, in its deepest aspects, is only a part, is whether we shall maintain or shall forego our national Christianity."

This shows that the National Reform Association, of which the *Statesman* is the chief organ, looks with great expectation to the rising Prohibition party to further its aims. That its expectations are based on reason appears not only from the above, but from many other things. In last month's SENTINEL, page 94, there appeared a short article showing from the statement of an intelligent Prohibition worker that the Prohibition party is the Church and State party.

These are points enough to show that the SENTINEL could not be true to itself if it did not antagonize, not temperance, nor Constitutional Prohibition, but that which constitutes the chief work of the nominally prohibition party. When the Republican party, or any other party, makes religion an issue, we shall oppose its work just as vigorously. We should oppose them as vigorously even if they were advocated by the church of which we are members.

E. J. W.

"The Amended Sunday Bill" *American Sentinel* 4, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

We have already, in two separate issues of the SENTINEL, printed and commented upon the Blair Sunday Rest Bill; but certain changes have been made in it of late, and in order that our readers may keep informed as to the spirit of Sunday legislation, we once more print the bill, together with the amended form. First, we print the bill as it is, and second, the bill with the changes desired by the "American Sabbath Union," followed by the reasons for the changes, and our comments thereon. The "Special Committee" spoken of in the title of the

report consisted of Col. Elliot F. Shepard, Bishop Hurst, Dr. Sunderland, Dr. Ruskin, Dr. Knowles, Dr. Elliott, and others, with Mrs. J. Ellen Foster as legal adviser. The report is as follows:-

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CHANCES DESIRED IN THE SUNDAY REST BILL.

THE BILL AS IT IS

In the Senate of the United States, May 21, 1888, Mr. Blair introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:-

50th Congress, 1st Session, S. 2983.

A Bill to Secure to the People the Enjoyment of the First Day of the Week Commonly known as the Lord's Day, as a Day of Rest, and to Promote its Observance as a Day of Religious Worship.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.

SECTION 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: Provided, That whenever any letter shall relate to work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the Postmaster-General shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter, and shall make regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: And provided further, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week.

SEC. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, nor humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any

portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is, hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent or employe of any person or corporation, who shall willfully violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.

SEC. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States, on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord's day.

SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered, or for labor performed, or for the transportation of persons or of property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.

SEC. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal-routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory into another State, district, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed, so far as possible, to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day.

THE BILL WITH CHANGES DESIRED BY THE AMERICAN SABBATH UNION

(Changes indicated by full-face letters and stars.) Unanimously adopted December 12, 1888.

A Bill to Secure to the People the enjoyment of the *Lord's Day, commonly known as Sunday* , as a Day of Rest, and to *Protect* its Observance as a Day of Religions Worship.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on Sunday , no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business * * * works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, *show, exhibition* , or amusement * * * *open to the public, or of a public character* , in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States ; nor shall it be lawful for any person or

corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.

SEC. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall here-after be transported in time of peace over any land postal route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of *Sunday* .

SEC. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, * * * by the transportation of persons or property by land or water * * * on the first day of the week * * * is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent or employe of any person or corporation, who shall * violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable, or be paid for the same.

SEC. 6. That labor or service performed and ordered on *Sunday* in consequence of accident or disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the * * * transportation and delivery of *milk* before 5 A.M. * * * and after 10 P.M. but the same shall be construed, so far as possible, to secure to the whole people rest from toil during *Sunday*, their mental and moral culture, and the *protection of the* religious observance of the * day.

The reasons for the changes asked are, in part, as follows:-

For religious purposes we prefer the name Lord's day or Christian Sabbath, but as Sunday is already used in National laws, we think it better to use that uniformly in this bill, with the one exception of the double name in the title.

The word "promote" in the title goes beyond what many, even your Christian citizens, believe to be the proper function of Government with reference to "religious worship," while the word "protect" (we also last line) expresses a duty which Government owes to all legitimate institutions of the people.

Experience in the courts has shown that the words "show, exhibition," should be added to the list of prohibited Sunday amusements, and the words "in public," in place of "to the disturbance of others," as the latter clause has been construed as requiring that persons living in the neighborhood of a Sunday game or show must testify that they have been disturbed, in order to a conviction, which cannot be done in some cases without personal peril.

In Section 2, we believe that the exceptions for letters relating to sickness, etc., are unnecessary in this age of the telegraph; and that they would be used by unscrupulous men in business correspondence, and that this would destroy most of the benefits of the law in its bearing on Sunday mails.

In Section 3, we believe the exceptions made would greatly interfere with the law. The exception for work of mercy and necessity is made, once for all, in the first section. The reference to "the disturbance of others" is objectionable for reasons already given, and the word "willfully" is an old offender in Sabbath legislation, and requires evidence very hard to get in regard to one's motive and knowledge of the law. In other laws it is assumed that one knows the law, and the law-making power should see that the laws are well published, and leave no room for one to escape by agnosticism.

In Section 5 (as in section 1 also), we would omit "Lord's day," and in Section 6, "Sabbath," in order to preserve uniformity in using the less religious term, Sunday.

In Section 6, we think refrigerator cars make Sunday work in transportation of perishable food, except milk, unnecessary, and the new stock cars, with provision for food and water, do the same for stock trains. So many of the State Sunday laws have proved almost useless in protecting the rights of the people to Sunday rest and undisturbed worship, by the smallness of their penalties and the largeness of their exceptions, that we covet from Congress a law that shall make itself effective by small exceptions and large penalties.

With a little care in comparison, the reader can readily see what changes have been made in the bill. We have omitted sections 4 and 5 from the revised bill, because they are the same as the corresponding sections in the original bill, with the single exception of "Sunday" being substituted for "Lord's day," in last line of section 4. We hope that everyone will study both bills thoroughly, together with the committee's reasons for the changes. Anyone can see that the changes are in the line of greater stringency. We note only the most prominent points.

1. The change from "Lord's day" to Sunday, although a proper one, is in reality no change at all, since the term "Lord's day"

7

is still used at the beginning, and it is expressly stated that Sunday is used a matter of custom. It is understood that it is as a *religious* day, indicated by the term "Lord's day" that they want the observance of the first day of the week enforced; but if the term "Sunday" is quite generally used, it will no doubt "take" better.

2. In asking for the "*protection* of the religious observance of the day," instead of the *promotion* of its observance as a day of religious worship, the committee threw a sop to those who are "on the fence" in regard to religious legislation. As it stands, it amounts to nothing; for there is not a State or Territory in the Union where any religious service held on Sunday would not be protected.

3. The most important change of all, however, is the substitution of the words "in public" instead of "to the disturbance of others," in section 1. This will certainly make the law more effective. It is obvious that if a man were to engage in work a mile from a dwelling-house, it would be quite a task for the owner of the house to convince even an ordinary jury that such labor disturbed him; but by the terms of the amended bill, the man may be convicted if he is working in a public place, provided anybody can get near enough to him to see him.

4. Notice the radical change made in section 2. As amended, it is most sweeping, allowing of no exception. The mail is not to be carried at all on Sunday, even in case of sickness and death, lest some "unscrupulous" person should mention business on that day. If the mail is not carried, of course that will make him a good man! It is no concern of ours how they propose to carry out this law, but we can't help wondering what they will do when Sunday comes, and a train carrying the mail is on the way, say from Chicago to New Orleans. The train is owned by a corporation, and is not in a part of the country "subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States," and therefore could not be forced to

lie over. The only way out of the difficulty, under the provision of this bill, would be to dump all the mail out at the nearest station, and let it lie there till Sunday was past.

This, however, would not be done. What would be done would be the passing of laws by the several States, forbidding all labor within their jurisdiction, and it is this for which these zealous people are scheming. This United States law is designed as a precedent, and as a lever with which to secure the religious observance of Sunday by all the people in the United States, whether they are religious or not.

5. We wish to call special attention, also, to the last sentence of the "reason for the changes asked." It says: "So many of the State Sunday laws have proved almost useless in protecting the rights of the people to Sunday rest, and undisturbed worship, by the smallness of their penalties and the largeness of their exceptions, that we covet from Congress a law that shall make itself effective by *small exceptions and large penalties*." There the real spirit of the dragon exhibits itself. In that simple statement is compressed a world of bigotry and animosity. History has abundantly shown that the bitterness and hate which bigoted men feel toward those who differ with them in religious opinion, are the worst of all. It is very natural for a bigoted man to imagine that when *his* views are not respected it is a direct insult to the Lord, and that he is the divinely appointed agent to punish all such offenses. The spirit of the statement which we have just quoted is this: "We want things fixed so that those who do not believe as we do can be fully within our power, so that we can wreak on them all the hatred which we feel for them."

We speak strongly, because the case demands it. We do not speak thus in order to arouse a feeling against those who are engineering this thing, but that all who read it may be led to examine the matter for themselves more closely, that they may see the wickedness of the whole business, and may protest. Petitions against tampering with the Constitution, and dabbling in religious legislation, have been sent far and wide, and we believe that it will be seen that there are many thousands of people in the United States who are not willing to forge chains with which to bind themselves, nor to lend themselves to the work of binding others. No scheme more iniquitous, nor more opposed to the spirit of the gospel of Christ, was ever set on foot in this country.

E. J. W.

January 30, 1889

"The Parent and the State" *American Sentinel* 4, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

There is no paper that comes we prize more highly than we do *America*, because of its general straightforward, outspoken, manly defense of true American principles. It is therefore with the greater regret that we see it going so wide of the mark as it does in the following paragraph:-

"Fifty years ago instruction in primary principles of the Christian religion might have been left to private schools, churches, and the family; but it was not. To-day he must be an optimistic dreamer who expects Christian morality to be inculcated among our youth through any such adventitious means. Unless the children of the republic receive some religious training in the public schools, they will go absolutely without it."

The self-contradictory statements in this must be obvious to all. If there is so little Christian morality in this country that, unless it is taught in the public schools, the children will go "absolutely without it," where are they going to find people who can teach it in the public schools? This one thing stamps the article as the hasty utterance of one who made up his mind from feeling rather than reason.

It is not true that churches and the family are "adventitious means" for inculcating Christian morality. As a matter of fact, the Bible knows of no other means. Hear the divine rule for the instruction in the moral law:-

"Thou, shalt love the Lord thy God with

10

all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." Deut. 6: 5-7.

This is family instruction in morals, the only means of instruction that God ever ordained. The highest recommendation that God could give to Abraham was this: "I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment." Gen. 18:19.

The parent is to the child in the place of God, to give it instruction in the way it should go. In the Bible we find instruction to parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; to teach the commandments to their sons and their sons sons; to correct their children betimes, etc.; but we find not the slightest hint that the State should do this if the parent fails to do his duty. The same word that tells parents to teach the law to their children, also enjoins parents to have the law of God in their hearts. Now the same logic which would take the child out of the parent's hands, and turn him over to the State for instruction in morals, provided the parent is remiss in his duty, would also provide that the State should attempt to make the parent himself moral, if he has neglected the word of God. When the State begins to teach morals, it cannot logically stop short of assuming the whole business, and taking the place of the churches as the agent for spreading the gospel.

We read that a child left to himself will bring his mother to shame; but we have no intimation that the State is to take such a child, and train him so that he will be an honor to his parents. When the position is taken that the State must assume the responsibility of caring for children, and seeing that they have good morals, it is but a step to the old heathen custom which was advocated by Plato, and which was actually in use among the Spartans, and some other Greeks, that the State should control the matter of who shall beget children. Surely if the State has the

burden of training children in morals, so as to make them the best citizens, it should have a chance to see that its burden is as light as possible. And since, from the very nature of the case, it is impossible for the State to control absolutely the matter of marriages and births, so as to secure only the best specimens of childhood, it is but another step to the heathen custom of destroying those infants which the officers of the State did not deem suitable to bring up.

We don't say that this Government will ever do this thing, for we don't think that it will last long enough to come to that; but it is the logical result of the parental theory of Government; and if the United States Government should exist for a hundred years after the adoption of National Reform ideas, that is just what it would come to.

In the Cincinnati Convention, in 1872, Rev. A. D Mayo said:-

"But why not divide this work, and leave the moral and religious part of the education of the citizen to the parent and priest? Because you cannot hold the parent or the priest to any public responsibility to educate the child into that practical form of religion and morality essential to good citizenship in a republican State."

There you have it. National Reform doctrine is, just as *America* proposes, that the State shall take the child out of the parent's hands entirely. If you are in favor with the State, you may be permitted to retain your child; but if your morals are not such as the State approves, if your form of religion is different from that which the State has adopted, no matter how moral you may be, then your child must be taken from you and brought up in such a way that it may be an honor to the church and the State. This has the Roman Catholic Church ever assumed the right to do, and thus National Reformers stamp their movement as the legitimate child of the Papacy. And since the Papacy is but paganism under another form, what is there to prevent them, if time should continue, from degenerating into the heathen custom before referred to?

Our position is this, and we challenge anybody to show that it is not correct: Every child ought to have good moral instruction, and should be trained to fear the Lord. The parent or guardian is the only one who has the duty of giving to the child this instruction and training. If the parent, either from indifference or incompetency, fails to do his duty in this respect, it is the child's loss, but there is no power on earth that has a right to take the child out of the parent's hand on this account. If the child is lost, the parent alone is responsible to God for bringing into the world a child and then neglecting its most important interest. And so we say that if the parent does not give the child moral instruction, and does not put the child in the way of receiving such instruction from the church, then the child must go absolutely without it, at least until it is old enough to act for itself. This we say without any reserve. It would be true even if the State should assume the obligations of a parent; for, since the State can do properly only that which it is ordained to do, it follows that the children whom it might adopt would, in reality, be as destitute of moral instruction as though their unbelieving parents had been allowed to retain full control of them.

E. J. W.

"Make a Note of This" *American Sentinel* 4, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

At the session of the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor, held in Philadelphia, November 16, Rev. W. F. Crafts delivered a speech on "Sunday Work from an Humanitarian Standpoint," which the Journal of United Labor calls a "masterly address." It was, of course, an appeal to the Knights of Labor to lend their influence to the securing of a National Sunday law. At its close opportunity was given for questions, when the following was asked among others:-

"Could not this weekly rest-day be secured without reference to religion, by having the workmen of an establishment scheduled in regular order for one day of rest per week, whichever was most convenient, not all resting on any one day?"

This was a fair question, and the plan suggested affords a perfect solution of the question, if the claim so often made be true, that the sole object for a Sunday law is the securing to working men of the right to rest on one day in seven, in accordance with the requirements of nature. But notice Mr. Crafts's answer:-

"A weekly day of rest has never been secured in any land except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out, and you take the rest out."

Ah, just so! Thus, according to Mr. Crafts, who must be the best authority, for he is the prime mover in the matter, what they are after is a law compelling people to observe the first day of the week religiously. This is in harmony with the following utterances before the National Sunday Association assembled in Washington. Referring to the petitioners for a Sunday law, Mrs. Bateham said:-

"They are praying that the Government will pass a law that will compel the people to observe the first day of the week."

Of course, if there can be no rest without religion, then it follows that they want to enforce the religious observance of Sunday; and if that would not be enforcing religion, and trying to compel people to be religious, we should like to know what would be. The show still further that this is the case, we quote the following statement, which we have seen in several reports, and which seems to be credited to Mr. Crafts:-

"The bill which has been introduced makes Sunday the ideal Sabbath of the Puritans, which day shall be occupied only by worship. No amusement or recreation should be indulged in, no mail handled or railroads run except under pressing necessity, with a fine of from \$10 to \$1,000 as the penalty for non-observance of the law."

There you have it. The paper from which these last two quotations are made is the *Lutheran Observer* of December 21. Its editor was present at the Convention, and took an active part in the proceedings. Yet, in spite of all these statements, Mr. Crafts, in the same speech to which we before referred, said that "Sunday laws do not in any way interfere with true liberty, for they do not require, any man to be religious"!

Think of it! A law is required that will compel all people to rest on Sunday. It is expressly claimed that there can be no such law except on the basis of religious

obligation, and that if the religion be taken out, the rest is taken out; and yet he says that such a law would interfere with no man's liberty, because it is not designed to make men religious. With the last we perfectly agree. Such a law is not designed to make men religious, but only hypocritical. But we cannot agree with the first part, for there are some people whose liberty would be greatly interfered with, by an attempt to make them play the hypocrite. We claim the liberty to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and not according to somebody else's opinions or practices. E. J. W.

"A Sample of Moral Obtuseness" *American Sentinel* 4, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* of September 27, 1888, had, as usual, a report from Secretary Foster. In it he told about a sermon which he preached in Cincinnati on "Sunday Observance," and after detailing the compliments which he received for it, he continued thus:-

"There is a general feeling of anxiety among the people for our sabbath. They feel that something should be done, but there is a nightmare inability to do anything. A good brother said to me: 'The Sunday paper comes to my house regularly. We began taking it during the war. We wanted the latest news from the battle-fields, and it has been coming ever since. I know it is wrong. There should not be any Sunday paper. It is an injury to society; but when others take it, we might as well have it.'"

And so, of course, he is in favor of a law that will stop Sunday papers and all other work. On the statements in the paragraph just quoted, we have just the following points which we wish to emphasize:-

1. The people do well to be anxious about their sabbath, when they themselves have not interest enough in it to keep it without being forced to do so.

2. If Sunday is "our sabbath," as they call it, what right have they to compel people who have no interest in it to adopt it as theirs? As well might the shop-keeper compel people to buy his goods as to compel them to accept his sabbath.

3. This man is not alone in calling Sunday "our sabbath." National Reformers, and all Sunday-law advocates, speak of "our sabbath," "our American sabbath," etc. This they want enforced upon the people by law. At the same time they insist that there can be no real Sunday rest secured to the people, except on the basis of religious obligation. Then it is a point that admits of no debate, that they are seeking to enforce religion on the people, and that the religion which they wish to enforce is *their* religion. In other words, they want to put themselves in place of God, and have the people's sciences regulated by *their* will.

4. When a man has not enough moral stamina to do a thing which he believes in his heart he ought to do, without being forced to do it by civil law, how much better will the law make him? Not a particle. He will be in just the condition of the thief who has been shut up in prison, and who is honest because there is nothing for him to steal. It is such service as this that National Reformers think will bring in the millennium!

5. If they wish to know the cause of this laxness in Sunday observance, on the part of those who profess to keep it, and who even clamor for laws enforcing its observance, we can give it. It is because they do not really believe that Sunday has any claim upon them. They know full well that it has no divine sanction, and they cannot keep themselves up to the point of doing that which in their inmost heart they know is not required of them by divine law. Their appeal for a civil law shows their unbelief in there being any divine law upholding it.

We believe that these points are clear to the comprehension of every reader, and that they cannot be gainsaid.

E. J. W.

February 6, 1889

"The Latest Sunday-law Petition" *American Sentinel* 4, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

There is now being circulated quite extensively a petition to the California Legislature, asking that body to enact a Sunday law. From some things, which it is not necessary to name here, we feel as though it is not being circulated as extensively as it might be, and we believe that there is an effort on the part of those who are behind it, to keep its contents a secret from all except those whom they are quite sure will favor it. Be that as it may, we propose to give the matter a little more publicity than it has yet had, and to that end shall give the substance of what is on the petition, with some comments.

The fact that the petition is the work of the California Woman's Christian Temperance Union, is no secret. It is so stated in bold letters on the face of it. Underneath this statement are the words, "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work." Ex. 20: 8, 9. And by the side of this is the following text of Scripture: Hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." Eze. 20:20. What logical connection these texts can have with a petition for a Sunday law, is more than we can imagine. They both refer to the seventh day of the week, and not to the first, and this fact is well known by every member of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Even if they could by any possibility apply to Sunday, they would be out of place on a petition a "civil Sabbath," as it is called, if that is what they are after; and this also they very well know. We are therefore forced to the conclusion that what they want is a law that will enable them to have Sunday treated as though it were the Sabbath which God gave to his people, and commands men to observe. In short, they want the State to enforce an act of religion on purely religious grounds.

Next follows the petition itself, which reads as follows:-

"To the Honorable, the Senate and Assembly of the State of California:-

"Greeting: We, the undersigned, residents of--, in the county of--, State of California, in view of the dissipation and demoralizing influences arising from the desecration of Sunday in the State, earnestly and respectfully petition your

honorable body for the enactment of a Sunday law that shall give laboring men a day of rest; prohibit the carrying

18

on of all unnecessary business; prohibit barbarous, unseemly, and noisy amusements, such as theaters, processions, concerts, games; and also the opening upon Sunday of all places where intoxicating beverages are sold; also providing, by proper legislation, for the enforcement thereof."

Following this is the blank space for signatures. There are a few points in this to which we wish to call the attention of the people of California, and especially of the honorable members of the Legislature. The first is the statement concerning the "desecration of Sunday." The word "desecration" is the exact opposite of "consecration." Nothing can be *desecrated* unless it has first been *consecrated*. But you will search in vain for any record of the consecration of Sunday. In fact, but few people presume to argue for any express divine sanction for Sunday observance. Therefore "desecration" is not a proper word to apply to Sunday labor or amusement.

But pass by the question of Sunday sacredness. One thing is clearly shown by its use in this petition, and that is, that the petitioners propose to get such a law as will, enable them to prohibit anything that would be a desecration of the day if it were sacred. They, propose to have a law that will enable them to make people *act* as though they regarded Sunday as a holy day, whether they really think so or not. They want the State to make people who are not religious act as though they were, and to force *their* forms of religion on those who do not believe them.

The required law must "prohibit the carrying on of all unnecessary business." Who is to decide what business is necessary, and what is not? The man who carries on the business is the best judge of whether or not it is necessary, but it is obvious that the law would be a dead letter if he were allowed that privilege. "Unnecessary business" indefinite. Suppose a man is a mechanic. He has a job on hand which he cannot finish according to contract unless he works on Sunday. He may think that such work is necessary but our observation of the administration of Sunday laws convinces us that it would not be so regarded by those in power.

We wish especial notice to be taken of the fact that such a law as is petitioned for would naturally lead to religious persecution. We shall prove this on two counts.

First, take the man who conscientiously observes the seventh day of the week. If he is a laboring man, he is obliged to work six in order to support his family. His conscience will not allow him to work on the seventh day, and therefore, since he must work on Sunday in order to make a week's work, it follows that his conscience obliges him to work on Sunday. His conscientious convictions of duty, first to God, and then to his family, will not allow him to do otherwise. Now if that man shall be punished for his Sunday labor, his punishment will be nothing but persecution for conscience sake. His punishment is solely on the ground that his religion differs from that of his neighbor. This charge cannot by any possibility be refuted. We say that work under such

circumstances is necessary, no matter what the nature of the work is. Of course we except the disturbance of any congregation; that is not allowable on any day in the week.

Second, take the man who has not rested on the seventh day. He may make a profession of religion, or he may not. It matters not whether he violates his conscience by working seven days in the week or not. If he sins against God by working on Sunday, then he is answerable to God. Now if he be prosecuted for not keeping Sunday,-that is, for not conforming in that respect to the form of religion held by the majority,-his prosecution will be religious persecution just as much as in the case of a man who in a heathen country should be punished for ignoring the gods of that country. Put them in the best light you can, it is a fact that Sunday laws do logically lead to religious persecution.

A few years ago there was a rigid Sunday law in Arkansas. When it was enacted, it was ostensibly for the sole purpose of closing up the liquor saloons. Did it stop with that? No; it did not even begin with that. Not a saloon was closed; but quite a number of peaceable farmers were persecuted almost to the death. You may say that that persecution was only the work of bigoted persons. Granted; but are you sure that there are no bigoted persons in California? And are you ready to pass a law that will give bigots the power to persecute inoffensive citizens?

Another indictment: The petition calls for the prohibiting of all barbarous amusements on Sunday. Under this head would be classed prize fighting, cock fighting, and bull fighting. But in this petition the Woman's Christian Temperance Union shows itself to be far behind the times, and behind public sentiment, for there is a law prohibiting such things every day in the week. We have very distinct recollection of reading of several instances in which the police made a raid upon parties engaged in such barbarous sports. The framers of this petition may say that they know this. Then their petition is an insult to the law, in that it asks for its enforcement only on Sunday. In any case, they virtually declare by their petition that barbarous sports are not objectionable, provided they are not indulged in on Sunday. We cannot agree with them; and we believe that in this respect our legislators, even though they be non-professors; will show themselves to be ahead of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. We do not believe that they will enact a law that will virtually legalize barbarous sports six days in the week.

One word more, concerning the matter of closing saloons. When, we urge that such a law as is desired virtually sanctions the keeping open of saloons on six days of the week, we are told that the law is demanded in a special manner on Sunday, because people are idle then, and there is more opportunity for them to be decoyed into the saloon. The fallacy of this plea may be seen by the fact that people are no more idle on Sunday than they are at night during the week, and especially on Saturday night after six o'clock. Many a laboring man spends all his wages on Saturday night, yet the petition makes no note of this. The simple fact is this, and it cannot be denied, that they want to have Sunday strictly observed as a day of rest and worship; and all the plea that the law is desired in behalf of temperance, is nothing but a blind. It has not the first principle of

temperance in it. We believe that the law-makers of this State are too intelligent to be deceived by any such pretensions.

We have made this article long enough, and have only considered the *face* of the petition, and that is not half of the document. We shall consider the remainder of it elsewhere, under the head of, "The Back of that Petition."

E. J. W.

"Why the California Sunday Law Was Repealed" *American Sentinel* 4, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

The Oakland *Tribune* of January 19, in announcing a call for a meeting to be held on Tuesday evening, January 22, in the interest of a State Sunday law, used the following language:-

"Ever since the repeal of the California Sunday law, the Christian people of the State have been dissatisfied. This is the only State in the Union wholly without law in reference to the Christian Sabbath. It is believed that if the voice of the people could have been taken at the time of the act of the Legislature repealing the law, a very large majority of the best citizens in the State would have opposed the repeal, and they would now favor the enactment of a similar law. It is known that in the Legislature now in session, a new bill, not unlike the former, will be introduced, and its enactment is not very improbable. If the people could vote, it no doubt would become law. In view of such facts, the call of a public meeting in our city is timely."

From the above, a stranger would get the idea that the repeal of the California Sunday law six years ago was an underhanded proceeding,-that it was sprung on the people when they were not thinking, and carried through before they had a chance to protest.

21

As a matter of fact, the case was exactly the reverse of this. The matter was before the people for nearly a year. Following is a brief history of the case:-

Some of the church people sought to rigidly enforce the Sunday law. They entered into it with enthusiasm, and thought they saw success just ahead. Some of them made boasts of what they would do to those who had the presumption to work on their Sabbath. Arrests were made by the wholesale. A few convictions were obtained in different parts of the State, for the movement was general. One or two cases were appealed to the Supreme Court. Thus the matter attracted the attention of everybody, and the eyes of many in distant States were turned toward California.

Of course there was opposition. It was the year of a State election, and the Republican party of California espoused the Sunday cause. At the State Convention a plank in favor of the Sunday law was adopted with the greatest enthusiasm. No other plank in the platform received one-fourth the attention or applause that that one did. When the Democratic Convention was held, that party declared for the repeal of the law. This was the sole issue between the two parties in California that year, and the campaign was a most exciting one. For

months the principal topic of conversation was the Sunday law. The papers were full of it, and there was not a political speech made in which it was not discussed. The ministers all preached on it. Everywhere it was the one thing before the people.

Of course every voter turned out on election day. The result was that a Democratic Governor and a Democratic Legislature was elected. The State Government, which had previously been strongly Republican, became by that election just as strongly Democratic. Everybody knew that it was because of the Sunday law. The Republican party well knew that its defeat was due to its espousal of the Sunday law. The first thing that the Democratic Legislature did when it convened, was to fulfill its pledge to repeal that law. The members could not in conscience do otherwise, because their promise to do so was that which accrued their election. That is the whole history.

And now for the *Tribune* to say that "it is believed that if the voice of the people could have been taken at the time of the act of the Legislature repealing the law, a very large majority of the best citizens in the State would have opposed the repeal," is arrant nonsense. The one who believes that, will believe anything. If the voice of the people is not heard at the polls, especially when the main issue has been the subject of discussion for months, then we should like to know how that voice could be heard. Everybody who has lived in California for the last seven years, or who was here during the campaign of 1882, knows that we have related the simple facts. The California Sunday law was repealed because the majority of the people said that they wanted it repealed. Whether or not the sentiment of the majority has changed materially since then, remains to be seen. Let the matter have a fair trial before the people, and if the majority want a Sunday law, it will appear. But let no one seek to appeal to sympathy by pleading that a fair trial was not had six years ago.

We are well aware of the fact that an effort is being made to push the matter of a Sunday law through this Legislature as quickly and quietly as possible; but we shall do our part towards securing a full and free discussion of it. Of the meeting to influence legislation in behalf of the Sunday law, we shall have something to say next week.

E. J. W.

February 13, 1889

"Sunday Law Meeting in Oakland" *American Sentinel* 4, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

The meeting held in Hamilton Hall, Tuesday evening, January 22, in the interest of a Sunday law in California, was a very tame affair. The speakers read or recited their pieces in a perfunctory manner, having the appearance of men somewhat discouraged. Although they have little or no hope of getting any satisfaction at this session of the Legislature, they showed very clearly the spirit that underlies their movement, and the nature of the law that they want, and that is all that we are concerned about.

Dr. M. C. Briggs, of Santa Clara, and Dr. Dwinelle, of the Pacific Theological Seminary, were the speakers of the evening. In his opening prayer, Dr. Dwinelle prayed that the State might be awakened to the necessity of making Sunday not only a day of rest, but of moral quickening as well. In his remarks, he said: "The whole business of the community must cease practically, in order that all may have the benefit of the rest day." That is to say, that the Doctor does not and cannot rest on Sunday, unless everybody else stops work. The untruthfulness of such a statement should be apparent to all. Thousands of people in the United States and in Europe, who rest on the seventh day, and who enjoy their rest and worship, and get all the benefit from it that there is in a rest day, show clearly enough that it is not necessary to have a law compelling everybody to rest, in order to accommodate a few.

Dr. Briggs's speech was mostly a labored theological argument. It would be utterly useless to report him in this, for two reasons. First, because theology has nothing to do with the matter. If the Doctor could read on every page of the Bible a plain declaration that Sunday ought to be kept as the Sabbath, it would not have a particle of bearing on the matter of a State Sunday law. The State has no business to legislate in matters pertaining only to God; and second, because the Doctor stumbled so much over Hebrew roots, that his efforts excited only pity.

He did treat us to one brilliant, original piece of Biblical exegesis. Speaking of the phrase, "the morrow after the Sabbath," which occurs a few times in connection with the Passover, he said: "The morrow after the Sabbath, is mentioned all the way along as following the Sabbath." His conclusion was, that Sunday is the Sabbath! When such arguments as that are hurled at us our only refuge is silence. This may be taken as a fair sample of the arguments by which the necessity for Sunday laws is shown; and since it is less than nothing, we are driven to the conclusion that force of numbers will be the all-prevailing argument in taking away the liberties of the people.

When he struck the New Testament, he didn't venture any such original thoughts, but contented himself with retailing the stale argument on the Greek of Matt. 28:1, and similar passages, where the word "week" is rendered from *Sabbaton*. The Doctor asserted that that text should read "the first of the Sabbaths," instead of "the first day of the week." This assertion was made with as much boldness as though all the scholarship of the world were not against such a rendering. Any Greek scholar or lexicon will tell him that the word *Sabbaton* has the meaning of "week," as well as of "Sabbath."

While the Doctor was dwelling on this, we thought that we would like to quote to him Luke 18:12, where the Pharisee in the temple is represented as saying in his prayer, "I fast twice in the week." Here the same word is rendered "week" as in Matt. 28:1; and according to Dr. Briggs's theory of exposition, the text ought to read, "I fast twice in the Sabbath." Just imagine that well-fed Pharisee clasping his hands aldermanic sides, while he sanctimoniously raised his eyes, and said to the Lord: "I thank thee that I am not as other men are, for I abstain from eating twice every Sabbath-day"! This is absurd, but no more so than the renderings given by Dr. Briggs; so we may dismiss his Scripture argument.

When the Doctor came right down to the matter of a civil law compelling men to keep Sunday whether or no, he was more at home, and spoke with more freedom. Said he, "We don't want to make men religious." How often that is reiterated. One would think that there was nothing that these civil Sunday-law preachers dreaded so much as making men religious. He said that the Sunday law is designed only as a measure of protection to those who are dependent on others; a police regulation; a sanitary arrangement." We can well believe that if it is ever enacted it will be a police regulation, and that is just what we oppose. We don't want any police regulation of religious matters. As to sanitary arrangements, we would have more confidence in them if they originated with the medical fraternity, instead of the preachers.

Only one thing more need be noted, and that is, his reason why there must be a law compelling everybody to rest on the same day. Said he, "If every man is at liberty to choose his own day of rest, my neighbor who doesn't keep my day will work on my day, while I want to rest. So there must be one day for the whole community."

There you have an expression of the mean selfishness out of which all Sunday laws spring. "My neighbor will work on my day, unless there is a law compelling him to observe it." Very likely; but how about Doctor Briggs? Will he not work on the day on which his neighbor

27

wants to rest? Why, of course; but then, "what rights has my neighbor, that I am bound to respect? *I'm* in the majority." We don't wonder that men become infidels, when Doctors of Divinity, who profess to be living exponents of Christianity, show such an unrighteous disregard for the rights and feelings of others. The gospel which they teach is one which says, "Whatsoever ye would not that your neighbor should do to you, that do you to him if you feel like it and have the power."

We are happy to inform our friends that Christianity has nothing in common with such teaching. Christianity leads men to be considerate of others; and if a man is weak and in the minority, that is the very one whom true Christianity would seek out and protect. As we left the meeting, musing on the heartlessness of the men who are clamoring for Sunday laws, we could think only of these words, "O my soul, come not thou into their secret, unto their assembly; mine honor, be not thou united."

E. J. W.

"A Sign of the Times" *American Sentinel* 4, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* of November 29 had an article copied from the *Christian Intelligencer*, about the amount of business done by photographers on Sunday. Following are a few paragraphs from it, which will serve to show the drift of sentiment in regard to such labor:-

"It is hardly probable that the Christian people of this city are aware of the extent to which the Sabbath is violated by the photographers. Many of the

principal galleries are filled with waiting patrons, and their largest business is done on the Sabbath.

"The famous galleries, although not exactly open to the public, are ready to make appointments, and prefer that day to execute the pictures of the popular actors, singers, etc.

"And most of the small places, after passing a dull week, erect to make up on the Sunday business enough to give them a profit over the week's expenses.

"There is a wholesome law against this transact tug business on the holy day, but it is not enforced.

"A few years ago an attempt was made to close up the violators of the Sabbath, but it was not successful, and several of the prominent men in that effort, seeing no remedy, now keep open, and find their purses better filled, their bank account much larger, and their credit much better with the stock dealer. Now in view of this truthful statement, what is the duty of the Christian public in this matter?"

The article carries with it its own answer to the last question, that is, from the standpoint of the *Statesman* and the *Intelligencer*.

The plainly implied demand is that such business should be stopped by law. And this indicates to what lengths the instigators of the Sunday-law movement will go when they have secured the legislation which they want, and have the power in their hands. It shows that a system of *espionage* will be inaugurated, and that nobody's privacy will be sacred from the prying intrusion of the minions of such an iniquitous law.

There is no business that is conducted with more quietness than the business of photography. Nothing is less calculated to disturb public worship or private devotion. Even a monk in his cloister could not be disturbed by the business of a photographer next door, if he were not informed of its proximity.

When the photographer may be arrested for quietly conducting his work in an upper room on Sunday, then no person will be exempt. Some

29

zealous individual, anxious for political preferment, will find out that the merchant is in his private office on Sunday, looking over his ledger, and forthwith the merchant will be arrested. The lady who takes in sewing may be arrested for making button-holes or fitting a garment in her back parlor, on Sunday. The literary man who writes for hire may be arrested for quietly working at his desk on Sunday. In short, from such a wholesale stoppage of Sunday work as is desired by the *Statesman*, the *Intelligencer*, and all who may be classed as National Reformers, it will be but a step to the arresting of every citizen who is found away from church on Sunday, unless detained by sickness. That this is not an exaggerated conclusion is evident from the statement of Dr. Herrick Johnson, that he longed for the breath of the Puritan, for the Puritan Sabbath; and this is just what was done in the days of the Covenanters and Puritans. Robert Wodrow, a Scotch ecclesiastical historian, of whom it is said that his "veracity was above suspicion," and of his writings, that "no historical facts are better ascertained than the accounts . . . to be found in Wodrow," makes the following statement concerning the methods used to secure attendance at church:-

"It is thought expedient that ane baillie with tua of the session pas throw the towne everie Sabbath day; and nott aie as they find absent fra the sermes other afoir or efter none; and for that effect that they pas and *aerehe sic houss as they think moist melt.*"-*Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen.*

In modern English this is as follows:-

"It is thought expedient that one bailiff with two of the session pass through the town every Sabbath day, and note such as they find absent from the sermons either before or after noon; and for that effect that they pass and search such houses as they think most meet."

In his "Collections" he says: "The session allows the searchers to go into houses, and apprehend absents from the kirk." Now when one of the great cries for a Sunday law is because people do not go to church, and when the only ground for stopping a photographer from working in the seclusion of his own room, could be that he was staving from church and at least inviting others to do so, the conclusion is inevitable that when the clamorers for a Sunday law get what they want, they will make no scruple of going into any house where they have reason to suspect that anybody is working on Sunday, and arresting the occupants.

Are we not warranted in saying that the liberties of the American people are in danger? Is it not high time that the people were awakening to the alarming growth of the religious legislation evil? Who will protest against the degeneracy of Protestantism?

E. J. W.

"Showing Its Parentage" *American Sentinel* 4, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

In the (Detroit) *Christian Herald's* brief report of the National Sunday Convention at Washington, the President, Col. Elliott F. Shepard, is reported as having said that "Congress and the law-making powers in this country have virtually repealed the fourth commandment." By this he of course referred to the failure to enforce Sunday observance. It is not our intention to make any argument on what is plain enough without, namely, that Sunday and the fourth commandment have nothing whatever to do with each other; that we pass for the present. But taking him on his supposition, that repealing the fourth commandment would affect Sunday, we wish to point out sharply the position which the National Sunday Union proposes to assume. Note well the following:-

Allowing that the failure to enact laws compelling people to keep Sunday, or the repealing of those already in existence, is a virtual repeal of the fourth commandment, then it follows that in their efforts to secure the enactment and enforcement of such laws, they are working for the re-enactment of the fourth commandment. Is not that a logical conclusion? Certainly it is, and Colonel Shepard, as the representative of the Union, would admit it. Then mark this point:-

It was the Lord Jehovah who spoke the fourth commandment, with the other nine, from Sinai. It was God who enacted that law. Therefore the National Sunday Union, consisting of the National Reform Association, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and various religious organizations, in proposing to re-enact the fourth commandment, is proposing to put itself in the place of God. Not only so, but it is putting itself above God, by assuming that it is more competent to vindicate his law than he is himself. In this it is showing itself a true child of the Papacy, that "man of sin," the "son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Is not the likeness perfect? In other words, Is it not trying to make of this nation an *image* of the Papal beast? E. J. W.

"Who Are Working for the Sunday Law?" *American Sentinel* 4, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

Our National Reform friends, and all who are laboring so zealously to secure a Sunday law, have a good deal to say about our opposition to such a law. They accuse us of joining with infidels, and with those who are not in harmony with law and order and good government. As a matter of fact, we have not joined with anybody in our opposition to Sunday laws. We are against such laws, because we know that the State has no right to legislate concerning matters of religion, and because we know that such laws are unjust, and oppressive, and contrary to the spirit of true Christianity. If anybody else sees the injustice of such laws, and opposes their passage, or works against them on any ground whatever, we have no objection to make. This is a free country yet, and will continue to be so until National Reformers secure the control of it. We do not oppose Sunday legislation by the State because somebody else does; if everybody else should favor such laws, we should oppose them just the same.

But we cannot see that National Reformers are in a position to denounce us very much because we oppose the same thing that men do who are not Christians. On the ground that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones, it becomes them to be cautious. In the *Lutheran Observer's* enthusiastic report of the Sunday Convention held in Washington, we find this statement:-

"The church in which the convention was held was festooned with petitions from probably ten millions of people, representing Protestant and Papal churches, labor unions, saints, and sinners."

No truer statement was ever made than this last. We venture the assertion that if the facts could be known, it would appear that the sinners outnumbered the saints in the proportion of ten to one. Yet the saints (?) who are engineering the Sunday movement are perfectly willing and very anxious to receive the co-operation of those very sinners, while they endeavor to heap contempt on us because some who do not profess to be Christians happen to oppose their work. Truly, consistency is a jewel not found among National Reformers or their allies.

The *Congregationalist*, also, in its issue of December 20, 1888, said of this effort to secure Sunday legislation:-

"A thing to be noted specially is that the movement affords ground for, and already has secured of a large degree, the support of many who work for purely secular ends."

They claim to be doing gospel work, and yet they bid for the support of those who have no interest in the gospel, but who from professedly selfish motives. Polluk describes one who stole the livery of the court of Heaven to serve the devil in. This looks to us very much like stealing the devil's tools to serve the Lord with. Anything to win! seems to be their motto. It is a common saying, that politics makes strange bed-fellows, and National Reform politics differ in no respect from the rule.

E. J. W.

February 20, 1889

"A Tangible Object" *American Sentinel* 4, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The following letter was received from a gentleman in the State of New York. We print it entire, in order that all who have similar ideas may receive the benefit of our reply:-

EDITOR OF SENTINEL:-Dear Sir: Someone is kind enough to send your paper to me. In it I find much to admire, but some things which to my mind militate against your general object-the correction of existing evils in society.

I believe there is such a thing as the true church of Christ; but that it is not the Roman Catholic, nor the Greek, nor the Protestant Episcopal, nor the Methodist Episcopal, nor the Presbyterian, nor the Baptist, nor the Congregational, nor any other humanly constituted organization; but that it has in its membership all true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ as their present Saviour from sin, and who, by virtue of his faith, are saved, regenerated, made new creatures in him, and who, consequently, are living out his life among men. This body of people, for they are "one body," I believe to be the "little stone cut out of the mountain without hands," which, increasing in magnitude with an ever-accelerated momentum, is to subdue all opposed to it, until it fills and rules the whole earth. Of the rule of such a church, there must be no fear.

Human laws and institutions must, therefore, more and more conform to the divine, as this divinely constituted church goes forward in its mission of subduing and assimilating all things to its own likeness. Already as the divine law prohibits theft, and adultery, and murder, etc., so also do our human laws. And quite recently we have conformed our human Constitution to the divine in making it repeat the command, "Let the oppressed go free." And now again the nation is rising up to prohibit that which, legalized as it now is, virtually legalizes theft, and adultery, and murder, and every other abomination which only men under the influence of strong drink are capable of, thus giving a new and most striking evidence of the purpose and power of the "little stone" to subdue all things to itself.

This result achieved, and the final conquest will be near at hand; for the little demons, seeing their great leader slain, will take to their heels and fly away, leaving the field in possession of its rightful Lord and Law-Giver, and the universal shout shall go up, "Allelujah, the Lord omnipotent reigneth. The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

Our correspondent is mistaken in his supposition that the "general object" of the SENTINEL is "the correction of existing evils in society." This is not its object; it has never contemplated so impossible a task. Its sole object is, as stated, in its prospectus, "the defense of American institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious." This is the sole work of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. There are plenty of papers devoted wholly to showing the evils of intemperance, and to working in other lilies of reform; but the SENTINEL is comparatively alone in calling attention to the evils of religious legislation, and to the imminent danger which this country is in because of it. That even in its special field it will be able to prevent bigoted and selfish, and well-meaning but deceived men from passing unjust and oppressive laws, its editors are not vain enough to imagine; their highest hope is, by warning people of impending danger, to arouse those who love real liberty to take a stand for it-to keep them from being taken by surprise. The work of a sentinel is to warn people of danger, so that they may be prepared to meet it. In this case, the danger to which we refer, is not so much that of being oppressed by unjust laws, as it is of being a party to the passing and the execution of such laws. The man who is persecuted for conscience sake, is in a far better state than the man who either directly or indirectly contributes to that end.

As to the existing evils in society, we have no idea that they will ever be corrected until the end of the world. Our correspondent has stated a view that is quite generally accepted, namely, that the church of Christ will advance and increase in strength and numbers until it will finally swallow up everything, and fill the whole earth, and that when the church has corrected all the evils of society, and the world has become morally perfect, then the Lord himself will come and reign over his people. This is essentially the National Reform view, for it has been declared that the triumph of National Reform would be the ushering in of the millennium. The National Reform view differs from the one that has been taught in the past, only in the way that the millennium shall be brought about. It was formerly taught that this would be done by the preaching of the gospel; but National Reformers find that way too slow; they find that the world of vice is gaining ground, and that morality is losing; and so they propose to convert the world by an act of Congress and of other law-making bodies, and so

34

have it all done at once. This view is now superseding the old one. It comes, therefore, strictly within our province to show from the Scriptures that such a result as they look for is chimerical in the highest degree.

1. In the first place, it is contrary to all the history of the past, that all the world should ever be converted. It is true that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation, but it is only so to those who believe; and there is no more reason to

suppose that all the world will believe in this age, than that all should believe in some past age. The gospel was as much the power of God unto salvation in the days of Noah, and of Abraham, and of the apostles, as it is now, yet but very few of the inhabitants of the world believed in those days. This is not because the gospel was at fault, but because men would not believe. If all men would believe, the gospel would save them from sin; but it is not the work of the gospel to force men to believe. "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely," is the gospel cry; but the mass of mankind have ever been the willing servants of sin, and so their minds have been blinded to the glorious light of the gospel. All men might have been healed, both in body and soul, when Jesus was on earth, if they had cared for the simple yet glorious truths which he spoke; but he was compelled mournfully to say, even to his own people, "Ye will not come unto me, that ye might have life." The preaching of the apostles, fired as it was with the zeal of Pentecost, was able to turn but very few of the people of the world to righteousness. Are they not presumptuous, then, who imagine that they can accomplish what never has been accomplished?

2. Jesus said to his disciples: "enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life; and few there be that find it." Matt. 7:13, 14.

The reason why so few will be saved, is because so few want to be, and not because of any lack on the part of God or his gospel. The tray to life is narrow; that is, there is only one way to do right; but the way to death is broad; for there are many ways of doing wrong. It is much easier, much more in accordance with natural inclination to do wrong, and God has foreseen that most people will follow their own inclination. It has ever been so, and the Scriptures declare that it will be so to the end of time.

3. Paul wrote to Timothy, and through him to us, as follows:-

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." 2 Tim. 3:1-5.

Here is a list of sins almost identical with those ascribed to the ancient heathen (Rom. 1:28-32), and all are to be prevalent in the last days. Surely this does not look as though the church is to be able, either by legal or moral suasion, to correct the existing evils of society

4. We have a still stronger testimony than this. In Christ's discourse upon the time of his second coming, he said:-

"And so it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and

brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." Luke 17:26-30.

Since the world when the Lord comes is to be like it was in the days of Noah and Lot, it is going to grow worse instead of better, for "the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly" (Gen. 13:13), and before the flood "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Gen. 6:5.

If space allowed, we might add many like Scripture testimonies, but these are sufficient. The true church, as our correspondent says, is indeed composed of all those who truly believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and who by virtue of their faith in him are regenerated, and made new creatures; but it is not the province of the church to correct the evils of society. When the church gets that idea, it begins to pass laws to make men religious, or rather, to make men act as though they were religious, and then it ceases to be the church of Christ. The church is simply to be a light to the world, to exhibit the character of Jesus. But if the church begins to use the civil power to carry forward its work, it ceases to represent Christ, for he did not do so. The gospel is to be preached in all the world for a *witness* unto all nations, and with that its work ceases. A witness is not a prosecutor, nor a judge; and when the existing evils of society shall be corrected by the destruction of them that corrupt the earth, the gospel will have ceased its work. Sentence is never pronounced nor executed until after the witness has finished his testimony. And so those who think that to punish men for not serving God, is a part of the gospel, show that they do not know what the gospel is. They cease to be ambassadors for Christ, and usurp the place of Christ himself, as judge.

The few Scripture texts and arguments that have been given are sufficient to show the fallacy of the whole of our friend's letter. It is Christ himself, and not the church, that is the rock that is to grind men to powder. It is not by the conversion of the whole world, against their will, that the earth is to be made the abode of peace, but by the utter destruction of those who will not obey God. The kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; but it is God the Father, and not the church, that gives them to the Son. And when they are given to him, it is not as converted nations, asking "What is the word that cometh forth from the Lord?" but it is as thorns fit only to be burnt; "reprobate silver," because the Lord hath rejected them, to be "broken with a rod of iron, and dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel."

We would only add, in closing, that the Constitution of the United States is not conformed to the divine. If it were, we should not want it preserved as it is. Not because we are not in harmony with the divine constitution, but because we don't think men are capable of administering a divine constitution. The amendment prohibiting slavery was in the line of simple justice between men, and for the good of society. We believe in a divine Government, highest aim to be loyal subjects of it; but we don't want it administered by human deputies and we are glad to know that God does not rule by proxy, but executes his own decrees. The work of the SENTINEL is no less to keep people from laying profane hands on sacred things, then it is to preserve the American Constitution as it is; and so, while we are laboring in the interest of human rights, we are to the same extent

laboring for the preservation of the purest Christianity.
E. J. W.

"Provisions of the Sunday Rest Bill" *American Sentinel* 4, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

We are persuaded that there is a great deal of misunderstanding in regard to the Blair bills, not only among those who are opposed to religious legislation, but by those who are at least nominally favoring them. We have seen and heard the statement that the Sunday-Rest bill would, if it should become a law, shut down all business throughout the country. This is a mistake. The passage of the Sunday-Rest bill would have a direct effect upon only a comparatively small portion of the people of the United States, although it would very seriously affect them indirectly. The first section of that bill reads as follows:-

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on Sunday, no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe, of any person or corporation; shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, show, exhibition, or amusement in public, in any Territory, District, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section"

This section confines the working of the bill, if it should become a law, to those places that are "subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States." These are the Territories and the District of Columbia. It is an absolute law for the Territories, making no exception, but obliging everybody to rest on Sunday.

Section 2 reads as follows:-

"That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in times of peace over any land postal route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week."

This is so plain as to need no comment. The third section reads as follows:-

"That the prosecution of commerce between the States, and with the Indian tribes, by the transportation of persons by land or water on the first day of the week, is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent or employe of any person or corporation, who shall violate this section, shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars; and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid, for the same."

This shuts off inter-State commerce. By the first section, overland trains would be stopped in the Territories, but this section prohibits all Sunday traffic between States, whether on land or water. The reader can readily see what bearing such a law as this would have on State Sunday legislation.

Section 3 provides for cessation of labor on Sunday in the army and navy, prohibiting all drills, musters, and parades, except in time of active service or

preparation therefore. Section 5 makes exception in case of labor or service performed or rendered on Sunday in consequence of

36

accident or disaster or unavoidable delay in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of transportation, and allows for the transportation and delivery of milk before 5 A. M., and after 10 P. M. This is the whole of the bill, so far as its prohibition of labor is concerned. It will be seen that it is very strict as far as its jurisdiction extends, but it does not directly affect citizens of the States, except Government employes.

But its indirect effect in the States will be scarcely less than its direct effect in places subject to the exclusive control of the United States. It is well known that the great obstacle in the way of enforcing existing Sunday laws in the various States, has been the United States Government. In the hearing on the Sunday-Rest bill before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, December 13, Mrs. Bateham said that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union based their claims and petitions on the following facts:-

"1. Nearly every State has Sabbath laws, but the National Government has none, though greatly needed, since the question has become emphatically a national one, and the very perpetuity or loss of our national rest, the Christian Sabbath, seems to depend on its being protected by the Government from the encroachments of organized capital, and the reinforcements of State laws by National.

"2. It is in gross violation of nearly every State Sabbath law, that railroads run their Sunday trains, yet these States are powerless to prevent it, since only Congress can control inter-State commerce.

"3. By the State laws ordinary labor and traffic is forbidden on Sunday, but in defiance thereof the United States Government keeps its post-offices open and sells as on other days, and sends its mail to all parts of the country."-*Report, p. 22.*

It will be seen that the plea for a National Sunday law is made on the ground that the State Sunday laws are powerless without it. In that same committee meeting, Senator Blair, the chairman, stated that the General Government takes advantage of what the States have given to it in the way of jurisdiction over the post-offices, inter-State commerce, and the army and navy, to introduce practices that nullify their attempt to enforce Sunday laws, and said:-

"To prevent this, is the object of this legislation. That is all that is undertaken here. It is simply an act proposing to make efficient the Sunday-Rest laws of the States, and nothing else."-*Report, p. 97.*

We shall hereafter take occasion to show how terribly "efficient" some of those Sunday laws will become when this Sunday-Rest bill becomes a law.

National Reformers have ever referred to the general Government as the great Sabbath-breaker, holding that running of mail trains, and the keeping open of post-offices practically nullified all their efforts to have Sunday strictly observed. With this objection removed, there would be speedy and strict enforcement of the Sunday-laws that already exist, and enactment of laws where there are none now. The passage of the bill, therefore, would practically result, as

was said at the National Sunday Convention, in making Sunday the ideal Sabbath of the Puritans, to be occupied only by worship. It should be opposed by everybody; by those who do not care to observe Sunday, as a matter of course, and because it is unjust and un-American; and by those who do care to observe Sunday, both from the standpoint of the golden rule, and because they should protest against having their worship from choice made to appear as though it was a matter of compulsion.

E. J. W.

February 27, 1889

"Subjection to the Powers That Be" *American Sentinel* 4, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." Rom. 13:1, 2.

This text of Scripture has been the cause of a great deal of controversy concerning the scope of civil governments, and the relations which Christians should sustain to them. There are a great many people who take the extreme view that whatever civil governments enact should be scrupulously obeyed, no matter how much it may conflict with the will of God, as revealed in the Bible. They seem to imagine that God has delegated all power to men, and that he waives to the claims of men his right to govern in matters of morals. They virtually say that the inspired command to be subject to the higher powers, absolves people from direct allegiance to their Creator. The very statement of the case should be enough to show anybody the absurdity of such a view.

The thirteenth chapter of Romans affords in itself ample proof that the powers that be are ordained of God only in matters that pertain to the outward peace of society. But we wish to bring a few other Scriptures to bear, to show just how we are to be subject to earthly powers, and at the same time be subject to the highest power of all.

The seventh verse of the same chapter says: "Render therefore to all their due: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." Render "honor to whom honor" is due, is a part of this command. Now it is beyond question that honor is due to God, for the Lord himself says that he will honor only those who honor him. 1 Sam. 2:30. And that this tribute and honor which are due to God are entirely different from those which are due to earthly governments, is evident from the words of Christ to the Pharisees, which are exactly parallel with those of Paul to the Romans: "Render therefore unto CÊsar the things which are CÊsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Matt. 22:21. Thus we see that while we are to be subject to the earthly

powers, that subjection must in nowise conflict with our subjection to God.

That inspiration does not teach that men are in duty bound to obey every edict of earthly powers, but that they are to disobey every enactment which conflicts with the law of God, is very plain. Take the case of the three Hebrew children at the court of Nebuchadnezzar. They were as truly bound to be subject to him as ever any men were to an earthly ruler, for Nebuchadnezzar was king by God's own appointment (Jer. 27:4-7), and they had by the same power been placed under him. Yet when the king commanded them to worship an image which he had set up, they absolutely refused to do anything of the kind. For their stubbornness, as the king doubtless thought it, they were cast into a fiery furnace; yet God who commands us to be subject to the powers that be, showed his approval of their course in the most marked manner.

Take the case of Daniel in the court of Darius. That king made a decree that for thirty days no man should make a request of any god or man except himself, under penalty of being cast into a den of lions. But Daniel paid no manner of attention to the decrees. When he knew that the writing was signed, "he went into his house; and his windows being opened in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." Dan. 6:10. Like his three fellows, he made no secret of his disobedience to the king's order. Yet the same God who commands us to be subject to the powers that be, showed his approval of Daniel's course by delivering him from the lions, and honoring him before the whole empire.

The apostles afford another case in point. An express injunction was laid upon them by the Jewish Sanhedrim "not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus." Acts 4:17, 18. The apostles, however, refused to keep silence, saying, "We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard" (verse 20), and they went right on teaching as though the rulers had said nothing. When they were again brought before the council, and reminded of the injunction which had been laid upon them, they boldly replied, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 5:29. All these cases, and especially this last, show that the command to be subject to the powers that be, does not mean that we should obey them when obedience to them involves disobedience to God.

Now the question arises, were these men subject to the Governments under which they lived? Can men be subject to the powers that be, and yet not obey them in every particular, no matter what they command? We answer that men can be subject to the powers that be, and still disobey them when their decrees conflict with the laws of God; and the record shows most clearly that Daniel and his fellows, and the apostles, were subject to the powers that existed in their time.

A passage from the writings of one of the men who refused to obey men, when to do so involved disloyalty to God, will make this matter clear. We quote from 1 Peter 2:17-20:-

"Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the King. Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for

your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God."

The command to "honor the king" shows this to be a parallel passage to Rom. 13:1, 2. Here, as there, we are exhorted to be subject to rulers, even though they be not good. But that this does not mean that we should in so doing disobey God, is evident from verse 19: "For this is thank-worthy if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully." The fact that he is called upon to suffer wrongfully, and that he is buffeted because he does well, shows that his doing right has been in direct opposition to the commands of his master. He suffers "for conscience towards God." That is, his conscience will not allow him to disobey God's commandment in obedience to the powers that be, and so he patiently suffers for it. And although he cannot obey the master's command, his patient acceptance of the threatened punishment shows his subjection to the power.

So we see that being subject to the powers that be, means simply that we are to obey them when their commands are right; and to disobey them when they conflict with those of God, and meekly to take the consequences. This is just what Daniel and his fellows and the apostles did. They did not resist, but they did not obey an unrighteous commandment. Now turn again to Romans 13, verses 2 and 5, and you will see that this is just what is taught. We quote:-

"Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." "Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake."

The Bible everywhere teaches respect for authority. Anarchists can find no warrant in the Bible for any of their contempt for authority. Rebellion against authority is not countenanced under any circumstances. Every soul must be subject to the powers that be, and that subjection consists in willing, prompt obedience to all their laws when they do not require disregard of God's law, and as willing an acceptance of the penalty for disobeying laws that do contravene the laws of God. An example of this is found in the early Christians, who took joyfully the spoiling of their goods. Heb. 10:34. Where there cannot be obedience, there must not be resistance. David would not lift his hand against the king of Israel, even though that king was most unjustly seeking his life; Paul would not knowingly speak ill of the high priest, although that priest was a wicked hypocrite. He counseled the Christians to be subject to the powers that were, even while he was daily violating the laws of the most wicked ruler; and he showed his subjection to a power which was despicable because of its moral rottenness, by willingly yielding up his life as the price of his necessary disobedience.

E. J. W.

"Proposed Persecution in Tennessee" *American Sentinel* 4, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

We learn that the following is being circulated western part of Tennessee:-

NOTICE,

"To whom it may concern:-

That we, the undersigned citizens of the Texas neighborhood and vicinity, being desirous of the welfare of our community, and that peace may prevail, and that the morals of our children may not be insulted and trampled upon by willful violation of the Sunday laws of our land, do this day pledge our honor that we will individually and collectively prosecute each and every violation of our State law that may come under our observation."

That our readers may know just what will be the result of carrying out that pledge, we print the Tennessee Sunday law, which they propose to enforce. Here it is:-

If any merchant, artificer, tradesman, farmer, or other person, shall be guilty of doing or exercising any of the common avocations of life, or of causing or permitting the same to be done by his children or servants, (acts of real necessity or charity excepted) on Sunday, he shall on due conviction on thereof before any justice of the peace of the county, forfeit and pay three dollars, one-half to the person who will sue for the same, the other half for the use of the county."

If the enforcement of that law would not be persecution, then we don't know what would be. If any farmer shall be "guilty" of planting squashes behind his barn, or of hoeing corn in the back lot, down by the woods, on Sunday, he may be hauled up and fined. Yet we are gravely assured that Sunday laws are simply "sanitary arrangements," and are not intended to make men religious. We do not need to be informed that they are not intended to make men religious. such a law is calculated only to make anarchists hypocrites.

Sanitary arrangements, forsooth! What is there about the Sunday that makes it so much more dangerous to a man's health to dig potatoes or weed onions on it than on any other day? We propose to ring the changes on this matter until the people shall see the inconsistency, or the duplicity, whichever it is, of those who argue for Sunday laws. If they want sanitary regulations, let them try their hands at framing something that would indicate it. If they want what the laws they frame seem to indicate, then let them say so plainly, and we shall have far greater respect for them.

It may be said that the Tennessee law will never be enforced according to the strict letter of it, and that we have supposed an impossible case. But the fact is that less than three years ago, under the Tennessee Sunday law, men were arrested and fined and imprisoned for quietly digging potatoes on Sunday for dinner, and for pulling up weeds out of their garden. And this was not in town, where people might see the work while passing to or from church, but in remote country districts, where the informer had to go out of his way in order to see the Sunday work.

This fact, taken in connection with the last clause of the law, reminds us of another gross abuse that may be perpetrated. The law gives one-half the fine to the person who sues the Sunday worker. Vagabonds who have nothing to do but loaf around, may make a very fine thing for themselves by spying around the

country, and peeping into shops to see who is working, and then lodging information against them. The Tennessee Sunday law is a disgrace to the State and to civilization, yet the reader will look in vain to see any denunciation of it by any National Reformer or advocate of a Sunday law "for sanitary purposes only." W.

March 6, 1889

"The Blair Education Amendment Bill" *American Sentinel* 4, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

We promised some time ago to comment on Senator Blair's remarks on this bill, but since then other matter which seemed more important has crowded it out. Now, although the bill has been twice printed in the AMERICAN SENTINEL, we propose to print it again in connection with Mr. Blair's remarks in the Senate, and to make such comments on both as will enable all to see just what is involved in the proposed amendment. The largely increased, circulation of the SENTINEL, since the bill was last printed, warrants and even makes necessary this repetition.

Before proceeding to the consideration of the bill, it may be well to read what some of the most prominent men in the United States think of the Constitution as it is. The New York *Independent*, without any reference to the Blair amendment, sent out letters asking the following question: "Has there been such advance in political science, and such development of this Nation, during the past hundred years, as to demand any considerable modification in our Constitution? If so, in what lines should it be made?" To this the following answers, which appeared in the *Independent*, January 10, 1889, were received from men who certainly need no instruction in the United States Constitution. We first quote the closing paragraph of a long reply by Francis Wharton, LL.D.:-

"The Constitution itself requires no amendment; but what is required is the removal from it of the patches impairing its symmetry, its comprehensiveness, its elasticity, its durability, which have been imposed on it by the judiciary."

Hon. George Bancroft, the historian, who is as familiar with the Constitution as ordinary people are with the alphabet, said:-

"I have your letter asking what changes had better be made in the Constitution. I know of none; if any change is needed, it is in ourselves, that we may more and more respect that body of primal law."

This is to the point, and we commend it to the careful consideration of National Reformers. It is they that need amendment; not the Constitution of the United States. The remaining answers are from judges of the United States Supreme Court, whose special business it is to be familiar with the Constitution. Justice Bradley wrote, "I would have no change" and then added:-

"I think it is a most happy arrangement that sudden whiffs and gusts of popular feeling are not always able to execute and carry out the rash purposes with which they are inspired."

To the same intent is the following from Justice Gray:-

"I am so old-fashioned as to think that the Constitution, administered according to its letter and spirit, is well enough as it is. And I am of the opinion of the late Governor Andrew, that it is not desirable to Mexicanize our Government by proposing constitutional amendments as often as there is supposed to be a disturbance in its practical working."

If the so-called Educational Amendment should be adopted, the flood-gates of religious legislation would be opened, and the Constitution of the United States would in time become little more than a church creed. This is not empty assertion, as will presently appear.

Justice Blatchford's letter to the *Independent*, which we quote in full, is as follows:-

"I am satisfied with the Constitution as it is. It cannot be bettered. Constitution tinkers are in a poor business. If there are ills, it is better to bear them than fly to others that we know not of."

There you have the opinion of men whose business it is to make a special study of the Constitution of the United States. Surely it should be entitled to some weight. Reason should teach men that there cannot be any serious defect in a Constitution under which this Government has grown to an extent and with a rapidity unprecedented in the history of Nations. But we come now to the proposed amendment, which reads as follows:-

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:-

ARTICLE-

"SECTION 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

"SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools, adequate for the instruction of all the children

50

living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character, or such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonial, or observances be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.

"Sec: 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve Governments republican in form, and in

substance, the United States shall guarantee to every State, and to the people of every State, and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.

"SEC. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary."

This joint resolution was introduced into the Senate on the 25th of May, 1888, and after being read twice, was ordered to lie on the table. It remained there until December 22, 1888, when Mr. Blair, having obtained the consent of the Senate, called it up, and had it referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The Charleston News and Courier has printed quite a number of letters from Southern college presidents and professors, concerning this bill, most of them favoring it on the ground that it would be a help to the Southern States. None of them look at the religious features of the bill, but only to the material help which it promises. It is this which will lead many to overlook the very objectionable clause in it; yet even this is condemned by some who are in the South, where the greatest benefit would be received in this line. Thus, Prof. C. F. Smith, of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, says:-

"At first I was favorably inclined to the bill, as I feared that most of the Southern States would not be able to bear the burden of illiteracy thrust upon them by the Civil War. I am now opposed to the bill on general principles. I do not believe that many of the Southern States really need this help. Granted, however, that in many, or even most of the Southern States, the immediate result would be good,-that is, that more men would, in the next few years, be able to read and write with this help than without it,-in the long run I fear we should be more injured than benefited. Unless States are different from individuals, the policy of helping them to do what, even with great effort, they might do for themselves, could only end in making them dependent."

President J. F. Crowell, of Trinity College, North Carolina, is in favor of the bill because of the material help which will be afforded to the States, although he acknowledges that it is defective as a measure of financial administration, and on constitutional grounds, admitting that it will "stretch the Constitution till it cracks."

Prof. E. C. Woodward, of South Carolina College, Columbia, says: "The South needs additional educational facilities, but this bill does not offer the educational aid most needed by our people."

President W. S. Candler, of Emory College, Oxford, Georgia, says:-

"In view of the sore need or more and better educational facilities in the South, I am strongly tempted to indorse the bill, but my judgment, unbiased by such considerations, is that the bill is not to be approved. I do not believe that the general Government is authorized to make any such appropriation to the cause of education. As to its possible effect on the South I cannot speak so confidently, but I fear it would be disappointing as a method of popular education, and, besides, would teach our people a parental view of this Government which would be vicious in its results. We need something more than money to educate the people, and there are many evils we can endure with less danger than we can invite a revolutionary departure from the constitutional functions of the National Government."

From the quotations already made, all of which have been copied from *Public Opinion*, January 26, 1889, it appears that the amendment is not to be commended even aside from its religious features, to which we shall now give attention. The second section is the one which contains the real point at issue. That requires each State to "establish and maintain a system of free public schools, adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion."

It would seem that the most superficial observer could see that this section is in direct opposition to the first, which says that "no State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" for it does provide for the establishment of a State religion. Some apologists for the bill have sought to evade this, by saying that the amendment does not require the States to maintain an establishment of religion, but only to maintain schools adequate for the education of children in the principles of the Christian religion.

This is the thinnest kind of an evasion; for what would be the sense of maintaining schools adequate for the education of children in the principles of the Christian religion, if those principles were not taught? What is meant by "schools adequate for the education" of children in the principles of the Christian religion? Evidently, schools equipped with suitable text-books, and provided with teachers competent to give instruction in those principles. That would involve quite a change from our present school system, for our schools are not now capable of imparting such instruction. Now it is the height of folly to say that the Government would be at the expense of providing extra text-books and teachers, so as to make the schools adequate for the education of the children in the principles of religion, and yet not require any such instruction to be given. The very fact that the State is required to establish and maintain a system of schools adequate for the education of children in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion," shows that they would be expected to teach those principles, just as much as the common branches of knowledge.

E. J. W.

(To be continued.)

March 13, 1889

"Only the Name, Not the Power" *American Sentinel* 4, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

A correspondent of the *Carrier Dove* says:-

"I say it in all seriousness, there is no name under heaven, the power of which we as a progressive people have greater reason to fear, than the name of Jesus, as used by religious people. It is the rallying-cry under which they are striving to

unite Church and State; the claim is that he shall be the ruler of, not only this, but all Nations; the Sabbath bill is being backed by the power of Jesus' name, and step by step we are thus being deprived of our liberties."

This is only one of the things that the National Reformers and their allies are responsible for; but this is enough to stamp their whole scheme as antichristian. While they profess that theirs is a Christian movement, there is nothing else in the world that is doing so much to bring Christianity into disrepute. Just as the false Christianity of the Roman Catholic Church, which was accepted as true Christianity, was responsible for the infidelity of Paine and Voltaire, so this professed National Reform, which will be taken by many as being just what it pretends to be,-an exhibition of real Christianity,-will disgust many with the very name of Christ and Christianity.

We can tell our neighbor that although the name of Jesus is used very often by these would-be reformers, "the power of Jesus' name" is altogether wanting. It matters not how much they may claim that he is to be king of this Nation, he himself has declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." The *power* of Jesus' name has never been exercised except for the benefit of the human race; but the mere name, the sound, has been used to back up crimes that would almost make a demon blush. It was the *power* of his name that healed the sick and raised the dead, in the days of the apostles. When, however, the sons of one Sceva, a Jew, thought to accomplish the same wonders that the apostle did, by calling the name of Jesus over one possessed with a devil, the demon overcame them, and drove them from the house naked and wounded, proving to them that the name of Jesus without the power could accomplish nothing towards diminishing the woes of the world. National Reformers should learn a lesson from the seven sons of Sceva.

The "power of Jesus' name" has done more than to raise the dead; it has enabled men to resist the strivings of appetite and passion, has delivered them from the bondage of vice and sin, so that they have stood free men, pure and clean, changed so greatly as scarcely to be able to recognize themselves. The power of the name of Jesus can and does diminish sin; but nobody can apply that power but Jesus himself. When men attempt to diminish sin by law, using the name of Jesus, they will find that they only increase it. Jesus does not have any vicegerents in this world, and his reign is a reign of love. National Reform Christianity is of the kind described by the apostle Paul, when he says that in the last days men shall be "lovers of their own selves," etc., "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." From such we are exhorted to "turn away."

E. J. W.

March 20, 1889

"The Blair Educational Amendment Bill. (Concluded.)" *American Sentinel* 4, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

3. It is utterly useless to talk about teaching the principles of the Christian religion as one would teach the principles of arithmetic and geography. Such a thing cannot be. Those sciences are fixed. There is no chance for a difference of opinion in regard to them. They are the same in every nation and among all classes of religionists and men of no religion at all. An infidel could not possibly teach any different principles of arithmetic than a Christian would. But it is not so with religion. Even though it had been decided by vote of a council, what the principles of the Christian religion are, that, as already shown, would not change any-body's mind, and every teacher of the Bible would give his teaching the bias of his own conception of truth. It could not be otherwise.

4. To obviate this, it is evident that, the principles of the Christian religion having been settled by the council of the churches, the State would have to embody them in a text-book, which all would be required to use. Mr. Blair has already seen the necessity for this, and has planned for it, as appears from the following extract from a letter which he wrote to the secretary of the National Reform Association:-

"I believe that a text-book of instruction in the principles of virtue, morality, and of the Christian religion, can be prepared for use in the public schools by the joint effort of those who represent every branch of the Christian church, both Protestant and Catholic."

First, of giving the Catholic Church the controlling voice in determining what religious instruction should be given in the public schools, so that very many, if not the majority, of the public schools would virtually be only Roman Catholic parochial schools. Second, it would necessarily result in withholding the Bible from the people. For even though the principles laid down in the text-books or catechisms were in harmony with the Bible, it would not do to let the teachers have free access to the Bible, or else they would be imbibing doctrines that would be heretical, according to the religion of the State, and would be teaching them to the children. Within four hundred years men have been burned at the stake for doing just such things as that, and punishment of some kind would certainly follow in this country.

So we see that from whatever side we approach this amendment, it provides only for a union of Church and State, and that union on the Catholic model. We have not indulged in any fanciful speculation. History repeats itself; because human nature is ever the same. The reason which led to the prohibiting of the Bible in the Middle Ages, will do the same thing now.

One other point in Senator Blair's remarks should be noticed. That is, that it is of the greatest importance that a child should possess a knowledge of the principles of the Christian religion, even if he does not apply those principles in his personal conduct. We most heartily dissent. We don't believe that the knowledge which Judas had of the principles of the Christian religion, and he must have had an intimate knowledge of them, made his traitorous act one whit better. The principles of the Christian religion are of no account whatever unless

they are applied to the personal conduct. Indeed they are worse than useless if not applied to the personal conduct, since they make the individual satisfied with a mere form of religion. And so again we charge this amendment with providing for a State religion which will be utterly destitute of the power of vital godliness, and of planning the education of children in this form, so that they will become conceited formalists, sunk in carnal security.

If anybody says that there is no danger that the amendment will ever be adopted, we warn him against indulging in any such delusion. The National Reform Association is to a man in favor of it. The *Christian Statesman*, of said:-

"Senator Blair's proposed amendment furnishes an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people."

In the *Christian Statesman* of September 6, 1888, Mr. John Alexander, the father and first president of the National Reform Association, congratulated the association on the introduction of the Blair amendment, and said: "The National Reform Association ought to spare no pains and omit no effort which may promise to secure its adoption." And in the issue of December 27, 1888, the same paper spoke most enthusiastically of both of Mr. Blair's religious bills, and said: "Both of these measures involve the principle of National Christianity," thus showing that we are not taking a partisan view when we say that its adoption will make the union of Church and State.

The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at its annual convention in New York in October, 1888, formally indorsed the Educational

67

Amendment bill. See the report of Resolution Committee, in *Daily Union Signal*, October 24, 1888.

Besides this, the American Sunday Union, which was organized to push the Sunday-Rest bill and similar measures, is in favor of it. In fact, where the Sunday-Rest bill would find one supporter, the Educational Amendment bill would probably find a dozen; because so many are carried away by the glittering promises in the last part of section two, that they cannot see the danger in the other part. While plucking the rose, they will be stung by the serpent, unless they are warned. Will not the reader of this join us in sounding the alarm?

E. J. W.

"The State to Enforce Church Discipline" *American Sentinel* 4, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

The *National Presbyterian*, January, 1889, in an editorial entitled, "The Church and the Sunday Newspaper," said:-

"The responsibility of the church for the continued existence of the Sunday newspaper, is beginning to attract the attention of thoughtful men. It is a fact which it is idle to attempt to conceal, that it is sustained by the patronage of the members of the evangelical churches. It is the support given them by this class, and this alone, that makes it practicable to continue the publication of these papers. The responsibility, then, of this great and growing evil is with the church."

Similar statements are very often made. That the churches are the greatest Sunday breakers is quite generally admitted. It is a fact that the first Sunday excursion train was run at the request of ministers and church people. In *Our Day*, January, 1889, there is an article by Prof. W. G. Ballantine, of Oberlin, Ohio, which is wholly devoted to a statement of how members of churches in the East disregard the Sunday when they are on pleasure excursions in the West. In that he makes it apparent that professed Sunday-keeping Christians are responsible for a large part of the business that is done on Sunday. He says:-

"There can never be a Sabbath in Colorado until Eastern Christians have more conscience. They give the lie, when they go there, to the teachings of the home missionaries whom they support there."

These testimonies might be duplicated many times over, but they are sufficient for the purpose of our argument. Read them again carefully before you go further. Mark well the statement of the *National Presbyterian*, that the Sunday newspaper, which is regarded as a synonym for the rankest kind of Sunday desecration, "is sustained by the patronage of the members of the evangelical churches. It is the support given them by this class, and this alone, that makes it practicable to continue the publication of these papers."

It is to stop just such things as this that Sunday laws are wanted. Everybody knows that whenever a speech is made urging the necessity for a Sunday law, the Sunday excursion and the Sunday newspaper are set forth as equal to the saloon in desecrating the day. Now take particular note of this point:-

1. Since, by the admission of the representatives of the churches, it is church members who are responsible for the greater part of the Sunday desecration, it is evident that if church members kept Sunday strictly, the amount of Sunday business and pleasure would be reduced to a minimum. 2. Since these church members do by the very act of becoming church members pledge them-selves to observe Sunday as a rest day, it is evident that in violating Sunday they are violating a rule of the church, and are proper subjects for church discipline. The *National Presbyterian* makes this very emphatic. 3. Therefore it is evident, further, that when these churches call for State and National laws to enforce Sunday observance, they are simply asking the civil power to enforce the rules of the church, and to execute church discipline.

Let the reader judge if this is not a legitimate conclusion. We know that it cannot be fairly disputed. And therefore the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws does mark the consummation of the union of Church and State. No different state of things from this ever existed in the middle ages. The church then declared who were heretical, and the civil power executed the penalty upon them. That is what the American Sunday Union is asking to-day, that the Government shall enforce one of the laws of the church. And so by the evidence which they themselves furnish, they are working to secure an exact re-production of the Papacy. No wonder they find Cardinal Gibbons willing to co-operate with them.

But they will say that many States have Sunday laws and have had them for a long time, and yet there have been no such terrible results as would naturally follow a union of Church and State. To this we reply: (1) That these laws have

been largely inoperative. It is this very fact which makes the American Sunday Union call for a National Sunday law. They want a National law to give efficiency to the State laws. Therefore it is not to be expected that we should have seen the full effect of Sunday laws. (2) But even with the manifest disadvantage which the Union claims, of having no National law to give force to the State laws, we have seen such results from Sunday laws in some States, notably in Arkansas and Tennessee, that we have no desire to see the union of Church and State made any more complete. If State Sunday laws can get in such deadly work now, what would they not do with a National law back of them to make them "efficient"? We leave the reader to solve the problem. E. J. W.

March 27, 1889

"Civil Sunday and Civil Lent" *American Sentinel* 4, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

A few weeks ago we received from a friend a long communication received by him from a friend who is a prominent and active member of the Prohibition party in Ohio. The letter was a defense of the Prohibition party against the charge of desiring religious legislation, but as it would fill about four pages of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, we were forced to decline it. One paragraph, however, we preserved, and present it herewith:-

"Nowhere has or does the Prohibition party ask that the Sabbath be preserved as a religious institution, but, on the contrary, asks it on purely civil grounds, and for purely civil reasons."

We are not disposed to deny that statement, and we are not aware that we have ever said any-thing to the contrary. It is admitted that the Prohibition party has asked for legislation in behalf of "the Sabbath," and that is enough. We care not on what grounds such legislation is asked for; we have no more objection to Sunday legislation upon avowedly religious grounds than we have for Sunday legislation upon professedly civil grounds. Sunday legislation is Sunday legislation, no matter what reason is given for it. It can have but one effect, whether asked for in the interest of religion, of temperance, of the workingman, as a "police regulation," or as a purely "sanitary arrangement," for the cure of corns or some other of the numerous ills that flesh is heir to.

We have no doubt that very many people are sincere in their appeal for "civil Sunday laws." They believe that religious legislation is a bad thing, and, without stopping to reason, they imagine that if they can only change the name, the evils will all vanish. Sunday is purely an institution of the church, and Sunday legislation cannot be anything else but religious legislation. This becomes specially apparent when its advocates talk about preserving "the Sabbath." It makes no difference what day of the week men have in mind when they speak of the Sabbath, the fact is that "the Sabbath" is a religious institution. If its observance is enforced by civil law, that will not deprive it of its ecclesiastical character. If Sunday observance is enjoined for purely civil reasons, then we

shall have religious legislation for civil reasons. Now it is not the reasons for the legislation that we object to, but the fact of the legislation.

The people who are active in the support of Sunday laws "for purely civil reasons," have a great deal to say about the kind of men who are elected to official positions in the State. They say that an immoral, licentious man should not be elected to public office. But the friends of these immoral men might say, We do not want to put them in office on the basis of their private moral characters, but solely on intellectual grounds; he may be an immoral man, but we are electing him only in his civil and not in his moral aspect. Would the National Reformers accept any such reasoning? Not by any means. They would say that an immoral man would still be an immoral man, no matter on what grounds he was placed in office. Why is it that they cannot or will not see that the name that may be given to Sunday legislation does not change its character.

The State might as well, command the observance of Lent as to command the observance of Sunday. Both are institutions of the church, and both might be enforced from "purely civil grounds." Certainly considerations of health demand that six weeks of the year should be spent in a mild mortification of the flesh. Thousands of people would have no intermission in their round of gaiety if it were not for the halt which Lent calls; yet there are other thousands who pay no attention to Lent, and who keep all sorts of amusements going, much to the discomfort of those who see them, and yet are deprived by the customs of their church from joining in them.

But when it comes to the interest of the workingman, then Lent is a long ways ahead of Sunday. Our National Reformers who have the good

74

of the workingman so much at heart, have been neglectful of their opportunities, or they would have know that Lent was perpetuated solely in the interest of working people. Read the following from "The Puritans and Queen Elizabeth," by Dr. Samuel Hopkins (Gould and Lincoln, 1860), Vol. 2, pp. 73-75:-

"A remarkable English reason for observing fast-days, and particularly the Lent Fast, is forced upon our notice by an order of the Council to the Archbishop on the thirteenth day of December.

"It was a matter of State policy-and wise, being insular policy-that 'the numbers of cattle should be increased, and that the abundance of fish which the sea yieldeth should be generally received. Besides, there should be great consideration had for the preservation of a navy and maintenance of convenient numbers of sea-faring men, both which would otherwise decay, if some means were not found whereby they might be increased.' King Edward VI. and his Council were of this mind. By proclamation January 16, 1547-48, 'the king allowed that men should on fast-days abstain from food of flesh to subdue the body unto the soul and spirit. And also for worldly and civil policy, to spare flesh and use fish for the benefits of the commonwealth where many be fishers, . . . and that the nourishment of the land might be increased by saving flesh, and especially at the spring-time when Lent doth commonly fall, and when the most common and plenteous breeding of flesh is, . . . and that divers of the king's subjects have good livings and riches in uttering and selling such meat as the

sea and waters do minister unto us.' These reasons were so highly appreciated that the Parliament, which met in the next November, enacted a law for observing fasting-days, which contains the very reasons given in this proclamation.

"But the Puritan aversion to everything which savored of superstition and of slavery to Rome, had turned against ceremonial, periodical fastings; and thus the fish-days of the church had fallen into general disrepute and desuetude. The fishermen found their occupation on the wane, and prayed to the Council for help.

"The Council, therefore, interfered; and, in terms unusually clear, set forth their reasons. Addressing a letter to the Archbishop, they wrote: 'The laws for the observation of Embring and Fifty Days are not so duly observed as they ought to be, and as is requisite in policy for the maintenance of mariners, fishermen, and the navy of the realm. Her Highness hath therefore given strait charge unto her own household for the observance of those days; and also, to the Lord Mayor of the City of London and other of her Majesty's officers and loving subjects abroad, to the intent. . . the State might take such benefit by the laws as was at the time of making intended. Which, we can assure your Lordship is *the only cause* why at this time the observation of the days is so much urged. . . We have thought good to require your Lordship to give order within your province, that the ministers and preachers be commanded in their sermons to the people to instruct them to conform themselves and their families to the said laws ; and further to declare unto them, that the same is not required for any liking of Popish ceremonies heretofore used (which are utterly detested), *but only to maintain the mariners and navy in this land, by setting men a fishing.*"

If our Catholic and Episcopal friends wish to enforce the observance of Lent, there is an abundance of ground on which they can do so, aside from its ecclesiastical character. What does it matter if it did originate with the church? People generally eat too much anyway, and it would be for the benefit of their health if they would fast a little. So let our Sunday-law friends be consistent, and while they legislate in behalf of the workingman, let them not forget Lent.

E. J. W.

April 3, 1889

"Questions of the Blair Bills" *American Sentinel* 4, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

EDITOR SENTINEL: I understand that you take the position that Senator Blair's Educational bill is in reality a bill for the "establishment of a national religion."

But I understand that the claim has been made, and on good authority, that the bill was introduced for the primary purpose of preventing a condition of things threatened by the recent at-tempt of the Catholics to gain control of the public schools of Boston and vicinity.

Do you not think that the lack of educational facilities in some States of the South had also much to do with the proposed legislation on that question?

Do not the prohibitions relative to institutions, corporations, or persons giving instruction or training "in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being or claiming to be religious in its character," prevent the possibility of the bill under consideration ever favoring the Catholic Church in teaching their peculiar doctrines in the public schools?

With such provisions incorporated into the United States Constitution, could not our general Government prevent under all circumstances the promulgation of Catholic views in communities where the Catholics were in the majority, as in California?

Do you not think that section 1 of the Educational bill will aid in carrying out the spirit of the first amendment to the United States Constitution?

Would not your objection to the bill be removed if the expression, "the principles of the Christian religion," in section 2, were omitted?

In your quotation from the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, in the article, "Provisions of the Sunday-Rest Bill," in the SENTINEL of February 20, do you not make two omissions of a very important part of the bill, viz., "to the disturbance of others"? Are not your arguments on the "absolute" requirements of the law for the Territories, based on such omissions? When you represent the bill as "obliging everybody to rest on Sunday" in the Territories, do you not convey an incorrect idea of its requirements?

I notice the bill is given in full in the report of the hearing of the Sunday-Rest bill. A large number of the reports have been printed by order of the Senate, and the readers of the SENTINEL in the several States can be supplied by addressing their respective senators. A full account of all that was said and done on the occasion of the hearing is given. The report is official and worthy of consideration by all candid investigators.

Yours truly, L. T. NICOLA.

To these questions we reply as follows: We have taught that the Blair Educational Amendment should properly be entitled, "An amendment providing for the establishment of a national religion," and we teach so still. The correctness of this teaching has been demonstrated by plain arguments.

We should be pleased to have our friend cite the "good authority" for the claim that the amendment is for the purpose of preventing the Catholics from getting control of the schools. But that is immaterial. It is of very little importance why the amendment was proposed; all that concerns us is the effect that it would have if it should ever become a part of the Constitution, and that we can ascertain from the wording of it, regardless of any claim that may be made for it. It has been demonstrated that the practical effect of the amendment would be to give the Roman Catholics virtual control of the public schools in many States, and, in fact, in the whole country. Thus:-

The second section provides that none of the doctrines, tenets, observances, etc., peculiar to any sect shall ever be taught in the public schools. But at the same time it stipulates that the principles of the Christian religion shall be taught. Now there are some things that one denomination regards as vital principles of the Christian religion, that other sects ignore; the teaching of these the proposed

amendment prohibits. It is obvious, therefore, that only those principles are contemplated which are common to all; and what these are can be determined only by a general church congress. But in such a congress the Roman Catholics, being stronger than any other sect, would hold the balance of power, and with their long experience in political wire pulling would have but little difficulty in running the convention to suit themselves. But even after such a convention each State would attend to its own educational affairs, and in those States where the Roman Catholics are in a majority, they would teach their religion.

But our friend misapprehends the position of the AMERICAN SENTINEL if he thinks that our opposition to the proposed amendment is solely on the ground that it may throw the schools into the hands of the Roman Catholics. We are utterly opposed to the Government's teaching religion of any kind whatever, or to any degree. If the Catholics were barred out entirely, and no principles were to be taught except those which are held in common by the Protestant sects, we should be as much opposed to it as we are now, or as we would be if it, proposed to give the Catholics sole control. We go farther, and say that we should oppose the amendment even if it provided that each State should see that its schools taught only the religious principles we hold to be vital. Our conception of the gospel is something entirely different from what that would be. We cannot imagine that the Saviour, who would not remain in a country when its inhabitants requested

84

him to leave, would take pleasure in seeing his gospel forced upon people who reject it in their hearts. Nothing could so surely bring the gospel of Christ into disrepute as the teaching of it to all, by the State. People who might be reached by persuasion, would be repelled by force.

The lack of educational facilities in the South had nothing to do with the proposed amendment. The Blair Educational bill, which has already passed the Senate, and which provides for the distribution of \$77,000,000 among the States, doubtless had that in view; but even that, if it should pass both Houses of Congress, would never be any help to the South. If that should pass, and the amendment should be adopted, the National Reform people would simply have \$77,000,000 at their disposal with which to teach religion in the public schools.

Section 1 of the Educational Amendment is nullified by section 2. The first section says that no State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, and section 2 demands that each State shall set itself to teach religion. The State doesn't need to make a law respecting an establishment of religion, when it is itself an establishment of religion—a machine for teaching it. If the amendment prohibited the teaching of any form of religion in the public schools, leaving all denominations free as they are now, to teach at their own expense whatever doctrines they choose to, we certainly should have no objection to it. But if the clause relative to the teaching of "virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion," were omitted from the proposed amendment, there would be nothing left. Senator Blair made his principal plea before the senate on that clause. He seemed to regard that as the main feature of the whole thing.

Now as to the Sunday-Rest bill. That bill has been printed in the SENTINEL no less than four times, so that it is not our fault if every reader of the SENTINEL does not understand it. We commented on the bill as it is, and also on the bill as the National Sunday Union wish to have it modified. There is no doubt that if the bill should pass it would be amended according to their wishes, since it is their bill. For our part, it makes no difference which form is adopted. The original form says that no work shall be done on Sunday "to the disturbance of others." But it would astonish one who has had no experience, to see how easily some people can be disturbed on Sunday. The reports of the Sunday-law cases in Arkansas show that nearly every man who was prosecuted for working on Sunday was working in so retired a place, and so quietly, that nobody could have found it out without taking special pains; yet people were greatly "disturbed" by it. We have seen people very much "disturbed" because they knew that some other people were working at a noiseless occupation in the privacy of their own rooms. A law providing for the punishment of anyone who does any work on Sunday "to the disturbance of others," would open the flood-gates of religious bigotry and persecution. As to the amended bill, which provides that no work shall be done on Sunday "in public," nothing more need be said.

We did not incorrectly represent the bill when we represented it as "obliging everybody to rest on Sunday," as the bill itself will show. The bill, as drafted by Senator Blair, says that "no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business" on the first day of the week. We should be pleased to have our friend, or anyone else, name some people that are not included in those terms. If the bill is not "absolute" in its requirements for rest, to the full extent of its jurisdiction, we do not know how language could be framed to make it any more so.

We sincerely hope that "all candid investigators" have the report of the hearing on the Sunday-Rest bill. If they have been hitherto in favor of the bill, the reckless determination on the part of the workers for the bill, to gain their ends, no matter at what cost to others, and the false and contradictory position taken, will suffice to convince them that the whole thing is an iniquitous scheme.

We are not infallible; and are as liable as others to make mistakes; but if we may always be as correctly represented as the Blair Sunday-Rest bill and its advocates have been in the AMERICAN SENTINEL, we shall be satisfied.

E. J. W.

April 10, 1889

"Sunday Laws and Temperance" *American Sentinel* 4, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

By the above heading we do not mean to imply that Sunday laws and temperance have anything in common, or that they have any connection, for they do not. We have had some sharp discussions with friends that thought we ought not to pronounce wholesale condemnation on Sunday laws, but ought to work

for, or at least not antagonize, laws prohibiting the selling of liquor on Sunday. But the more we see of the Sunday-law argument, the more convinced we are that no more vicious law could be passed than a so-called temperance Sunday law. All such laws are designed solely to exalt the Sunday above other days, but they do also exalt the liquor traffic to a place of respectability. We have lately come across a little tract on the subject, which shows this more plainly than anything we have ever before seen.

The tract in question is entitled, "Through the Side Door." It is published by the "New York Sabbath Committee," and purports to have been written by a working-woman. At the top of the first page of the tract, the following statement appears: "This paper received the prize of fifty dollars for the best essay on Sunday Liquor Selling, by a working man or woman." This shows that the argument is considered an extra good one.

As a matter of fact, and as might be expected, the tract contains no argument whatever. It is simply a story, whether of real or fictitious occurrences is not stated. The lady represents herself as having been employed in a library just across the street from a saloon, where she could see all that went on. Moreover, the bartender was a patron of the library, and with him she had frequent talks. In the first conversation the young man told how he was forced, by lack of employment, to engage in the saloon business. After stating that he was obliged to tend bar or starve, the following dialogue occurred:-

*"Working-woman-*Could not these same arguments be used just as well by a man who, from being out of money, had taken to house breaking or highway robbery?

*"Bartender-*Perhaps they might, and most men would feel justified in doing either of those things rather than starve. But you must remember that those avocations are not lawful businesses, as ours is.

*Working-woman-*Except when you sell on Sunday."

There you have it. In this tract, issued for the purpose of arousing public sentiment in favor of Sunday laws, and against the saloon, the liquor traffic is plainly declared to be lawful and right on any day but Sunday.

But this is not all. After describing the building owned by Mr. Rorkle, for whom the young man tended bar, and speaking of the side door, she says:-

"Now we knew, and all the neighbors knew, that despite the law, many customers of the bar-room came through this door every Sunday, and procured drinks just as easily as upon any other day.

92

Men went into the door with natural complexion and demeanor, and came out flushed and excited; they went in with sedate expression and firm step, and came out with dazed and vacant look and unsteady limbs. We and the other neighbors all were perfectly cognizant of how the laws of the land (and higher laws beside) were violated every Sunday, over at that corner, and yet none of us liked to become an informer."

There it is again. Of course it is understood that there was a law against selling liquor on Sunday, and none against selling it on other days of the week, but we challenge anybody to show that the whole tenor of that paragraph does

not go to support the idea that it is the day that makes the business wrong. Doubtless she and her neighbors saw the same scenes enacted every day, if they looked for them on any other day; they must have seen men go in sober and come out intoxicated and silly; but it didn't disturb them on any day but Sunday. The tract makes mention of Mr. Rorkle, telling what a fine, law-abiding man he was, and only one fault is recorded against him, namely, that he kept open his saloon on Sunday.

We have no apology to offer for liquor selling. We believe that liquor is the cause of an untold amount of crime, and that it results in nothing but evil. But to say that it is worse to sell liquor on Sunday than on other days is the same as saying that it is worse to kill a man on Sunday than on any other day in the week. We take no stock in Sunday liquor laws, because we know that they do not help the cause of temperance a particle. On the contrary, they hinder it, by elevating the liquor traffic to a level with all other employments. Moreover, from what we have seen of the working of such laws, and from the arguments that are adduced in favor of them, we know that if strict Sunday laws were once secured, that would practically put an end to all temperance legislation. No general effort would ever be made to close saloons on other days. And so we say that the profession that Sunday liquor laws are temperance laws is the result either of ignorance or hypocrisy.

E. J. W.

April 17, 1889

"Is This 'the Breath of the Puritan'?" *American Sentinel* 4, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Western Christian Union* is the name of a paper that is published weekly in the city of Oakland. We are thus explicit because, from what we shall quote from it, some might think that it is published in some remote portion of the world, where Christianity has not yet penetrated. Not only is it published in "the Athens of the Pacific Coast," but its editor is the Rev. G. W. Bothwell, D.D., pastor of the Second Congregationalist Church of Oakland. In his issue of March 22 the editor has a diatribe against the Adventists for the work which they did in securing signatures to the petitions against religious legislation by Congress, though we cannot see why he should level all his guns at the Adventists, since men of every denomination and profession signed that petition, and worked for it.

After saying that if the Blair Sunday-Rest bill should become a law, "it will be the formulated sentiments of nine-tenths of all the evangelical churches of the country," thus admitting that it is wholly a religious bill, he proceeds thus:-

"Against these majorities, constituted as they are, why are our Adventist friends continuously protesting? We are weary of Ishmaelitism in theology and upon questions of public morals. The methods employed in securing many of the 31,000 names of alleged citizens of California, recently presented in Congress, were not creditable to any people calling themselves religious. We refer to their practice of button-holing unsuspecting citizens in the railroad waiting-rooms, and

on the street corners-not a few of whom were wholly unfamiliar with the question, and of inducing them to sign a narrow, sectarian protest, under the specious plea that the Constitution of the United States was threatened. We had entertained a high opinion of this people until we were forced to observe how they secured signatures to their recent petition."

Well, we are glad that he bears testimony to the fact that people were button-holed before they signed the petition against religious legislation. He has been forced to observe the methods employed by those who canvassed for signatures. He is sure that they actually got near enough to the men whose names appear on it to button-hole them. And over 31,000-about 10,000 more-have been thus approached. Yet Mr. Bothwell is not pleased. Indeed, he feels very much grieved over the course taken. Why? Was, it because he thinks the canvassers were too painstaking? No; he is grieved and indignant and angry to think that the canvassers should actually button-hole unsuspecting persons, and ask them to sign the petition. Doubtless he would have had them send a postal card to every person a week beforehand, informing them that on such a day they would be pleased to meet them to confer about the propriety of asking Congress not to pass a law enforcing religious observances. Then, no doubt, he would have had a crier precede each canvasser, and announce his mission, so that no "unsuspecting citizens" could possibly be approached.

But if he would have had all this precaution taken in securing signatures; if he feels so indignant at the thought that men were actually button-holed without previous warning, who can picture what his feelings must be at the thought that of the 14,437,744 alleged petitioners for a national Sunday law, only 407 had any opportunity to be button-holed about it? It has been some time since we exposed the iniquitous scheme by which the friends of the Blair Sunday bill sought to make Congress believe that public sentiment was overwhelmingly in favor of their measure, therefore we show it up again in another part of this paper, with a few points that were not previously noticed. Please turn and read that before you read further, and think that a man who has no word of condemnation or apology for such a course, says that it was disreputable to go to men in person and ask them to read the petition and sign it. What is the ground of his objection? Simply this, that so many *bona fide* signatures have been obtained to the protest. As what follows will show, he thinks it outrageous that any should dare protest against being ruled by a few self-constituted religious leaders.

Passing by more of the same unto quid sort we come to the following, which carries with it far more than the breath of the Puritan; it is the breath of the Inquisition:-

"Most of the States make provision for the exercise of the peculiar tenets of belief which are entertained by the Adventists. They can worship on

Saturday, and call it the Sabbath, if they choose, but there let their privileges end. Instead of thankfully making use of concessions granted them, and then going off quietly and attending to their own business, as they ought, they start out making unholy alliances that they may defeat the purposes of their benefactors. None of these bills are aimed at them, but if they fail to appreciate the fact, they may yet

call down upon themselves such a measure of public disfavor as that legislation embarrassing to them may result."

Shades of Dominic! Did anyone ever hear of more cool assumption? "Upon what meat cloth this our CÆsar feed, that he has grown so great?" Seventh-day people "can worship on Saturday, and call it the Sabbath, if they choose, but there let their privileges end." If they are not thankful for these "concessions," and if they work against "the purposes of their benefactors," they may call down upon themselves such a measure of public disfavor as that "legislation embarrassing to them may result." Now what does this mean? Simply this: That these Sunday-law people are beginning to assume that the Lord created the earth for their especial benefit, and that it is a great "concession" on their part for them to allow anybody even to think differently from them. Those who do not do as they do ought to be thankful that they are privileged to live in this country. They are the "benefactors" of Seventh-day people, because they have tolerated them so long. Did the Papacy in its worst days ever assume any more lordly position?

It means further that if Seventh-day people will keep perfectly quiet, and be content with the privilege of resting on Saturday, they will not be molested. But let them, as Mr. Edwards said, begin to "rave;" that is, let them but teach their conscientious convictions to others, and then "legislation embarrassing to them may result." This can mean nothing else than that, whereas Seventh-day people are allowed, by existing and pro-posed Sunday laws, to rest on Saturday if they choose, they will be prohibited from doing even this if they rebel against their "benefactors," and refuse to rest also on Sunday, and if they attempt to stir up others to similar rebellion. This is a declaration of intention on the part of the Sunday-law agitators a little in advance of anything we have previously heard.

Mr. Bothwell says of Seventh-day people that "none of these [Sunday] bills are aimed at them." We cannot say definitely as to that, but we know where they always hit. We know that Sunday laws, whatever the purpose for which they are enacted, are always used for the purpose of "embarrassing" those who observe the seventh day of the week.

In 1885, Arkansas had Sunday laws reading as follows:-

"SECTION 1883. Every person who shall on the Sabbath, or Sunday, be found laboring, or shall compel his apprentice or servant to labor or perform service other than customary household duties of daily necessity, comfort, or charity, on conviction thereof shall be fined one dollar for each separate offense.

"SEC. 1884. Every apprentice or servant compelled to labor on Sunday shall be deemed a separate offense of the master.

"SEC. 1885. The provision of this act shall not apply to steamboats and other vessels navigating the waters of the State, nor such manufacturing establishments as require to be kept in continual operation.

"SEC. 1886. Persons who are members of any religious society who observe as Sabbath any other day of the week than the Christian Sabbath, or Sunday, shall not be subject to the penalties of this act [the Sunday law], so that they observe one day in seven, agreeable to the faith and practice of their church or society."

In the session of the Arkansas Legislature of 1885, section 1886 was repealed, by act of March 3. The object of those who secured the repeal of that section was, as they said, to close the saloons. It was claimed that, under cover of that section, certain Jews who kept saloons in Little Rock had successfully defied the law against Sunday saloons, and that there was no way to secure the proper enforcement of the law without the repeal of that section. The legislators believed the statements made, and repealed the section as stated.

"Bear in mind that the object of this movement was said to be to close the saloons on Sunday; and what discussion there was on the bill in both the Senate and the House, shows that such was the object, so far as the legislators understood it. But when the act was secured, and was framed into a law, not a saloon was closed, nor was there an attempt made, any more than before, to close them. Not one of the saloon keepers was prosecuted. And in Little Rock itself, during the session of the Legislature of 1887, when the law was in full force, up to the time of the restoration of the exemption clause, the saloons kept their doors wide open, and conducted their business with no effort at concealment, the same as they had before the act was passed. But, so far as we have been able to learn by diligent investigation, from the day of its passage, the law was used for no other purpose than to punish peaceable citizens of the State who observed the seventh day as the Sabbath, and exercised their God-given right to work on Sunday."

A. T. Jones, of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, who makes the above statement, has had the privilege of investigating the records of the cases of those who were prosecuted under the law as amended, and has published them in his pamphlet, "Civil Government and Religion." In another article, entitled, "Where Sunday Laws Hit," in this week's issue, we shall present some of those cases, that our readers may learn the practical workings of "temperance Sunday laws." As they read these things we ask them to decide whether or not they want the Inquisition set up in this country. People may talk as much as they please about the enlightenment of this nineteenth century, and the impossibility for persecution to arise; but every can-did person whose eyes are open must see that we are upon the very eve of as bitter a persecution as ever disgraced this earth. The minds of men are being inflamed by ecclesiastical leaders, and all that is needed is the color of law to give the malignant passions of bigots full exercise. E. J. W.

"Whose Image and Superscription Is This?" *American Sentinel* 4, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

It is evident that the leaders in the American Sabbath Union are considerably disturbed over the SENTINEL'S disclosure of their crooked methods in obtaining indorsements to their petitions to Congress. This is shown by the fact that they are endeavoring to shield themselves by insinuating that unfair methods were employed by those who secured signatures to the counter petition. It is worthy of note, however, and should be remembered by all, that the worst charge that has yet been brought by the most bigoted Sunday-law worker is that people were "button-holed" and asked to sign it. Inasmuch as no one could put his own

signature to the petition unless the canvasser did come pretty close to him with it, we regard this as a good testimonial to the conscientiousness with which the work was performed.

We have before called attention to the frauds practiced by the active workers for a Sunday law, but we fear that some have lost sight of them. Many people still think that fourteen million signatures have actually been obtained to the petition asking Congress to make a Sunday law. We ourselves were deceived at the first into thinking that two or three million signatures had been obtained; but when the number jumped at once from six million to fourteen million, by the letter from Cardinal Gibbons, we knew there was fraud; and from that time we kept discovering fresh frauds. Following is a brief statement of them.

The petition for a Sunday law, to which it is claimed that upwards of fourteen million signatures have been obtained, reads thus:-

"The undersigned, adult residents of the, United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding in the Nation's mail and military service, and in inter-State commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday work, traffic, etc."

That is plain enough to be understood by anybody. If that had been circulated in a legitimate manner, for individual signatures, no complaint could have been made. But right on the face of the sheet which contained the petition, provision was deliberately made for fraud. Immediately below the petition was the following note:-

"When a labor organization or church, or any other society, indorses the petition BY VOTE, let the 'name' of the organization be signed, with the attesting signatures of the presiding officer and clerk or secretary, with place and date, and in the margin, under 'number of petitioners,' indicate the numbers in the organization petitioning."

This meant that at any meeting of any church or society, a vote could be taken on the petition. If a majority of the members present voted in favor of it, the presiding officer and the clerk would sign their names and set down the number of members in the entire church or society. Now it must be evident to the most zealous partisan that such a plan could not by any possibility secure an individual expression of opinion. In the first place it allowed a part to speak for the whole.

Not only was this provision made for fraud, but people were urged to commit fraud by securing the indorsement of the same person twice. In the "Monthly Document" of the American Sabbath Union, for December, the following appeared in a circular which editors were requested to publish:-

"We ask every religious paper to publish our petition, and every church and preachers' meeting and religious conference or convention to indorse the petition by resolution, and also, as far as possible, by individual signatures, which duplicate its strength."

That is plain enough, too. The leaders of the American Sabbath Union deliberately urged people to perpetrate fraud in securing indorsements of the Sunday-Rest bill. The above shows that the indorsement "by vote" was considered the chief thing. Whenever there was an assembly they wanted those present to vote the indorsement of the organization, so that all the members

could be counted as favoring the petition, and then they wanted the strength of the petition duplicated, "as far as possible" by individual signatures. This shows that the securing of individual signatures was considered a secondary matter, except that those individual signatures would duplicate the strength of the petition. A church of three hundred members could indorse the petition by vote some Sunday evening, and the whole three hundred counted for it, even though no more than one hundred members were present. Then zealous workers could secure the individual signatures of two-thirds of the members, including those present at the time of the vote; and so from a church of three hundred members, of whom only one hundred had seen the petition, and only one hundred more had heard of it, a list of five hundred petitioners could be sent in. And just such fraud as this was provided for and urged by the leaders in the Sunday-law movement. The method of indorsement "by vote" was so much easier, however, that, as will be seen, very little effort was made to secure individual signatures.

On Wednesday, January 16, the first petitions were presented to Congress. After senators from several States, including Illinois, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Indiana, had presented petitions from churches, labor unions, Woman's Christian Temperance Unions, etc., from their respective States, Mr. Blair arose and said:-

"I present petitions of several bodies, praying for the passage of a Sunday-Rest law. Of the petitions, the following analysis is submitted by those who desire their presentation:-

Petitions from national bodies:

CONTENTS

1. Individual signatures	407
2. Representative signatures by indorsements of bodies and meetings	14,174,337
Total	14,174,744

"Analysis of the latter:-

"First indorsement is that of the American Sabbath Union, which was officially constituted by official action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Home Missionary Society of the Baptist Church, the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church (North and South), and the Synod of the Reformed Church, five denominations, whose membership together is 5,977,693. Of the membership of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the indorsement of whose international convention stands second, at least 20,000 citizens of the United States. Of the Knights of Labor, the indorsement of whose international convention stands third, at least 219,000 citizens of the United States. The Presbyterian General Assembly, North, whose action stands next, had at the time of the indorsement 722,071 members. The convention of Christian Workers, whose indorsement is next, had 450 present when the unanimous vote of indorsement was taken. The Woman's Christian Temperance

Union, which comes next, had 185,521 at the time of the vote. The Roman Catholics, for whom Cardinal Gibbons speaks, number 7,200,000."

Now what do we learn from this? Several things, namely: That out of 14,174,744 alleged petitioners for the Sunday law, only 407 persons actually signed the petition. That in order to produce a greater effect, the petitions were presented first by States and Territories, and then in bulk. In that way the strength of the petitions, which had already been duplicated, was duplicated again.

But this is not all. We find that the entire membership of the Methodist, the Baptist, and the Presbyterian Churches in the United States is taken to help make up the 14,174,744 alleged petitioners. This was done because the annual convention of those bodies indorsed the petition. A vote by a few hundred people was thus swelled into nearly seven million. Not only so, but by the wording of the petition, every member of those churches was certified to as being "21 years of age or more." Of course everybody recognizes that as another fraud.

Still further: The entire membership of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Knights of Labor, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, is counted on the strength of a vote taken by a few members of those bodies, in convention assembled. Of course the members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union could, on general principles, be counted as favoring the bill; but as they are Christian women, they of course belong to some one of the churches previously reported. The same is true largely of the Knights of Labor and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. Not only were they represented as favoring the bill, although but few of them had ever heard of it, and many were opposed, but they were represented three times, as we have already seen.

More yet: After this 14,000,000 and more petitioners, only 407 of whom ever petitioned, had been presented to Congress as organizations, then as churches, etc., Mr. Blair arose again and said:-

"I have here a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Jersey, with 6,000 members; of Indiana, 2,500 members; of Massachusetts, 6,000; of Delaware, 800; of Illinois, 9,000; of Iowa, 6,000; of Pennsylvania, 6,000; of Dakota, 1,800, and the National nearly 20,000, praying Congress, etc."

Just think! Petitions from many of these State temperance unions had been first presented by other senators. Then they were presented in the churches, then in the National Union, then again separately, and then once more in the National W. C. T. U. again; and after all this some more petitions were presented from Temperance Unions and "Sabbath Associations." Some of these good women were therefore presented as petitioners not less than six times in one day; and since then petitions have been presented from the same people nearly every day while the session lasted.

But this is not all by any means. Mr. Blair said in his analysis of the petitions: "The Roman Catholics, for whom Cardinal Gibbons speaks, number 7,200,000." Cardinal Gibbons had written a letter to Mr. Crafts, personally favoring the Sunday bill, and on the strength of that letter, the American Sabbath Union counted 7,200,000 names. Not only that, but they certified that all the Catholics in the United States, men, women, and children-are "21 years of age or more." Not

only did Cardinal Gibbons say nothing about indorsing the petition for anybody but himself,

100

which he clearly had no right to do, but he himself, as will be seen by his letter, which follows declares that he had no thought of committing anybody else.

One thing more shows the unprincipled methods employed to manufacture a huge list in favor of the Sunday bill. Not content to have the separate labor organizations indorse it by "representation," that is, by a vote of a few, which could not represent the body, Mr. Crafts has lately gone to work to secure the indorsement of the Federated Trades, by which means he is able to count all the laboring men again. Thus he can count every man as many times as there are associations to which he belongs. Not only so, but by their peculiar scheme of representative indorsement, they count many who are positively opposed to their movement, and who have signed the counter petition.

Now we ask the readers of the SENTINEL to decide whose image and whose superscription this Sunday movement bears. Does it bear the stamp of God? God cannot lie. But there is another being, the enemy of God and of all righteousness, the prince of the power of the air, "the spirit which now worketh in the children of disobedience," whose sole method of work is by fraud and deceit. Of him it is written that "he is a liar, and the father of it." We make no further statements, but leave the reader to trace the parentage of the Sunday movement as best he can.

Let those who have been misrepresented by being counted in these wholesale indorsements, and those who have not been aware of the character of the movement, protest vigorously, and at once, so that the leaders in the Sunday-law movement may no longer be able to pose before Congress as the representatives of all goodness and honesty.

E. J. W.

May 1, 1889

"Sunday Law and the Law of Nature" *American Sentinel* 4, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

A gentleman in Kansas, who has been receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL for some months, by the courtesy of a friend, writes to us that he does not indorse its teachings, and particularizes after the following fashion:-

"It would be unwise to enter into detail, but I am amazed that Americans calling themselves intelligent should oppose so-called civil Sunday legislation, and, at the same time, favor legislation touching other propositions contained in the decalogue. 'Thou shalt not kill,' 'Thou shalt not steal,' 'Thou shalt not bear false witness,' etc., might as well be kicked against on religious grounds as, 'Remember the Sabbath-day,' etc.

"I have had personal occasion to know that a mule team can make a one-thousand-mile journey at the rate of six days per week, and come out at the end in less time and in better condition than when worked seven days per week.

"I once asked a locomotive engineer which would be the best for the locomotive, all other things being equal, forty-two days' work in six weeks, or forty-two days' work in seven weeks? He replied, 'The latter, by all means.' Mules and locomotives cannot be accused of religious fanaticism.

"My conclusion is that a rest-day of one in seven is *inwrought into the nature of things*. You and I cannot change it. We may buck, and kick, and wax profane, but the great law of a necessary rest-day will still exist, and the higher the enlightenment the more the law will be recognized."

We quote this much of the letter because it is a fair sample of the understanding, or rather the misunderstanding, which Sunday-law advocates seem to have of our opposition to their work. Our correspondent well says that we are opposed to "so-called civil Sunday legislation." That is it, exactly. It is so-called civil Sunday legislation, but actually religious or ecclesiastical Sunday legislation. To show that this is so we make a few quotations.

In an article in the *California Prohibitionist*, of December 6, 1888, the Rev. N. R. Johnston, a prominent National Reformer, said:-

"We do ask a law that will be in accordance with the divine law of the fourth commandment."

And again:-

"We recommend most strenuous and prayerful efforts in the States and Territories to secure legislation in harmony with the fourth commandment."

In Mr. Crafts's speech before the general assembly of the Knights of Labor, at Indianapolis, November 16, 1888, he said:-

"A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out and you take the rest out."

The Rev. James Brand, D.D., in an article in the *Advance* of March 21, 1889, said:-

"If there is no good moral principle behind the Sunday law it cannot stand."

And Colonel Shepard, president of the American Sabbath Association, in his address upon his election, said: "Every man, woman, and child in our country is going to be judged by the fourth commandment," indicating, as Mr. Johnston said, that Sunday laws are designed to enforce the religious observance of the day.

Finally, as an admission of what we have always claimed, we quote from a sermon by Rev. Byron Sunderland, D. D., entitled, "The Right to Sunday Laws," published in the *New York Evangelist*, March 28, 1889. Speaking of the declaration made by Mr. Wolfe of the secular league, before the Senate Committee, that "he did not object to the civil Sunday, and would help to enforce it," Mr. Sunderland says:-

"No man can make such an admission and not go to the end with those who secure and retain a Christianity which is the rational observance of our American Sabbath in every particular. It is simply impossible to have a civil Sunday, that is, a day of rest from ordinary occupation, and not exclude from it a voluntary religious observance. The declaration forcibly reminds one of a certain lord bishop who said, 'Oh, but you know, John, I do not swear as a bishop, only as a

man.' 'That is true, your grace,' replied the valet, but I was thinking when the devil comes for the man what will become of the bishop who said, 'Oh but you know, John, I do not swear as a bishop, only as a man.' 'That is true, your grace,' replied the valet, but I was thinking when the devil comes for the *man* what will become of the *bishop*?"

These statements, from among many that might be quoted, show not only that Sunday legislation is religious legislation, but that it cannot by any possibility be anything else.

Concerning the sixth, eighth, and ninth commandments, which our correspondent quotes, we have this to say: First, that there is a universally recognized difference between the first four commandments and the last six. The first four relate

114

only to man's duty to God, but the last six present his duty to his fellow-men. With man's duty to God no man has any right to interfere, but Governments exist for the sole purpose of preserving the proper relation of citizens to one another. Second, legislation concerning killing and stealing and bearing false witness is not legislation upon the sixth, eighth, and ninth commandments, and does not derive its authority from those commandments. The Government punishes the murderer, not because the commandment says it is wrong to kill, but because the murderer interferes with the right to life and liberty which the Government grants to all citizens. This is shown further by the fact that, when the Government punishes the murderer, it does not execute one particle of the penalty for breaking the sixth commandment. The punishment which civil government metes out to the murderer does not make his guilt any the less, or leave him any the less to answer for before the bar of God. It is simply a pledge on the part of the Government that the people shall be protected in future from his lawlessness.

We might call attention, while passing, to the fact that Sunday legislation has nothing whatever to do with the fourth commandment, even though it were proper and possible for Government to legislate concerning the decalogue. A man will search in vain for any reference to Sunday in the fourth commandment. A law in accordance with the divine law of the fourth commandment, such as Mr. Johnston wants, would enforce the observance of the seventh day, or Saturday; but, although this day is enjoined by the commandment, civil government has no right to enforce its observance.

Our correspondent says that "a mule team can make a thousand miles' journey at the rate of six days per week, and come out at the end in less time and in better condition than when worked seven days per week." We do not question that at all, but we claim that it affords no reason for Sunday legislation. Granting that man and beast could do more work if they rest one day in seven, what is there in that to indicate that that day should be Sunday? and what right has the Government to specify on which day they shall take their needed rest? We are not, as he imagines, "kicking against a rest-day." We not only believe in the right of every man to rest one day in seven if he chooses to, but we also believe that it is the duty of every man to rest one day in seven, even on the day which the fourth commandment enjoins; but we do not recognize the right of Government to

say that a man shall do his duty in regard to the fourth commandment, any more than it may compel him to obey the first, and worship God.

Then again there is a difference of opinion among men as to what day is enjoined by the fourth commandment; and Government has no more right to decide the question between them than it has to interfere with men's honest difference concerning the age of the earth or the mode of baptism. Every man has reason, and one man cannot think for another, neither can the Government take it upon itself to do the thinking for all its citizens.

In line with the statement that "mules will do more work if allowed to rest one day in seven," is the statement that "a rest-day of one in seven is inwrought in the nature of things;" but that does not prove that the Government should compel men to comply with that law, neither does it indicate upon what day that periodical rest should be taken. If we are to fall back upon the law of nature, then we must let nature execute her own laws, or else we must legislate upon everything which the laws of nature demand.

We will take a parallel and see how it works. The necessity for bodily rest is inwrought in the very nature of man, and not only so, but nature has indicated when that rest should be taken, by making a regularly recurring period of darkness, in which sleep is natural, and work is most difficult. Now, if the State may legislate concerning a weekly rest, surely there is more reason why it should legislate concerning a daily rest, because the daily rest is more necessary to one's physical well-being than is the weekly rest, and nature indicates when the daily rest should be taken, but indicates nothing concerning the time of the weekly rest. If the State may say that all men must rest upon Sunday because it is good to rest one day in seven, then it may likewise say that all men must take eight hours' sleep every night. And just as the State makes no difference even though a man may have rested one day in the week and is not tired when Sunday comes, so it must make no difference even though a man is not tired when the regularly appointed hour for retiring comes. Sunday-law makers say that those who observe another day than Sunday are a very small minority, and that they must submit even though they are inconvenienced and obliged to lose more time than others. They say that the liberty of rest for one depends upon the law of rest for all. Now we will apply that argument in another case.

The State, as we have seen, is under greater obligation to compel people to rest every day than to rest once a week, but when it comes to enforcing this law, it finds some men who are employed upon a morning newspaper, and who are obliged to work in the night and to take their needed rest in the day-time. These would naturally protest against a law compelling everybody to go to bed at nine o'clock and stay there till five in the morning; but the advocates of the law may claim that the liberty of rest for each depends upon the law of rest for all, and that no discrimination can be made. The number of those who work upon morning newspapers is only a small proportion of the number of inhabitants of the country, and the convenience of the majority must be considered. We think, that anyone can see the injustice of this, and we know that the only reason why they cannot see the gross injustice of the same argument concerning Sunday is because of prejudice and religious bigotry.

Later on in his letter, our friend tells about people who have been "downed" in trying to reverse the nature of things; but, as we have shown, we are not trying to reverse the nature of things. We are not protesting against a weekly rest-day. All that we protest against is the assumption that, because some men want to take their rest on Sunday, everybody else must be compelled to do likewise. This is not in the nature of things only as it is man's nature to be selfish; and against such unreasonable selfishness as that everybody ought to protest. It is neither civil nor religious.

E. J. W.

May 15, 1889

"Fitly Designated" *American Sentinel* 4, 16.

E. J. Waggoner

The leading article in *Our Day* for April is an address by Rev. W. F. Crafts, at Mr. Cook's Monday lecture, March 25, and is entitled, "A Strategic Year in Sabbath Reform." This is a most appropriate heading for a summary of the work of the American Sabbath Union during the year 1888. It shows that Mr. Crafts appreciates the situation. A strategem is defined by Webster as "a trick by which some advantage is to be obtained. An artifice." Strategic means, "pertaining to strategy, effected by artifice. Therefore, since, according to Mr. Crafts, the year 1888 has been a strategic year in the Sunday work, it has been a year of trickery and fraud.

That this is indeed so must be evident to anyone who has read the SENTINEL'S exposure of the methods of Mr. Crafts and his associate Sunday reformers. They started out with deceit, and with exhortation to deceive, when they requested all public conventions to indorse the Sunday petition by vote, and then to duplicate the strength of the petition as far as possible by securing the individual signatures of the assembly. Then, by securing a few representative indorsements, they counted in whole denominations, thousands of members of which had never heard of the petition. A letter from Cardinal Gibbons stating simply that he personally favored the movement, was forthwith counted as the signatures of 7,200,000 Catholics. Not content with counting in the entire membership of the various religious organizations as well being twenty-one years of age or more, they went to Sunday-schools, and secured the names of the children to their petition, which stated that each signer is twenty-one years of age or more. Then, in order to swell their list of petitioners, they counted some of the religious denominations twice, then counted the Woman's Christian Tempperance Unions as local organizations as State organizations, and again twice as a national organization, besides already having counted them in with the religious bodies. The same way with the Knights of Labor. They secured the votes of local assemblies, then by a vote of the general assembly they counted in the entire organization, and then securing a favorable vote from the Counsel of Federated Trades they succeeded in counting the workingmen in again, although thousands of them are opposed to the Blair bills.

Mr. Crafts went in person to the Assemblies of the Knights of Labor and pleaded with them to indorse his petition. Yet he claims that the petition was started to satisfy the clamor of the workingmen! Not content with these methods of making it appear that the great majority of the people of the country are calling for Sunday laws, they now garble the statements of those who are opposing the movement with all their might, and give it out that their opposition is really not opposition, but a plea for the law.

Then again the Rev. Herrick Johnson, in his address on Sunday newspapers at the Washington Conference, in December, said, as quoted in the February number of *Our Day*:-

"If we base the Sabbath on mere human expediency, we base it on sand, just as we would found honesty, if we adopted it simply as a policy. This is no basis for the Sabbath, to put it on the ground of mere expediency. I do not question the propriety of using this argument as a means of influencing a certain class of men. Many will join in this Sunday movement and work heartily in the defense of Sunday as a rest-day, in the interests of health and morals, and good citizenship, who will not come to the higher ground. But we can never permanently keep our Sabbath on the basis of expediency."

Here we find this man, a zealous advocate of Sunday laws, deliberately counseling the use of argument in which he does not believe, in order to catch some who will not accept the argument in which he does believe. Much more to the same intent might be quoted, but this is sufficient to show the aptness of the title which Mr. Crafts gives to his summary of Sunday work,-a year of artifice and fraud. The same course was pursued in the history of the early church, as is shown by the following quotation from Mosheim:-

"By some of the weaker brethren, in their anxiety to assist God with all their might (in the propagation of the Christian faith), such dishonest artifices were occasionally resorted to as could not, under any circumstances, admit of excuse, and were utterly unworthy of that sacred cause which they were unquestionably intended to support."-*Commentaries, cent. 2, sec. 7.*

It was just such work as that which resulted in the establishment of the man of sin-the Papacy. It is just such work in these days that will result in the formation of a living image to that man of sin-an American Papacy.

E. J. W.

May 22, 1889

"Protection to Religious Worship, and the Bible in the Schools"

American Sentinel 4, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago we received from a friend in the East some questions concerning Sunday legislation, and religious teaching in the schools, which had been put to him, and which he could not answer. As they are questions that might be asked to anyone, we print them herewith and give our reply, for the benefit of all:-

"Your position is no civil Sabbath laws. Such a position, carried out with our present influx of foreign element, will soon reduce our present Christian Sabbath to the level of the Continental Sabbath—a day of excursions, picnics, beer gardens, revelries, and, if desired, make a day of din or confusion right when the majority desire to engage in worship. You cry out against coercion on one side but lose sight of protection on the other. Here are what you would regard as two evils, and one or the other of them must be chosen; hence, would it not be better to have a Sunday law? Is not a village or neighborhood with a Sunday law where things are kept quiet better than one where everything runs riot on Sunday?"

"2. The position of the SENTINEL is no Bible in the schools if objected to by Catholics. Many of our text-books have the name of God in referring to him as Creator, etc. Suppose some atheist objects, shall his objection be sustained? Some 'fogy' objects to grammar being taught because he don't believe in it; shall his objection be sustained?"

"Does not the matter of finances, building school-houses, and *selection of text-books lie with the majority?*—It certainly does. Then if they choose to select the best of all books for a school reader have they not power to do so, even if it does not suit the majority?"

The first question has been answered many times, but we will answer it again more in detail. The answer is very simple. The whole point is protection to religious worship on Sunday. This is the great plea that made in favor of Sunday laws. People must be protected in their right to worship. We say so too; but there is no necessity for Sunday laws in order to secure this undisturbed worship. To show that this is so, we will make some extracts from the penal codes of a few of the States. Section 302 of the penal code of California reads as follows:—

"Every person who willfully disturbs or disquiets any assembly of people met for religious worship, by noise, profane discourse, rude or indecent behavior, or by any unnecessary noise, either within the place where such worship is held, or so near as to disturb the order and solemnity of the meeting, is guilty of misdemeanor."

Such misdemeanor is punishable by "imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding six months, or by fine not exceeding \$500, or both."

The Pennsylvania law reads thus:—

"If any person shall willfully or maliciously disturb, or interrupt, any meeting, society, assembly, or congregation convened for the purpose of religious worship, or for any moral, social, literary, scientific, agricultural, horticultural, or floral object, ceremony, examination, exhibition, or lecture, such persons shall on conviction be sentenced to pay a fine not exceeding \$50, and suffer an imprisonment not exceeding three months, or both, or either, at the discretion of the court."

Following is the reading of the penal code of New York on this subject:—

"SECTION 274. *Disturbing religious meetings.* A person who willfully disturbs, interrupts, or disquiets any assemblage of people met for religious worship, by any of the acts enumerated in the next section, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

SEC. 275. *Definition of the offense.* The following acts, or any of them, constitute disturbance of a religious meeting:—

"1. Uttering any profane discourse, committing any rude or indecent act, or making any unnecessary noise, either within the place where such meeting is held, or so near it as to disturb the order and solemnity of the meeting.

"2. Engaging in, or promoting, within two miles of the place where a religious meeting is held, any racing of animals or gaming of any description.

"3. Obstructing in any manner, without authority of law, within the like disturbance, free passage along a highway to the place of such meeting."

From the criminal code of Illinois we quote the following:-

"Whoever, by menace, profane swearing, vulgar language, or any unusual conduct, interrupts or disturbs any assemblage of people met for the worship of God, shall be fined not exceeding \$100. Whosoever, during the time of holding camp or field meetings for religious purposes, within one mile of the place of holding such meeting, hawks or peddles goods, wares, or merchandise, or, without the permission of the authorities having charge of such a meeting, establishes any tent, booth, or other place for provisions or refreshments, or sells or gives away, or offers to sell or give away, any spirits, liquor, wine, cider, or beer, or

130

engage in gaming, or horse-racing, or exhibits, or fairs, shall be fined not exceeding \$100 in each offense."-*Illinois Statute, chap. 35, paragraphs 53, 54.*

Section 189 of the criminal code of Colorado reads thus:-

"Whoever shall be guilty of any noise, rout, or amusement on the first day of the week, called Sunday, whereby the peace of any private family may be disturbed, or who shall by a disorderly, immoral conduct interrupt or disturb the meeting, procession, or ceremony of any religious denomination, on either a week-day or Sunday, such person so offending shall be guilty of misdemeanor, and upon conviction therefor shall be fined any sum not exceeding \$50."

Section 4,853 of the criminal code of Tennessee says:-

"If any person willfully disturb or disquiet any assemblage of persons met for religious worship, by noise, profane discourse, rude or indecent behavior, or any other act at or near the place of worship, he shall be fined not less than twenty nor more than two hundred dollars, and may also be imprisoned not exceeding six months in the county jail."

We do not know of any State that does not have similar provisions. It is very evident, therefore, that Sunday laws are not needed in order to protect people in their right to rest and worship undisturbed on Sunday. And since, notwithstanding the existence of these statutes, it is claimed that Sunday laws are needed in order to protect the Christian Sabbath, or, as the Blair Sunday-Rest bill says, "to protect the religious observance of the day," it is evident that the de-sire is not to protect those who do keep Sunday, since they have protection already, but to compel others to observe the Sunday religiously against their will.

A case in point occurred in this city not long since. At a public meeting, the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, and others, complained very bitterly that a service had been disturbed on the previous Sunday, by the beating of drums in a circus tent, which had been pitched adjoining his church. He stated that at times it had been almost impossible for the congregation to hear the sermon,

because of the outside din. An impassioned plea was made for a Sunday law in California, so that congregations might be protected in their worship. The case was put very strongly, so as to excite sympathy, and no doubt many persons were moved by it to resolve to do all in their power to secure a Sunday law. Yet the readers of this article will see from the section quoted from the penal code of California, that ample provision already exists for the stopping of all such disturbances. The church where this thing happened is not more than two minutes' walk from police headquarters, and it is safe to say that in five minutes from the first beat of the drum, the offenders might have been lodged in a cell at the police station. Yet those people endured all the disquiet, rather than avail themselves of the provisions already made. Why was this?-The only reason that can be given is that if they had demonstrated that religious service can be conducted quietly, and that any disturbance to it can be promptly checked, they would deprive themselves of their strongest arguments for the enactment of the Sunday law.

We trust that our friends will save these quotations that we have made, and secure others if they can, and use them whenever it is claimed that Sunday laws are a necessity in order that worship may be conducted undisturbed.

The second question concerning the Bible in the schools might be answered briefly, as follows:-

1. The position of the SENTINEL is not simply "no Bible in the schools if objected to by the Catholics." We are utterly opposed to the teaching of the Bible in public schools, no matter whether desired by Catholics or Protestants, or both. The reason is that the schools established by the State were not established for the purpose of teaching religion, and are not competent to do that work. What will be taught will be simply the empty shell, destitute of all power, for it is claimed that it is not desired to have the Bible in the schools for the purpose of teaching religion, but simply as a reading book. We reply that the Bible is essentially a religious book, and it is nothing less. The history and biography which it contains were written for the sole purpose of showing God's dealings with men. They are practical object lessons in real piety, or else in the results of a failure properly to acknowledge God; and when the Bible is read or studied with any other object than to arrive at a knowledge of the religion which it inculcates, it is read and studied to no profit.

There is no point in the argument that if the Bible is kept out of the schools, all books in which the name of God occurs should likewise be kept out, else some atheist will be disturbed. It is a matter of fact there is no such thing as a real atheist. This was well shown in a convention of so-called atheists in Paris a few years ago, in which one of the leaders said, in an impassioned address, "I am an atheist, thank God."

2. No one ever heard of a conscientious objection to the teaching of grammar. There is no parallel whatever between the teaching of grammar and the teaching of the Bible. There is no difference of opinion concerning grammar, arithmetic, and geography. Those principles are well known and agreed to by all men of all nations and all classes. If the same thing were true in regard to the Bible, there could be no objection to having it taught in the schools. We say that if there were

no disagreement as to the doctrines which the Bible teaches,-if all men who know anything about it were perfectly agreed upon it, as are all educated persons upon the principles of mathematics and language, and if there were no more possibility for a disagreement than there is upon the principles of these studies, there could be no objection to its being taught, because there would be nobody to object in that case. If a person did not want to study the Bible, he could refrain from studying it, just as he can now refrain from the study of the common branches of knowledge, if he wishes to remain ignorant.

This covers the whole ground. The trouble with those who plead for the Bible in the public schools, is that they do not discriminate between it and the common text-books. As we have before charged, they bring the Bible down to a level of grammar and geography; thus they convict themselves of the very things they charge us with, namely, of working against true religion and a real knowledge of the Bible. We think anyone can see the justness of our opposition. We are opposed to the teaching of the Bible in the public schools, because we love the Bible, and we do not want to have people steeled against what influence it has in the world, by having it taught as a thing of no more importance than grammar.

E. J. W.

"The Blair Bill" *American Sentinel* 4, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

This is the heading of the communication which follows, to which we herewith reply. While it is true that the Blair bill is dead, by the adjournment of Congress, yet the movement which resulted in the presentation of the Blair bill, is not dead, and we are assured that, as soon as the next Congress assembles, another bill will be presented, which will be even stronger than the one introduced by Senator Blair; therefore, it is not out of place to consider that bill even now. Following is the communication:-

"EDITORS OF THE AMERICAN SENTINEL: I wholly misapprehend the meaning of the Blair bill, if it mean anything more than that some one of the days in each week shall be observed as a day of rest. To this construction of the bill, I give my unqualified assent; to any other meaning of the proposed law, I am uncompromisingly opposed. I never will support any law that takes from the citizen the right to observe his own Sabbath, according to his own convictions of right.

"It is in man's physical nature to need one day of rest in the week; all toiling creatures, whose muscular energy is strung to its highest pitch to drive life's varied pursuits, or to promote man's pleasure, need a time to recuperate these worn and often over-taxed powers. For them, as well as for man, I plead for one day of rest at least. With the same zeal I would plead for religious freedom; I would compel no man to observe for rest, and for religious exercise, a sabbath that he believes is not the day appointed by the divine Being. When we give away one item of that faith, so well expressed by our institutions, we take one step toward that despotism that has over-run the hopes of religious freedom in the world, one step from the principles upon which our institutions were founded.

"Am I mistaken in the meaning of the Blair bill? or are you not wrong in opposing a measure, a specification, that is comprehended in the great principle upon which your faith is founded?"

"J. W. HERVEY, A.M., M.D.

"Indianapolis, Ind., Feb. 4, 1889."

The fact is, as our correspondent suggests, that he wholly misapprehends the meaning of the Blair bill. He certainly did not read it very closely or he could have seen that it did mean a great deal more than that some day in each week should be observed, but that any individual was at liberty to select his own day of rest. It was entitled a "bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship." In the new bill the word "protect" is to be substituted for "promote." Now this contemplates nothing less than the enforcement of the observance of the first day of the week, and that upon every individual within the jurisdiction of the proposed law.

That this is true, is shown by the first section, which says that "no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, amusement, or recreation to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States." In the new bill this is to be made stronger. Instead of prohibiting work, amusements, or such like, "to the disturbance of others," they propose to prohibit any work or amusement that is done "in public," whether it disturbs anybody else or not. It needs no comment to show that our statement is true, that the purpose of the Blair bill is to compel everybody to keep Sunday.

This is further shown by the introduction. It states that the object of the bill is to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, and to promote, or protect, its observance as a day of religious worship. Now as we have before shown in the SENTINEL, there are ample laws in every State to protect the people in their rest upon Sunday, and also to protect them in their religious worship. There is no necessity for a Sunday law in order that people may be protected in the enjoyment of Sunday rest and worship. But note that it is not the people that are to be protected, but the day. The bill is "to protect the observance of Sunday as a day of religious worship." That is a different thing from protecting the people. We protect a flower garden by building a fence around it, and putting up a sign warning people to keep off. So Sunday is to be protected as a day of religious worship by putting the fence of the law around it, and warning everybody not to trespass upon it. There is a vast difference between protecting people in their worship on Sunday, and protecting Sunday as a day of religious worship. The former, the State is in duty bound to do, just as it is in duty bound to protect all citizens, at all times, who conduct themselves peaceably. The latter it has no business whatever to do.

Our friend says that he would give his unqualified sanction to a bill providing that some one of the days in each week shall be observed as a day of rest, and gives as his reason that man's physical nature needs one day of rest in a week. We hardly think he has considered this matter carefully, or he would not make so sweeping an assertion. We agree that it would be all right for the Government to enact a law that every man may rest one day in each week, or, in other words, that no one shall be compelled to labor seven days in a week. But that would be the same as saying that no peaceable, law-abiding citizen shall be interfered with in his right to conduct his own affairs as he pleases, and our laws already provide that. It is a most pernicious idea that the State must compel a man by force to do everything that is for his physical or moral welfare. Let that principle be admitted, and then every man's privilege of judgment is taken away. He is left no chance to decide what is good and what is bad. The State decides for him, and he becomes simply a machine to be manipulated by the Government. Moreover, such a principle as that invests the law-makers with infallibility, in that it assumes that they are fully qualified to decide what is best

132

for every man, when, as a matter of fact, they may be far less qualified than many men in private life.

It is altogether a false assumption by National Reformers and their allies, that the Sabbath is for the purpose of securing to the people physical rest. The only Sabbath law that we know of is the fourth commandment, and that says nothing about man's nature requiring a weekly rest. The Sabbath was ordained for the purpose of worship, and for that alone. Of course, if it is observed, there is a benefit physically, but that is only a secondary matter in connection with the Sabbath observance; and when professed Christians appeal for Sunday laws on the basis of man's physical necessity, they virtually deny the morality of the Sabbath.

Our correspondent says he never will support any law that takes from the citizen the right to observe his own Sabbath according to his own convictions of right. That is good, and we hope that after a little further consideration he will say with us, that he never will support any law that takes from the citizen the right to take his rest whenever he feels like it.

National Reformers make the very specious plea that seventh-day people will be at full liberty to observe their Sabbath, even though a strict Sunday law be enforced. Now here is a query. Seventh-day people form a very small minority of the population of this country. Now if the Sunday-law advocates are sincere in their statements that they will lose their rest-day if they do not have a civil law to protect them, and to compel others to rest on that day; if they are sincere in their statement that "the liberty of rest for each depends upon a law of rest for all," how can they say that seventh-day people will have perfect liberty to keep their Sabbath even though a strict Sunday law be enacted? If the great majority of people, who profess to regard Sunday as a sacred day, cannot keep it without a law enforcing its observance, how can the very small minority of people who regard the seventh day holy keep that day with no civil law favoring it, but with a law which tends to compel them to use it for labor, by depriving them of one of

their regular working days? We apprehend that no one will attempt to harmonize this.

As a matter of fact, seventh-day people can and do observe Saturday strictly with no law to favor them, and even with laws discriminating against them; therefore, it is a self-evident fact that Sunday people may, if they will, observe the first day of the week without any Sunday law. Therefore, it is evident, still further, that the only reason why they desire a Sunday law is that they may compel others, against their will, to keep the day. Sunday laws are always and everywhere oppressive, immoral, and antichristian.

E. J. W.

May 29, 1889

"Dr. Crafts at Pittsburg" *American Sentinel* 4, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

The event of the evening of the second day of the National Reform Convention at Pittsburg was the speech by Dr. Crafts, entitled, "Liberty and the Sabbath." With the exception of the speech by Dr. McAllister on the "School Theory of Education," this was the only one of the speeches, so far as we have received them, containing anything worthy of notice. That which makes this speech noteworthy is not its logic, because it has none, but the perverted ideas of liberty to which the speaker gave expression. In the beginning of his speech, he referred to the Sunday-law petition, copies of which had been placed in the seats, and which he read. It has been changed somewhat, so we will quote it as it now reads:-

"To the United States Senate.-The undersigned organizations and adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, earnestly petition you to pass a bill forbidding in the Government's mails, military service, and inter-state commerce, and in the District of Columbia, and Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, excepting works of necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who religiously and regularly observe another day of the week, by abstaining from labor and business, as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship."

Concerning this, Mr. Crafts said: "It may be best to define it as a supplement to the State Sabbath law, by doing through Congress what the States cannot do,- giving protection to thousands beyond the jurisdiction of the State laws." From this it seems that Mr. Crafts's idea of liberty and protection is that they shall be guaranteed only to those who think as he does; and that everybody else must be deprived of liberty and protection. Mr. Crafts knows as well as we do that public worship is already protected, and that no Sunday law could afford any better protection to it than it has now. His continually harping on that string shows that he is working for a law from some other motive than that of reason and regard for religion.

While we are talking about protection to religious worship, it may not be amiss to inquire why those who religiously and regularly observe another day, are not

entitled to as much protection as those who observe the first day. If Mr. Crafts says it is because those who observe another day are in the wrong, then he contradicts his statement that the Sunday law is not a religious law. To say that Saturday is not the correct day for Christians to observe, and to say that Sunday is the proper day, and ought, therefore, to be enforced by the State, is to say that the State should decide for people on questions of religious duty, or, in other words, that the State should act as Pope.

But the answer which, Mr. Crafts does give is that those who observe another day are so few that they are not worth noticing. In his speech he spoke of the opposition to his movement as composed of "two little Christian sects, professedly Christian,-the Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists, who, with the Jews, make about one per cent. of the population." Of course he knows that his wished-for law will work great disadvantage to these people, but he philosophically answers that it is better for a few to suffer in order that many may be benefited. This is what the false-hearted high priest Caiaphas said when the council were considering whether or not Jesus should be tolerated. He said that it was expedient that one man should die in order that the whole nation should not perish. So, in order to save the nation, they put the one man to death; nevertheless, the whole nation miserably perished, and for the very reason that they rejected Jesus in order to gave themselves.

Now we will say this, that any law which works injustice to a single individual in a nation, is an unjust law; and the man that talks about securing liberty for the multitude by means of a law which shall deprive a few equally deserving persons of their liberty, shows that he does not understand the first principles of liberty and justice, but is at heart a tyrant. True liberty knows no favoritism. It may seem to some of the Sunday-law workers that liberty for the people can be obtained only by a law which will deprive some people of their liberty; but they will find in the end, that they are grievously mistaken, as did the Jewish people who crucified Christ in order that they might retain their nationality. Their ideas of liberty, and of gaining it, are just such ideas as were held by Napoleon, who, in order to gain his ends, which no doubt he forced himself to believe were for the good of the people, heartlessly sacrificed thousands of men. When people find that in their supposed march to liberty they are obliged to trample upon the rights of a single individual, they should halt, and take that as a sure indication that they are on the wrong road.

Referring to the observers of the seventh day

138

as in the front rank of opposers to the Sunday-law movement, he said that they constituted but one per cent. of the population, and added, "And yet they would have the other ninety-nine per cent. yield their convictions in this matter." To this we have to say, first, that the observers of the seventh day do not ask anybody to yield their convictions, unless their convictions are that everyone who does not observe Sunday should be deprived of their civil rights. Sunday-law advocates profess to think that the opposers of their movement want to deprive them of their rest-day. Nothing could be more untrue. The opposers of the Sunday law are perfectly willing that everybody who wishes to keep Sunday should be allowed

the fullest liberty to do so, and be protected in his worship on that day to the fullest extent. We challenge Mr. Crafts, or any of his co-workers, to quote a single line from any opposer of the Sunday law, whether he be Christian, Jew, or infidel, which could possibly be construed as indicating any desire whatever to deprive any individual of the fullest liberty to rest and to worship on Sunday. The intolerance is all on the other side. It is the Sunday-law advocates who have such overweening ambition to rule, that they cannot enjoy their Sunday rest so long as any person who differs with them is granted freedom of action. The opposers of the Sunday-law movement simply ask equal and exact justice for all.

Again, by his statement that the seventh-day people, who, as he says, form one per cent. of the population, would have the other ninety-nine per cent. yield their convictions in this matter, he conveys the idea that ninety-nine per cent. of the population of the United States have decided convictions in favor of Sunday. Now if that were true, they would not be asking for a Sunday law. If ninety-nine per cent. of the population of the United States were conscientious observers of the Sunday, the day would be observed so strictly that the labor that would be done by the one per cent. would not make a ripple on the surface of society. But let us look at figures for a moment. The population of the United States is about sixty-five million, but the number of church-members in the United States, both Protestant and Catholic, is not more than thirteen million. That is, only twenty per cent. of the people of the United States are even nominally Christian. This is a good deal less than ninety-nine per cent., but not all of these church-members are desirous of a Sunday law. We have in our possession the statements of prominent religious workers to the effect that the larger part of the present disregard for Sunday is due to members of churches. It is repeatedly stated that if it were not for the patronage of church-members the Sunday newspaper could not exist. Certainly, then, the conviction that Sunday should be observed strictly cannot be overwhelmingly strong, even among the small minority of the people who are nominally Christian. Then there are many thousands of people who conscientiously observe the first day of the week, who are as strongly opposed to a Sunday law as any seventh-day person can possibly be. Mr. Crafts himself only claims ten million petitioners presented to Congress shows that only a few hundred people actually signed the petition; and it is making a very liberal estimate to say that the entire number of people in the United States, who are zealous for a Sunday law, is less than a million. So then we may say that one per cent. of the population desire a Sunday law, and are determined to have it in spite of the opposition, and the passive indifference, of the other ninety-nine per cent.

Mr. Crafts says: "It is a very shallow objection, the attempt to charge that this is at the bottom of a Catholic conspiracy to put Catholicism in this country." We do not know of anybody who makes this charge. We know very well that the Roman Catholics are not at the bottom of this movement. We should not think any the worse of it if they were. We know that there are many Catholics who are opposed to it. All the wickedness in the world does not result from what is called Catholicism, neither is all the goodness bound up in Protestantism. Those who are engineering this Sunday movement call themselves Protestants, but they

have not the faintest conception of what Protestantism is. Protestantism derives its name from the protest of the German Princes at the Diet of Spire against religious interference with the Government and the rights of the people. A man is not necessarily a Protestant because he calls himself one. When these professed Protestants labor for the very thing against which the German Princes protested, they show that they are not Protestants, but Papists, at heart.

Mr. Crafts devoted a little time to the consideration of the objection that the Sunday law would be unconstitutional. His answer is as follows: "In cases where it has been carried up to the Supreme Court of the State the decisions have been without reserve that such laws are perfectly constitutional. It seems strange that this cry should still be raised, and the curious thing about it is that in the papers that publish these objections there is not the slightest intimation of the decisions of the courts in this matter." A fitting answer to this is the following incident related of that eminent lawyer, Henry W. Paine, of Maine. One day Mr. Paine was riding in a horse-car, reading a sheep-skin-bound volume of law reports. An acquaintance hailed him, and said, "See here, Paine, do you have to study law still?" "This is not law," said Paine. "It is only a collection of decisions of the Massachusetts Supreme Court." So it may be said of the Supreme Court decisions that Sunday laws are constitutional. They are not law. They are not justice. They cannot make wrong right. Just as Chief Justice Taney's decision in the Dred Scott case did not make slavery any more constitutional than it was before.

Mr. Crafts claims that the clause of the first amendment of the Constitution, which says that Congress shall not prohibit the free exercise of religion, is infringed in this country. He says: "Certainly it is an infringement of the free exercise of religion, when the public service is so managed that hundreds and thousands of employes in the service of the Government cannot have their rightful privilege accorded them. No deeply conscientious Christian man can take an office in the whole Post-office Department. No man who has a strict conscience can either be a postmaster or a post-office clerk, and I say it is an infringement on the free exercise of religion." What about the man who has conscience in the observance of the seventh day? He cannot occupy any position in the Post-office Department, because the post-office is regularly open continually on Saturday, when his conscientious convictions compel him to refrain from all labor. Mr. Crafts does not expect that this condition of things will ever be changed. On the contrary, he intends to make it even more uncomfortable for them than it is at present. Therefore, according to Mr. Crafts's own statement, he and his followers intend to perpetuate that infringement of the Constitution. We have never heard a Sunday-law advocate admit more plainly that the passage of a strict Sunday law would prohibit the free exercise of religion.

But as a matter of fact, the keeping open of post-offices on Sunday does not interfere in the slightest degree with the free exercise of a man's religion. Any man who has conscience in regard to Sunday will keep it. There is no law compelling him to accept a position under the Government. There are thousands of people who keep Sunday strictly, just as there are other thousands who keep Saturday strictly, who have never dreamed that they were being interfered with,-

that their religious freedom was infringed by the mere fact that somebody else worked while they were resting.

One more point in Mr. Crafts's speech we will notice, and then leave him for the present. He said: "We will now notice the work of the seventh-day Christian people who are doing so much in this country to disturb the objects which we seek. I have been criticised for calling this people Saturdarians. They say that I have viewed that work a little uncharitably; but we claim that they make a fetich of Saturday." If "Saturdarians" is a proper term to apply to those who observe the seventh day, then "Sundarians" must be a proper term to apply to those who observe the first day of the week. Mr. Crafts would undoubtedly think us uncharitable if we should apply it to him.

Mr. Crafts says that the seventh-day people make a fetich of Saturday. Let us look into this matter. A fetich, according to Webster, is "a material thing, living or dead, which is made the object of brutish and superstitious worship, as among certain African tribes." Now Mr. Crafts charges seventh-day people of making a fetich of Saturday, because they observe it strictly. Suppose we look at the other side. Mr. Crafts and his fellow-workers make a great parade of their conscientious regard for Sunday. Now if the simple fact that seventh-day people observe Saturday strictly is evidence that they make a fetich of it, then it must be that Mr. Crafts makes a fetich of Sunday. Indeed, he is a hundred fold more open to the charge of fetichism than seventh-day people are, for whereas seventh-day people are strict observers of Saturday for themselves only, Mr. Crafts not only observes Sunday strictly, but de-sires to compel everybody else to do so. This is one of the characteristics of fetichism; for it is well known that nothing will more quickly exasperate the ignorant devotee than to have people lightly regard his fetich. He not only holds it in superstitious reverence, but he thinks that everybody else ought to do the same; and the less worthy the object of his worship is of adoration, the more intense is his desire to have other people give homage to it, and the more intensely is he excited when it is disregarded.

Still further may we turn Mr. Crafts's charge upon himself. A fetich, as before quoted, is the object of superstitious worship. "Superstition," as defined by Webster, is "extreme and unnecessary scruples in the observance of religious rites not commanded." Now there is nowhere in the Bible a command for the observance of Sunday. We defy any individual to produce even a semblance

139

of such a command. Mr. Crafts manifests extreme scruples in the observance of Sunday, and it is certain that he manifests unnecessary scruples, in that he wishes to compel others to do so against their will. Therefore his regard for it is superstition; and since a fetich is the object of superstitious worship, we have proved conclusively that Mr. Crafts makes a fetich of Sunday. The columns of the SENTINEL are open to him to clear himself from this charge if he can.

E. J. W.

"Sunday Laws Antichristian" *American Sentinel* 4, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days* (New York Mail and Express) of February 8 contained an article entitled, "The Sabbath and the Individual," by Rev. George S. Mott, D. D., the vice-president of the American Sabbath Union for New Jersey, from which we quote the following reasons why Sunday laws and their penalties must be made universal:-

"The person who keeps the law must not be put out and disadvantaged thereby, and this would be the case were there no penalties for breaking Sabbath laws. The merchant who closes his store might find that his neighbor who keeps open on Sunday was drawing away a trade which belongs to him. Now we must not permit the Sunday-keeping merchant to be the loser because he regards the law, and so must it be with all kinds of labor. Let public sentiment in favor of Sunday law die away, and try to popularize in this country the Sunday of France, and the American will not be protected in his day of rest. Thus he would be compelled to work on that day or lose his situation. No public conscience or statutes will be on his side."

This is one of the most common arguments for, a Sunday law, and is urged by doctors of divinity who claim to be working in the interests of the gospel and pure morality; but to our mind it is one of the strongest evidences of the antichristian character of all Sunday legislation. A Christian is a follower of Christ, that is, a follower of his example and teaching. Now let us quote a few words from his lips, that we may have his statements concerning what must be done by those who follow him:-

Matt. 5:10-12: "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven. Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for any sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in Heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."

Luke 6:22, 26: "Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the son of man's sake." "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets."

Matt. 7:13, 14: "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."

Matt. 16:24, 25: "Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it."

Luke 14:27: "And whosoever cloth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple."

John 15:18-20: "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his

lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also."

John 16:33: "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."

140

The American Sabbath Union proposes to change this order of things that Christ prophesied should exist. He said that as it was before his first advent, so it should be till the end of time: the righteous should be evil spoken of by the world, and would have greater difficulty in making a living. He expressly told his followers that they would be cast out even as he had been; that they could not plan for ease in this life, and at the same time secure the life to come. He taught them that, when there was a question of right and wrong, they should not parley, nor take anxious thought as to what they should eat or drink or wherewithal they should be clothed, if they should pursue a right course, but that they should first seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and trust him for their necessary support. He expressly stated that if a man did not take up his cross and deny himself, he could not be his disciple.

Now, suppose the American Sabbath Union succeeds in getting laws upholding the Christian religion, and making it easy for a man to profess Christianity, making it impossible for him to suffer any loss thereby, what would be the result? It would simply show that the Christianity that was thus professed was not Christianity at all, but a false profession thereof. By their claiming that they are going to have the religion of Christ respected, and to secure those who profess it from being put to disadvantage, they are doing their best to prove that Christ was a false prophet. But this cannot be done. Christ spoke truth. He did not say that the majority of men would reject truth because he wanted them to do so, but because he knew just what they would do. National Reformers may say as much as they please that, although their laws will make it easy for men to profess Christianity and to comply with the outward forms of it, they will not hinder them from being real Christians at heart, and true followers of Christ; but before they can make their claim good, they will have to prove that the Bible is untrue.

Jesus said: "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat;" and that the way to life is narrow, and that few will find it. But the American Sabbath Union proposes to make the way to life so broad that nobody can help finding it; and then if anybody has a desire to follow the Saviour, and to walk in the narrow path, it will pursue him with a goad and compel him to walk in the broad way. But "the Scripture cannot be broken." The broad way will be till the end of time the way to destruction. And so, when the National Reformers shall have succeeded in getting their system of Christianity so protected by civil law that nobody can suffer any inconvenience in obeying its demands, they will simply have succeeded in changing the truth of God into a lie, and in leading people to destruction while making them believe that they are leading them to everlasting life.

Christ never authorized anybody to offer ease and comfort as an inducement for people to follow him. He had no ease while on earth, and he said that it is

enough that the servant be as his Lord. When he sent Ananias to baptize Saul of Tarsus, he said, "I will show him how great things he must suffer for my sake." The American Sabbath Union says: "We must show men how little they will have to suffer, and how prosperous they may be in business, for the Lord's sake." Is it not antichrist?

When a man came to Christ, saying, "Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest," he replied: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." He was "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," and he says, "If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?" But the American Sabbath Union proposes to make Christianity very popular; therefore it proposes to lead men away from Christ and pure Christianity.

The apostle Paul says, "If we suffer, we shall also reign with him;" but the American Sabbath Union proposes to make it impossible for anybody to reign with Christ, by making it impossible for anybody to suffer with him. Again he says of the children of God that they are "heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified together." But the American Sabbath Union says that it must not be possible for anybody to be made to suffer for Christ. Therefore we say that the American Sabbath Union is an antichristian institution, devoted to the suppression of pure Christianity, and the propagation of hypocrisy and dead formalism; and to just that extent, also, is it an enemy of mankind. Let every lover of pure Christianity and of his fellow-men work heart and soul against its iniquitous work.

E. J. W.

June 5, 1889

"The Secular Theory of Education" *American Sentinel* 4, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

Thursday morning, April 25, Rev. David McAllister, of Pittsburg, delivered an address upon the above subject before the National Reform Convention assembled at that place. In beginning he referred to a paper that had just been read on "The Romish Assault on the Common Schools," stating that his address came in very appropriately after that topic, for the reason, as he said, that "when this assault is understood by multitudes of our citizens, they can see no way of meeting it except by the secular theory of education." He then proceeded as follows:-

"What commands my respect for the Catholics is this, that they maintain that education cannot be complete when that education ignores religion. They are on the right ground there. Man is a religious as well as an intellectual being, and no scheme of education, whether by the family, or the church, or the State, is worthy the name that ignores the higher part of man's nature. The only mistake with Romanists is this, that the religion which they insist upon it; the religion of Romanists. No other religion will they have. They won't accept the principles that are common to Romanian with Protestantism, for there are such principles. They

won't allow these to be taught, for they maintain that any system of religion that leaves out what they regard as essential is utterly defective, and heresy is to be condemned, and heretics who embrace it are to be persecuted."

There are several points about this paragraph which we wish to notice. We are willing to admit that a man is not perfectly developed whose education does not embrace the moral and the physical as well as the purely intellectual. But that does not prove that it is the duty of the State to educate him in all of these principles. Indeed, it is an open question with leading educators how far the State should go in education on even a secular basis. There are not a few who maintain that the State should teach nothing except the common English branches, leaving all scientific and classical studies to be provided for by the individual himself, or by his guardians. Certainly then the statement that man is a religious as well as an intellectual being,-that no scheme of education is complete that ignores the higher branch of man's nature,-proves nothing whatever as to how or by whom this higher part should be educated. We hold that it is not the province of the State to furnish religious education of any kind whatever; that for the State to get into the business of teaching religion is directly opposed to our Government, in that it involves class legislation. There are so many conflicting views concerning religion, and the public schools cannot by any possibility teach them all, so that if the State should go into the business of religious education it would be obliged to discriminate between a large class of citizens as worthy as those who are favored.

Again, note Mr. McAllister's statement that the only mistake with the Romanist idea of education is that the religion upon which they insist is the religion of Romanists. In this they are perfectly consistent, and nobody can justly find any fault with them for it. Protestants who are worthy of the name must take a similar position, and insist that whatever religion is taught their children, whether by the State or otherwise, shall be none but the Protestant religion. But by this token we know that National Reformers are not Protestants, because they are willing to join with Romanists. It is true that Mr. McAllister wishes to compromise, having the State teach such branches as are common to both Protestants and Romanists; but he might as well go right over to the Catholic Church at once; for when he begs the State to teach the principles of the Christian religion, and says that the principles which he desires to have taught are only those which are common to both Protestants and Romanists, he shows that in his mind there are no distinctive features of Protestantism, as compared with Romanism, that are worthy of being held.

Now let us see where this will lead to. The Romanist will not consent to any such fusion. He thinks that the principles of his religion which differ from Protestantism are vital, and he will not consent that they shall be ignored. In this he is consistent. The only reason why he remains a Romanist is because he regards his religion as superior to Protestantism. But Mr. McAllister, speaking for the National Reform Association, is not so strenuous in regard to his religion. He is willing to drop every feature that is different from Catholicism. The one point upon which Romanists and National Reformers are agreed is that the State shall support religious teaching. Now since the Romanists are decided in their

convictions, and refuse to compromise their religion, while the National Reformers are willing to compromise, it is very evident that the stronger and more decided party will carry the day. That is, when National Reformers see that they cannot have religion taught by the State without joining with Catholics, and that the Catholics will not yield, they will compromise, not simply on those principles that are common to Protestantism and Romanism, but on Romanism pure and simple. That this will be the result is further evident from a statement made in the *Christian Statesman* of August 31, 1881, by the Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, who, speaking of the desire of the National Reformers to secure the co-operation of Roman Catholics, said:-

"We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches as such; but the time is come to make repeated advances, and gradually 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."

146

Now no matter how ardently the Roman Catholic might desire religious education by the State, they would be very foolish to yield a single principle in their religion in order to gain it, when they can see clearly by such statements as this, that by remaining firm they can bring professed Protestants to their position. When the National Reformers say that they are willing to make repeated advances, and to endure repeated rebuffs, and will gladly accept co-operation in any form in which the Roman Church exhibits it, all the Roman Church has to do is to wait. She is well assured that the National Reformers will keep up their wooing, and she is sure of gaining all that she may exact from so ardent a suitor. National Reformers may deny that their scheme, if successful, will make Romanism the ruling power in this country; but their denials amount to nothing in the face of such statements as those of Mr. Scovel and Dr. McAllister.

In saying this we would not have anyone think that we objected to the National Reform scheme just because it will result in Roman supremacy. We would just as soon see the State enforce the Catholic religion as the Protestant religion. Not but what we have decided convictions in matters of religion, but we have no choice as to what religion the State shall enforce, if it is to enforce any. The Protestant religion united with the State would be no better than Mohammedism. It is the union of Church and State that we protest against. It was by such protesting that Protestantism originated. He who does not protest against such a union is not a Protestant; and when so-called Protestantism is enforced by the State, it ceases to be Protestantism. The reason why we make so much of the statements of National Reformers, both direct and indirect, that they are willing to join hands with Romanists, and of the fact that Romanism will thereby be supreme in the State, is that we thus show clearly that their scheme does embrace the union of Church and State; because Romanism is avowedly in favor of a Church and State union, with the Church as senior partner.

This one point is sufficient to condemn Mr. McAllister's entire speech. We might well leave the article here for the present, but will call attention to one little absurdity. Dr. Mc-Allister said:-

"I might pursue at considerable length a line of argument that has become very familiar with the National Reformers; but I will only revert to it very briefly. It is this: The great mistake that is made by secularists is in comparing the State itself to any mere business association. Secular education rests upon the social compact theory of government—a theory that has been exploded long ago. The best political papers do not entertain it for a moment. There is something back of the social compact theory. Men come together and make a covenant, and there is a compact. You cannot have a compact without the Nation, and there must be a Nation behind the compact. It is the Nation itself that makes the compact. The duties of government are laid upon it. Here is the being that is to undertake the work of education."

Let us make a parallel. Here is a railroad company. A number of men have come together and made a compact, or agreement. They mutually pledge themselves to work together in this line of business, and thus they form a company. They secure a charter and become a corporation. Now we may say there can be no there before the compact, that there must be a Nation behind the compact. But a Nation is not a mere aggregation of individuals, although there can be no Nation without people. Ten million people thrown together promiscuously within a certain territory, each one independent of everybody else, would not be a Nation. They become a Nation only when they unite their interests, and covenant together for mutual protection, and agree upon certain officers to execute their wishes. But according to the National Reform idea there has been a Nation stalking around this American continent from time immemorial, waiting for centuries for people to settle in order that it might make a compact with them, and have people to carry out its designs. Surely, if the National Reform scheme were not inherently wicked, the absurdities into which intelligent men are obliged to run in order to foster it, should consign it to oblivion. But people love to be humbugged.

E. J. W.

"A True National Reform Government" *American Sentinel* 4, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Century* of April, 1888, Mr. George Kennan had an article on "Russian Penal Code," from which in the August SENTINEL we copied what it had to say on the subject of religion. In that it was shown clearly that the Russian Government, with all its tyranny and intolerance, is the very kind of government that the National Reformers are working for. In the April *Century*, this present year, Mr. Kennan gives us a view of the workings of the Russian police department, in which is shown very clearly the working of National Reform principles. The following extract from the article will enable the reader to judge for himself:-

"The police, with the Minister of the Interior at their head, control, by means of passports, the movements of all the inhabitants of the empire; they keep thousands of suspects constantly under surveillance; they ascertain and certify to the courts the liabilities of bankrupts; they conduct pawnbrokers' sales of

unredeemed pledges; they give certificates of identity to pensioners and all other persons who need them; they superintend repairs of roads and bridges; they exercise supervision over all theatrical performances, concerts, tableaux, theater programs, posters, and street advertisements; they collect statistics, enforce sanitary regulations, make searches and seizures in private houses, read the correspondence of suspects, take charge of the bodies of persons found dead, 'admonish' church-members who neglect too long to partake of the Holy Communion, and enforce obedience to thousands of multifarious orders and regulations intended to promote the welfare of the people or to insure the safety of the State. The legislation relating to the police fills more than five thousand sections in the Svod Zakonof, or collection of Russian laws, and it is hardly an exaggeration to say that in the peasant villages, away from the centers of education and enlightenment, the police are the omnipresent and omnipotent regulators of all human conduct—a sort of incompetent bureaucratic substitute for divine Providence.

"In order to give the readers of the Century an idea of the nature and infinite variety of the trans-actions regulated in Russia by the Government through the police, I will quote, almost at random, the titles or subjects of a few of the circular letters of instructions sent by the Minister of the Interior to the governors of various Russian provinces between 1880 and 1884. They are as follows:-

"1. To regulate religious instruction in secular schools.

"2. Concerning measures to be taken to prevent horse stealing.

"3. Concerning a list of dramas that are unconditionally permitted to be put on the state.

"4. To prohibit the sale of Shimanski's Pills.

"5. To prohibit peasants from cutting young birch trees with which to decorate churches and houses on holidays.

"6. Prescribing the manner in which the censor shall supervise the reports and accounts of private societies.

"7. Concerning a removal of the restrictions upon the transportation of rendered tallow.

"8. Concerning personal identification marks in the passports of Jews.

"9. To regulate the use of mineral waters by sick or wounded officers of the army.

"10. Concerning an order for the sale of all grain by weight instead of by measure.

"11. Setting forth the circumstances under which, and the times at which, the police and other employes of the Ministry of the Interior can wear white linen covers on their caps.

"12. Concerning the question who has the right to collect subscriptions in the empire for the holy places in Palestine.

"13. To abolish the long chains used for the purpose of chaining together marching criminals in gangs of six.

"14. To regulate printing on the paper of cigarettes.

"15. Concerning the prohibition, at meetings of provincial assemblies and town councils, of the expressions of such opinions or judgments as may, from their nature, lie outside the limits of the jurisdiction of such bodies.

"16. Concerning an order prohibiting the emigration of dissenters to the Trans-Caucasus.

"17. Concerning regulations for the proper construction of houses in peasant villages.

"18. To control and regulate the transportation of animal bones.

"19. To regulate advertisements of medicines.

"20. Forbidding the use of all school-books-and appliances of instruction not approved by the Minister of the Interior and the ecclesiastical authorities.

"21. Concerning the proper method of measuring the legs of recruits for the army.

"22. Concerning meetings of school-teachers.

"23. Prescribing the manner in which permission shall be obtained for concerts, readings, theatrical performances, and other public entertainments.

"24. To require printers to send to the Departments of Police copies of all newspapers, magazines, and almanacs printed by them.

"25. To prevent the sale of quinine that is not of good quality.

"26. To regulate the censorship of price-lists, printed notes of invitation, and visiting cards.

"27. Concerning the construction of water-closets according to the removal or barrel system.

"28. Providing for the censorship of the seals, rubber stamps, and cards of private individuals and business corporations.

"29. To regulate begging for ecclesiastical institutions and for the holy places in Palestine.

"30. To regulate the sale by apothecaries of certain 'cosmetics'-namely, soap, starch, brilliantine, tooth-brushes, and insect powder.

"These are only a few of the countless thousands of orders, directions, and regulations that come within the jurisdiction of the imperial police. Of course they are not all carried into effect. The enforcement of such a multitude of prohibitions and restrictions, affecting every province of human life, is beyond the power of any one man or any set of men; but whether they are enforced or not, they operate constantly as a bar to individual enterprise, a network to restrain every free impulse, and a clog upon all human activity.

"It is difficult for Americans to realize that such relations can exist between the people of a country and the Government as those shown by these circulars to exist in Russia. Imagine a governor of New York State issuing an order requiring all the citizens of that State to send in their seals, rubber stamps, and visiting cards for censorial supervision. Or imagine a Postmaster-General writing a circular letter to the governors of all the States prescribing rules for the regulation of the sale of soap, starch, brilliantine, tooth-brushes,

and insect powder? Such an extension of the powers of the Government is to us almost inconceivable, both on account of its tyranny and on account of its

preposterous absurdity; and yet such regulations are not regarded in Russia as anything extraordinary, and one sometimes finds the police engaged in work that is even more remarkable than the regulation of the sale of tooth-brushes and insect powder. I have in my possession the original report of a Russian police *pristav*, written upon a printed form, in which the officer notifies his superior that, in compliance with instructions of such and such a date, he has called upon such and such persons, who are named, and has 'admonished' them that they must partake of the Holy Communion, 'upon penalty of an administrative calling to account [pod opasenient v' protivnom sluchae kazennaho vziskania]. This document bears in capital letters at the top of the first page the words, 'Ukase [oo-kaz] of his Imperial Majesty the Autocrat of all the Russias: In the newspaper *Sibir* (See-beer) for July 10, 1883, it is stated, as a matter of news, that the police authorities of the city of Irkutsk have just received orders to admonish all persons who have been neglectful of religious duty, and to oblige them to partake of the sacrament. The use of the police power as a means of compelling indifferent or backsliding Christians to partake of the Holy Communion-the sending of an armed man in a blue uniform to drag another man to the table of the Prince of Peace, and to compel him to eat and drink the symbols of the broken body and shed blood of Christ-is something that has not often been seen, I think, outside of Russia, since the Dark Ages."

A few words only are necessary to show that this very state of things must exist in this country, if the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, succeed in carrying out their (ir)religious designs. All of these associations heartily indorse Mr. Blair's proposed amendment to the Constitution, which requires that the principles of the Christian religion be taught in the public schools. It has already been shown in these columns that the adoption of that amendment would require that text-books on religion be issued, and that both text-books and teachers should be in harmony with the standard of religion that would be recommended by the ecclesiastical authorities. But when that is done it will be necessary that a strict watch should be kept to see that no other text-book is brought in; and to see that no teacher presumes to inculcate any ideas of his own, that may be different from the established religion.

The individuals who will have this matter in charge may not be called police, but their duties will be exactly such as are defined in the articles above numbered one, twenty, and twenty-two. They will have to regulate religious instruction in secular schools. They will have to note if any books and plans of instruction are used that are not approved by the ecclesiastical authorities, and they will have to oversee the meetings of school-teachers to guard against the introduction of anything in their discussions that shall differ in any way from the standard of religion set by those ecclesiastical authorities. In short, they will have to see that religion is not discussed at all; for it must be obvious to any thinking person that when the State, having taken counsel of the elders, prescribes the religion for its citizens, religious discussion is at an end. School-teachers will have no business to question the text-books, and they will not dare presume to make any alteration. If anything different is to be taught, it will have to be decided upon by

the ecclesiastical authorities of the Nation, just as in the days of old in Europe, no new thing can be even mentioned in the school unless a new council has passed upon it. When the council shall have decided upon what shall be taught the people, the school-teachers and ministers of low degree will have simply the duty of handing to the people that which has been given to them by their superiors.

Again, the enactment of a strict national Sunday law will require that the powers of the police be very greatly magnified. Indeed, the Sunday law is often called "a police regulation," showing that the enforcement of the law will rest largely in the hands of the police. Of course the number of police will have to be greatly increased in order that they may keep an oversight over all the people, to see that no one violates the law. It will be their duty, also, as in Russia, to "admonish" people who do not attend divine service at stated intervals. The leaders in the Sunday-law movement openly avow that their desire for a Sunday law is that people may go to church. But as we have before shown, if the mere enactment of a Sunday law does not accomplish their designs, they will necessarily have to amend it so as to require attendance at church. Moreover, Mrs. Bateham has said that what they want is the "ideal Sabbath of the Puritans;" the guarantee to rest and to worship. Now we have before us some of the laws by which that ideal Sabbath was secured, and we will quote them. In Robert Wodrow's "Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen," we find the following:-

"It is thought expedient that ane baillie with tua of the session passed throw the towne everie Sabbath-day, and nott sic as they find absent fra the sermons ather afoir or efter none, and for that effect that they pass and seiche sic hours as they think maist meit."

In his collections he says that the session allows the searchers to go into the houses and apprehend absentees from the Kirk. In the records of the governor and company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England we find that in 1629 the first Sunday law in the colony read thus:-

"And to the end the Saboth may bee celebrated in a religious manner we appoint, that all that inhabite the plantacon, both for the gen'all and pticuler imploymts, may surcease their labor every Satterday throughout the yeare at 3 of the clock in the afternoon, and that they spend the rest of that day in catichising and pparacon for the Saboth, as the ministers shall direct."

This is very similar to the law now required by the American Sabbath Union. But that law was found insufficient to meet the desires of the ecclesiastics, and so in 1634 they supplemented it by the following:-

"Whereas complaints hath bene made to this Court that dyvers psons within this jurisdiccon doe vsually absent themselves from church meetings vpon the Lord's day, power is therefore given to any two Assistants to heare and sensure, either by ffyne or imprisonment (aft their discrecon), all misdemeanrs of that kind committed by any inhabitant within this jurisdiccon, provided they exceed not the ffyne of vs for one offense."

It worked then just as we have said it will work now. First was the strict Sunday law. Then was the law requiring everybody to go to church, and allowing officers to search the town to discover absentees. In 1782 an act was passed

enjoining the worship of almighty God, as an essential part of the due observance of the Lord's day, and imposing a fine of ten shillings upon any said person who shall absent himself for a month from the public worship of God on the Lord's day. This statute provided for wardens to enforce the law, and gave them power to enforce it by stopping travelers, and by entering all places where they may find Sabbath-breakers.

That is the "ideal Sabbath of Puritans." That is the condition of things that Mrs. Bateham wishes to see in this country. When it shall be brought about we shall have a despotism fully as bad as that of Russia. Mr. Kennan says that Russian police are "a sort of incompetent, bureaucratic substitute for divine Providence." If the American Sabbath Union and the Christian Temperance Union shall secure their desired ends, we shall have a police who will not only be a substitute for divine Providence, but a substitute for men's consciences. Is there an American who has any love for freedom? If there is let him protest vigorously against any such usurpation. E. J. W.

"That Petition Again" *American Sentinel* 4, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

Since the AMERICAN SENTINEL has shown up so fully the crooked methods by which the Woman's Christian Temperance and American Sabbath Unions have added signatures to their Sunday petitions, the leaders of these organizations have found it necessary to do something to divert public attention from their course, and, not being able to offer any excuse for the dishonest methods, they have had no alternative but to try to snake it appear that the signatures to the protest were not obtained in a legitimate manner. Of course this does not help their cause any, for even if all the signatures to the protest were fraudulent, that would not make their duplicity any the less; but the charge which they bring serves in a measure to divert attention from themselves.

Their charge is: First, that the petition was signed only by Adventists. Second, that those who signed it who were not Adventists did so because they did not understand what they were doing. Third, that all besides Adventists who signed it were saloon keepers, who naturally disliked the idea of a Sunday law.

It needs nothing more than this statement of the charges which they make, to show to what straits they are driven to make it appear that they alone are not guilty of fraud; for one part of their charge contradicts every other part.

That the petition was not signed by Adventists exclusively is shown by the fact that, according to the Seventh-day Adventist Year Book, there are only 26,000 members of that denomination in the United States; whereas, there were 230,000 signatures to the petition that was presented in the Senate last winter, and as many more have been obtained since. These are not "representative" signatures either. Anyone who wishes to do so can verify the fact that there are 230,000 distinct signatures in the petition that was presented to Congress.

We have, however, just received a letter from a gentleman in Woodbury, N. J., a stranger to us, which covers every point of the charge which the Sunday-law people bring against those who circulated the protest. It is so concise a

statement that we present it in full. It was entirely unsolicited by us, and was called out by the statements of the Western Christian Union, which were quoted in the article, "Is This the Breath of the Puritan?" in the SENTINEL of April 10. Referring to the statement that the canvassers for signatures to the protest had adopted the practice of "button-holing unsuspecting citizens in railroad waiting-rooms and street corners, not a few of whom were unfamiliar with the question," the writer says:-

"Gentlemen, I am not an Adventist; neither am I ignorant of this great question now claiming the attention of so many people of this Union. I was one of several who signed this petition against the Blair bill. I was not asked to sign this until the gentleman who circulated it was fully satisfied that I knew just what I was signing. This paper was headed by the pastor of the M. E. Church of this city; next came that of my own pastor, of the Baptist Church, followed by the signatures of several of the prominent men of our city, whose signatures I recognized. I have in my possession a petition upon which I expect to receive a number of names of Christians. All of them will know why they sign it. I do not wish to weary you, but I want to say to you that I am sorry to see those of my own faith persecuting those Christians against whom they can bring no greater charge than that they insist upon having the liberty which God has given every man, and which our National Constitution guarantees. God speed you in this work. I remain, etc."

This simple statement meets every point of the charge which they bring against us; and coupled with the fact that every point of their charge contradicts every other point, it certainly ought to put a stop to their attempt at misrepresentation; but it will not. Having started on a career of misrepresentation, and being determined to have a Sunday law, which cannot be secured by fair means, they must necessarily pursue their course to the end. Our desire is to save as many as possible from coming to that end, which will not be simply the securing of a national Sunday law.

E. J. W.

"Exemption Clauses in Sunday Laws" *American Sentinel* 4, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Oracle* of April 25 contains an article from a fair-minded correspondent, upon "License and Sunday Laws." In it he makes the following reference to one who had previously written to the same paper:-

"He says that if the Blair bill should pass, and a strict Sunday law be passed, Adventists could obey the law without any violation of their religious principles. True; but if you forbid them doing any manual labor on that day you rob them of one-sixth of their power to earn a living for their families-or at \$2.00 per day it would amount to \$104 annually. Without their consent, is that American liberty? Suppose you rest on Sunday, and we pass a law to prohibit you from working Mondays; how would that suit you? Brethren, we don't want a Sunday law unless it has a proviso that those who conscientious keep the Sabbath shall not be prohibited from performing their usual occupation on Sunday. The Constitution is good enough as it is."

The writer of the above evidently believes in equal and exact justice to all; but he has not given the Sunday question sufficient thought, or he would know that there can never be any justice in connection with a Sunday law. In the

150

first place, a seventh-day Christian could not obey a Sunday law without violating his conscience. It is not necessary, however, to dwell upon this, since the writer would not have such compelled to rest on Sunday, because, as he rightly says, such compulsion would be robbery.

But those who have given much thought to the subject, whether friends or foes of Sunday legislation, know that no law can long be enforced with exceptions. We say that it is utterly impossible to enforce a Sunday law that makes an exemption in favor of those who observe the seventh day. Such a thing never has been done, and never will be done. True, there are Sunday laws which exempt observers of the seventh day ; but those laws are never enforced. They remain upon the statute books as dead letters. When the time comes that enough people get in earnest to have them enforced, they secure the repeal of the exemption clause. Then they can enforce the law, and not before.

Take the case of Arkansas as an example. It had for a long time a Sunday law which made an exemption in favor of seventh-day people. But that law was not enforced. No attempt was made to enforce it. Finally some unto quid people concluded that the law ought to be enforced. But they could not enforce it as it was. Why?-Because there was really nothing to enforce. The exemption in favor of seventh-day observers deprived the law of all its force. So they pleaded for the repeal of that exemption section, so that no non-religious person could evade the law by professing to be an observer of the seventh day. There is no evidence that any person had ever done so; but the Sunday-law people saw plainly that that could easily be done, and that to attempt to enforce a Sunday law with an exemption section, would be like trying to trap a fox with two holes to his den. So they stopped up all chance of escape, by securing the repeal of that obnoxious section. Then the law was enforced for the first time in its existence. And right vigorously was it enforced too. Then the saloon keepers had to suffer, didn't they? Not much. They sold whisky as openly as ever, and were not even indicted therefor. It was enforced against those who had rested on Saturday, and against no others. The National Reformers of Arkansas seemed to feel a special interest in the physical welfare of the Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh-day Baptists, for they sought to compel them to rest after they had already rested, while others were left free not to rest at all.

This prosecution went on until public indignation demanded that simple toleration, if not justice, should be granted to those observers of the seventh day, all of whom were good citizens. So a bill was introduced and passed, which granted to conscientious observers of the seventh day immunity from the pains and penalties of the Sunday law. The result was that the prosecution ceased. No attempt has been made since to enforce the law. Surely this is far more than merely suggestive.

Now a National Sunday law is desired. Its advocates make a great show of liberality, and say that they are going to see that it exempts those who observe

the seventh day. The Blair bill, however, made no such exemption. Nevertheless, fair-minded persons are caught by the pretension to liberality on the part of the National Reformers and the American Sabbath Union. But let it not be forgotten that the object of this proposed National Sunday law is to make efficient existing State Sunday laws. But it cannot give efficiency to them unless it is itself "efficient;" and it may be accepted as a fact that it will be no exception to previous laws, and cannot be enforced so long as it makes any exemption of those who observe another day. So the exemption will be allowed to remain only till the law is secured, and when the time comes to enforce it, the exemption will be repealed. That is the way it is done. Exemption clauses in Sunday laws are frauds. They are designed only to delude fair-minded persons into favoring the enactment of the law, and they never serve any other purpose. Let all lovers of justice pay no heed to the voice of the National Reform charmer, charm he never so wisely.

E. J. W.

June 12, 1889

"A Misleading Petition—Which One Is It?" *American Sentinel* 4, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

In the February number of *Our Day*, the magazine edited by Joseph Cook, in an editorial notice of the presentation of the Sunday-law petition to Congress, we find the following:-

"The Seventh-day Adventists, whose chief aim in life seems to be to break down the American Sabbath, are circulating a misleading counter-petition, which gives the impression that it is the religious observance of the Sabbath which the great petition asks Congress to promote, whereas nothing is asked beyond protection of Sunday rest and public worship in the domain of the National Government, as has been afforded in nearly all the States from the beginning to citizens in the domain of State governments."

About the same time Mr. Crafts published a circular letter in which he said:-

"Prompt action on the petition is the more important from the fact that the enemies of the Sunday-Rest law, a curious combination of Saturdarians, saloonists, and a few papers, are becoming very active in the circulation of misrepresentations and misleading counter-petitions, the latter so worded as to give the false impression that we are asking for a law to promote the religious observance of the Sabbath, whereas our petition seeks only protection for Sunday rest and worship."

Since so much is said about this counter-petition, it may be well to publish it, that all the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL may know what it does ask for. The petition reads as follows:-

"To the Honorable, the Senate of the United States-

"We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, or any other

religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way tend, either directly or indirectly, to give preference to the principles of any religion or of any religious body above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion; but that the total separation between religion and State, assured by the National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it."

Now we can compare the statements with the petition. Mr. Cook and Mr. Crafts say that this counter-petition is misleading, in that it gives the false impression that the Sunday-law people are asking for the promotion or protection of the religious observance of Sunday. But the most careful reader of the counter-petition will fail to find in it any reference whatever to the American Sunday Union, or to a petition for a Sunday law, or to the Blair bill, or to anything whatever that has been done. It simply asks that Congress shall not pass a bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or in regard to any other religious institution; nor to favor any amendment that would tend to give preference to any religion, or to any religious body, above another, but to keep Church and State entirely separate, as they were designed to be by the fathers of our country. In short, the sum of the petition is that Congress will not interfere in religious controversies, and in matters purely religious. Our Sunday-law friends claim that this is just what they want; they claim that they do not want religious legislation; they claim that they want Church and State kept entirely separate. Now if they are sincere in their protestations, why do they object so strongly to this counter-petition? Indeed, if they mean what they say when they deny the charge that they are laboring for a union of Church and State, and are so bitterly opposed to civil interference in matters purely religious, they ought to sign the petition. Indeed, they should be intensely anxious to sign it. If their protestations are of any value, then this so-called counter-petition is not a counter-petition at all, but is exactly in harmony with their petition and their line of work, and they ought to adopt it. But they do not indorse it; they most bitterly denounce it. Then what shall we conclude? We can form no other conclusion than that they are not sincere when they say that they do not desire a union of Church and State; when they say that what their petition calls for is not religious legislation. It is the wounded bird that flutters. The hatred which they manifest to this petition, and their evident chagrin at the large number of signatures of the best people that have been secured for it, show that the petition strikes directly against their work. They show that the counter-petition asks Congress not to do the very thing that their petition desires it to do. And what is that? It asks them not to legislate upon the subject of religion, and not to do anything that tends to Church and State union. By opposing

the petition which asks that this be not done they show that they want it done. In no other way could they so clearly show the real object of the Sunday-law petition, and the spirit of the Sunday-law movement, than by the bitter opposition which they make to this counter-petition. Their action in the matter stamps their

movement as a movement to secure a union of Church and State, and nothing else.

Now we will have a little direct testimony concerning the matter of the religious observance of Sunday, which both Mr. Cook and Mr. Crafts say they do not desire. We will quote once more a few statements which will show clearly just what they do want. We have given them many times, but we shall doubtless be compelled to repeat them many more times, for the Sunday people persist in telling the people generally another thing from what they talk among themselves. First, we repeat the statement made by Mrs. Bateham in her speech at the Washington Convention last summer. Referring to the petitions that hung around the assembly room, she said:-

"As I look about this church to-night, I cannot help thinking of the fourteen million people that this meeting represents, all of whom are praying to have the holy day observed. They are praying that the Government will pass a law that will compel the people to observe the first day of the week; and people in every State of the Union are distributing circulars to secure signatures to that effect."

This statement is taken from the report in the *Lutheran Observer* of December 21, 1888, whose editor, Dr. Conrad, was one of the speakers at the convention, and is one of the officers of the American Sunday Union. Nothing that we could say could more directly contradict the statement made by Mr. Cook and Mr. Crafts than does this statement by Mrs. Bateham. They say that their petition does not ask for the religious observance of the day, but she says that the petitioners pray to have the holy day observed. Of course, we know that there were not fourteen million petitioners, and that the day is not holy; but her statement intimates that those who signed the petition intelligently did so with the understanding that it was a request to have the day observed as though it were holy. It is true that the petition itself does not say anything about religious observance; but Mrs. Bateham says that those who sign the petition thereby pray that the Government will pass a law to compel the people to observe the first day of the week. And the fact that she calls it a holy day shows that they sign the petition with the understanding that it is to secure the compulsory observance of Sunday as a holy day. Therefore, if Mr. Cook and Mr. Crafts are so righteously indignant because their petition has been, as they say, misrepresented and made to appear as though it called for the religious observance of Sunday, they should turn their guns upon Mrs. Bateham. Not an enemy to the Sunday-law petition or the Sunday-law movement has said a single thing beyond what Mrs. Bateham herself has said.

Again, in the report above referred to in the *Lutheran, Observer*, we find the following statement made by Dr. Crafts. He said, "The bill which has been introduced makes Sunday the ideal Sabbath of the Puritan, which day shall only be occupied by worship." That bill was introduced by Senator Blair in response to the petition which has been referred to, which was gotten up by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Yet Mr. Crafts says that they do not want anything like religious legislation, and that they don't petition to have Sunday observed religiously.

Again, Mr. Crafts said in his address before the general assembly of the Knights of Labor, reported in the *Journal of United Labor*, November 29, 1888, that "the weekly day of rest has never been secured in any land, except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out and you take the rest out."

Col. Elliott F. Shepard is president of the American Sunday Union. The New York Mail and Express of January 25, 1889, gives in full his address before the convention upon his election as president of the Union. In that address, he spoke of the petition as follows:-

"We have already been told that there are upon this petition for a National Sunday-Rest law some six millions of Protestants, and some seven millions of Romanists. The Romanists are supposed to be represented by that one signature-of Cardinal Gibbons-which was obtained with much less trouble than the greater part of the Protestants in our country. We have some six millions already on the petition, so that we have a basis to work upon; but there are still fifty-two millions of Protestants whom we must interest in this movement. We must go on; we must bring them to sign the petition for the Sabbath. We are very glad to welcome as a coadjutor the Roman Catholic Church in any branch of Christianity, or in any form of benevolent work in which it will consent to join us; but we must not forget the greater number of the population outside of that church, and we are bound to prosecute this work until we lay its binding truths of divine authority before the whole people, and bring them all into the valley of decision. Choose this day whom ye will serve; if the Lord be God, serve him; and if the world be God, serve that. You have to say yes or no-whether you will stand by the decalogue, whether you will stand by the Lord God Almighty, or whether you will turn your back upon him. The work, therefore, of this society has just begun. We do not put this work on mere human reasoning-for all that can be overthrown by human reason. We rest it directly and only on the divine commandment."

Now this shows that their petition is the one that is misleading. It shows that they expect to gain a great deal more than appears on the face of their petition; it shows that they have worded their petition just so as to secure the greatest number of signatures to it. They are multiplying signatures by every means, both fair and foul-principally foul-counting in its favor thousands of people who never heard of it, as well as other thousands who have heard of it, but who know really nothing as to its real design; and then they intend to wheel these petitioners into line, as favoring their construction of the petition, and demanding a law to compel people to observe Sunday as a holy day.

We might give other quotations from the leaders in the Sunday movement, but these are sufficient. We are not dealing in conjectures, but we give the statements as they appear in black and white, upon the authority of the leaders of the Sunday-law workers themselves. If anything in our language seems to be harsh, we leave it to the candid reader to decide if it is not just. We make no scruple in charging bad faith upon the leaders in this Sunday-law movement, because we condemn them only out of their own mouths; but in so doing we wish to make no reflections upon these men as individuals. We have no doubt that personally they are very pleasant men, and that under almost any other

circumstance they would reason logically and act fairly. We attribute their course, not to any inherent wickedness in themselves but to the force of circumstances. They have committed themselves to the securing of an iniquitous law, and such a law can be secured only by iniquitous methods. Religious legislation by civil Governments has always been marked by fraud and a disregard for the rights of dissenters; and when these men give themselves to such unrighteous work they can do no other than what they are doing. We pity them, and hope that some of them, at least, may see the error of their way and turn from it.

E. J. W.

"Mr. Crafts against Facts" *American Sentinel* 4, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

We have before us a copy of the Vineland (N. J.) *Evening Journal*, of April 19, which contains a report of an address on the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, delivered in that place by Doctor Crafts. From that report we make the following brief quotations, that we may compare them with the facts:-

The Blair bill, said he, is not what its enemies would have it. Blair drew this bill for the Sabbath men the same as any lawyer would draw bills for any client. Blair has drawn bills for another sect who are opposed in some degree to the American Sabbath, or a day of rest. The two bills are put together by enemies of the Rest bill, and thus misrepresentations are made. When Blair drew the original bill he used his own language, and the bill read 'promote' Sabbath observance instead of 'protect.' Enemies took the word 'promote' as an effort to get God in the Constitution and establish State religions-that is, religions supported and maintained by the State.

"The friends of the bill never had any desire to 'promote' Sabbath observance, and therefore that word was stricken out and 'protect' inserted, and this was done immediately, but the enemy still delights in informing the people that 'promote' is the word. Dr. Crafts gave a history of how the movement for Sabbath observance first started, and denied, as has been charged, that the W. C. T. U. was at the head of the move. The movement was started, not as a religious measure at all, but because some people saw that it was necessary to have a day of rest for the health of the multitudes, and that in these days of soulless corporations and combinations, it was necessary that law should stand between the 'spoiler' and the employes. When P. M. Arthur, the head of the Locomotive Engineers, and T. V. Powderly, the head of the Knights of Labor, each representing thousands of signatures, signed the petition for this Sunday-Rest bill, it was plain that they saw a need of a day of rest for the workingmen. Now labor organizations are taking the matter up and will carry reform out. Understand that 'religious observance' nor the 'word of God' are not mentioned in the bill, and are no part of it. The 'Rest bill' is for the benefit of the masses and the health of the people. The bill does not deny the right to work to any citizen in the United States, on any day of the week, provided that citizen does not engage in trade where there is competition, so that his neighbor is compelled to keep open his shop."

We know nothing of a bill that Mr. Blair has drawn for a sect that is opposed to the American Sabbath or to a day of rest. Indeed, we do not know of any sect in the United States that is opposed to a day of rest; but whatever other bills Mr. Blair may have drawn up, the enemies of the Sunday-Rest bill have not put together nor confounded it with any other. All our strictures have been made upon the Sunday-Rest bill, without any regard to any other bill. Further, Mr. Blair did not draw up the Sunday-Rest bill just as a lawyer would draw up any bill, but has shown himself intensely partisan in pushing the bill. In the notice which the April number of *Our Day* gives to the hearing on the Rest bill, we find this sentence: "We subjoin from its pages some of the dialogues between Senator Blair (who showed himself matchless in cross-questioning) and the opponents of the bill." This states the case exactly, as the reader of that hearing will see. Mr. Blair did act the part of a paid attorney, cross-questioning and arguing with the opponents of the bill, but assisting those that were praying for its passage. This may be set down as one instance where Mr. Crafts unfortunately differs with facts.

Again, concerning the relative importance of the words "promote" and "protect." It is not true, as Mr. Crafts states, that "the enemy still delights in informing the people that 'promote' is the word." It is a matter of fact that the bill

156

was not amended, now was any substitute introduced during the session of Congress. All there is to it is this: The American Sabbath Union, at its meeting in Washington last December, saw that the statement that the bill was designed to promote the observance of Sunday as a day of religious worship, showed too plainly upon its face that it was an act to establish a State religion. Accordingly they appointed a committee to formulate changes they desired in the bill. This committee reported; and among other things was the substitution of the word "protect" for "promote" in the preamble and last clause of the bill. These changes we immediately noted, publishing the original bill side by side with the bill as the Union desired it to read; we have printed it more than once, and have repeatedly referred to the change from "promote" to "protect;" although, as it has been said before, the bill which was introduced into Congress read, "to promote its (the first day) observance as a day of religious worship," until the bill died a natural death by the adjournment of Congress.

What Mr. Crafts objects to, however, is the fact that we have showed that the word "protect" does not conceal the object of the bill any more than did the word "promote." We have shown again and again that so far as the people who observe Sunday are concerned, they do not need any more protection than they already have. There is abundant provision in the laws of every State for the protection of religious worship. And the bill which Mr. Blair introduced does not say that it is desired that the people shall be protected, but that the religious observance of the day shall be protected; and that can mean nothing else but that all the people shall be prohibited from using the day in any other way than as a day of religious worship.

And this is just what Mr. Crafts himself has said that they desire to secure by the passage of the bill. In the Washington Convention he declared that "the bill

which has been introduced makes Sunday the ideal Sabbath of the Puritans, which day shall be occupied only by worship." So here we have No. 2 of Mr. Crafts's unfortunate collisions with facts.

Again, the report says that "Dr. Crafts gave a history of how the movement for Sabbath observance first started, and denied, as has been charged, that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union was at the head of the movement." Unfortunately for Mr. Crafts, we have something upon this point also. In the Union Signal of May 3, 1888, there appeared a report of a hearing which the Senate Committee on Education and Labor gave on the 6th of the preceding month to the friends of a Sunday law. Mrs. J. C. Bateham, the superintendent of the Sabbath Observance Department of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, presented the opening paper, and was followed by several ministers. The Union Signal, to which we just referred, said: "Senator Blair will now draft and present a bill for us." This shows that the bill was introduced at the request of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Again, in the hearing before the committee on Education and Labor, on Thursday, December 13, 1888, Mrs. Bateham, in replying to a question by Mr. Blair, said: "This petition work has been done chiefly by our Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The ministry, I may say, have had almost nothing to do with it. It was started in behalf of the elevation of the masses to protect the morality of the people." This is sufficient on that point.

Mr. Crafts says that the movement was started, not as a religious measure at all, but because some people saw that it was necessary to have a day of rest for the health of the multitude. Again he says: "Understand that 'religious observance' nor the 'word of God' are not mentioned in the bill and are no part of it. The Rest bill is for the benefit of the masses, and the health of the people." Mr. Crafts may presume upon the ignorance of the people to whom he lectures, but he ought to take some precaution to keep his lectures from getting into print, where they can be seen by those who are familiar with the Blair bill. With his statement that religious observance is not mentioned in the bill, and is no part of it, compare the preamble of the bill. We quote it with the changes desired by the American Sabbath Union, so that Mr. Crafts can find no fault with it. It reads as follows:-

"A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the Lord's day, commonly known as Sunday, as a day of rest, and to protect its observance as a day of religious worship."

Now it is technically true that the term "religious observance" does not occur in this preamble; that is, the words do not occur in just that relation; but nevertheless it is plainly declared that the bill is to protect the religious observance of the day. But this is not all; the bill itself closes with the statement that "the act shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during Sunday, their mental and moral culture, and *the protection of the religious observance of the day.*" Yet in the face of this Mr. Crafts wishes us to understand that "religious observance" is not mentioned in the bill and is no part of it! The reader can draw his own conclusions as to the design of Mr. Crafts in making that statement.

Again he says that "when P. M. Arthur, the head of the Locomotive Engineers, and T. V. Powderly, the head of the Knights of Labor, each representing thousands of signatures, signed the petition for this Sunday-Rest bill, it was plain that they saw the need of a day of rest for the workingmen." Mr. Crafts is here trying to substantiate his assertions that this Sunday movement was originated solely by the workingmen and not by the churches. But it is about as nefarious a statement as the other; for, as a matter of fact, Mr. Powderly and Mr. Arthur did not indorse the petition in behalf of the thousands who had never seen it, until Mr. Crafts had labored with them for several hours, overcoming their objections. And further than this, the Union Signal, referring to the vote passed by the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor after Mr. Crafts had argued and pleaded with them, said that it was a wonderful victory achieved by Mr. Crafts. It could not have been very much of a victory to secure the signatures of those workingmen, if the workingmen had instituted the movement. There seems to be a little discrepancy here which we will leave to Mr. Crafts to explain.

Once more, Mr. Crafts says that the bill does not deny the right to work to any citizen in the United States, on any day of the week, provided that citizen does not engage in trade, where there is competition, so that his neighbor is compelled to keep open his shop. If we had the space we would reprint the bill in full; but those who have files of the AMERICAN SENTINEL can find it, and can verify our statement that the bill specifies nothing of the kind. We will quote enough to show that it does deny the right of any person subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States to work on Sunday, even if he is not engaged in trade, and if there is no competition. Section 1 of the bill (and let it be understood that we are quoting from the bill as amended by the American Sabbath Union) reads as follows:-

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, games or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section."

We advise Mr. Crafts to study the Sunday bill a little more thoroughly before he lectures again. We might dwell at length upon the last statement quoted by Mr. Crafts in regard to competition, but if we merely call attention to it it will be sufficient in this place to let the reader see that if his statement were true it would show that the Sunday movement was simply a part of a gigantic monopoly, that if carried out would eclipse anything that has ever been known. All that we designed to do in this article was to call attention to the almost constant collisions between the statements of the leaders in the Sunday-law movement and the truth. It can truly be said of them that they are not afraid of the truth, for they

meet it in conflict nearly every day.
E. J. W.

June 19, 1889

"Christopher Ephraim's Tottering Morality" *American Sentinel* 4, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

Someone has favored us with a copy of the *Home Record*, a paper published at Leavenworth, Kansas, which contains an article that shows very clearly the spirit that actuates some of those who are zealous for a Sunday law. The article in question is by Mrs. H. F. Hartough. It purports to be the experience of an old lady with a young lady who was circulating the protest against religious legislation. After a little introductory gossip about her son, Christopher Ephraim, who was a little wild, the old lady describes the visit of the young lady and her introduction of her business, and finally asks what the petition is. The story then proceeds in the old lady's language, as follows:-

"'It is against establishing a religion in this country,' says she, 'that will make a man keep a proscribed Sabbath-day, or believe in things he cannot believe in. It is against recognizing God in the Constitution.'

"That Sabbath business made me think of Christopher E. How he went to base-ball games and races on Sundays in summer-time, and hunting in winter time, an' it wasn't doing him any good. So I says, says I, 'I'm in favor of getting more of God an' the Sabbath in our Constitution! It won't hurt our systems one bit. Now, my Christopher Ephraim is lettin' all the Sabbath get out of his constitution, an' he's failin', morally. His foundation is totterin', an' he'll fall, sure as fate, if there ain't something done. I want a law passed,' says I, 'that'll compel people to keep the Sabbath-day just as much as to keep 'em from killin' folks.'

"'Whether they believe in it or not, eh?' says she, sneerin'.

"'Certainly,' says I. 'If a man believes in killin' would you let him murder your family, ma'am?'

"'That's quite a different matter,' says she.

"No, 'tain't,' says I, getting warm. 'One's just as right as the Pother. It's no more right for my son to go to base-ball games on Sundays, an' horse-races, an' all such, than it is for him to steal or kill. No, ma'am; I want a Sunday law an' want it enforced, an' if somebody or other don't believe in keepin' the law let 'em go where there ain't none. We don't want 'em here.'

"She looked at me as if she felt sorry for me. She actually did. But I didn't mind her looks. I was thinking about Christopher E., and how he was doomed to destruction if these things wa'nt put a stop to, an' I just went on: 'This land's getting too free,' says I, getting up and resum' my dustin'. 'We've put the Bible out of the public school for fear of hurtin' somebody's feelings; we've let the base-balls run for fear the workingmen wouldn't get exercise enough, an' now them freedom-lovin' folks want us to give up our Sunday. Pretty soon they'll come sneaking 'round an' petition Congress to compel the preachers to hunt texts out of the daily papers or the magazines instead of the Bible, for fear o' hurtin' their

feelings. They ain't patriots, they're heathen infidels, an' the quicker we send 'em out o' this land the freer we'll be."

This little story was of course written with an object, and that object was to prejudice people against those who oppose Sunday legislation and Church and State union. We propose to give a brief review of the portion which we have just copied, with the object of showing the real purpose of these Sunday workers.

The first point that we notice is the idea that religious legislation will make men good. The old lady gives as a reason why she is in favor of recognizing God in the Constitution, that her Christopher Ephraim is "lettin' all the Sabbath out of his constitution, an' he's failin', morally. His foundation is a totterin', an' he'll fall, sure as fate, if there ain't something done." The idea seems to have obtained a firm foothold that men can be made moral by law; but there is not a law in the universe that can make man moral or religious. The moral law does not make man moral, and will not prop up a "tottering" morality. God's own righteous law cannot make men righteous. The ten commandments only point out the unrighteousness of men, and drive them to Christ, whose righteousness may be imputed to them, and who, through their faith in him, will enable them to fulfill the righteousness of the law.

When people talk about propping up tottering morality by civil enactments, they show their ignorance of what morality is. Does the writer of that story imagine that the enactment of the Sunday law, and the recognition of God in the Constitution, will keep man from falling?-It seems so, and that is a regular National Reform idea; for in the *Christian Nation* of December 5, 1888, the Rev. N. M. Johnston tells of the time when Christ's "gospel will prevail, and wickedness be suppressed by law." In a speech in Monmouth, Ill., September 29, 1884, reported in the *Christian Statesman* of November 6, of the same year, M. A. Gault said:-

"This movement includes the triumph of every moral reform. Every true reform is simply an effort to get back to some one of the ten commandments. If that law was taken as a standard of religion, and if public sentiment were lifted up to that standard, it would do away with stealing, intemperance, profanity, Sabbath desecration, licentiousness, murder, and every evil that now vexes society. So we do not flatter ourselves when we say that the glorious millennial day will be ushered in by the triumph of this movement."

This shows just how much knowledge these National Reformers have of what sin is. They are going to suppress Sabbath-breaking, murder, licentiousness, etc., by law; but the truth is that very often the most vicious are those of whom the law cannot take any notice, because their viciousness is concealed in their own hearts. When a man commits a murder, the law can punish him, but it cannot prevent him from committing the murder. For instance, here is a man that has received some injury at the hands of another. He broods over the wrong, and cherishes anger and hatred until his revengeful feelings assume entire control of him, and he resolves to murder the object of his hatred. He fixes on the time when he will carry his murderous designs into effect, secretes himself at the place where he expects the man to pass, has his knife all in readiness to give the fatal blow, but his intended victim passes by another way where he cannot reach

hire without exposing himself, and so his plan is frustrated. Is he any less a murderer than though he had carried his design into effect? If he should die that moment, would God hold him any less guiltless than though he had killed the man? No; for the Bible declares that whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer. Yet not another soul on earth has known of this man's murderous intentions. Then how would it be possible to suppress murder by law?

Take the case of Sabbath-breaking. It is not simply the abstaining from labor on that day that constitutes Sabbath-keeping. Through the prophet Isaiah, the Lord says that to honor him by keeping his Sabbath, men must not do their own ways nor find their own pleasure, nor speak their own words. Now the minions of the Inquisition cannot keep such persistent watch over men as to know every word they speak, and does anyone suppose that the thoughts can be prevented from running riot even in the house of worship?

Take the matter of licentiousness. The law

164

punishes the adulterer and the seducer, but it cannot prevent licentiousness. Here is a man whose very soul is rotten with iniquity. He cherishes lustful desires toward someone of the opposite sex, and his whole thought is how he can accomplish his design. He thinks of it by day, and dreams of it by night. He lives in an atmosphere of impurity, and is wholly corrupt. In imagination he again and again accomplishes his desires; but something happens to prevent the overt act, and nobody but himself knows his evil purpose. Yet, according to the Bible, he is as guilty as though the act had actually been committed. The Saviour said that he who looks upon a woman with lust, has already committed adultery. But law cannot prohibit lust. Even the agents of the Inquisition cannot fathom a man's thoughts and read his corrupt desires.

So it is utter folly to speak of suppressing immorality by law. It is not only folly but it is wicked, for it leads to an establishment of a false standard of morality. When men talk of putting down immorality by law, they thereby say that the outward observance of the law, which is all that can be secured, is all that constitutes morality. Therefore they deceive the man who is outwardly correct in deportment but abominably corrupt in heart, into the belief that he is an upright man.

The writer of the article under consideration makes the old lady say: "I want a law passed that will compel people to keep the Sabbath-day just as much as to keep them from killing folks." Now granting that it is just as wicked to break the Sabbath as it is to murder, it does not follow that there should be a civil law against Sabbath-breaking, just as to punish murder. The two things are entirely dissimilar. A man may break the Sabbath, and do no injury to any person besides himself. He does not interfere with the inalienable right of any individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as he does when he commits murder. He does not by his act compel anybody else to do wrong. His act begins and ends with himself; therefore the Government cannot rightfully take any notice of it.

But says one, What about the hilarious, boisterous Sunday picnics, in which drunken hoodlums annoy people, disturb worship, and endanger or destroy property?-Why, deal with them just as you would on any other day of the week.

The same law that arrests the drunken hoodlum for making a nuisance of himself on Monday will do it on Sunday. The old lady in the story said that her Christopher was doomed to destruction if Sunday labor and amusements were not stopped. This again shows the National Reform theory that the people of the country are to be saved by law. The State is to take the place of the church, and men are to be swept into the kingdom of Heaven by wholesale, whether they will or no. The gospel knows nothing of such methods of salvation.

Only one point more need take our attention. That is the intolerance of religious legislation. Says the old lady: "I want a Sunday law and want it enforced, and if somebody or other don't believe in keeping the law; let them go where there ain't none. We do not want them here." And again, "The quicker we send them out of this land, the freer we shall be." These statements stamp this Sunday-law movement as being the very essence of National Reform, for the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL have often read the statement made by Mr. Graham, one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, to the effect that if the enemies of their movement did not like it they could go to some barren land, and in the name of the devil and for the sake of the devil, stay there till they die. Now notice where this false zeal for religion will lead these people to. First, they must Christianize the country by law. Those who do not like the law and do not wish to be Christianized after their methods can leave the country. But some other country to which they might go will be fired with the same kind of zeal, and so will refuse to receive them. Thus we may imagine them wandering from country to country only to find that all are zealous for the same sort of millennium, and that the people are getting so good that they will not tolerate anyone who they think is bad, and that will be the one who does not think as they do. Then what?-Why, then the only thing to do with these persistent heretics, who refuse to be Christianized according to the National Reform idea, will be to put them to death. There will be no room for them on the earth. This was the conclusion that was reached in the days of the Papal supremacy. And if National Reform, which is the image of the Papacy, shall ever be carried to its finality, it will result again. The spirit of so-called National Reform from Sunday legislation to the end of the chapter is the spirit of intolerance and persecution.

E. J. W.

June 26, 1889

"Who Are the Friends of the Bible?" *American Sentinel* 4, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Congregationalist* of February 7 contained an editorial entitled "Unsectarian Morality," in which it says:-

"The *Christian Register* published last week the replies of thirty-five eminent men and women, many of whom are practical educators, to the questions whether morality can be taught in our public schools without sectarianism, and what suggestions they had to offer as to methods and influences. As, naturally, they look at the subject from widely different points of view, their replies vary

considerably in detail. It is the more gratifying, therefore, to notice that most of them answer the first question heartily in the affirmative. Of course the five Roman Catholics claim that morality cannot be taught, in any sense satisfactory to them, without including the inculcation of the principles of Roman Catholicism; and there are one or two others who reply negatively."

This is in line with the ideas expressed by Senator Blair in his speech in the Senate, December 21, on the occasion of referring his proposed religious amendment to the Committee on Education and Labor. Said he:-

"In regard to the general principles of the Christian religion, no one but a bigot would think of having introduced into the public schools instruction in favor of any form of sectarianism; but a knowledge of the Christian religion, even if there be no enforcement of those truths upon the conviction and belief of the child, instruction in those principles, a statement or explanation of what they are, exactly as instruction is given in the principles of arithmetic and geography and any of the common branches of science, is exceedingly desirable and important for every citizen of this country to possess, whether he applies the principles in his personal conduct or not."

No one can talk that way who has any just idea of the Scriptures-their nature and object. Such talk can come only from those who can see no more in the Bible than they do in an ordinary text-book on science; just as the carrying out of Mr. Blair's proposed amendment would result in lowering the Bible, in the minds of the people, to the level of text-books on arithmetic and geography.

In contrast with the statements of those who imagine that the Bible can be studied with profit in the same way that history and geography are studied, let us place the statement of a man who knows what the Bible is, and what it is for. In the *Old Testament Student* of February, 1889, the editor, Prof: William R. Harper, of Yale University, writes as follows:-

"The Old Testament is not Hebrew literature. This statement may appear startling; but it is true. The Old Testament is not Hebrew literature in the sense that the Iliad and the Greek Drama are Greek literature; or the Book of the Dead, Egyptian; or the Zend Avesta, Persian. If one desires simple Hebrew literature, the product of the Jewish mind, he will find it in the Talmud, Targums, and other rabbinical writings. The writers of the Old Testament were more than mere Hebrews. Moses, David, and Isaiah did not simply reflect national thought and feeling. They were inspired, were men to whom divine thought and feeling were revealed. When we speak of the study of the Old Testament as literature, we mean, then, the study of the national dress and outward adornment of a body of divine truth. Such study is profitable and interesting, and very important. But is it insignificant when compared with the study of the doctrine which this outward national dress contains? Renan has made a special study of the Hebrew Scripture from the point of view that they are a national literature, and with what result? The divine truth has made so little impression upon him that he can write a play, 'the story of which, of a man's debauchery the day before the guillotine, is as correct as can well be conceived, and its leading thought is that passions must run their course even if death stands at the door.' Such debasing thought and philosophy may thus co-exist with the highest appreciation of the Bible as a

literature. Turn now from Renan to those who have studied these sacred writings to find therein the voice of God speaking of sin, justice, and mercy; and how great the contrast! Here belong such men as Luther, Calvin, Latimer, Knox, Wesley, together with the great rank and file of earnest Christian workers and believers. The Old Testament is not the history of men's thoughts about God, or desires after God, or affections toward him. It professes to be a history of God's unveiling of himself to men. If it is not that, it is nothing; it is false from beginning to end. To make it the history of the speculation of a certain tribe about God, we must deny the very root of any speculations which that tribe ever had. For this root is the belief that they could not think of him unless he had first thought of them; that they could not speak of him unless he were speaking of them."

"In the modern revival of biblical study there is a danger that the Scripture by some may be studied only after the manner of Renan, or too exclusively as a national literature."

Dr. Harper is not ignorant of the literary beauty of the Bible, as anyone who is acquainted with him can testify; but he sees the danger of studying it with that sole object. As a matter of fact, it cannot be taught according to Mr. Blair's ideas—except by avowed infidels, which of course would never be thought of, and if it were, the result would necessarily be to make infidels. No man who has any regard for the Bible as the word of God, can teach it without conforming his teaching to his own religious views; and if this were done in the public schools, confusion and religious strife would inevitably follow. How can the danger be averted?—Only by keeping the Bible out of State schools, and leaving instruction in it to the family, the church, and the private or denominational school.

They are not true friends of the Bible who are clamoring for its introduction into the public schools. They may be sincere in their motives, but they would give the sacred Book the worst blow it has ever received. The friends of the Bible are those who wish it studied for just what it is—the revelation of God's will to man—the guide to holiness and eternal life.

E. J. W.

July 3, 1889

"Editor Shephard and the Baptist Clergymen" *American Sentinel* 4, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

On the 22nd of April, Mr. Shepard, editor of the *New York Mail and Express*, and president of the American Sabbath Union, addressed the Baptist Ministerial Association of Philadelphia upon the subject of "The Observance of the Sabbath." The Philadelphia Bulletin of that date gives a brief notice of his address, from which we clip the following:—

"He spoke without notes, and began by saying that it was owing to his Baptist grandmother that he was not known as Jack Shepard, and that when he goes to the city of brotherly love he always remembers that his mother is a Quaker; and continuing said it would be affectation to think that he could say anything new to

an assembly of Baptist clergymen. The blessing in the book of Genesis is not for a seventh day but for the Sabbath. We should take the spirit of the commandment, and take one-seventh part of time and devote it to God. As the majority of Christians have taken the first day of the week it is better that we too should observe it."

It would indeed seem to be affectation for Mr. Shepard to think he could instruct an assembly of Baptist clergymen. On first thought we should call it presumption, or great self-conceit; but inasmuch as the Baptist clergymen listened quietly to his instruction, doubtless they thought it profitable. Whether it was presumption or not, it is certainly strange that an editor of a secular newspaper should be able to instruct a party of Baptist clergymen in theology. It either speaks a great deal for the editor or very little for the clergymen.

When we read his statement that the blessing in the book of Genesis is not for the seventh day, but, for the Sabbath, we are fully assured that even if he could not say anything new to the assembly of Baptist clergymen, he could say something that was not true. Doubtless Mr. Shepard has read in the book of Genesis the account of the blessing to which he referred. If he had, then he must have known that what he said was not true. We will quote it: "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." Gen. 2:3. Mr. Shepard says that the blessing was not for the seventh day. The Scripture says that the blessing was for the seventh day. Moreover, the pronouns in the verse refer to the definite day, the seventh day, the day in which God rested. By no possible construction could it be made to appear that this blessing is for the Sabbath institution and not for a definite day. The preceding verse says that God rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. Now the day was not the Sabbath until God had rested, because Sabbath means rest. It was his resting on that day that made it a Sabbath. It was his blessing it and his hallowing it that made it the holy Sabbath. But it was the seventh day in which he rested; and he blessed it-the seventh day-and sanctified it-the seventh day-because that in it he had rested. Will Mr. Shepard say that God did not rest on the seventh day, but only on the Sabbath? He cannot without denying the plainest declaration of Scripture; but the statement that God rested on the seventh day is no plainer than the statement that he blessed that day.

Mr. Shepard says that we should take the spirit of the commandment, and take one-seventh part of time and devote it to God. Now it is susceptible of the clearest proof that the spirit of the commandment, as well as the letter, has no reference to simply one-seventh part of time, but to a definite seventh day. But we will let that pass, and take Mr. Shepard's version of the commandment, namely, that it requires one-seventh part of time, leaving the specific day to the choice of the individual. In a speech made by Mr. Shepard at the National Sunday Convention, last December, he implied that they intended to re-enact the fourth commandment. In speeches since that time, and in articles, he and other leaders in the Sunday-law movement have claimed that they wanted the law in harmony with the fourth commandment. Now if he really believes that the spirit of the commandment requires simply one-seventh part of man's time, and does not

specify the particular day, why does he labor so zealously for a law to compel people to keep one particular day of the week-the first day? Does he not by his own statement convict himself of laboring for something that is contrary to the Bible?-He certainly does. He claims that he wants this Government to be Christian, to be in harmony with the Bible; and yet he is laboring to have it pass laws which are directly contrary to what he himself says the Bible teaches. We should be glad to see how he can absolve himself from the charge of gross inconsistency.

Seventh-day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists claim that the fourth commandment is very definite, and that by it the Lord requires the observance of the seventh day of the week, and no other. Mr. Shepard and many of his under-shepherds deny this. They cannot make the claim for Sunday that seventh-day people do for Saturday, because they well know that the fourth commandment makes no reference whatever to the first day of the week. In order, however, to make it appear that they comply with the fourth commandment, they adopt the theory that it calls

178

for the observance of simply a seventh part of time; but they ought to be able to see that such a theory does not help them any as against seventh-day observers. Saturday is one-seventh part of time just as much as Sunday is. Therefore, if they propose to legislate in harmony with the fourth commandment, and they say that that commandment requires simply the observance of a seventh part of time, without specifying which day, they stultify themselves whenever they attempt to enforce their definite Sunday law upon seventh-day people.

We have a stronger charge yet to bring against them. Out of their own mouth we will convict them of doing the very thing which the apostle Paul charges upon the "man of sin" in 2 Thess. 2:4. They say that God has not specified the exact day that is to be observed, but that he simply requires an indefinite seventh part of time, and they propose to go beyond him and require all men to observe the same time, and they specify the first day of the week. Now if they believe the theory which they put forth concerning the commandment, then they are exalting themselves above God. They say that God left the commandment indefinite. Now if that is so he must have had a reason for it. What reason have they to say that his reason is not a good one? What right have they to attempt an improvement upon his commandment? They must stand convicted of the grossest presumption. We would advise them not to meddle with the affairs of God, but to leave his commandment as he left it.

"As the majority of Christians have taken the first day of the week, it is better that we all should observe it," says Mr. Shepard. Who are the "we" to whom he refers? He cannot include all creation in that word. He was speaking to a company who already observe the first day of the week. Of course if they think it is better for them to observe the first day, they are at perfect liberty to do so. But that does not prove anything in regard to those who do not think it is better to observe the first day of the week. His theory of the fourth commandment leaves every-one to choose his own time, only so he is sure to take a seventh; and his

statement that it is better to observe the first day because the majority of Christians observe that day, shows that he does not pretend to have any authority for the observance of Sunday other than custom; and yet he proposes to three others to follow his custom, for which he acknowledges that he has no authority. What more than this is needed to show that this Sunday-law movement has its origin in selfish bigotry and the spirit of Papal assumption?
E. J. W.

July 17, 1889

"Mr. Crafts and the Petitioners Again" *American Sentinel* 4, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Christian Statesman* of May 30, Mr. Crafts has a long article concerning the petitions against a National Sunday law. We have already noticed at some length, in the AMERICAN SENTINEL, the statements that Mr. Crafts has made in his speeches, but inasmuch as he keeps reiterating them, we can do no less than follow him up. He says of the counter-petition that it "would be unworthy of the attention of the religious press, but for the fact that in many cases it has deceived the very elect." We wish to notice first his charge of deception. The petition which he says deceives the people, reads as follows:-

"We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your honorable body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the Amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way tend, either directly or indirectly, to give preference to the principles of any religion, or of any religious body above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion, but that the total separation between religion and State, assured by the National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it."

We cannot see what there is about this that would deceive anybody. All there is to it is stated plainly on the face of it. It asks nothing more nor less than that Congress shall not enact any Sunday laws, nor indulge in any kind of religious legislation, nor favor any amendment of the Constitution that would in any way discriminate in matters of religion. Those who are opposed to such legislation, and who believe that it will work disastrously, sign the petition. Those who want religious legislation, and who favor action tending toward a union of Church and State, are naturally opposed to the petition. That is all there is to it. But Mr. Crafts says:-

"The counter-petition is not technically a falsehood, but it is certainly calculated to give the false impression that the petition which millions of us have been urging before the National Congress, includes a proposition to enforce Sabbath observance as a religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite, and also a proposition to weaken the present guarantees of our Constitution against a union of Church and State."

But the counter-petition makes no reference whatever to the petition which Mr. Crafts is circulating. It says nothing about it. It does not even imply that such a petition is being circulated. It makes no reference to any action that has been taken or that is being taken. It simply asks Congress not to do a certain thing. It asks Congress to secure the maintenance of the separation between religion and the State just as it was provided by the men who framed the Constitution. Mr. Crafts thinks that this is aimed at his petition. If that is what he is working for; then this counter-petition is against it; but if he is opposed to a union of Church and State, as he would have us believe, then the petition does not affect him or his work in the least.

But it will be urged that - the petition requests Congress not to pass any law in favor of the Lord's day; and Mr. Crafts says that it conveys the false impression that the American Sabbath Union includes a proposition to enforce Sabbath observance as a religious ordinance. But the Sabbath is solely a religious ordinance, and if Sabbath observance be enjoined, it cannot be enjoined in any other way than as a religious ordinance; and Mr. Crafts said so in his speech before the general assembly of the Knights of Labor, which we have referred to many times. He stated that Sunday rest could not be secured except on the basis of moral obligation. The Rev. Dr. Sunderland, who is one of the leading spirits in this Sunday crusade, says that it is simply impossible to have merely a civil Sunday without the religious features.

Dr. Herrick Johnson, who is another leader in the movement, says that to base the Sabbath, meaning of course Sunday laws, on mere human expediency is to base it on sand, and that while it may be proper to use the argument of expediency in influencing a certain class of men, it can never be permanently kept on such a basis, and that the anchorage of this movement is in the divine nature of the institution. And Mr. Shepard, the president of the Sunday Association, says that the only object of the organization should be to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship, and that laws framed to protect the weekly rest-day will fail to accomplish their full purpose when denied this moral basis. Therefore, from the admissions of the advocates of the Sunday law, the passage of the law would be to unite religion and the State. So that although the counter-petition mentions in particular laws in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, it may truly be said that the only thing that the counter-petition protests against, is the union of Church and State. So then, it would not be misleading in the least, if it positively declared that the Sunday law petition is a movement for the union of Church and State.

Here is a simple proposition that we will re-state. The counter-petition protests against a movement looking toward a union of Church and State. Mr. Crafts and his fellows say that they are strenuously opposed to any union of Church

194

and State. Then they ought to be in favor of this petition. But the fact that they themselves call it a counter-petition shows that they regard it as directly opposed to their petition; and the fact that they themselves are bitterly opposed to this petition against a union of Church and State, shows that they themselves are strenuously working for that very thing.

Mr. Crafts says that his petition "simply asks a law to protect the people in their right to a weekly day of rest, without requiring of anyone a religious observance of the day, and without hindering those who observe another day from either worshipping on that day, or working on the first day of the week-unless the work be of such a nature, shop-keeping for instance, as will interfere with the general rest."

Now, we ask, what necessity is there to ask for a law to protect the people in their right to a weekly day of rest? Who is attempting to deprive them of it? Who could deprive them of it if the attempt were made? Who can stop people from keeping a weekly rest-day if they want to keep it? These questions answer themselves. There is no law in the country to hinder anybody from resting on Sunday if he wants to, and there are very strict laws to preserve to the people their liberty to rest undisturbed. Can the ministers keep the rest-day?-Certainly. It has never been claimed that their right to worship undisturbed has been interfered with. Can the people rest on the Sunday? They can if they want to. Then in what does the desired protection consist? Simply in forcing those to observe it who do not want to keep it. That is all. But this is an unchristian act, in that it is doing to others what the doers would protest against if tried upon them, and also in that it can result in nothing else but the manufacture of infidels. It will have this result in two ways. First, by disgusting people by such unchristian methods carried on under the name of Christianity, and second, by substituting a form of Christianity for real service to God.

It is not simply desired to force unbelievers to keep the day so as not to disturb those who wish to keep it, but it is desired to prevent church-members from breaking the day, for the indictment charged against the Sunday newspaper is that it is a continual temptation thrown in the way of church-members, and leads them to neglect church duties. Again and again we have seen it stated in religious journals that the Sunday newspapers could not exist if it were not for the patronage of church-members. Therefore the desire about suppression of Sunday newspapers is that these weak-kneed professed Christians may not be tempted to belie their profession. In other words they ask the State to discipline their church-members. So that the protection they want is not to the Sunday, nor to the right of the people to observe the Sunday, but to the churches.

Notice that Mr. Crafts says that while they want this Sunday law, they don't desire to hinder those who observe another day from working on the first day of the week, unless the work be of such a nature, shop-keeping for instance, as will interfere with the general rest. But how will shop-keeping interfere with the general rest? A man may have a store and keep it open and not interfere with anyone, if he does not go out on the street and drag people into it. If he remains in his store, as reputable dealers usually do, and waits upon people who voluntarily come in to do business, he certainly does not interfere with anybody's rest. The whole scheme of this Sunday legislation seems to be based on the idea that the people, church-members as well as others, are bent on doing as they please on Sunday, and that if any possible chance is given them to do business or seek pleasure they will run after it, and that to keep them to anything like an observance of Sunday, every possibility to break it must be taken out of the way,

so that it will be impossible for them to do work or find amusements. What business has the State to say what kind of work a man may do upon a certain day? The statement that they do not intend to stop any work except that which will interfere with the general rest, is a mere blind to cover up their design to stop everything. For it is certain that if so quiet an occupation as shop-keeping will interfere with the general rest, there is nothing that will not be considered as interfering with it.

Mr. Crafts further states that the wording of the Blair Sunday bill, as originally presented, showed that it was designed to promote the religious observance of the day, "but only by giving opportunity for the culture of conscience on the part of those who desired it through the general suspension of public business." As much as to say that a man could not cultivate his conscience if somebody else were working. Mr. Crafts must be one of those unfortunate individuals who think that religion is a matter for Sunday only, for he doesn't propose to hinder people from laboring six days in the week, yet he implies that a man can't develop his conscience unless everybody stops working. The thing is absurd on the face of it. It simply shows an effort to try to find an excuse for an unjust, oppressive law; but the excuse is so thin that it only makes more apparent the weakness and injustice of the case.

Again Mr. Crafts says:-

"It was stated in the hearing of the chief promoter of the counter-petition four months and a half ago, at the time of the Washington Convention and hearing, that the word 'promote' in this connection would be changed to 'protect,' so that public worship so far as this bill is concerned, would simply have that protection which any legitimate institution of the American people is entitled to on that day."

We have no patience with any such quibbling as this. Mr. Crafts knows as well as anybody that public worship is already granted more protection than any other institution on any day of the week. There are the most severe laws against the disturbance of public religious assemblies. The bill had no reference to protection of public worship, and was not designed for any such purpose. We say this without any reservation, because if all the burden these men had were simply the protection of public worship, they would be content with the laws already existing. No one would ever think of petitioning Congress to pass a law making it a crime to commit murder, because there are abundant laws in every State concerning that. And so the fact that religious worship is already protected, abundantly shows that when Congress votes this law, they have something else in view entirely, that is not the protection of worship, but the enforcement of the religious observance of the day, just as the bill itself says.

But Mr. Crafts continues:-

"Those who are urging this counter-petition by voice and pen attempt to enlist yet others in their motley army, by declaring what is as ridiculous as it is false, that the Sabbath-rest movement is only a preparatory step to a further measure compelling everybody to attend church on the first day of the week."

It is true that the charge has been repeatedly made in the AMERICAN SENTINEL and elsewhere that the whole tendency of this movement is toward compulsory church attendance. These arguments have never been made and no

attempt has been made to meet them. And now when Mr. Crafts notices the charge he simply says that it is ridiculous and false. But a simple statement like that does not meet the case at all. The AMERICAN SENTINEL has not made any statements concerning the motive of those who desire Sunday legislation, but has simply declared what this thing would inevitably lead to. If it had said that they deliberately intend to enforce church attendance, or could they say that they do not, and that would be sufficient; but when we charge upon their sentiment, that it will necessarily result in compulsory church attendance, they cannot turn aside the force of this charge by simply asserting that it is absurd. The duty devolves upon them to show wherein it is absurd.

Now we will just make a very brief argument that has before been made in support of this charge, and then will ask Mr. Crafts to show its absurdity. We take first the statement made by Mr. Crafts himself at the first hearing before the Senate Committee. He said:-

"The postmaster-general agrees with me, and stated this morning, that it should not be possible for any post-master in this country to run the United States post-office as a rival and competitor and antagonist of the churches. The law allows the post-office to be kept open during the church hours unless the first mail of the day comes during those hours. If it comes five minutes or before the church service begins, the post-office can be run and is run in many cases all through church hours, as the rival and competitor and antagonist of the churches." "A law forbidding the opening of the United States post-office during the usual hours of public worship would remedy this difficulty, and would be better than nothing; but we desire more than this. The law should also take from the local post-master the power to keep his employes at work at such hours as would prevent them from going to church."

The idea of this is that the keeping open of the post-offices on Sunday prevents employes from going to church. Now suppose that the law is secured, and the post-offices are closed, and the clerks do not *then* attend church. It will be seen then that the reason why people work on Sunday instead of going to church is because they would rather do so. The Sunday-law people understand this just as well as we do, but that does not satisfy them. The churches must be attended. Now we submit as a reasonable proposition that if the post-offices are closed for the sole purpose of getting the employes to church, and that move does not succeed in getting them to church, then the next step will be to try some other method, and if that fails to try still another, until they have a simple, direct law requiring everyone unconditionally to attend church on Sunday. Then they will have just what Mr. Crafts at the Washington Convention said they desired to have,-"the ideal Sabbath of the Puritans."

Again, the Rev. Henry Wilson, at the Elgin Convention, said plainly, while arguing for the Sunday law, "The industries of the world should be silent one day in seven that the toiler may hear the invitation of the Master, Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest, and that the temple of God may be built without the sound of the hammer." It is a simple statement that all they want the Sunday

law for is that people may go to church. They want the people to hear their version of the invitation of the Master; but suppose the toiler does not care to hear that invitation, even when he is forcibly compelled to desist from labor. Why, then, they will necessarily take steps to compel him to listen.

In the same line was the complaint made by Dr. M. C. Briggs, in a Sunday-law meeting held in Oakland a few years ago. He said in substance, "You relegate the teaching of morals to the churches, and then make it impossible for us to teach the people, by allowing them to go where they please."

Now, if Mr. Crafts thinks that the charge that the Sunday-law movement will result in compelling people to attend church is absurd and false, we will give him space in the AMERICAN SENTINEL to show it.

One more point we will notice, and then we will leave Mr. Crafts for the present. He says:-

"The laws of our statute books that re-enact the seventh commandment are as distinctly Biblical in their origin as the laws that re-enact a part of the fourth commandment."

We would ask what the necessity is for the reenactment of either the seventh or the fourth commandment. Nay, what possibility is there for the re-enacting of either of these commandments, or for any other commandment of the Decalogue? Those commandments never have been abrogated. They stand as firm as when first given by the Almighty. Therefore there is no necessity for their re-enactment, and certainly it would be the height of presumption for any body of men to presume to re-enact laws given by the Creator. To assume that the State can do such work is to place it not only equal with God, but above God; and this assumption on the part of Mr. Crafts shows the work in which he is engaged to be papal in its character. Not only so, but it shows that Mr. Crafts and those who are laboring with him to the same end have no understanding of the commandments, or they would not make so ridiculous an assumption as that the State can either enact or re-enact them.

Still further, such a statement shows that those who make it are preparing to sink not only themselves but the whole people into the grossest immorality under the garb of Christianity. And here is the proof. The State can enforce only outward obedience to the commandments; but simply outward obedience to the commandments is no obedience at all. A man may be the grossest libertine, and still not commit any violation of the seventh commandment of which the State could take any notice. Yet, Mr. Crafts says that the laws of the State do re-enact the seventh and fourth commandments. This shows then, so great a misunderstanding of the commandments as to suppose that they require only such service as the State can enforce. Therefore, since the law of God is the standard of morality, those who hold with Mr. Crafts that the State can "re-enact" and enforce that law, will consider themselves moral if they comply with as much of that law as the State can enforce, that is, if they simply observe it outwardly. In other words, they will be in the very same condition as were the scribes and Pharisees, of whom Christ says, "Ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of

all uncleanness. Even so ye also appear outwardly righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." If this charge is a severe one, the responsibility of it rests with Mr. Crafts and his fellows, and not with us.

E. J. W.

July 31, 1889

"To Crush The Liquor Traffic?" *American Sentinel* 4, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

On Sunday evening, June 30, the Pennsylvania Sabbath Association held a meeting in the Salem M. E. Church; Philadelphia, at which several active workers for a Sunday law were present. One of the principal speakers was Lewis D. Vail, the attorney for the Law and Order Society. After speaking of the continental Sunday, and arguing that the working men would be great sufferers by its introduction into this country, Mr. Vail spent the greater portion of his time talking about saloons and licenses. Speaking of a recent Supreme Court decision, he said:-

"The Supreme Court says that their location is not a matter of public convenience, and they can all be located in a solid block, if they so elect. These so-called wholesalers can sell at any time on a week day, and eventually they will sell on Sunday. They will send their own men to the Legislature, and will work to control every branch of the Government. What you and I have to do is to fight for this control of the Government, and vote only for men who are pledged to work for good laws and for a better observance of the Sabbath. You may rest assured that God will look out for his Sunday, but we must do our work. God will grind this glorious country into powder if we disobey his laws. If a so-called Christian man votes for a man opposed to God's law, even if he belongs to a dozen churches, the devil will get him at last."

One need not take long to determine from the above what the Law and Order Society regards as the greater evil, the liquor traffic or Sunday work. Mr. Vail seems to feel very bad to think that the liquor-sellers are in danger of controlling every branch of the Government, and that they will locate their saloons anywhere they please. But the only remedy he and his Law and Order Society have in mind is, to fight for the control of the Government, and when they get this control to-do what? To crush out the liquor traffic? Oh no; to stop the sale of liquor on Sunday. The Law and Order Society has not yet got educated to the idea that selling liquor on any other day of the week than Sunday is disorderly.

If Mr. Vail really thinks that Sunday belongs to the Lord, he would do well to leave it with him and trust him to take care of it; but we cannot avoid the suspicion that the reason why he and the other leaders in the Sunday-law move are working so zealously for Sunday laws is, that they do not believe that God has any regard for Sunday any more than for any other day; and they are afraid that if they leave it with him the law will not be enforced, and they are determined to make people keep Sunday whether or no.

Rev. Mr. Redner, speaking of the prevailing disregard for Sunday, said the trouble was not so much with the chief justice and the other justices as with Christians, and professed Christians. That is exactly the point. Sunday is a church day; it is one of the days which "the church," according to the catechism, commands to be kept holy along with Christmas, New Years, Easter, St. Patrick's day, etc. But a large majority of professed Christians do not carry out the commands of the church. They disregard the obligations which they took upon themselves when they joined the church; and because of this disregard of church law, by those who belong to the church, the Sunday is not kept as a holy day. And now certain leaders in the church are knocking at the door of Congress with all their might to induce that body to pass a law to enforce the observance of Sunday.

In other words, they are asking Congress to come to the help of the churches, and compel church members to obey its laws. This is the sole object of Sunday legislation, and stamps the movement for Sunday laws to be purely a step toward the securing of Church and State.

E. J. W.

August 7, 1889

**"Relation of Civil Governments to the Moral Law" *American Sentinel*
4, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

Among right-minded persons there can be no question as to the right of earthly governments to exist. There is a class of persons known as "Anarchists," who deny that there is any necessity for government or law, or that one person has a right for exercise authority over another; but these persons, true to their name, believe in nothing; had they the power, they would cast God down from the throne of the universe as readily as they would the earth monarch from his limited dominion. With such persons we have nothing to do. It is useless to argue with those who will not admit self-evident propositions. The only argument that that can effectually reach them is the strong arm of the law, which they hate. Our argument shall be addressed to those who acknowledge God as the Creator and the supreme Ruler of the universe, and the Bible as the complete and perfect revelation of his will concerning his creatures on this earth. With such, the declaration of the prophet, that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will" (Dan. 4:25), and the statement of the apostle, that "the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:16), together with many other Scripture references to earthly governments, are sufficient evidence that nations have a right to exist.

Admitting that earthly governments are in the divine order of things, the next question is, For what purpose? The word itself indicates the answer: Governments exist for the purpose of governing, or, in other words, for the purpose of enforcing laws by which justice and harmony may be maintained. The apostle Peter says that governments are sent by the Lord "for the punishment of

evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well." 1 Peter 2:13, 14. Paul says also that the ruler is God's minister to execute wrath upon them that do evil. Rom. 13:4.

The next step in the investigation would naturally be to find out what laws earthly rulers are to execute. This is plainly indicated in the text first referred to. If the ruler is a minister of God, then the laws against which he is to execute *wrath*, need be such laws as God can approve—they must be in perfect harmony with the laws of God. Indeed, it could not be otherwise; for since God's law is *perfect* (Ps 19:7), covering in its range every act and thought (see Eccl. 12:13, 14; Heb. 4:12; Matt. 5:20-22, 27, 28), even, human law must be embraced within its limits. No one can dissent from this proposition. It is one of the fundamental principles of human law, as will be seen by the following extract from Blackstone's commentaries:-

"Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, that no human laws should be suffered to contradict these. There are, it is true, a great number of indifferent points in which both the divine law and the natural leave a man at his own liberty, but which are found necessary, for the benefit of society, to be restrained within certain limits. And beside it is that human laws have their greatest force and efficacy, for with regard for such points as are not indifferent, human laws are only declaratory of, and act in subordination to the former. To instance in the case of murder: This is expressly forbidden by the divine, and demonstrably by the natural law; and from these prohibitions arises the true unlawfulness of this crime. These human laws that assess a punishment to it, do not at all increase its guilt, or superadd any fresh obligation, *in foro conscientia* [in the court of conscience], to abstain from its perpetration. Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin as to commit it, we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine."-*Blackstone, vol. 1, p. 36.*

The State, then, according to both sacred and secular testimony, has no power to contravene the law of God, it cannot declare an act to be right or wrong unless God's law so declares it, and in that case the innocence or guilt arising from the performance of the act is due solely to the enactments of God's moral law, and not to the human enactment, the latter being subordinate to the former. The indifferent points, in which, as Blackstone says, human laws have their only inherent force, are such as regulate commerce, the tariff upon imported goods, etc. These are simply matters of convenience or expediency.

These questions being settled, the last and most important one is this: How far in morals have human laws jurisdiction? or, For how much of the violation of the moral law has God ordained that earthly rulers shall be his ministers to execute wrath? The Bible, which settles every important question concerning man's duty, must also divide this. We shall find the answer in the thirteenth chapter of Romans, a portion of which must be briefly examined:-

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt

have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good." Rom. 13:1-4.

The "high powers" do not include the *highest* power. While every soul is to be subject to earthly powers, some are absolved from allegiance to God. The service of the two will not be incompatible, so long as the earthly powers fulfill the object for which they are ordained, viz., to act as ministers for *good*. When they forget this, their subjects are bound to follow the example of the apostles under similar circumstances, and say, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 2:28.

The verses above quoted from the thirteenth of Romans show plainly that earthly governments alone are the subject of consideration in that chapter. The following verses show, with equal clearness, the extent of their jurisdiction:-

"Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love

219

worketh no ill to his neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. 13:8-10.

"He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law," and "love is the fulfilling of the law." What law?-Why, the law concerning which earthly rulers are the ministers. The law of God is summed up in the two great commandments: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." See Matt. 22:36-40. The second great commandment, defining our duty to our fellow-men, is expanded into the last six precepts of the decalogue, showing to what law he refers when he says, "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." To make this still *more* emphatic, he closes his enumeration of the commandments composing the last table of the decalogue, with the statement that "love worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore love is *the fulfilling* of the law." Now since the apostle is speaking only of earthly governments, and the duty of their subjects, we know that he who does no ill to his neighbor-loves his neighbor as himself-has fulfilled all the law of which these earthly governments are empowered to take notice.

Thus it is seen that Paul's argument concerning the office of civil government is confined to the last six commandments of the decalogue. But let it not be supposed that human governments can recognize all violations of even these last six commandments. Earthly governments are solely for the purpose of securing to their subjects mutual rights. So long as a man does no ill to his neighbor, the law cannot molest him. But any violation of the law of God affects the individual himself first of all. For example: Christ said that the seventh commandment may be violated by a single lustful look and evil desire; but such look and desire do not injure anyone except the individual indulging in them; it is only when they result in the commission of the open act of adultery, thus injuring others besides the adulterer himself, that human governments can interfere. To God alone belongs the power to punish sins of the mind.

Of the sixth commandment we are told that whosoever hates another has violated it; but the State cannot prevent a man from hating another, nor take any notice of hatred until it culminates in open crime.

There are innumerable ways in which the fifth commandment may be violated, for which the civil government has neither the right nor the power to punish. Only in extreme cases can the State interfere. A man may be covetous, and yet he is not liable to punishment until his covetousness results in open theft or swindling. Yet before the *act* is accomplished, of which the State can take notice, a man's covetousness or lying or hatred may work great annoyance to his neighbors.

We see, then, how imperfect are human governments even within the sphere allotted to them. God alone has the power to read the heart, and he alone has the right to "bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." With matters of purely a religious nature-those which rest solely upon our relation to God, and not to our neighbor-human governments have no right to interfere. Concerning them, each individual is answerable to God alone.

August 14, 1889

"An Unchristian Union" *American Sentinel* 4, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

At the State Convention of the Vermont Woman's Christian Temperance Union, something over a year ago, the 170 delegates adopted by unanimous vote,

"*Resolved*, That we believe Christ, as the author and head of government, should be recognized in all political platforms, and by all societies, and we will rejoice to see the day when a political party distinctly gives such recognition."

Miss Willard is reported as having said concerning this resolution, "There is not a W. C. T. U. in the land that will not echo this."

This is sufficient of itself to settle the question as to whether or not the W. C. T. U. is an ally to the National Reform Association. But it was not especially for the purpose of commenting on this resolution that we quoted it, but to place before our readers some correspondence which took place in regard to it, and which, though old, will doubtless be new to a great majority of the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and will be of interest, as the principles are ever the same.

Shortly after the passage of this resolution, Mrs. Lucinda B. Chandler addressed an open letter to Miss Willard, which was deemed of sufficient value by the latter to merit what she termed "a reply." After a brief introduction Mrs. Chandler proceeds as follows:-

"It is impossible for me to understand the record of the teaching of Jesus so as to claim him as 'the author and head of government.' He emphatically declared that his kingdom was not of this world. Jesus of Nazareth neither established ecclesiastical nor civil government. He founded neither church nor

State. The great burden of his teaching was to pronounce the relation of humanity to the Father as one of spirit, and the only worship he enjoined was to worship in spirit and in truth.

"How much would this true worship and love of the Spirit be promoted by grafting upon political platforms the name of Christ as 'the author and head of government.'

"With your fertile imagination I beg you to forecast the effect upon the native honesty and integrity of office-seekers and political partisans, of making the condition of a place in office and political power a religious test, and the subscribing to a claim that Jesus Christ is 'the author and head' of our national affairs. Have we not already enough of lying and hypocrisy in our land? Have we not enough of centralizing power already oppressing the people in mammoth-bred monopoly? Shall we have added a religious test to the sycophancy, and hypocritical pretense?"

It would seem as though this should commend itself to everybody as just criticism. It is incomprehensible how any one with any knowledge of American politics, or with any knowledge of human nature, should think that politics will be purified and human nature elevated by a political party having as the chief plank in its platform the recognition of Christ as "author and head of government." When we see how ready men are to profess anything, in order that they may advance their own interests; when the history of the world contains scarcely anything else than the record of the time-serving policy of men, of how men have sold their influence and their honor and everything, to gain popularity and power; how men have professed one religion to-day and another to-morrow, according as one or the other had the greatest hold upon the masses of the people-it is as clear as noon-day that if a political party should base its platform chiefly on the recognition of Christ as "author and head of government" it would only make hypocritical followers of Christ. Just as soon as it should by any means,-and it could not do it by Christian methods,-begin to gain control of affairs, all the baser element, all those who intend to feed at the public crib at any cost, would turn and support it; and men who are gross and profane and licentious in private, if not in public, would shout themselves hoarse for Christ and his kingdom.

Again we quote:-

"Religious tests as qualification for civic service would not develop a spirit of truth. Religious tests and a formal recognition of the name of God or Christ would inevitably become the fettering gyves of an assumptive hierarchy. The Protestant idea and principle having abnegated itself by adopting the method of hierarchial authority, would be swept into the abyss where liberty had already been cast, wounded unto death.

"No, no, my much-respected sister, I must hope that your more matured consideration will lead you to a different conclusion and determination. I cannot believe you wish religious liberty overthrown. I cannot think you would welcome the reign of hypocrisy and cant as an agency of political power. To enforce outward conduct by offering political preference would not advance either the spirit of truth or of love."

We quote again:-

"Righteousness, justice, truth, and above all 'love which vaunteth not itself and is not puffed up,' cannot be actualized in peoples or nations through legislative enactment."

With this last paragraph everybody ought to agree. It is self-evident. Love is not a thing that can be forced. Who is there so foolish as to think that one person can be compelled to love another? Who is there that would think of using physical force to get a child to love its teacher? and yet the W. C. T. U. and other National Reform bodies think to promote love for Christ and his truth by legal enactments! The statement of their desire should be sufficient to show the folly of it.

The letter proceeds as follows:-

"It is earnestly to be hoped that the W. C. T. U. will not lend its influence to any proposed political measures to destroy our constitutional liberties, religious or civil, but that they will continue to work diligently on the lines of education, toward a higher physiological, social, and moral standard of life on the comprehensive principle of temperance."

We heartily second this wish. With the legitimate work of this W. C. T. U. as we have always been in sympathy. If they would . . . they begun, to labor for the advancement of temperance by moral and intellectual *thought* they would never have a word of criticism from us. We heartily support them in their work to educate the children and all others in the principles of health and temperance and morality; but we cannot go with them when they depart from this reasonable and just method of work,-the only method which can accomplish any real results,-and adopt the unreasonable and unjust and wicked method of attempting to compel men to be Christlike.

We do not see how anyone can answer the following paragraph of the open letter to Miss Willard, except by endorsing it:-

"Jesus said to Zebedee's sons: 'Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you. Whosoever would be chief among you, let him be your servant.' The real followers of Christ will serve and minister unto humanity, and not seek to establish political power by means of religious test, even of the name of Christ."

The following also is worthy of careful consideration:-

"If the church under the constitutional freedom secured to it cannot leaven the people with a love of justice, and make itself a power against political corruption by its higher life, and the spirit of truth in its membership, it would surely fail of accomplishing it by platform dogmas or constitutional amendments."

This last paragraph strikes at the very root of the matter, and shows that such a course as is marked out by the National Reformers is derogatory to the Christian religion. It virtually says there is no power in the Spirit of Christ, and that God, working through his own divinely appointed ways, cannot accomplish the result that he designed; that if men work according to the rules he has laid down they will fail, and that therefore they must inaugurate a system of their own.

Further than this, it can be shown that a political party with such a platform as is desired by the W. C. T. U. can succeed only by stultifying itself. It can come to

power only by going directly contrary to all the principles of Christ and his kingdom, which they profess to wish to establish. Thus, political parties have influence according to the number of votes that they can control. These alone count. Now why is there call for such a party as the W. C. T. U. desire to see? Why do they wish it? Simply because existing parties are corrupt. And why are existing parties corrupt? Because the men who control them are corrupt; and not only are those who control them corrupt, but the pen they control are corrupt. In other words, politics is corrupt because the good men, the Christian men, and the men of high moral principle in the government are in the minority. They are outvoted by those who have no principle but selfish policy. Now how is this reform party to secure the controlling influence? Only by meeting these corrupt elements on their own ground, by opposing policy to policy, and by wire-pulling and underhanded means, such as are now employed; and then if they ever get into power, what will constitute their strength? Simply the number of votes they can secure to back their principles? And from what ranks will these voters have been secured?-from the ranks of the existing corrupt parties, from professional politicians who will have taken their stand because they have been led to think that there is profit in it; and as they will have a party professing allegiance to Christ, but made up of the very same men who

227

composed and controlled the old parties, and holding the very same principles; and, worse than all, these men will think themselves good Christians because they belong to the "Christian party." We say that all good Christians ought to pray to be delivered from complicity with any such party as this.

We say nothing concerning anyone's personal Christianity, but we are sure that no one who is really and intelligently Christian can ever favor any such scheme.

But how did Miss Willard reply to the letter from which we have quoted these strong, sensible paragraphs? She acknowledged the whole point in the questions so pertinently addressed to her, and simply reiterated her declaration in favor of a national Christianity. Here is a specimen:-

"Can the heart of God beat anywhere more potently than in a party and a platform that allies itself to God as revealed in that Christ spirit which knows neither foreign nor native, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female, but lifts humanity to one equal level of opportunity and hope?"

It is indeed true that in Christ there is neither bond nor free, neither male nor female, and all are one; but does Miss Willard expect this state of things to be brought about by political action? Every Christian knows, both from observation and experience, that there is nothing but the personal work of the Spirit of Christ in the heart that can break down distinctions of race and personal peculiarities and preferences, so that different peoples may unite as one. But can party platforms control the Spirit of Christ and bring it into the hearts of men. The fact that written creeds do not make Christians is almost universally recognized; and what would a political party with a platform recognizing Christ be but a creed; and how can such a creed have any more effect in transforming the life and character than a creed which men may receive or reject voluntarily?

There is indeed a party whose platform and all who compose it should be allied together by a tie that would break down distinctions of nationality and personal peculiarity, and that party is the church. Those only who are Christians can unite in the most perfect fellowship, but those who are Christians are members of this church, which is His body. It follows therefore that when Miss Willard desires a party that shall have this for its object she simply desires a political church, in other words, a union of Church and State. Of course, the object will fail of being achieved, and she will have simply a form, and such a church will not be the church of Christ.

Here is Miss Willard's idea of recognizing Christ. She says:-

"Christ is to-day the great world force for righteousness, for gentleness, for purity; and I believe with all my heart the world can in no other way do itself so great a favor as by making much of his mission. He is so high as to be seen from everywhere; to whom else can the nations rally with such unanimity. He is so vast as to encompass us all in his plan and his record; shall we not let him gather us as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings? He is so universal as to be claimed by all, from Catholics to Spiritualists, and even agnostics and atheists say with Pilate, 'I find no fault in the man.' Can we not all then consent to be claimed by him as loyal, loving followers?"

We are amazed that a woman of so much culture and presumably Christian experience as Miss Willard, can be so blinded as to think that a union of Catholics, Spiritualists, agnostics, and atheists, together with evangelical churches, upon a platform recognizing Christ, can be anything more than the most hollow and wicked sham.

Here the reader may see that all we have charged upon the movement is just. There will be no Christianity in it whatever. He who says that there will be real Christianity in the union, must say that infidels, agnostics, and atheists are real Christians. We believe that these men can be good citizens, but we are certain that they are not Christians. It needs no argument to show that a man who denies Christ is not a Christian. If it is true, as Miss Willard says, that all the Christian Unions in the United States are in favor of this thing, and are working for it, it is true the National W. C. T. U. is working itself into a position where it will be not a Christian Union, but an un-Christian union.

We do not know that we need to quote any more from this letter. It shows that the National Reform party, of which Miss Willard stands as the best representative, is visionary in the extreme. We are willing to grant that they desire a better state of things than now exists. They see that there is wickedness and corruption, and they desire to see a reversed state; but, they have dreamed an impossible thing. Their desires may be laudable, but their methods of work do not indicate a knowledge either of human nature or of the gospel of Christ.

E. J. W.

September 11, 1889

"Sunday Prohibition" *American Sentinel* 4, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

In the SENTINEL of May 1, 1889, we referred to a bill passed by the Tennessee Legislature, making it a misdemeanor to sell wine, ale, or beer on Sunday. In commenting upon this we stated that the bill makes it a righteous act to sell those articles on the other six days of the week. To this statement exception has been taken. A gentleman who writes that he is friendly to the work of the SENTINEL, says that he thinks it is wrong to sell intoxicating drinks at any time; but believes that if the traffic cannot be wholly suppressed, it is right to suppress it partially. We will state in brief our position, and explain the statement that we made.

We believe that the liquor traffic is entirely wrong. We are also in favor of suppressing it to any extent that can be done, and we do not decry a measure that will actually diminish the sale of liquor, for the simple reason that it is not total suppression. We believe that even less than half a loaf is better than no bread, but we have yet to see any evidence that the closing of Sunday saloons diminishes the amount of liquor drank. But even if this could be shown, it would not at all militate against our comment on the bill passed by the Tennessee Legislature. Our comment had reference not so much to the closing of saloons on Sunday, as to the way in which the matter was put. It was stated that selling

262

not mean that it is not a misdemeanor to sell it on other days, it does not mean anything. That it does mean to convey the idea that it is not a misdemeanor to sell it on other days, is shown by the fact that there is no penalty attached to the selling of it on other days of the week, whereas there would be a penalty if it were considered a misdemeanor. But a misdemeanor is misbehavior, wrong-doing; therefore to specify Sunday as the day on which it shall be considered a misdemeanor to sell liquor is virtually the same as saying that there is nothing wrong in it on other days of the week.

We do not see how anyone can controvert this view, and so we repeat, as we have often said, that the great objection we have to so-called Sunday legislation is that it tends to lower the standard of what temperance really is, and tends to make the liquor traffic respectable, thus making it impossible to gain the end that is de-sired by many who are earnest temperance people, and conscientious in their efforts to stop the sale of liquor on Sunday.

E. J. W.

September 18, 1889

"Our Position" *American Sentinel* 4, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

It has been our duty in our work to criticise very severely at times the actions and sayings of certain men,-churchmen, ministers of the gospel and lay workers,-and also the action of certain religious organs, in connection with the movement to secure national enforcement of Sunday observance. It has not been a

pleasant task to do this, and we have not done so because of any feeling of antagonism to the individuals so criticised; much less have we done so because of any antagonism whatever to religion; but there are some who do not distinguish carefully, and there are others, we are sorry to say, who willfully misrepresent our motives. Therefore we will make a few statements.

We do not oppose this Sunday movement because we have no respect for the convictions of those who observe Sunday. Not only do we reverence the Bible, but we have respect for every man's belief concerning the Bible. We are perfectly willing to afford to every person the free privilege of believing as he chooses. Not only are we willing but we insist upon it for every person. We believe that the government must protect all. We believe that the government should protect the Sunday observer in his observance of Sunday, just the same as it protects one who observes another day of the week in his observance of that day.

It is only the unchristian methods of doing what professes to be Christian work, but which is in reality unchristian, that we oppose.

We oppose Sunday legislation not because we are not willing that people should observe Sunday if they wish to, and not because we are unwilling that the government should see that they are not interfered with in their observance of Sunday, but we oppose the Sunday movement because it is unchristian, and it is shown to be unchristian by the unchristian methods employed in its maintenance.

We have the kindest feelings for all religious people. We would grant them the same consideration in their belief and practice that we would ask them to show us. It is only when they claim as their right that which they are not willing to grant to those who differ with them that we oppose them. When they do that, they are doing just that which they would not have others do to them, and that very thing shows their movement to be unchristian, because it is contrary to the rule laid down by Christ.

Let this distinction be kept constantly in view. Anything that can be shown by argument to be right, the SENTINEL will not oppose. Nay; more; although we do not believe that Sunday has the slightest sacredness, or has any claim to respect, more than Monday or Tuesday, yet if they will confine their advocacy of it to legitimate lines, -namely, the pulpit, the press, the Sunday-school, the family,- the SENTINEL would never say a word against them. In fact if this were so, there would be no SENTINEL.

The advocates of Sunday have the most perfect right to go anywhere or everywhere that they can secure a hearing, and speak night and day, teaching people to observe Sunday as a day of rest, appealing to their conscience and bringing arguments to bear upon them. They have a right to publish papers and circulate them everywhere, wherever they can induce people to read them. Against such work the SENTINEL would never lift its voice. But when they advocate the use of force, when they advocate measures which they would by no means consent to have carried out toward themselves were the conditions reversed, then the SENTINEL will oppose them, and it will call upon every consistent Christian to unite with it in its opposition.

We want it distinctly understood that the SENTINEL is opposed to nothing that is Christian-like. It was not started with the idea of antagonizing Christianity or any Christian movement. With doctrinal matters it has nothing to do. Its sole work is the maintenance of religious liberty of thought and action, because under such circumstances alone can true Christianity flourish. It does not claim to be the arbiter of what Christianity is, it does not presume to say what men ought to believe, or what they are to teach, or what religious customs they are to practice; it has only to do with efforts to propagate views by methods that tend only to oppression. Who is there that cannot stand upon the same platform?

E. J. W.

"The State to Let Religion Alone" *American Sentinel* 4, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

We recently had the pleasure of listening to one of a series of talks by Bishop Vincent, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on the epistles of Paul to Timothy, and were much edified by some remarks that he made upon the first two verses of the second chapter of the first epistle, which read as follows:-

"I exhort therefore; that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty."

Said he, "We should pray for kings and those in authority-for what purpose? That the church may have power in the government? No. That our ministers may have good appointments under the government? No. That the church may have the authority of the government to carry forward its work? No. But that they may so mind their business that we may have a quiet and tranquil life. The church makes a

266

gross mistake when it seeks to secure worldly position, and to influence temporal power.

He said that he always admired the answer that Diogenes made to Alexander, when the king visited the philosopher and asked him what he could do for him. The philosopher answered, "Stand out of the light." "Such," said he, "should be the position of the church. All that Christians should ask of the government is to let us alone, and to stand out of the way so that we may live quietly and peaceably, and carry on the work of the gospel by the power of the Spirit."

The bishop said further, "The abomination of abominations is the aspiration on the part of the church for temporal power. What the church wants is spiritual power." He then stated that the spiritual power of a church always declines in proportion as the church gains temporal power.

These are truths that have been time and again set forth in the AMERICAN SENTINEL, but we are glad to be able to present them anew from the mouth of so prominent and eminent a man as Bishop J. H. Vincent. It shows that the work of the AMERICAN SENTINEL in opposing the so-called National Reform movement, instead of being infidel or atheistic, is most truly Christian, and that the most active Christian workers,-those who have a right to that title,-promulgate the very same principles that the SENTINEL does.

While we in our work often have to make severe strictures on certain churchmen, we would not have anyone get the idea that it is because we are opposed to churches or Christianity. Our strictures upon those persons are not because we oppose whatever of true Christianity they may possess, but it is because they are doing not only unchristian but antichristian work. They are attempting to secure the very thing which Bishop Vincent says is the abomination of abominations in the church, and tends to dearth of spirituality. Therefore we may say without fear of successful contradiction that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is working for the conservation of true Christianity in this country.

E. J. W.

"Does it Pay" *American Sentinel* 4, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

Not long since, we listened to a lecture by Col. Elliott F. Shepard, president of the American Sabbath Union, on the question, "*Does the Sabbath pay?*" The lecture was notable chiefly for what the lecturer did not say, but there were one or two points which are worthy of careful attention, inasmuch as they show the principle, or rather the *lack of Christian* principle in this movement for the legal observance of Sunday. The whole thing is contained in the subject of the lecture, viz., "Does it pay?" We will note a few statements. Said Mr. Shepard:-

"Divine finance; what is it? The Old and the New Testament agree in contradicting Wall Street, and show that prosperity is to be found in obedience to God's commandments?"

This was the main feature of the lecture, namely the proof that more money could be made by resting on Sunday than by working upon it; and nothing but a mercenary motive was placed before the people. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Shepard said to the chairman of the meeting, "I would make some converts here to-night;" and then he proceeded to state that the railroads of the United States have suffered pecuniary loss because of their Sunday work. To emphasize this he made a little mathematical calculation to demonstrate, which we shall not try to follow; but the conclusion of which was that a manufacturer would make thirty-six per cent. more on Sunday might make fourteen per

267

cent. on his investment, by a strict observance of the day he would make fifty per cent. on his investment. This shows a gain of thirty-six per cent. for Sunday observance. And then the question was asked, Which is better, for a man to work on Sunday and make fourteen per cent. or to rest on Sunday and make fifty per cent. Anyone will say the latter is better."

We are not at all convinced that Mr. Shepard's mathematical calculations are correct, but let that pass. The question that at once arose in our mind was this: If Sunday-keeping pays pecuniarily, and if it can be demonstrated that a merchant or a manufacturer can make thirty-six per cent. more by resting on Sunday than by working, what need is there to ask the government to pass laws making it a crime for working on Sunday? Are the merchants and manufacturers in the United States so blind to their own business interests, so obtuse, so dull where dollars and cents are concerned, that they cannot be made to see the gain there

is in Sunday observance? and, seeing it, would they deliberately choose a small per cent. in preference to a very large per cent? We are forced to conclude that there is either something wrong with Mr. Shepard's mathematics or with his position as president of the American Sabbath Union. But this is not the worst feature of the case.

The pernicious effect of such teaching as that of Mr. Shepard cannot be seen now, but it will be demonstrated in time. The only argument he presented in the course of the whole evening (and his discourse was on Sunday evening too) was that there would be pecuniary profit in resting on Sunday, that Sunday-keeping would invariably bring prosperity, and that Sunday-breaking would as invariably result in financial ruin. Now any person of common sense knows that this is not so; but that is not the point. People do not always use their common sense, and that idea of Mr. Shepard's is getting to be quite common. Now couple this with another statement that he made in the same discourse. Said he, "It is useless for any one to claim that the Sabbath [by which he meant Sunday, of course] has any rights, except as they plant themselves on the divine commandment" He had already stated that the fourth commandment was the first commandment with blessing, and the only blessing that he made reference to was financial prosperity. Therefore the natural conclusion from his talk would be that the only blessing that is connected with the fourth commandment is temporal.

Still further: It is not a fact that obedience to the commandments of God will invariably bring temporal prosperity. In fact, it is most often the opposite, and has been so from time immemorial. The Psalmist recorded his feeling when he saw the prosperity of the wicked, seeing they were not in trouble as other men were, while the righteous were cast down. Everybody knows that some of the richest men in the world have been profligate, often base, grinding the poor, and have obtained their wealth by the most dishonorable methods, and have trampled upon every principle of right and justice. But let such teaching as that of Colonel Shepard become generally accepted, and what will be the result? Simply that the possession of great wealth will be taken as an expression of divine favor. The man who is enormously wealthy will be taken as a special favorite of Heaven. Let it be accepted that keeping the commandments necessarily results in worldly prosperity, while a violation of them results in embarrassment and ruin, and there can be no other conclusion but that the man who is rich is the one who is doing right; and so people in estimating his character will not compare his life with the commandments to see if he is obeying them, but will simply measure his bank account; and no matter how vile he has been, or by what unjust methods he may have obtained his wealth, he will be considered righteous. And so we have another indisputable proof that this Sunday movement is unchristian, and tends only to immorality.

We know that in ancient times the idea prevailed that the possession of wealth was a sign of the divine blessing. This idea was firmly fixed in the minds of the ancient Pharisees. So firmly did they believe it that many of them made it the great point in their lives to get wealth, regardless of the means by which it was acquired. And while continually transgressing the divine commandment in acquiring their wealth, they would point to the possession of that wealth as the

evidence that they were righteous, and that God loved them. There are Pharisees enough in the world now, but Col. Shepard and the Association to which he belongs are doing their best to make more.

E. J. W.

October 10, 1889

"National Reform Bigotry" *American Sentinel* 4, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* of August 8, contains a characteristic report from Secretary Gault. He has been circulating through Iowa recently, and in the course of a report of some meetings held at Malvern, we find the following paragraph:-

"The preceding Sabbath I preached twice at Afton, county seat of Union County, in the evening, on the Sabbath-Rest question, at a union service of the Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Evangelical churches. Here there was but one lady, a Seventh-day Adventist, who opposed the petition when it was put to vote of the congregation. She was landlady in the hotel where I lodged, and all day Sabbath her sewing machine hummed with a vim that was significant and unmistakable."

We mean nothing personal when we say that that is the utterance of a narrow-minded bigot. We simply state a fact. A bigot is one who thinks there is no one in the world of any consequence but himself, that the world was made for him, and that the sun shines principally for his benefit. The only possible inference that can be drawn from Mr. Gault's remark is that that lady committed an unpardonable act in doing her ordinary work on Sunday while he was in the hotel. The bigotry of the thing may be shown if we turn it around. Suppose that lady, or any individual who conscientiously observes the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, should chance to stop at a hotel kept by one who observes Sunday, would Mr. Gault think that person ought to cease his ordinary work on that day?

If Mr. Gault were a hotel keeper, and by chance a seventh-day observer should stop over the Sabbath with him, would he have everything stopped in his own house? Of course he would not. It is only when he is around that things must stop. It is his presence that must be regarded. If anyone believes differently from him, that individual has no right to exist, at least to carry out or act upon his belief. This principle is not peculiar to Mr. Gault, although it seems to be very fully developed in him, from what we have seen of his writings. But it is the principle of National Reform to act as though "we are the people, and the government must shape its action to conform to our opinions and to please us. It does not make any difference if other people are discommoded. What does that matter? They have no business to believe differently from what we do." This is National Reform in a nutshell. It must, from the very nature of the case, make bigots of those who devote themselves to it, no matter how liberal minded they might be by nature.

E. J. W.

October 16, 1889

"Sunday in California and New York" *American Sentinel* 4, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

Mr. Crafts has been in California, the only State in the Union which has no Sunday law; and the people may now expect to have it held up in season and out of season as the terrible example of immorality and vice consequent upon having no Sunday law. In his speeches here he declared that the State had retrograded in religion and morals since the repeal of its Sunday laws six years ago. To be sure Mr. Crafts was not in California six years ago, or before, when they had a Sunday law, and has not been here since that time, with the exception of a few days this year; but that doesn't make any difference with him.

But he does not find it all clear sailing in his endeavor to make capital for Sunday laws at the expense of California. At a meeting of the Congregational club in San Francisco, at which Mr. Crafts was present, the Rev. Dr. Barrows, of that city, said that what Dr. Crafts had said about the moral and religious declension in California was not true; that he had been here eight years, and that in all that time there had been a steady and constant advance in the moral and religious status, and that Dr. Crafts had been here but a few days and could not judge. He protested strongly against Dr. Crafts carrying such a report back to the East, because it was not true. The report of the meeting continues as follows: "Dr. Williams of Tulare City indorsed Dr. Barrows' remarks. The Sabbath was as well observed in Tulare as in any city that he had ever lived in. He was certainly in favor of the workingmen having the privilege of Sunday rest, but for the churches to press Sunday observance on the State, upon religious grounds, and endeavor indirectly to compel men to go to church by strict Sunday laws, could do no good, and might do much harm to the cause of religion. Rev. Dr. Cruzan of the Third Congregational Church, San Francisco, agreed with Dr. Williams and Dr. Barrows. During his recent visit to the East he had spent a Sunday at Coney Island. There was nothing like it for immorality and dissipation on the Pacific Coast; yet this was right under the nose of Dr. Crafts when he was at home, in a State that had strict Sunday laws."

"Let this be repeated everywhere Mr. Crafts goes. It comes from men who are earnest in their endeavor to get Sunday laws, but who are more interested in truth than in victory. It shows, what the *Alta California* claimed in a recent editorial, that Sunday laws are not necessary for the preservation of morality, and that California without any Sunday law is equal with, and even in advance, morally, of some States that have a stringent Sunday law.

But the point in the above quotation to which we wish to call especial attention is the charge by Dr. Williams, that Sunday laws, such as Mr. Crafts is laboring to secure, are an attempt to compel men to go to church. Mr. Crafts has complained bitterly because we have charged the same thing upon his movement. But here we have a statement to the same effect made by a minister who is engaged with him in an effort to secure a Sunday law, but who does not believe in going to the

same length. This is another demonstration that the SENTINEL has not misrepresented the Sunday-law movement. E. J. W.

"Mr. Small on Church and State" *American Sentinel* 4, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

Under the heading, "No Steps Backward," the *Voice*, in its issue of August 8, had the following:-

In a recent issue of *The Voice*, we called attention to some very foolish things uttered by the AMERICAN SENTINEL, a paper published at Oakland, Cal., which devotes itself to getting up religious bugaboos. It made the childish statement that "work done for party Prohibition is work done to promote the union of Church and State, and to bind the citizens of the United States in a worse slavery than was ever suffered by the negroes;" and then, in reply to our article showing just where the Prohibition party stood, it said:-

"*The Voice* says it has 'never heard of a prominent Prohibitionist who favored the union of Church and State.' Now Mr. Sam. Small is a prominent Prohibitionist-one of the most prominent of Prohibitionists in fact. He was secretary of the National Prohibition Convention of 1888, and he publicly declared this in Kansas City in January of that year:-

"I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, national, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it and enact it into laws.'

"If that would not be a union of Church and State, will *The Voice* please tell us what would be? If that would not be a union of Church and State, then there never has been and never can be any such thing as a union of Church and State. Such a thing as that, therefore, being a union of Church and State, and Mr. Sam. Small being a prominent Prohibitionist, it is proved that there is at least one prominent Prohibitionist who favors a union of Church and State."

Thinking Mr. Small the most competent person to speak for Mr. Small, we inclosed the article to him and asked him to state his opinions on the union of Church and State, which he does as follows:-

"*To The Voice*-The representation of the AMERICAN SENTINEL that I favor a union of Church and State is wholly an invention of the enemy. The extract he quotes from a partial report of a sermon I preached in Kansas City in January, 1888, is sufficiently correct to mislead; not exact enough, however, to convey the thought which I clearly expressed and which, at the time, secured the approval of an audience of thousands, the large majority of which was not made up of 'third party' prohibitionists. If the AMERICAN SENTINEL desires to do me and the Prohibition party justice, I can repeat my thoughts as clearly now as I did on the occasion in question.

"The quotation from my sermon should read as follows:-

"I want to see the day come in the history of our country when the voice of the church of Christ will be heard and respected upon all vital, moral issues. I shall ever hope for and patiently expect the day when legislation, State, national,

and municipal, will be projected in harmony with the eternal principle of justice and righteousness, revealed by Christ and proclaimed by his church. Happy will be the day when "righteousness exalts the nation," when sin is no longer the reproach of our people; when the harmonious judgment of the people of God in America upon the issues of temperance, purity, and uprightness shall be received with respect and enacted into laws; when this people, who owe so much to divine favor, will have no more fellowship with "throne of iniquity," "which frameth mischief by a law," and that continually!"

"I hold that the above expressions are in perfect harmony with the principles of the National Prohibition party, as expressed in its preamble and platform. There is in them no warrant for any sane man to pronounce me an advocate of the 'union of Church and State.' The charge is a device of desperation to compass an argument against the Prohibition party. At the same time it is a fraud upon the readers of AMERICAN SENTINEL, or a queer confession of the idiocy of its constituency.

"Yours truly, SAM. W. SMALL."

If any person's superstitious fears have been wrought upon by stories of the spooks of the Dark Ages, he may rest assured that the Prohibition party isn't going to revive any of them. The wheels civilization don't turn backward.

The extract referred to was published in thee SENTINEL a long time ago. It was taken from a religious paper, one that could have no interest in misquoting Mr. Small, therefore we were warranted in supposing that it was correct. The SENTINEL has never knowingly misrepresented a single person.

But in this case we are happy to learn from Mr. Small's own version that the SENTINEL did not do him any injustice. While he did not use the exact words that were attributed to him in the report which the SENTINEL quoted, he did use language which conveys all that we drew from what we supposed were the exact words. Said he, "I want to see the day come in the history of our country when the voice of the church of Christ will be heard and respected upon all vital moral issues." Mr. Small will not deny that his idea was that the voice of the church should be heard and respected not simply by men as individuals, but by men as grouped together in political parties, and by men as statesmen, judges, etc. Now we say that when that time does come, we shall have a union of Church and State as surely as such a thing ever existed. It will simply be the church dictating, and we say the church has no right to be heard and respected by political parties as such. In the darkest of the Dark Ages, when Church and State union was at its height, the case was simply that the voice of the church was heard and respected

299

by the State. The church dictated the policy of the State.

Bishop Vincent says most emphatically that the church makes a great mistake when it seeks to secure worldly position and to influence temporal power. Said he, "All the church wants is spiritual power, and the only influence it has any right to have is the influence it may have with individuals as individuals." Mr. Small is doubtless perfectly sincere and honest in his disavowal of any union of Church and State. It would seem that he simply wants the church to assume its rightful

prerogative. That is all that Cardinal Woolsey or Pope Hildebrand ever desired. The great trouble with them was that they were mistaken in regard to the church's rightful position. That is the trouble with Mr. Small. We see no reason, after a careful reading of Mr. Small's own statement of his position in his sermon, to withdraw our statement that he is really in favor of a union of Church and State.

And this charge is no device of desperation to compass an argument against the Prohibition party. The SENTINEL has no fight with the Prohibition party upon its prohibition principles. We have to do simply with those Prohibitionists who, like Mr. Small, would use the Prohibition party as a religious machine. We are thankful to know that there are many in the party who have no sympathy with any such movement.

As to Mr. Small's insinuation against the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, we have only to say that they number many thousands in every part of the United States, consisting chiefly of professional men, doctors, lawyers, judges, members of State Legislatures, ministers of the gospel, as well as laboring men; and Mr. Small will not enhance his own popularity by wholesale charges of idiocy against our country's best citizens.

As to the statement of the *Voice*, that the AMERICAN SENTINEL spends its time in getting up religious bugaboos, we will only say that there is no need for us to work in that line so long as the *Voice*, while professedly working for prohibition, actually makes that secondary to religious legislation. The SENTINEL lays no claim to being an inventor; it simply exposes the inventions of others.

E. J. W.

"Sunday Closing Not a Temperance Measure" *American Sentinel* 4, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

In our opposition to Sunday laws we have frequently been charged with working in the interests of the liquor traffic. Many claim, and we do not doubt but a great majority of them think, that the enactment of a rigid Sunday law would be in the interest of temperance. We have always denied this, and we think have demonstrated it many times. It was only recently that we published a short article on this point in the SENTINEL, in answer to the criticism of a sub-scriber. We are glad now to be able to present a definite statement on this point from a temperance worker who is also an ardent advocate of the Sunday law. The *New York Voice* of August 22 contains the experience of a pastor residing in Crete, New York. From some statements in his letter we think he is a Congregationalist. In the course of his article, which is a strong prohibition utterance, he says:-

"The saloon keepers of this place have not sold openly on the Sabbath to any great extent. That the Sunday restriction has its merits as a Sabbath-observance measure is true, and as such it should secure a strict enforcement. As a temperance measure it has little merit. It is just as practicable to get the Sunday supply of whisky or beer as of steak or roast. When the Omaha mayor a few weeks ago began shutting up the Sunday saloon in that city, men had a dry and

dreadful time for the first Sunday under that policy. They had not dreamed it to be a serious purpose of the mayor. They were not caught a second Sunday, however; they got an abundant supply the Saturday before. The entire traffic can be carried on in six *days*, the only objection being that it is a little less convenient to get and keep over the Sunday supply."

We hope the *Voice* will not be accused of working in the interest of the saloon, because it published this statement. We believe in prohibition, but we are strongly opposed to prohibition, so called, only one day in the week. But we are in favor of it three hundred and sixty-five days in the year. We say that the Sunday-closing movement not only has no value whatever as a temperance measure, but that it is a strong prop to the liquor traffic, in that it tends to make it respectable. This it does by placing it on a level with all other lines of business and making it legitimate. Let us illustrate:-

A good, conscientious woman who on Sunday morning sees her little boy playing ball, says, "Johnny, you should not play ball on Sunday. You must not do that." What idea would Johnny get from his mother's words? Would he say, "Mother says it is not right to play ball"?-No. He would say, "Mother says it is not right to play ball on Sunday, but it is right to play ball on other days." Suppose she sees her boy smoking a cigar on Sunday, and, of course, does not want him to smoke, would she say, "Johnny, don't you know that you ought not to smoke cigars on Sunday?" Would not the boy get the idea from that that it was not wrong for him to smoke cigars, but that it was simply wrong to smoke on Sunday? He could get no other idea. But, no; it is wrong, and it hurts her boy, no matter on what day it is done, and she does not want him to smoke at all, Sunday or any other day.

The special point that we would leave with our readers is this, that any of them who are inclined to oppose Sunday laws, yet who have been hesitating because they were temperance men, need hesitate no longer. The Sunday-closing movement and the temperance movement have nothing in common.

E. J. W.

"The Petition and the Inquisition" *American Sentinel* 4, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

The supplement to the March monthly document of the American Sabbath Union was devoted to a statement of how the friends of the Sunday might cooperate with the union. Following an extract from the constitution, which states that the object of the union is "to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship," there was an earnest appeal to every individual to push the petitions for a Sunday law, making not the least abatement because Congress had adjourned. The following form of petition, was suggested:-

"The undersigned organizations and adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, earnestly petition you to pass a bill forbidding in the government's mail and military service and in inter-state commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, except works of necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who religiously

and regularly observe another day of the week by abstaining from labor and business, as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship."

We claim that this petition alone furnishes ample proof that the American Sabbath Union contemplates a union of Church and State in the fullest sense, and is providing-unconsciously it may be, but none the less surely-for the establishment of the Inquisition. Strange as it may seem to some, we find the strongest proof of this in the proposed exemption of those that observe another day.

The workers for a Sunday law lay a great deal of stress on the fact that they make such an exception. In his speech before the Senate Committee, Mr. Crafts spoke of the exception that is made to the Seventh-day Baptists by the laws of Rhode Island, allowing them to carry on public industries on the first day of the week, and said that "the tendency of Legislatures and executive officers towards those who claim to keep a Saturday Sabbath is to over-leniency rather than, over-strictness."

In the same hearing Mrs. Bateham spoke of the exemption that was asked for in the petition, stating that they would like to exempt Seventh-day keepers from the penalties of the law for which they asked, providing it could be done, but that if such an exemption would work, against the general enforcement of the law then they did not wish it. These statements show that they simply regard themselves as making a great concession when they do not persecute people who rest upon Saturday. Dr. Bothwell, of Oakland, Cal., stated their reeling very well when he said:

"Most of the States make provision for the exercise of the peculiar tenets of belief which are entertained by the Adventists. They can worship on Saturday, and call it the Sabbath, if they choose; but there let their privileges end. Instead of thankfully making use of concessions granted them, and then going off quietly and attending to their own business, as they ought, they start out making unholy alliances that they may defeat the purposes of their benefactors."

With these statements compare the following from the first chapter of Dr. Schaff's work on "The Progress of Religious Freedom, as Shown in the History of Toleration Acts." Says he:-

"An edict or act of toleration is a grant of the civil government, which authorizes religious societies dissenting from the State religion to worship according to the dictates of conscience without liability to persecution. Such an edict always presupposes a religion established by law and supported by the State, and the right of the State to control public worship. Toleration may proceed from necessity, or from prudence, or from indifference, or from liberality and an enlarged view of truth and right. It may be extended or withdrawn by the government; but it is usually the entering wedge for religious liberty and legal equality.

"There is a wide difference between toleration and liberty. The one is a concession, the other a right; the one is a matter of expediency, the other a principle; the one is a gift of man, the other a gift of God.

"Toleration implies more or less censure or disapproval. We tolerate or endure what we dislike or cannot prevent. The most despotic governments are tolerant

towards subjects who are too numerous or too useful to be killed or exiled. Russia tolerates Romanists, Protestants, Jews, and Mohammedans; Turkey tolerates 'Christian dogs,' and likes them to prey upon each other; but woe to him in either country who apostatizes from the State religion, or attempts to induce any member of the same to apostasy. Toleration is first sought and granted as a favor, then demanded and conceded as a right, and at last spurned as an insult. In a free country nobody wants to be tolerated for his religious opinions or sacred convictions.

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

"Toleration is an intermediate state between religious persecution and religious liberty. Persecution

306

results from the union of Church and State; toleration, from a relaxation of that union; full religious liberty and legal equality require a peaceful separation of the spiritual and secular powers."

Note particularly what he says of toleration, that it is an intermediate state between religious persecution and religious liberty. He says also that it is usually "the entering wedge for religious liberty and legal equality." This is true, providing it has been preceded by despotic intolerance. If a government has rigidly persecuted everyone who dissents from the established religion, then an act of toleration would be the entering wedge toward religious liberty—a step toward freedom; but if perfect liberty and equality have been enjoyed by the citizens of a government, then an act of toleration would be a long stride toward the taking away of religious freedom. For an act of toleration, as Dr. Schaff truly says, "Always presupposes a religion established by law and supported by the State, and the right of the State to control public worship."

The very fact of exemptions being thought of in a law—the use of the word concession and toleration—shows the existence of a despotic law; so that the more the Sunday-law advocates talk about "concessions, the more they boast of their leniency, the more they press their petition for a Sunday law which shall exempt those who religiously and regularly observe another day, the more they proclaim the fact that they are working for a State religion. Now, whenever a religion, or any form of religion, is established by the State, the Inquisition and persecution must inevitably follow. For in such a case an offense against the

established religion is an offense against the State; and of course the State is bound to punish all who violate its laws. But punishment by the State for differences of opinion, or of acts in matters of religion, is persecution.

Note particularly the petition which we quoted. It provides for the exemption of those who "religiously and regularly" observe another day of the week. How, in the face of this, it is possible for the framers and advocates of that petition to claim that they are not working for a State religion, it is impossible for us to conceive. That petition lays the foundation for the Inquisition; and if a law should be passed in harmony with it, the Inquisition would have to be established. How can the State tell who do and who do not religiously observe another day? Anyone can see that the petition plans for the State to inquire, not simply into a man's religious or irreligious acts, but into the motives of his acts. Of course it is well understood that under all circumstances there are people who have a form of religion, people who do certain things professedly in the name of religion, yet from selfish motives. Now if a law is passed in accordance with this petition, the State through its officers would be obliged to inquire into the motives which prompt a man's rest upon Saturday. No individual will have any guarantee that he will remain unmolested for a week. He may be brought up at any time at the instigation of any bigot or any person who has a fancied grudge towards him, and put under examination as to whether or not he observes another day from religious motives. And the worst of it all will be that in such examination his own testimony will avail nothing. Of course those who do observe the day religiously would say so; and any who are not conscientious in their observance of the day would, in order to escape the penalty, declare that they observed it religiously. And so whether or not a person were cleared would depend upon the testimony of men who might have bitter prejudice toward him.

We believe that every thoughtful, candid individual can see that to work for this petition is to work directly for as wicked a persecution as ever existed on earth. Let those who see this point use all their energy in setting the light clearly before others, in order that they may not be deceived by the specious arguments of those who are working for the Sunday law. To every individual that petition will be presented, and many will be misled by its outward pretention to justice and of caring for the rights of a minority, unaware that in this very concession is the strongest proof of the wicked character of the proposed law.

E. J. W.

October 30, 1889

**"The American Sabbath Union and Human Rights" *American Sentinel*
4, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

In Dr. Herrick Johnson's address before the American Sabbath Union, on the Sunday newspaper, as published in the March *Monthly Document* of that association, there are four propositions laid down concerning the Sunday

newspaper, the last of which we shall give special notice. Quoting from an Illinois Supreme Court Report, he says:-

"Every individual has the right to the enjoyment of the Christian Sabbath without liability to annoyance from the ordinary secular pursuits of life, except so far as they may be dictated by necessity or charity."

This proposition is self-evident, and needs no discussion. No one would uphold it more strenuously than would the editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. But there are some questions that we would like to ask, to find out the idea of the Sunday-law advocates upon the subject of human rights. Suppose a man does not wish to exercise his right to rest on the first day of the week; what then? Must he be forced to exercise it? Will he be compelled to rest, whether he wishes to or not? If he is to be, then it is demonstrated that the law does not contemplate the protection of Sunday observance as a man's right, but the enforcement of it as a duty. Governments are organized for the protection of people's rights, not for the purpose of compelling them to exercise their rights, for it is considered self-evident, as a law of nature, that no man will need to be compelled to assert his own rights.

Another point that should not be passed lightly by is this: How extensive an idea of human right have these Sunday-law advocates? Do they mean to imply that every man has a right to the enjoyment of a Sabbath rest whenever he chooses to take it, and on whatever day he chooses to rest? or do they mean to limit that right to a certain day? Do they mean that every man has a right to be protected in the enjoyment of rest only on Sunday? This we should infer from the proposition, which plainly implies that a person has no right to the undisturbed enjoyment of rest on any other day. If they say that a man has a right to the undisturbed enjoyment of rest on the seventh day of the week, then they deprive themselves of all argument for a Sunday law; and if they say that a man has not a right to rest upon Saturday, they thereby confess that their proposed law is a law against the rights of conscience; for it is well known that those people do conscientiously rest upon the seventh day. This is just what they mean.

That their movement for a National Sunday law is a movement to the effect that no one has any rights except those who keep Sunday, is evident from the following. It has been quoted many times before in the SENTINEL, and it doubtless will be quoted many times again, unless National Reform Sunday-law advocates specifically repudiate it. It is from Dr. Edwards' speech at the New York National Reform Convention. He says:-

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would a poor lunatic, for in my view he is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator."

And later he exclaims, "Tolerate atheism, sir? there is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon."

And what is Dr. Edwards' idea of an atheist? Following is his own statement, in the same lecture:-

"The atheist is a man who denies the being of a God and a future life. To him mind and matter are the same, and time is the be-all and the end-all of consciousness and of character.

"The deist admits God, but denies that he has any such personal control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he manifests himself and his will in a revelation.

"The Jew admits God, providence, and revelation, but rejects the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ as sheer imagination, or-worse-sheer imposture.

"The seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.

"These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first-named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry,-the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party."

That is, the man who differs with the majority as to the exact day to be observed, the man who conscientiously observes the seventh day, because the Bible says so, instead of the first, concerning which the Bible says nothing, is classed as an atheist; and it is plainly declared that an atheist is not to be tolerated, except as a lunatic would be tolerated. A lunatic is allowed to run at large so long as he is quiet; but as soon as his mania takes an aggressive form, he is shut up. Dr. Edwards regards the keeping of the seventh day as evidence of an unsound mind. So long as the individual should say nothing about it, he might perhaps be considered a harmless lunatic; but whenever the observer of the seventh day should begin to promulgate his faith, and openly teach others that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and persuade them to accept it, he would be raving, and, therefore, would be shut up and treated as a conspirator.

In the *Christian Statesman* of July 7, 1887, it is positively denied that atheists, among whom it will be remembered Christians who keep the seventh day are classed, have "any reasonable claim to conscientious convictions, and privileges at all." Thus it is plainly seen that the success of this National Sunday-law movement means the depriving of a large number of the citizens of the United States of the rights of conscience.

Let it be understood that whatever right any man has is bestowed upon him by God himself. Human rights are not bestowed by civil government. All that civil governments are instituted for is to protect men in the enjoyment of rights which God has given them. The Declaration of Independence, which has justly been called the charter of American liberties, declares that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This means that every individual is

equal, with respect to the rights with which God has endowed him. Now, while we have heard National Reformers and the president of the American Sabbath Union rail against the Constitution, we have never yet heard an American, or any other person, for that matter, find fault with the Declaration of Independence. That document voiced a truth as sure as any statement of holy writ. God has given to every man the same right; if ninety-nine per cent. of the people in any country have a certain right, the other one per cent. have the same right. But the American Sabbath Union is organized for the express purpose of protecting one class in the enjoyment of certain rights, and the depriving of another class of the same rights. In other words, it is organized for the express purpose of overthrowing the work done by the founders of this government. It is distinctively un-American. Nothing is surer than that its work is the exact opposite of the work of the immortal framers of the Declaration of Independence; and therefore since their

314

work was to secure to this land perfect liberty, its work has for its sole object the overthrow of American liberty. It seems as though this demonstration must be clear to every individual.

It will be said that those who are thus discriminated against and deprived of equal rights with others are only a few. Thus Dr. Edwards, in the same speech from which we have quoted, said:-

"The parties whose conscience we are thus charged with troubling, taken altogether, are but few in number. This determines nothing as to who is right, but the fact remains, and is worthy of note, that, taken altogether, they amount to but a small fraction of our citizenship. They are not even as many as those among us who do not speak the English language."

Mr. Crafts, in his speech before the Senate Committee, spoke of "the one or two small sects of Christians who worship on Saturday." And after speaking of the difficulties that rise in exempting them from the penalties of the Sunday law, contemptuously dismisses them in the following words:-

"Infinitely less harm is done by the usual policy, the only constitutional or sensible one, to let the insignificantly small minority of less than one in a hundred, whose religious convictions require them to rest on Saturday (unless their work is of a private character such as the law allows them to do on Sunday), suffer the loss of one day's wages rather than have the other ninety-nine suffer by the wrecking of the Sabbath by public business."

Many times have we heard Sunday-law lecturers pass the consideration of the fact that their law would cause seventh-day observers to suffer, with the statement that such people constitute only about seven-tenths of one per cent. of the population, and that therefore they were too insignificant to be noticed. Perhaps they may think so; but such expressions show that they do not understand what they are doing. It is not a question of whether a few people who observe Saturday will be injured or not, but whether the government can afford to adopt the principle that minorities have no rights. If that principle is adopted, it will not be limited in its application to observers of the seventh day. It may seem very fine for the majority on any question of opinion to decide that those who differ

with them have no rights; but they should remember that majorities sometimes change. This question of Sunday law will determine whether a man's life or property is safe in this country. If the government lends itself to a scheme which will be unjust to a single individual, then nobody has any assurance that injustice will not be done him. If the rights of a few people may be trampled upon because they keep the seventh day, the rights of some other people may be trampled upon because they differ with the majority on some other question. If in this country the principle of trampling upon human rights is once adopted, nobody can tell where it will stop. We are not alarmists, but we have no hesitation in saying that if the government follows the course marked out for it by the American Sabbath Union, the scenes of the French Revolution will be re-enacted in this country. It cannot be otherwise.

E. J. W.

"How is This?" *American Sentinel* 4, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

On Tuesday evening, October 1, the Prohibitionists of Nashville, Tenn., met in convention to nominate a city ticket, and adopted resolutions, a part of which are as follows:-

WHEREAS, We, Prohibitionists of the city of Nashville, in convention assembled, have unshaken confidence in the wisdom of that action by which a political party has been organized for the accomplishment of an object more important than any other offered to our consideration as a free people, to wit, the prohibition of the beverage liquor traffic by State and national law, as the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors are the constant and fruitful source of physical, intellectual, and moral unsoundness, producing degradation and crime, robbing women and children, and in ways manifold and extreme perverting the blessings of free institutions,

Resolved, That the prohibition of the liquor traffic should be the dominating and dividing political issue until such prohibition shall have become the recognized and settled policy of the government.

Resolved, That the policy of prohibition, because of the scope of its economic and social relations, and the largeness of its connection with civil liberty, should be embodied in the organic law of the States and the United States, as a safeguard of enlarged social life, which is the basis of all stable and prosperous government.

Resolved, That the American Sunday, in the interest of public order and morality, should be zealously guarded, and we hereby arraign and condemn the municipal authorities of the city of Nashville for the non-enforcement of law against Sunday tippling.

Resolved, That as Prohibitionists we heartily indorse

316

and support the recent protest of citizens of Nashville against Sunday tippling, and proffer cordial co-operation with them in their patriotic and lawful efforts to enforce the law against its violators, and in the enforcement of all other laws.

Our third-party friends who think that if we would demonstrate our temperance principles we should by all means support the Prohibition ticket, seek to allay our fears by saying that the Prohibition party has nothing to do with Sunday laws. We would like to have them explain this resolution, and tell us whether or not the Prohibitionists of Nashville are in harmony with the party at large.

We cannot understand how the mention of Sunday in the connection that it comes in these resolutions, has anything to do with temperance. The first resolution says that the sale of intoxicating liquors is the "source of physical, intellectual, and moral unsoundness;" that it produces degradation and crime; and therefore they believe in prohibiting it. Very good; but if they do actually believe in prohibiting it, why do they need to specify their protest against Sunday tippling, and their determination to enforce the prohibition of liquor on Sunday? If they are really Prohibitionists, as we have always understood the term, that would include the stopping of the sale of liquor on Sunday as well as on all other days. But if their movement involves something less than the complete suppression of the liquor traffic,-if, as their reference to Sunday implies, they will be at least in a measure content with the suppression of the sale of liquor on Sunday,-how can they harmonize that with the terrible arraignment of the liquor traffic in the first resolution? It seems to us that there is insincerity somewhere, or else a compounding of crime. Will some third-party friend inform us why it is necessary to specify Sunday tippling in resolutions declaiming against any sale whatever of liquor?

E. J. W.

November 6, 1889

"Is the Constitution Infidel?" *American Sentinel* 4, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman*, of August says that the statement that the American government was established on the secular principle, is untrue. It says that to represent the National Reform movement as revolutionary is to forget, or intentionally ignore, the plainest facts of history. It says that the government is Christian, but overturns this in the same short article by saying: "We admit that infidelity stole a march on the American people in the framing of the Constitution of the United States, and we admit that, largely through the unsettling influences of that instrument, the relation of government to religion has become an open question, now in process of settlement, in this country. But the claim that the secular theory is the established American theory is false and unfair, and, like all unfair attempts in controversy, will yet bring confusion to those who make it."

To the covert threat in this last clause we have nothing to say. But we would like to ask the *Statesman* what it is that determines the character of the government, if it is not the Constitution. If, as it admits, the Constitution of the United States is a secular document, then the American theory of government must be the secular theory of government. And therefore the unfairness is wholly

on its own part, in claiming that the American theory of government is to combine religion with the government, when, according to its own admission, such a claim is a false one. Whatever confusion results, must necessarily come to those who make such false claims.

But mark, that while we say the American theory of government is the secular theory, we do not at all admit the *Statesman's* charge that it is an infidel theory. Infidelity did not steal a march on the American people in the framing of the Constitution of the United States, and that document is not an infidel document, it does not teach infidelity. It has no tendency whatever towards infidelity. To show the falsity of the statement that infidelity stole a march on the American people in the framing of the Constitution of the United States, it is only necessary to say that there were religious men in the Constitutional Convention, and serious consideration was given to the matter of recognizing God and religion in the Constitution; and the omission of such recognition was the result of careful, deliberate, conscientious consideration. This is more clearly apparent from the fact that within two years after the Constitution was adopted, ten amendments were added, the first of which is the following: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." If the omission of the name of God, or the recognition of religion, was an oversight, the, first amendment, instead of declaring against an establishment of religion, would have provided for it. Nay; the original Constitution itself declared that no religious test should ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

But the fact that God's name is not mentioned does not make the Constitution an infidel Constitution, any more than the fact that a merchant's sign or his advertisement in the newspaper does not contain the name of God proves that he is an infidel. The Postmaster-General, John Wanamaker, is the pride of the National Reform party, although perhaps not a member of that organization. He is pointed to with pride as the Christian merchant. We have no disposition to question his Christianity; but we would simply call attention to the fact that in all his extensive advertisements the name of God does not occur once. Are we to judge from that that he is an infidel? His clerks transact his business and sell goods over the counter without making any mention of the name of God. Does that show that his business is an infidel business? Nobody thinks so. On the contrary, if he should flaunt the name of God in his advertisements, and if he should instruct his clerks to make some mention of God with every yard of cotton or silk that they tore off, the people would justly question the genuineness of his profession.

In his book, "Church and State in the States," Dr. Schaff speaks as follows concerning the proposed amendment recognizing God in the Constitution:-

"Our chief objection to such an amendment, besides its impracticability, is that it rests upon a false assumption, and casts an unjust reflection upon the original document, as if it were hostile to religion. But it is neither hostile nor friendly to any religion; it is simply silent on the subject, as lying beyond the jurisdiction of the general government. The absence of the names of God and Christ, in a purely political and legal document, no more proves denial or irreverence than

the absence of those names in a mathematical treatise, or the statutes of a bank or railroad corporation. The title 'holiness' does not make the Pope of Rome any holier than he is, and it makes the contradiction only more glaring in such characters as Alexander VI. The book of Esther and the Song of Solomon are undoubtedly productions of devout worshipers of Jehovah; and yet the name of God does not occur once in them."

According to the National Reform view, the book of Esther and the Song of Solomon would be called infidel documents. But of all who talk about infidelity, the National Reformers show the least knowledge of what infidelity is; and this for the reason that they have the least knowledge of what constitutes Christianity.

E. J. W.

"The Christian Statesman in Favor of Church and State Union"
***American Sentinel* 4, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Christian Statesman* of August 29 the AMERICAN SENTINEL 18 described as chronically unfair, in that it charges the National Reform Association with working for a union of Church and State. There are two noticeable things in connection with this controversy. The first is that the *Statesman* has never yet attempted to prove that it is not in favor of Church and State; it simply denies the charges. This would be all that is required, if our charges consisted simply of assertions; but when we cite facts, and make arguments, and draw conclusions, to show that it is in favor of Church and State union, they have never yet attempted to show the fallacy of one of the arguments, or to disprove one of the conclusions. And the other noticeable thing is that the *Statesman* scarcely ever makes a denial of its desire for Church and State union without in that same denial furnishing proof that it is desirous of such a union. In this very article it says:-

"We hold as strenuously as do our opponents to the absolute separation and independence of Church and State, but we also hold, with Professor Leiber, that the theory of American institutions requires the total separation of the State from the Church-not from religion."

As Dr. Edwards said in the New York convention, they believe in a union of religion and State, but not in Church and State. Now if that were true, it would seem to be proof that they do not believe in religion in the church; and surely that admission must be worse than the other; for a church without religion is a deplorable thing. We are, however, convinced that the National Reformers do not believe in religion in the church, from the very fact that they believe in religion and the State, that is, in making the State the Church; for when this is done there will be no religion in it-only an empty shell.

But on the first page of the same paper, the *Statesman* shows in an editorial that it is the champion of the union of Church and State. It notes the call for the annual congress of the American Secular Union for 1889, and publishes a statement of the object of that union, which object is to secure the total

separation of Church and State. After quoting this declaration of principles, the *Statesman* says:-

"We cheerfully and zealously assist in giving publicity to this call. Nothing could give the American people a clearer view of the pending situation than these frank, logical, and comprehensive demands of the American Secular Union."

The *Statesman* recognizes itself as the direct antagonist of the object of the American Secular Union; we do not say the antagonist of the infidel

324

views of its members, but the antagonist of the work of the association. Therefore, it declares itself to be the champion of a union of Church and State.

This is still further shown by the fact that the *Statesman* is one of the most virulent opposers of the petition which has been circulated asking Congress to pass no laws which would look toward a union of Church and State. It is no use for the *Statesman* to try to conceal its motives. It would be much more honorable for it to boldly avow its advocacy of Church and State union. As it says, nothing can be gained by persistent misrepresentation. It might as well declare the real object of the National Reform Association; for it cannot make a denial of that object without in that very denial revealing it. E. J. W.

November 13, 1889

"Their Object" *American Sentinel* 4, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

The following paragraph is from a paper on "The American Sabbath," read at the Ocean Grove Convention, August 9, by Dr. Robert S. Doherty, formerly assistant editor of the New York *Christian Advocate*. He said:-

"The Sunday newspaper, as published in our chief cities, is a peculiarly American institution. It could not be supported by its foreign patronage, nor, for that matter, without Christian patronage. It is directly hostile to the Sabbath. Now the most serious aspect of this Sunday paper business is not so much the fact that a few journeymen printers are engaged after midnight on Saturday, or that the fast train carries the edition with great speed, and with more or less disturbance, out into the remote parts of the country. The chief mischief is done in the reading of the paper. For this there is no excuse. For the harm which comes from it, the reader is himself responsible."

In this short paragraph we have again revealed to us the real object of Sunday laws,-they are not so much for the purpose of prohibiting all labor on the first day of the week, as for the purpose of inducing men to go to church by cutting off all other means of spending the day. From this and similar utterances, we are warranted in the conclusion that if all the people would faithfully attend church every Sunday there would not be so much objection raised to the work which is done outside of church hours.

This is not an isolated utterance. Everyone who fights the Sunday newspaper makes the same statement. When told that more work is done on Sunday in preparing the Monday paper than in preparing the Sunday morning edition, they

say that the Sunday work that is done by the newspaper employes is not the evil against which they strike; but that what they are concerned about is the fact that the newspapers keep people away from the church and destroy the effect of the sermon on those who do go. Thus they show that they are working not so much in the interest of Sunday rest as in the interest of the pulpit. We wish to emphasize this point until our readers see that this Sunday movement is nothing more nor less than an effort on the part of the churches to have the State legislate in their behalf.

But this is not all that is shown; the paragraph just quoted shows the seemingly utter inability of the advocates of Sunday laws to comprehend the fact that the State does not possess the same power that the Spirit of God does. They want the State to pass laws to suppress a thing the evil of which, they themselves confess, rests solely with the individual. It is not a public nuisance—not something which, like the saloon,

331

tends only to destroy the well-being of society; for whatever mischief is done, the individual reader is himself alone responsible. Yet they expect that the State is going to remedy this evil; they expect that the State, by taking away the newspaper, will make the individual who now reads it spiritually-minded. They do not seem to understand that the lack of spirituality is what leads professed Christians to read these papers when they should be engaged in worship; and that if the newspapers were taken away, their carnal minds would find some other worldly means of gratification. If they would think of the matter seriously, they could but confess that the suppression of the Sunday newspaper would not in the slightest degree increase the spirituality of the people; and that admission would at the same time be a confession that they are more interested in having people possess a *form* of godliness than in laboring through the divinely-appointed agencies to really convert them; in other words, that they have lost sight of the gospel. And so it is no doubt true that while National Reformers have so much to say about atheism on the part of those who oppose Sunday laws, they themselves are most zealously working to undermine true Christianity.

E. J. W.

November 20, 1889

"The Principles of Constitutional Recognition of God" *American Sentinel* 4, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Christian Statesman* of September 5, R. C. Wylie gives quite a lengthy report of the discussion of the proposal to acknowledge God in the constitution of the new State of Washington, which is quite interesting. There were some things said which show that some of the members had the right idea as to the relation of Church and State. When the convention went into committee of the whole to consider the preamble and bill of rights, the following preamble was read:-

"We, the people of the State of Washington, to preserve our rights, do ordain this constitution."

Immediately one of the members moved to substitute the following:-

"We, the people of the State of Washington, grateful to almighty God for our freedom, to secure and transmit the same unimpaired to succeeding generations, do ordain this constitution."

The mover of this substitute afterward with-drew it in favor of the following, after it had been read:-

"We, the people of Washington, in order to form more independent and perfect government, . . . profoundly grateful to almighty God, for this inestimable right, and invoking his favor and guidance, do ordain and establish the following constitution and form of government for the State of Washington."

The discussion was on the adoption of this, instead of the simple preamble first read. Mr. Comegys, of Whitman, made a strong speech upon this, the force of which Mr. Wylie attempts to break down by a slur upon the personal appearance of the speaker, who said:-

I am opposed to the substitute. The gentleman is in favor of it, because he thinks we ought to be grateful to almighty God. I would like to ask him if he thinks this provision would add anything to our gratitude by being in that preamble. He admitted the necessity for brevity, and has made it as brief, he says, as he could and include that point. Now, as I understand it, Mr. President, this has nothing to do with gratitude, or reverence, or irreverence. A man may be very reverent or very grateful, without lifting up his voice on the street corners, or he may lift up his voice and claim to be very grateful and yet not be grateful. The question is, Shall we advertise it in this way? Has it anything to do, here? The framers of the Constitution of the United States had this matter under advisement, and after mature deliberation (and many framers of the Constitution were devout Christians), they deemed it not wise to have any reference to the Deity, because they had agreed that Church and State and matters of religion should forever be separate from civil government. Now, what object is to be attained? Will we be more grateful by reason of putting it there? or will we be less ungrateful, notwithstanding we put it there?"

We say that this is sound. Gratitude is shown rather by acts than by words. The people of Washington might all of them be profoundly grateful to God, and yet make no statement of it in their Constitution; and on the other hand; they might make a profession of gratitude in their Constitution, and have none in their hearts. Now, which would be the better condition?-Manifestly, to be grateful, and not to advertise it in the Constitution; that would be far better than to proclaim it from the capitol, and not possess it.

But there is another point to consider. If that were stated in the Constitution, would it tell the truth? Are the people of Washington grateful to God for the blessings which they enjoy?-No doubt some of them are; but the most zealous National Reformer will not claim that all of them are. Are even a majority of the people of Washington grateful to God for the blessings which they enjoy? The people of Washington are doubtless as good as the people of any other section of the United States; but it cannot be denied that only a small minority of people

in the United States, or in any individual State, have any real gratitude to God. It is not going beyond bounds to say that the majority of the people scarcely ever think of him. The entire church membership of the United States is less than one-fourth the population, that is, less than one-fourth of the people of the United States make any profession of, or belief in, a gratitude to God; and the declarations of leading ministers and religious journals are to the effect that the churches themselves are lamentably deficient in godliness; that thousands of church members are in no respect different from the professed ungodly. This being the admitted fact, it is manifest that for the people of any State, or of the United States, to put in their Constitution a statement that they were grateful to God would be to make their Constitution state a falsehood. If that preamble were adopted which says, "We, the people of Washington, grateful to almighty God," etc., the constitution would be a lie upon its very face. Certainly no good can be accomplished by falsehood. Truth cannot come from evil. Placing the acknowledgment of God in the constitution would not make a single individual more grateful to God than he now is. Therefore, for people to adopt a constitution with such a statement would be a positive wrong. People who know nothing about God would

338

imagine themselves to be grateful to him, simply because they had subscribed to a constitution which said that they were grateful. So the constitution, instead of making people better, would have a tendency to confirm them in their ungodliness.

One of the speakers in favor of the substitution was a Mr. Cosgrove. He started out by saying that the effort to have such a preamble was not an attempt to connect the Church and the State. He said: "It does not in any way associate the Church and State because of this recognition of God. It is not necessarily recognizing the Church in any sense." And then he went on to disprove this statement, by saying: "We expect to get a large amount of immigration into this country before many years, and I do not care what the committee intended by leaving it out of this preamble, the masses of the United States will take it as an indirect attack upon the church, and as an indirect pandering to infidelity by leaving out this word." This statement of his shows conclusively that the substitution would in a way connect Church and State, although it is not true that the omitting of the substitution would be an attack upon the church. Anyone can see that to adopt a constitution which says nothing about the Deity or the church, could not be considered an attack upon the church any more than a bank corporation could be said to be making an attack upon the church if it adopted articles of corporation without making any reference to the Deity.

Mr. Cosgrove said further: "Let me say, gentlemen, that this territory would have been built up long ago had it not been that the people of the East believed that Washington Territory was a heathen land, peopled with heathens, without government." That statement shows the hollowness of the whole thing; the recognition of God in the constitution was designed simply as an advertising scheme, to induce immigration. But what nonsense to suppose that people would settle in the Territory any quicker because its constitution contained the name of

God. Did the speaker suppose that the people of the East are so ignorant that they could be duped into supposing that the insertion of the name of God in the constitution would make the people any better? Would they imagine that the inhabitants of the State were all pious, simply because of a few words in the constitution? The idea is absurd.

Mr. Warner, chairman of the Preamble Committee, said that he would yield to no one in reverence for God, but likened the placing of his name in the constitution to the action of the Pharisee in the Scriptures. He did not believe it was needed any more than the Lord's prayer. This is true, as we have already shown. The adoption of such a preamble would simply be a piece of Phariseeism, and that in reality is all that was expected. Mr. Cosgrove's argument showed that it was designed simply to advertise to the people of the world that the people of Washington were religious, although the statement would not represent the truth. Mr. Sullivan, of Tacoma, showed the sophistry of Mr. Cosgrove's statement, that to leave out the recognition of God would check immigration. He pointed to the Constitution of the United States, which contains no recognition of God, and said that there was no trouble about immigration to this country.

One speaker said: "If I remember right, the Bible says 'there is a time and place for everything.' It also says, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.' The convention therefore should not place the name anywhere, simply to tickle the ear of any individual or set of individuals." This, again, touches the very heart of the matter. We have already shown that such a recognition as is proposed would be falsehood upon its face; and because of this, it would be a taking of the name of the Deity in vain. God's name is taken in vain every time it is spoken lightly, every time it is mentioned in any way by those who have not at heart real reverence for God.

Mr. Warner stated that he was a member of a church which had the most reverent devotion to God; but he did not believe it necessary to advertise that fact in their business transactions.

Mr. Sturdevant showed the folly of the proposed recognition, by saying:-

"As well acknowledge the existence of the Supreme Being and an overruling Providence in the making of a promissory note, as in this constitution; yet who would not say it was ridiculous if you saw a promissory note something like this: 'For value received, I promise to pay to John Doe, or order, \$100.00, recognizing the overruling providence of the Supreme Court, and the credit business and the great privileges which have been conferred upon me by the Supreme Being by reason of this promissory note.' Then again: What would be said in court of the lawyer commencing his complaint in this way: 'John Doe vs. Richard Roe; the plaintiff in the above entitled action, recognizing the overruling power and constant care of the Supreme Being, complains of Richard Roe, and alleges,' etc. Now that is just as sensible, in my opinion, as placing it in the preamble of the constitution. Let us ask God to guide us and teach us common sense in the business which we are trying he transact in this convention."

We have devoted this much space to the consideration of the discussion in the Washington convention, because the principles involved are the same as

those involved in the attempt to recognize God in the national Constitution. We are anxious in this whole National Reform business to get the people to see that opposition to it does not imply irreverence or infidelity on the part of the opposers, but that the one who has the most intelligent reverence for God, and love for truth and pure Christianity, is the one who will be most zealously opposed to the schemes of the National Reformers. E. J. W.

"Why They Are Anxious" *American Sentinel* 4, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days* which, as is well known, is the organ of the American Sabbath Union, and is devoted exclusively to the work of securing the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws by the State and the national government, presents the following, which was said by an eminent Sunday advocate:-

"A gentleman living in the country, whose supply of water for household purposes was scant, had a cistern dug near his house for collecting the rain which fell on the roofs of the buildings. For a time the expedient answered perfectly; the supply of water was abundant. Suddenly, however, the pump failed to give forth the contents of the reservoir. The rain would fall copiously, and for a time a few pailfuls would be drawn, but very soon the supply ceased. The pump was carefully examined and found to be in perfect working order, and no flaw could anywhere be discovered. At length it occurred to the perplexed householder to examine the cistern itself; then the mystery was solved. It was found that in one corner the cement had cracked, and there was a gaping leak which allowed the water to escape into a distant pit. It was now plain that however freely the rain might fall the cistern would soon be empty again, as there was this ever-widening leak through which the water disappeared. Such a leak in our church life is the Sabbath profaned or neglected. The rains from above may fall abundantly, the church's machinery may be diligently plied, but the law of the Sabbath largely forgotten will prove a leak serious enough to undo and render nugatory the happy influences both of the showers of Heaven and the labors of man. It has been well said: 'The streams of religion run deep or shallow according as the banks of the Sabbath are kept up or neglected.'"

"This," says the *Pearl of Days*, "forcibly illustrates the cause of the love of church life." This may all be true, but to our mind it furnishes no argument for the enactment of a Sunday law. It is strange that people cannot see that the anxiety for Sunday laws is purely from a church standpoint. These people want Sunday laws, for what reason?-Because the church will be the gainer thereby, and because they expect that people will go to church more. Not only do they expect that people who now care nothing for the church will go to church when, other places of amusement are shut up, but they expect that people who are already church members; but who neglect their duties, will take hold of church work, if they are spurred up to it by the State. In other words, they want the State to legislate in behalf of the church, and to enforce church discipline.

It may seem to some that the expression just used concerning places of amusement is very irreverent. We do not mean to cast any reflection on the

churches, but the point is this. It cannot be denied that the great desire for Sunday law is that people who now find "amusement on Sunday, may constrained to go to church; and those who are working for such laws confess that picnics, theaters, concerts, Sunday newspapers, etc., are greater attractions than the church; but they expect by prohibiting these attractions to induct the people to come to church. That is, people want to pass the time in some way, and if they cannot do it with their favorite amusement they will then take the next thing that presents itself, and will go to church. In other words, they will go to church for a pastime the same as they now attend concerts, etc. They will simply substitute a form of amusement which is allowed in place of one which they would prefer, but which is prohibited. The movement may result in filling the churches, but it will not result in the spiritual and moral advancement of the people.

E. J. W.

November 27, 1889

"National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution" *American Sentinel* 4, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

This is most strenuously denied by all National Reformers, just as we should naturally expect; because if they should claim, or even admit, that the success of their movement would involve persecution, they could not proceed a step farther. As a matter of course, we expect that they will deny that persecution will follow the success of their movement. Doubtless a great majority of them are sincere in this denial, because they have never taken the trouble to look to the end of their work; and of all people in the world National Reformers seem to be most oblivious to the teachings of history; but their denials amount to nothing in the face of the declarations that they have made from the beginning, and are still making. We will quote a few statements.

Before the first annual meeting of the association an address to the public in behalf of the cause was prepared by the Rev. T. P. Stevenson, W. W. Spear, D.D., and Wm. Getty, Esq., in which the following statement was made:-

"It must be deplored that in a Constitution so universally and so justly admired and loved and studied by the American people, there is nothing to turn the mind of the nation to God, to inculcate reverence for the authority of his Sons, or respect for his word."

This shows plainly that the design of the National Reformers is to so modify the Constitution that the government will act as a teacher of religion. In the address of Dr. Johnathan Edwards, at the New York convention, in 1873, it was said of the Constitution:-

"We want to put the people into it; the people in full, with their deep and noble reverence for God, the greatest and best, and for his-word as the underlying and paramount law."

Again: In the Cincinnati convention, in 1872, Rev. A. D. Mayo, D.D., in an address on religion in public schools, said that "the State should teach the existence, sovereignty, and providence of God, and the duty of all men and nations to obey his laws; the spiritual nature, moral obligation, natural rights, and immortal life of man; the binding obligation of the morality of Jesus Christ as the only universal moral law; the acceptance of the New Testament morality as the moral constitution of every civilized State." He further said that the State is bound to see that the religious morality essential to good citizen-ship is taught.

At a convention held in Monmouth, Ill., September 29, 1884, Rev. M. A. Gault said:-

"This movement includes the triumph of every moral reform. Every true reform is simply an effort to get back to some one of the ten commandments. If that law was recognized as the standard of legislation, and if public sentiment was educated up to that standard, it would do away with lying, stealing, intemperance, profanity, Sabbath. desecration, licentiousness, murder, and every evil that now vexes society."

These statements show that the reform contemplates simply the adoption of the Bible as the law of the land. This was plainly declared by Dr. Edwards in the New York Convention. He said:-

"If there be anything in the law of Moses the coming of Christ and the subsequent of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be (and there cannot be many of them), and we are prepared to accept them, and have them re-enacted."

We say that with such a Constitution as this, persecution would be inevitable; but as facts are better than arguments, we will give an instance illustrative of the working of such a Constitution in the past.

The New York *Observer* of March 22, 1888, contained the fifth of a series of articles on John Calvin, written by the Rev. James M. Lucile D.D. The articles were, as a matter of course eulogistic of Calvin. The article in the issue referred to was upon the trial of Servetus, and the last days of Calvin. Having mentioned the visit of Servetus to Geneva, and his arrest mid trial, the Doctor says:-

"The specific charge against Servetus was that of teaching contrary to the Bible doctrines; but this was only a specification under the more general charge of attempting to destroy the peace, and, indeed, the existence, of the Genevan State. The Genevans had adopted the Bible as a part of their constitution, and every citizen had sworn to defend it; Servetus was thus the foe to the civil order. It was in no sense an ecclesiastical trial, but one which belonged to the civil court, by which it was conducted. Calvin was an expert witness on the points raised, not a judge. That the animus was not that of religious rancor is evident from the fact that Calvin himself was at the same time in fraternal correspondence with acknowledged heretics, like Socinus. But when the heresy was made a lever for the overthrow of the republic, it became a different matter, and the Genevans would have been unworthy of their political existence if they had not been willing to defend it."

The Genevans had a model National Reform government; and the burning of Servetus was a natural result, just as Dr. Ludlow says. And the fact that a man can be found who will apologize for the burning of Servetus, and who will say that

it was not an ecclesiastical trial, still at the same time admitting that it was the result of the Bible being adopted as a part of the constitution, is sufficient evidence that if the National Reformers should succeed in having the Bible adopted as part of the Constitution, doctors of divinity and influential teachers would not be lacking who would defend persecution under it.

But note that it is denied that the burning of Servetus was persecution, or that his trial was an ecclesiastical trial. It is stated that his heresy was made a lever for the overthrow of the government. But how could a heresy affect the government?-Simply

346

because the Bible had been adopted as a part of the constitution-not necessarily the Bible as it reads, but the Bible as interpreted by those in authority; and, therefore, whoever differed in opinion from the established belief concerning the Bible, was talking treason and violating the civil law. If it be denied that the execution of the law in such cases is persecution, then there never was persecution; for when the early martyrs were put to death it was only because they were violating the laws of Rome. James and Paul were beheaded simply because their conscientious convictions in regard to the Bible compelled them to violate the civil law of Rome. And so with what we have been accustomed to call the Roman Catholic persecution in the Dark Ages. If the trial of Servetus was not an ecclesiastical trial, and his execution was not religious persecution, simply because in differing with Calvin concerning the Scriptures he was going contrary to the law of the State, then the Catholics never persecuted anybody; for Cranmer, and Ridley, and Huss, and Jerome of Prague, and thousands of others who were burned at the stake, were tried and put to death for disobeying civil laws. The laws of the church were the laws of the State. The one who defends the burning of Servetus must likewise defend the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, and the destruction of the Huguenots and Albigenses. All these people were put to death simply because the Bible, as interpreted by the priests, was a part of the civil law of those countries. The Catholic Church says that all these persons were punished by the State as law breakers. This is in one sense true; but they neglect to state that the church apprehended them, and priests tried them. The Inquisition found them guilty of violating the ecclesiastico-civil law, and they handed them over to the State for punishment, recommending them always to mercy, but expressly stipulating that they should be burned at the stake; and the civil power, as the servant of the church, was bound to obey.

Let the State become the servant of the church again, according to National Reform ideas, and let anybody's interpretation of the Bible, we care not whose, become a part of the civil law, and the same thing will take place again. It cannot be otherwise, for the State is bound to enforce whatever laws it enacts. If it enacts laws concerning matters of faith and doctrine, then it is bound to punish the man who differs from the established faith. But such punishment is simply religious persecution.

The cool way in which Dr: Ludlow disposes of Servetus, finds a parallel in the way that men defend the enforcement of Sunday as at the present time. Says he:-

"If there was one place in the world the fugitive should have avoided, it was Geneva. The laws of that place he knew were very strict. Calvin had long before warned him not to come there to disturb the peace. The people of that commonwealth had the right to protect their political existence. They had fought for twenty years to get rid of Catholic tyranny, and were now in a life-and-death struggle with the Libertine element. Yet Servetus turned up in Geneva. His purpose was clear. Here the Romish Inquisition could not follow him, for the Calvinists would defend him against that. But while thus receiving their hospitality, he could get a dagger under the fifth rib of Calvinism by siding with the Libertines."

We say this is simply abominable. The man that could coolly write such a paragraph as that would be a worthy companion of Loyola, and a ready tool of the Inquisition. He says that Calvin had warned Servetus and to come to Geneva to disturb the peace, and that the people had a right to protect their political existence. But what was their politics?-It was Calvinism. Servetus disturbing the peace did not consist in beating drums, or doing noisy work during public service, or in making any demonstrations whatever, but in writing and talking against Calvinism, as Dr. Ludlow himself says. The sum of his offense was opposition to Calvinism. For this and this alone he was burned. And a professed Protestant in this century and in this decade, upholds the cowardly and blood-thirsty deed! Yet there are men found who say that this is too enlightened an age to allow such a thing as persecution for religious opinion.

Such talk is very similar to that indulged in by the advocates of National Reform Sunday laws. They want to protect the peace of society, they say. It was only two weeks ago that a friend of ours was talking with another gentleman concerning the barbarous Sunday law of Georgia and the conviction of Mr. Conklin for cutting saplings in the woods on his farm on Sunday. Instead of expressing the contempt and indignation which every right-minded man must feel at so outrageous a law as that of Georgia, and at the persecution of an inoffensive citizen, the gentleman seemed to take his conviction as a matter of course, and threw the blame all on Mr. Conklin, saying he knew what the law was before he went to work; he need not have suffered if he had been of a mind to avoid it. If he had not known the law, there might be some ground of pity; but when he knew the law and deliberately violated it, nobody but himself is to blame for the result.

But when the National Reform American Sabbath Union movement succeeds, it will not be necessary for the person to work in order to disturb the peace. Servetus disturbed the peace of Geneva by writing and talking against Calvinism, because Calvinism was the politics of Geneva. And so when the State "re-enacts the fourth commandment," as Mr. Shepard and Mr. Crafts say, Sunday will be a State institution, and the individual who talks against that institution by declaring that the fourth commandment requires the observance of the seventh and not the first day, will be a disturber of the public peace. As much as this is contemplated in the statement which we have before quoted from the Western Christian Advocate, edited by Rev. G. W. Bothwell, D.D., of Oakland, Cal. Speaking of the

petition against a Sunday law and the union of Church and State, in his issue of March 22, Mr. Bothwell said:-

"Most of the States make provision for the exercise of the peculiar tenets of belief which are entertained by the Adventists. They can worship on Saturday, and call it the Sabbath if they choose; but there let their privileges end. Instead of thankfully making use of concessions granted them, and then going off quietly and attending to their own business as they ought, they start out making unholy alliances that they may defeat the purposes of their benefactors. None of these bills are aimed at them; but if they fail to appreciate the fact, they may yet call down upon themselves such a measure of public disfavor as that legislation embarrassing to them will result."

This is simply a threat of punishment that will be meted out to those who shall dare to protest against national religious legislation, and shall dare to teach that Sunday is not the Sabbath. It will not be necessary for them to work on Sunday; if by their preaching according to their conscientious convictions concerning the word, they strike against the established religion, they will be considered as violators of the public peace, and will meet with punishment.

Finally, as demonstrating conclusively, even to those who cannot draw conclusions, we quote the following bold declaration from a speech by Dr. Mayo in the Cincinnati National Reform Convention. Speaking of the people of the United States, he said:-

"They will plant in the great charter of liberties an acknowledgment of the nation's dependence on Almighty God, and its duty to conform to the laws of religious and Christian morality. They will protect the rights of every citizen, and persecute no man for his religion until that religion drives him to disobey the law which expresses the will of the majority concerning the moral duty of the citizen. And that will is always open to revision by constitutional means."

We do not know how anyone can ask for any stronger proof than this that the National Reform movement contemplates persecution. And note, it is not even claimed that the persecution will be for actual violation of the law of God, but for acting or thinking contrary to the will of the majority concerning moral duties, with the express understanding that that will may change at any time.

Any person who can defend so outrageous a scheme has no sense whatever of what constitutes liberty. If any National Reformer can explain these utterances so as to make them harmonize with the golden rule, and with simple justice, the columns of the SENTINEL are open to him.

E. J. W.

"They Are One" *American Sentinel* 4, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman*, of September 5, contains a report of the Lakeside Reform Assembly, by the editor, T. P. Stevenson. This assembly was a joint convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association. The first three days were devoted to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union work, in which addresses were given upon "Woman Suffrage"

and "Sabbath Observance." Addresses were delivered on "The Limits of Religious Liberty," and "The American Sabbath, and How to Maintain It." After noting the Woman's Christian Temperance Union Conference, Mr. Stevenson introduces the work of the days devoted especially to the National Reform Association, with these words:-

"There was no perceptible transition between the foregoing exercises and those properly relating to the National Reform Association."

This strikes us as very significant. It shows how rapidly the great Woman's Christian Temperance Union is losing sight of the object for which it was established, and is becoming simply a National Reform organization. The meetings of one cannot be distinguished from those of the other.

From Mr. Stevenson's report, we would not get the idea that the subject of temperance was mentioned in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union Conference. Of course we are not to suppose that the subject of temperance was entirely ignored, but the report warrants us in believing that temperance remitted less attention than woman's suffrage and Sunday legislation. We are sorry that this is so. We, are sorry that in combating religious legislation, which is evil, and only evil, we are placed in antagonism to the work of a professedly temperance organization.

347

We believe in temperance of the strictest kind, and wish to support every temperance measure and every temperance' organization; therefore we hope that the women of the National W.C.T.U. who believe that it should be devoted exclusively to temperance work and there are very many of them-will be able either to convert the national association, or else to fore a branch which will work in a legitimate way for real Christian temperance, and which we can support.

E. J. W.

December 4, 1889

"Legitimate Recreation" *American Sentinel* 4, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

In the report of the thirty and thirty-first years of the New York Sabbath Committee, we find a section on the Saturday half-holiday movement, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:-

"The Saturday half-holiday movement, from which much was hoped in its indirect influence upon the Sunday observance, has not accomplished as yet what was expected from it. Said Governor Hill, in a speech at Dunkirk, with reference to this measure: 'There may be a legal difficulty in dividing a day, making only one-half of it a legal holiday. That difficulty can be avoided by making every Saturday-the whole day-a holiday. Saturday would thus be set apart as a day of recreation and pleasure, and the following Sunday would become, what it was intended to be, emphatically a day of rest, and a better observance of Sunday would be promoted. Sunday is rapidly becoming a day of recreation, especially in the summer season, instead of a day of rest. Such a

holiday would afford every workingman an opportunity for pleasure, for some travel, for visiting friends, for study, and for whatever other legitimate recreation he may desire to take."

There are two points suggested by this which are worthy of serious thought. The first is in connection with the claim that the Sunday law is a temperance measure in that it will close the saloons on Sunday. It is well known that when the charge of discrimination is made of tacitly making the liquor traffic legitimate on other days by excluding the sale of intoxicants on Sunday, the Sunday-law people say that it is necessary because people are idle on Sunday, and, therefore, are then more subject to the attractions of the saloon; that if the saloons are closed on Sunday, when people are idle, the bulk of their traffic will be taken away.

The fallacy of this claim was shown in the SENTINEL a few weeks ago by a quotation from the *Voice*; but the effort of the Sunday-law movers to have Saturday made a half or a whole holiday is the strongest demonstration of the hollowness of their temperance professions. While professing to want the saloons closed on Sunday in order simply to protect the idle laboring men, they at the same time, work to have the pre-ceding day made a holiday, in which the workingmen shall be idle. But we have never heard of a Saturday-closing movement, so that it would seem that the saloon is dangerous to idle men only on Sunday.

But what is specially interesting in the paragraph we have quoted is the closing sentence in the extract from Governor Hill's speech. After recommending the setting apart of Saturday as a day of recreation and pleasure, so that Sunday might become emphatically a day of rest, he says: "Such a holiday would afford every man an opportunity for pleasure, for some travel, for visiting friends, for study, and for whatever other legitimate recreation he may desire to take!" That is the object of the proposed Saturday half-holiday; it is to allow the workingman time to take the recreation which he needs, but which would be prohibited by such a Sunday law as is desired. And what is the recreation? Read the above sentence again. It is travel, visiting friends, and study. Nothing could more plainly indicate that the proposed law would prohibit such quiet recreation as visiting friends and studying. Surely this would be the Puritan law with a vengeance. It would involve the spying into houses by the minions of the law, to see who is reading the newspaper or studying, or to see who is receiving an innocent visit from a friend. It is a striking comment on the inevitable working of a Sunday law, that its friends cannot make even the most incidental allusion to it without revealing the cloven foot of the Inquisition.

E. J. W.

December 25, 1889

"Civil Government and the Decalogue" *American Sentinel* 4, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

The advocates of Sunday legislation are earnestly trying to find a basis for their proposed action, in the fourth commandment. It is true that that commandment says nothing about the first day, which is the only day that National Reformers would consent to have the State set apart, while it does specifically enjoin the observance of the seventh day; and it is also true that if they could find in the fourth commandment some authority for Sunday observance, that would show beyond the possibility of cavil that their movement is simply an effort to secure religious legislation; but none of these things move them. They have, however, through the kind offices of the AMERICAN SENTINEL been brought to see that civil governments have to do only with civil matters; and, therefore, in order to have a show of reason for their work, they are claiming that there are civil elements in the ten commandments, inasmuch as some of those precepts relate to man's duty to his fellow-men.

There has been in the past a great deal of unnecessary discussion over the two tables of the decalogue. It has been rightfully claimed that with the first table of the law civil governments have nothing to do; and the National Reformers themselves more than half believe this. Mr. Crafts, who stands for the American Sabbath Union, has spent a great deal of time of late trying to readjust the tables of the law, so as to make the action of his association consistent with the principle just stated. Instead of dividing the decalogue into two tables, the first containing four commandments, and the second the last six, which is the most common division, he makes the division just after the first clause of the fourth commandment, putting the bulk of the fourth, and the last six, into the second table. Of course this is entirely arbitrary, having no authority but Mr. Crafts' assertion; but it serves to show that Mr. Crafts appreciates the truth of the statement that civil governments have of right nothing to do with the first table of the decalogue.

But that statement tells only a part of the truth, and is misleading; for the fact is that civil governments have nothing whatever to do with any of the ten commandments, whether in the first table or in the second. The discussion as to the two tables of the law is entirely unnecessary, and will be seen to be so when the character of the whole law is understood. The proposition which we lay down is this: Civil laws are not based upon, and do not derive their force from, the divine law; and civil government has nothing whatever to do with any commandment of the decalogue. This we think can readily be made to appear.

1. The law is a unit. It is, as a whole, the expression of God's will, the transcript of his character; and therefore whatever is true of one part of the law is true of the whole.

2. The inspired declaration is that "the law is spiritual." Rom. 7:14. This is spoken, not merely of the first four commandments, but of the whole law. Let us dwell upon this point for a few moments.

While it is true that the first four commandments pertain to our duties to God exclusively, and the last six relate to duties that also affect our fellows, it is not true that there is any less morality or spirituality in the last six than in the first four. Although they define human duties, there is in them no human element. They are

spiritual, and obedience to them must be spiritual. Anything else is not obedience.

Take for illustration our Saviour's comments on certain commandments, recorded in Matt. 5:20-28. In that passage we find that a word may be sufficient to constitute a violation of the sixth commandment, and that the seventh may be broken by a single look, or even a thought. It is worthy of note that the commandments whose breadth the Saviour thus indicated, are found in the second table. Now what did he do?-He simply showed what those commandments require. From his words we learn that the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," forbids malicious thoughts and words. He who indulges in these does not keep the commandment at all, although he may never have laid violent hands on any man. The commandment which says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," forbids impure desires. It does not stop short of that. He who indulges in these violates the seventh commandment, although he may have lived a hermit all his life.

From the words of the apostle Paul, and the illustrative application of Jesus, we learn that the law-including every commandment-is wholly spiritual. If it is not kept spiritually, it is not kept at all. There is no such thing as degrees in the commandments, so that a man may keep them half way, and receive credit therefor, as seems to be supposed by, those who talk about keeping the law outwardly. It is true that as the greater includes the less, strict compliance with the letter of the law is demanded, and is necessarily included in spiritual obedience; but the man whose apparent conformity to the law is only outward, has not yielded any obedience to it whatever. The law is wholly spiritual, wholly divine.

3. But civil government is not spiritual. No one can gainsay this proposition. Inasmuch as civil government cannot enforce spirituality, and cannot make men spiritually-minded, it has no right nor power to require spirituality. "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." A spiritual ruler justly requires spiritual obedience. He

378

can punish for violation of a spiritual law. But a civil ruler cannot execute spiritual law. Therefore the proposition is proved, that civil government has nothing whatever to do with spiritual law, and such a law is the decalogue. This proposition becomes self-evident as soon as one views the law of God in the light in which he himself sets it forth.

We can say, then, without the slightest fear of successful contradiction, that human laws are not based upon; and do not derive their force from, the divine law. The State rightfully makes laws against the taking of human life, but not in any sense as an enforcement of the divine commandment, or of any part of it. Does anybody suppose that a murderer who is legally hanged for his crime, will receive less punishment in the great Judgment-day than if he had escaped the civil penalty?-Of course not. Man punished him for his inhumanity; God punishes for immorality; and the sixth commandment is not human, but divine.

The great cause for confusion lies in a wrong use of terms. Like the hypocritical Pharisees of old, men have come to confound morality and

respectability. A man who does nothing to shock the sensibilities of his neighbors, and who does not interfere with their rights, is called a moral man, when in fact he may be grossly immoral. He is a good citizen, but if he is not pure at heart he is not a keeper of the divine law in any sense whatever. That law is spiritual, and that which is not spiritual is not to the slightest degree obedient to it.

If National Reformers and national Sunday-law advocates had any just conception of the nature of divine law, they would cease their insane attempt to make men moral by law, or to enforce the law of God. But because they have no real knowledge of divine government, and fancy themselves competent to act as its high executive officers, they also lose sight of the prime object of civil government, and ruthlessly trample upon human right.

E. J. W.

"Why We Oppose Religious Legislation" *American Sentinel* 4, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

This is a subject that should be clearly defined in the mind of every individual, especially of those who act as teachers either in public or private, or who have the power to influence public opinion to any degree whatever. Those who favor religious legislation very naturally imagine that opposition to their movement is actuated by selfish motives. They think that our only reason for opposing it is the fear that it will tend to inconvenience or endanger us. We say it is very natural that they, should imagine that opposition to their movement is wholly selfish, because religious legislation is actuated by nothing; but the most selfish motives; and those who advocate it cannot grasp the idea that there can be any action that is not selfish. To anticipate direct argument, we might call attention to the fact that their suspicion of our motives gives evidence of their real ideas of the natural results of the success of their movement. If they did not know that their movement cannot fail to result in persecution, they would not think that our sole reason for opposing it is the danger of being persecuted. But this, we may say, scarcely enters into the account at all. Our reasons for opposing religious legislation are not personal, but general, and of such a nature that we think all candid persons can appreciate them when fairly presented.

The first reason that we present-not the strongest, yet in itself amply sufficient, and one that will appeal most strongly to the largest number of people-is that religious legislation tends directly to the overthrow of civil liberty; it is based on the principle that minorities have no rights that majorities are bound to respect. As the matter of religious legislation is a live issue at the present time, we will take for our proofs and illustrations items from the working of the movement in this country.

And first it will be necessary to show that religious legislation is sought for at the present time. This we can do by the statements of those who are working for a national Sunday law. In his plea before the Knights of Labor, for help in securing a Sunday law, the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union said:-

"A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out, and you take the rest out."

Rev. J. H. Knowles, editor of the *Pearl of Days*, said in an editorial of January 25, 1889:-

"It will become more and more apparent that the real defenders of the day are among those who regard it a divine, not merely a human institution."

Col. Elliott F. Shepard, in accepting the presidency of the American Sabbath Union, said:-

"The work, therefore, of this society is only just begun. We do not put this work on mere human reasoning; for all that can be overthrown by human reason. We rest it directly and only on the divine commandment."-*Pearl of Days, January 25, 1889.*

Article 3 of the constitution of the American Sabbath Union reads thus:-

"The object of this union is to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship."

And finally, the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, which was so heartily indorsed by this union and by the National Reform Association, expressly declared that it should be construed-

"To secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath-day."

This evidence might be multiplied, but it is sufficient to show that Sunday legislation is religious legislation, and nothing else. Now let us examine its nature and results.

In Prof. Herrick Johnson's address before the American Sabbath Union, on the Sunday newspaper, an address which the union circulated broadcast over the country as an official document, there are four propositions laid down, the fourth one of which, taken from an Illinois Supreme Court report, is as follows:-

"Every individual has the right to the enjoyment of the Christian Sabbath without liability to annoyance from the ordinary secular pursuits of life, except so far as they may be dictated by necessity or charity."

This proposition is a sound one. We have no fault to find with it in itself, but only with the way it is applied; for the Sunday-law advocates' idea of giving people a *right* to rest on Sunday is to compel everybody to rest. The proposition that every individual has the right to the enjoyment of a rest on Sunday is no more self-evident than that every individual has the right not to rest on that day, but to rest on some other day. Both these propositions being true, it is very clearly seen that ample provision is already made against anybody being unnecessarily disturbed on his chosen day of rest. We concede that everybody who wishes to rest upon Sunday has the right, and should be protected in the right, to do so undisturbed. But the very essence of Sunday legislation, and the only foundation upon which it rests, is the theory that those who choose to rest on any other day than Sunday have no right to the enjoyment of that rest undisturbed, and have no right to refrain from resting on Sunday.

That this is what is implied by the proposition for our proofs laid down by Mr. Johnson, and indorsed by the American Sabbath Union, is clearly shown by their

official statements. Thus Dr. Edwards, in to an address before the National Reform Convention held in New York in 1873, having stated that the National Reform movement is opposed to atheism in the government, gave his idea of atheism as follows. Said he:-

"The atheist is the man who denies the being of a God and a future life. To him, mind and matter are the same, and time is the be-all and the end-all of consciousness and of character.

"The deist admits God, but denies that he has any such personal control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he ever manifests himself and his will in a revelation.

"The Jews admit God, providence, and revelation, but reject the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ, as sheer imagination, or, worse, sheer imposture.

"The Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.

"These are all for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class."

Here we find that when the National Reform movement shall have succeeded, the individual who does not regard Sunday will be counted as an atheist. Now listen to what Dr. Edwards said of atheists, in the same address:-

"What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic, for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator."

This is simply saying that under the National Reform *regime*, the man who should dare to observe another day than Sunday would be considered as having no rights whatever, and entitled to no respect. If he should dare to publicly declare his belief, his insanity would be considered dangerous, and he would be shut up.

This has been stated even more plainly in an article in the *Christian Statesman*, July 7, 1887, entitled, "The Bible in the Public Schools," which was editorially commended as "a masterly article." The writer said:-

"Some advanced champions for freedom of conscience and the rights of men, in Britain and the United States, cannot be accommodated. In this category must be classed agnostics, atheists, and scientific infidels. For my part, without hesitation or apology, I deny such men any reasonable claim to conscientious convictions and privileges at all."

Now substitute in the above Mr. Edwards' definition of an atheist, and you have the simple statement that under National Reform government, people who do not observe Sunday-no matter how strictly they may observe another day of the week-will not be considered as having any claim to conscientious convictions and privileges-they will not be considered as having any rights whatever.

Now listen to another statement. It is from the *Christian Nation*, of September 15, 1886. This is one of the official organs of the National Reform Association,

and therefore may be depended upon as properly representing National Reform. I read:-

379

"Neither does National Reform propose to deprive any citizens, without forfeiture, of any just and inalienable civil right."

But we have already shown from high authority that National Reformers consider that atheists-among whom are classed all who differ with them in religious faith, and especially those who differ with them in respect to the precise day of the week which should be observed-have no rights whatever; so that all a man will have to do to forfeit his rights in their estimation will be to disregard Sunday, or to religiously observe another day in its stead. Now mark, according to the statement that I have just read, National Reformers deliberately propose to deprive such citizens of just and inalienable rights.

And this is just what the advocates of religious legislation will do. The success of their movement cannot fail of resulting in religious persecution. With the above deliberately expressed intention to deprive men of just and inalienable rights, place another equally base avowal by Rev. Dr. A. D. Mayo, at the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, in 1872. After declaring that the people of the United States would acknowledge God in the Constitution, he said:-

"They will protect the rights of every citizen, and persecute no man for his religion until that religion leads him to disobey the law which expresses the will of the majority concerning the moral duty of the citizen."

Of course they will persecute. If they succeed in getting the laws that are desired, they cannot do otherwise. For the State is bound to enforce all the laws on its statute-books. If it has laws concerning religion and religious practices, it must enforce them, or else have its authority despised. But the punishment of a man because he differs with others in matters of religious faith and practice, is simply religious persecution.

Mr. Blair declared ("Senate Hearing," p. 97) that the only object of the proposed national Sunday law is to make efficient the existing Sunday laws of the States. Yet inefficient as he considers them, they have proved efficient enough in Georgia, Tennessee, and Arkansas to deprive men of property, of liberty, and, indirectly, even of life. Now listen to what Rev. J. M. Foster, district secretary of the National Reform Association, said when pressed to give his opinion of these outrages:-

"As to the alleged cases of persecution in three States, I have read the description of the cases in Arkansas, and they are not of the public-spirited class that is willing to suffer for the common good. The old man and his son of seventeen, whose horse was sold for \$27, and the man whose young wife and child died while he was in prison, brought that evil on themselves by breaking the law."-*Christian Statesman*, Oct. 10, 1889.

It is not too much to say that such talk is fiendish. Let no man say that persecution will not follow the passage of religious laws. It cannot be otherwise. And it will not be the vicious and depraved who will be the most active in the persecution. No; it will be the very men who are considered the guardians of public morals. Men who are personally very pleasant and amiable may make the

worst sort of persecutors; when they get so blind that they can regard as a common criminal the one who disregards an unjust human law in order that he may obey a just and divine commandment. One of the strongest indictments against religious legislation is that its tendency is to transform naturally amiable men into cold-blooded demons of cruelty.

Human rights are God-given; and since God is no respecter of persons, it follows that he has given to all men the same rights; and thus the Declaration of Independence simply formulated a Heaven-born truth when it declared that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That is, all men are created equal with respect to the rights with which they are endowed. Every man has a God-given right to find his pleasure, enjoy liberty, and pursue happiness in his own way. Of course it is understood that no one shall interfere with another; for all are to be equally protected; and if all are equally protected, none will be interfered with. Now it needs no argument to show that one man's violation of Sunday does not deprive another man of his privilege to rest. That ten men in any community who do not observe Sunday, do not in the slightest degree interfere with the right and liberty of the thousands of others to observe that day, is clearly shown by the fact that in scores of instances a single individual observes the seventh day regularly and strictly, and is not hampered in that observance in the least by the fact that thousands of others openly disregard it, and have no respect for his observance of it.

The proposition that every individual has the right to the enjoyment of Sunday, rightly interpreted, is only the inverse of the proposition that every individual has the right to the observance of Saturday, or of any other day, or, so far as man is concerned, of no day at all. But Sunday laws, as before stated, make no provision for the rights of any except those who observe Sunday, and deliberately propose to deprive all others of their God-given rights. As the *Christian Nation* says; they propose to deprive certain individuals of inalienable rights and privileges. Thus by their own mouth it is proved that religious legislation, as embodied in the movement of the National Reform Association and the American Sabbath Union, is a direct blow at the foundation of our government, and is directly in opposition to the Declaration of Independence, -the charter of American liberty. It is un-American, and that alone should be sufficient to condemn it. The man who in a public assembly would declare that the framers and signers of the Declaration of Independence were misguided men, and that their work was a fraud, would be set down as the worst kind of an anarchist. The preacher who should make such a statement would lose his congregation. The teacher who would make such a declaration to a class would be expelled from the public schools. Yet the National Reform Association and the American Sabbath Union make the same declaration no less boldly, although not in express terms. They have boldly and openly railed against the statement of the Declaration of Independence that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

We say, then, that their movement ought to be opposed, because it is of the very essence of anarchy. It does not help the matter to say that those whose

rights are thus disregarded are only a few, although Sunday-law advocates think to console themselves with this idea. Thus Dr. Edwards said:-

"The parties whose conscience we are charged with troubling, taken altogether, are but few in number. This determines nothing as to who is right; but the fact remains, and it worthy of note, that, taken all together, they amount to but a small fraction of our citizenship."

Almost every lecturer in behalf of Sunday legislation lays great stress upon the assertion that the observers of the seventh day "amount to but about seven-tenths of one per cent of the entire population;" and that, therefore, they are too insignificant to be noticed or to have their rights and privileges taken into account.

But right here is a principle which they overlook: It is not whether a few individuals who observe the seventh day may be ignored on that account, but whether the government can afford to disregard the rights of people simply because they are in the minority. Let the government once start upon the line of doing injustice to even a single individual, and there is no telling where it will stop. If a law may be enacted which will trample upon the rights of one individual, the same principle will allow the enactment of a law that will ignore the rights of many. If a few people may have their rights ignored because they differ with the majority as to the precise day of the week to be observed religiously, a few other people may have their rights ignored because they differ with the majority on some other subject. Moreover, majorities and minorities are subject to fluctuation. Politics are changeable, and the side which has the majority to-day may, within a year, be represented only by a feeble minority; so that if the government once starts upon a career of injustice, not a single individual will have any guarantee of safety.

We have been proceeding upon the supposition that those who observe Sunday, and those who are working for national Sunday laws, are in the majority; but this is a great mistake. The population of the United States is between 60,000,000 and 70,000,000; of this number the best statistics-those which are furnished by the religious denominations themselves-show that, less than 15,000,000 are even professors of religion. Only that number of people have their names on church-books. According to the admission of leading men in this Sunday-law movement, a large per cent. of this number pay no more regard to Sunday than do non-professors. Therefore, it is self-evident that the attempt to secure Sunday laws, and to have the government enforce them, is an attempt by a very small minority to control the country.

The petition that has been presented to Congress had, according to the highest estimate-of its friends, only 14,000,000 indorsers; and of this number the larger portion never saw the petition. The Methodist Episcopal Church, the Baptist Church, the Presbyterian Church North and South; and the Reformed Church, are counted as having indorsed the petition; and yet it was only a few delegates from these bodies that indorsed it; and on the strength of this so-called indorsement, the entire membership was counted, to make 6,000,000 of the 14,000,000. Leave out the vast number who had never seen the petition, and that 6,000,000 would dwindle down to a small fraction of 1,000,000. Then,

notwithstanding the fact that the Presbyterian Church was counted with the other denominations-which together only made up 6,000,000 of the 14,000,000-that church appears the second time in the same list of 14,000,000, thus furnishing 700,000 more to the list, all of which should be omitted.

Then, again, a letter from Cardinal Gibbons personally indorsing the movement, was counted as adding 7,000,000 to the list, all of which should be deducted.

380

Then the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 200,000 strong, was added, to help swell the 14,000,000 list. But the very name of the association shows that all of its members are also members of the various Christian churches; and, therefore, they were counted in the denominations that are represented by wholesale.

Then, again, the Knights of Labor were counted over 200,000 strong, to help swell the list. But, in the first place, many of these are members of churches, and so had already appeared in the count of those churches; in the second place, of the 219,000 Knights, probably not more than 200 were present in the assembly which passed a vote favoring the petition. And, lastly, the fraud that was perpetrated in counting the entire body of the Knights of Labor as favoring the Sunday-law petition, is shown by a recent dispatch from Milwaukee to the *Chicago Tribune*. It stated that the Sunday-closing question was likely to cause a great deal of trouble to politicians in Wisconsin. It mentioned the effort that was being made by some of the churches to secure Sunday legislation, and closed thus:-

"The proposition to hold a State mass convention for the purpose of organizing all over the State, has met with a great deal of favor, and will probably be put in effect sometime during the winter: The workers are also trying to interest the Knights of Labor in the movement."

This would sound very strange in the face of the fact that it has been certified to Congress that the Knights of Labor, 219,000 strong; have already indorsed the movement, did we not already know that that representation was a base fraud.

By this brief analysis of the pretended 14,000,000 signature petition, we have shown that an exceedingly small per cent. of the population of the United States is working for Sunday laws; but there is another point which will very largely cut; down even this small minority. The petition certifies that each one of its indorsers is an adult resident of the United States, twenty-one years of age, or more; yet the entire membership of all the churches was counted, although it is well known that every large denomination has a large percentage of members who are less than twenty-one years of age. That this fraudulent representation was deliberately planned is shown by the confession of the leading worker, the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union. In attempting to defend himself and his co-workers from the charge of deliberate fraud in the matter, he made the following statement under oath:-

"It is implied that some fraud was perpetrated because the whole membership of churches petitioning was given, not those above twenty-one only; but the

records quoted show that there was no attempt to deceive. It is impossible to tell how many in a denomination are under twenty-one, and so the whole number is given."

Who cares how many in a denomination are under twenty-one years of age? What has that to do with the securing of a Sunday law? The petition has nothing to do with the number in any denomination who are under twenty-one years of age, or who are over twenty-one years of age. All it has to do is with the individuals who voluntarily sign it. If those who formed and circulated the petition had been honest in their intention, the question of how many in any denomination were or were not under twenty-one years of age, would not have troubled them at all.

But they were determined to swell their list of petitioners by every means possible. They could have *guessed* the number of church members who were above twenty-one years of age, and put that number down, and thus have presented a little more nearly the appearance of honest dealing; but they resolved to run no risk of making a mistake in number, and so put down the whole number, thus deliberately perpetrating a base fraud. It may well be said that no attempt was made to deceive, because the fraud is so transparent that no one in his senses could be deceived; but the imposition was none the less on that account.

If anyone asks what this has to do with the reasons why we oppose religious legislation, we reply that it has a great deal to do with it. Truth is never advanced by fraud; it cannot be. Truth never seeks to gain its ends by trickery, for that would defeat them. Truth has a natural and irreconcilable repugnance for error and falsehood, but wickedness can be fostered only by deceit. Therefore when any movement seeks to advance itself by any fraudulent means, there can be no better evidence that it is a wicked affair. In every age, from the time of Constantine until now, religious legislation by civil power has been built up by fraud, vindictive selfishness, and perjury.

From what has already been given, therefore, it is plainly evident that the movement in this country for a national Sunday law is a movement for religious legislation, and that this movement is a most wickedly selfish attempt on the part of a few people to get, control of the government; a deliberate design to overturn the just and inalienable rights of the majority who either conscientiously differ with them, or else are indifferent; and a settled determination to persecute even to death those who do not tamely yield to their usurpation of authority. It is the worst phase of anarchy that has ever appeared in this country, and should be opposed by every true American citizen.

Another, and the chief reason why we oppose religious legislation, is that, no matter how sincere and conscientious its advocates may be, its influence can be only to bar the progress of true religion, and to propagate immorality. The proof of this is ample. We will begin with the argument for the suppression of Sunday newspapers. The *National Presbyterian*, of January, 1889, in an editorial on "The Church and the Sunday Newspaper," said:-

"The responsibility of the church for the continued existence of the Sunday newspaper is beginning to attract the attention of thoughtful men. It is a fact

which it is idle to attempt to conceal, that it is sustained by the patronage of the members of the evangelical churches. It is the support given them by this class, and this alone, that makes it practicable to continue the publication of these papers. The responsibility, then, of this great and growing evil is with the church."

The Chicago *Advance* of January 24, 1889, contained an article by Rev. Geo. C. Noyes, D.D., entitled, "The Sunday Newspaper,-an Expostulation," in which it was stated:-

"If all the Christian people in the land who read or advertise in the Sunday papers were to withdraw their patronage, the publication of every one of them would cease within a month. Upon Christian people rests the responsibility of their continued publication."

The Rev. Herrick Johnson, in his published speech upon the Sunday newspaper, brings this indictment against it:-

"It is tempting hundreds and thousands to stay away from the sanctuary, and making it manifold harder for the truth to reach those who go. Ruskin says, in view of the thronging activities of our times, the rush and roar of our busy life, the push and press and ambitions of trade, a minister on Sunday morning has just 'thirty minutes to raise the dead in.' The Sunday newspaper is another large stone laid on that sepulcher, making it just so much harder to raise the dead."

Again he says:-

"This is the fearful indictment against it, that it is keeping an army of workmen from the day of rest they ought to have. It is educating an army of newsboys to trample on the Sabbath, and so counteracting the best influences that Christian people are making to throw around them. . . . It is honeycombing society with false notions about the Sabbath; and it is deadening the spiritual sensibilities even of many of the people of God."

Now, here is an acknowledged evil in the church; professed Christian people are having their spiritual sensibilities deadened, and are openly violating their church obligations; and what is the remedy proposed? Is it a revival of religion? or increased zeal on the part of the ministry? Oh; no; it is to have the State suppress the thing which is leading them astray. What is the plan proposed to enable the minister to reach the people? Is it to ask the aid of the Holy Spirit?-Not at all; it is only to ask the aid of the State to suppress the Sunday newspaper. Thus the effect of religious legislation is to substitute the power of the State for the power of the Spirit of God. It surely can need no argument to show that the religion thus fostered will be only a hollow shell. It will be State religion, and not the religion of the Spirit of God.

The State may force people to church, and may enforce a form of religion, but the Spirit of God alone can reach the heart; and without this power an enforced form is worse than useless, since many people will trust in that form, and will rest content with that alone. It is a most humiliating confession of weakness and wickedness, when the church asks the aid of the State. Take the statements cited from the *National Presbyterian* and the *Advance*. Appeals for Sunday laws, based on such statements, amount to just this: "We have so much evil in the church-so many disorderly members-that we are unable to do anything; there are not enough conscientious members to discipline the disorderly ones, and not

enough of the Spirit of God in the church to convert them; and so we must have the help of the State to enforce church discipline, and establish a form of godliness."

They do not realize that this is simply to reject God and to trust in the power of man. Says Bishop Vincent, "The church makes a great mistake when it seeks to secure worldly position; and to influence temporal power." "The abomination of abominations is the aspiration after temporal power on the part of the church. All the church wants is spiritual power, and this goes out when temporal power is invoked."

Those who appeal to the State to help the church in its struggles, should learn a lesson from Ezra. When he was on his journey from Babylon to Jerusalem to build the city, he had to pass with women and children through a hostile country. He was greatly troubled; but instead of asking the king for a troop of soldiers to protect his company, he fasted and prayed to the Lord. Says he:-

"For I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way: because we had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him; but his power and his wrath is against all them that forsake him. So we fasted

381

and besought our God for this: and he was entreated of us." Ezra 8:22, 23.

The church has preached to the world about the power of God; yet, unlike Ezra, it is not ashamed to ask the world for help, instead of trusting in God. Thus they confess their lack of knowledge of God. Two great evils must result from this course: First, the world will no more believe that there is any such thing as the power of the Holy Spirit, and it will think itself supreme. Second, both the church and the world will be plunged more deeply into sin; because the church is appealing for help against an evil, to the very source of that evil. The world cannot purify the world. A worldly church cannot clear itself of worldliness by the aid of the world. Therefore Christians should oppose religious legislation for the honor of God, and for the preservation of his truth.

But I have a still stronger indictment in this line to bring against religious legislation. It is that such legislation naturally tends to the grossest immorality, and, what is worse, leads the vicious to think that they are Christians. Ground for this charge is found in the following statements. Dr. Edwards, in his New York address before referred to, said:-

"And yet another objection is that the laws of Moses will have to be re-enacted and enforced among us, and that these laws are not at all fitted to our times, our freedom, our civilization. I confess that I am not at all afraid of Moses. . . . Now, if there be anything in the laws of Moses which the coming of Christ and the subsequent overthrow of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be pointed out-there cannot be many of them-and we are prepared to accept there and have them re-enacted."

Again, in the hearing on the Sunday-Rest bill before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Blair asked the question:-

"Suppose that human beings trying to live in accordance with the will of God, re-enact his law, and write it in their statute-books; is it wrong for society to put

into its public laws the requirements of the obedience to God and his law?"-*Hearing, p, 65.*

And when this question had been answered by the statement that the effect of Sunday legislation is to call the attention of the individual to human authority, to the exclusion of the divine, Mr. Blair replied:-

"The will of God exists. He requires the observance of the seventh day, just as he prohibits murder; and as we re-enact his law in making a law and re-enforcing it against murder, so all the States have en-acted laws against the desecration of the Sabbath, going further or not so far, according to the idea of various Legislatures."-*Ib. p. 66.*

Just think of it! Re-enacting the law of God! And not simply re-enacting it, but even going farther than God, according to the State Legislature! Was greater presumption ever dreamed of? What could more perfectly meet the description of the power that should oppose and exalt itself above all that is called God or that is worshiped?

But listen to two more statements on the same point. In the *Christian Statesman* of May 30, 1889, Mr. Crafts said:-

"Now the question comes right to this point: God having ordained the Sabbath, as you concede, with all religious organizations, here is the national government, which alone can make that law of God operative in this sphere of national action. Why should not the national government, then, re-enact that conceded law of the Almighty, and make it effective?"-*Hearing, p. 66.*

Here we see an utter ignoring of the power of the Spirit of God to influence men. The national government alone able to make the law of God effective!! We have already noted the blasphemous presumption of such an idea, but now after one more citation we wish to call special attention to the result upon the people. In the *Christian Nation* of December 5, 1888, the Rev. N. M., Johnston, speaking of Christ's work on earth, said of him:-

"He healed disease; an intimation that when his gospel shall prevail, and wickedness be suppressed by law, then pestilence and disease shall be unknown."

Now note the following points:-

1. The law of God is spiritual. God requires truth in the inward parts. He has declared that outward compliance with his requirements amounts to nothing unless the service is from the heart. His word declares that hatred is murder, and that a lustful desire or look is adultery. No sign may be made that man can see, but God, who looks upon the heart, sees violation of his commandments. The Pharisees, who appeared righteous outwardly unto men, but were corrupt within, were denounced in most unmeasured terms. See Matt. 23:26-28.

2. As wickedness has to do with the heart, so has morality; and nothing but the Spirit of God can reach the heart. No law, not excepting the law of God, can put down wickedness. The only righteousness that is worthy of the name is the righteousness of faith. The apostle Paul declared that he did not want to be found at the last day having the righteousness of the law, but only with the righteousness which is by the faith of Jesus Christ.

3. Since the law of God has to do with the thoughts and intents of the heart, it is evident that no human law can enforce obedience to it, nor punish for disobedience thereof. A man may be as corrupt at heart as Satan can make him, and yet if he preserves a fair exterior, men may call him good. Therefore it follows that,

4. When the State assumes the power of re-enacting and making effective the laws of God, it will declare men to be moral who are grossly corrupt. And since the natural tendency of men is to self-satisfaction, the result will be to fasten men in chains of vice. It will be useless to preach the gospel to men whom a power which they are taught to believe has authority above God, has declared to be righteous. And so the so-called Christian nation will be a nation where murder, adultery, and theft will be clothed with the garb of Christianity. Thus the abettors of religious legislation take away the key of knowledge, not entering into the kingdom of God themselves, and hindering those who would.

To sum up: We oppose religious legislation by civil governments, because it is unjust, and inconsistent with that civil liberty which is inalienable and God-given. Especially is it un-American, directly subversive of that which the founders of this government fought and labored to establish and maintain. Still more do we oppose it, because it is antichristian, tending only to immorality and practical idolatry. It repudiates the power of Christ and the Holy Spirit; it treats the word of God as a common thing, subjecting it to the judgment of men and the caprices of politicians; it even denies God himself, by attributing to fallible mortals the authority which belongs to him alone.

It is, in fact, of the very essence of heathenism; for while a true theocracy is the best government that could be imagined, -God himself being ruler, -when men appoint themselves vicegerents of God, they do just what the heathen did. Therefore, we call on all true Americans - upon all lovers of the liberty bequeathed to us by our fathers in the immortal Declaration of Independence; and with a still louder call we appeal to all lovers of God, of the Bible as his inspired word, and of the pure gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, to unite with us in warning the people against this monster of injustice and mystery of iniquity - religious legislation.

E. J. W.

American Sentinel, Vol. 5 (1890)

January 2, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

It is in one sense with feelings of considerable regret that the SENTINEL finds it necessary to sever its direct connection with California. Personally our associates there have been of the very pleasantest. Dear friends are there whom we hold in ever grateful remembrance. Professionally our associations have also been of the pleasantest; and it is with the kindest remembrances toward our contemporaries, of Oakland and San Francisco, and especially the *Times* and

the *Tribune* of Oakland, and the *Examiner* and the *Alta* of San Francisco, that the SENTINEL bids good-bye to the beautiful city by the Western Sea. Yet we all know that it was with the sole object of doing better service in the cause to which it is devoted that the SENTINEL made the change of location which it has made; and although we have been in our new quarters but a few days, we have already seen abundance of evidence of the propriety of the move that has been made. It is therefore with the best of courage that we enter anew upon our work with the beginning of this new year.

It is stated that the new government of Brazil proposes to sever the connection that existed under the monarchy between the State and the Roman Catholic Church. But while Catholicism was the State religion all other sects were tolerated. The only distinction made between that and other sects was that other denominations were restricted to the use of houses of worship "without the exterior form of temples." This was construed to forbid simply the erection of steeples and the use of bells. The appropriations for religious purposes in Brazil in 1887-88 amounted to \$454,000. The same budget appropriated \$280,000 for education. Neither of these sums was large, and certainly the Brazilian establishment was not very expensive, but the new government will do well to abolish it and let the churches support themselves, while the government looks after the schools.

"The American Sentinel" *American Sentinel* 5, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

With this number the AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon the fifth year of its publication. Started at Oakland, California, January, 1886, as an eight-page monthly, it attained the first year to a total circulation of more than 136,000 copies; the second year of more than 255,000; and the third year of more than 600,000. This rapid growth showed a demand for the paper which seemed to the publishers to call for a more frequent issue. Accordingly, in January, 1889, it was changed to an eight-page weekly; and more than a million copies were printed and circulated within a year. The rapidly multiplying demands for national religious legislation rendered it essential that our place of publication should be nearer the centers of information. We are therefore established at No. 43 Bond Street, New York City, from which place the AMERICAN SENTINEL salutes its old acquaintances and introduces itself to its new ones.

The SENTINEL exists for the purpose of opposing all manner of religious legislation, and every principle, effort, or movement, that tends in any way toward a union of religion and the State; and of maintaining in this opposition the principles announced by Jesus Christ and also embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution.

The SENTINEL is positively Christian. And as positively and decidedly as it is Christian, just so positively does it maintain that Christianity, to remain pure and powerful, must never be connected, as such, in any way with the State; and that the State, properly to fulfil its functions, must never have anything whatever to do with religion, as such, or with religious observances. With the Supreme Court of

Ohio we hold that "united with government, religion never rises above the merest superstition; united with religion, government never rises above the merest despotism; and all history shows us that the more widely and completely they are separated the better it is for both." And with Dr. Philip Schaff we hold that "secular power has proved a Satanic gift to the church, and ecclesiastical power has proved an engine of tyranny in the hands of the State." And the SENTINEL occupies this position because it is Christian, and because its editors and publishers love Jesus Christ and the religion which he brought to the world.

The SENTINEL maintains that civil government is an ordinance of God; that to the citizen it is supreme in civil things, for God has made it so by commanding Christians as well as all others to be subject to it; and that the authority of civil government is over only the civil relations of men, and does not extend at all to religious things.

The Saviour, when asked whether it was lawful to give tribute to CÆsar or not, replied by stating a principle which is for all people and governments unto the end of the world-"Render unto CÆsar the things that are CÆsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." He separates forever that which men owe to God from that which they owe to civil government. Religious duties and observances men owe to God; civil duties and obligations they owe to the State. Christ has separated these things; and what God has put asunder let no man join together.

Again, in Romans 13:1-10, every soul is commanded to be subject unto the higher powers, to pay tribute, to render to all thee dues; and then, after citing certain commandments which speak of the relation of men to their fellowmen, the Word says,

2

"And if there be any other commandment it is briefly comprehended in this saying, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'" This word covers all the field in which the duty of any man can be related to civil government. With the men who do the things there named no government can ever find any fault. But in the points named there is not embraced any of the duties which men specifically owe to God. Therefore, within the line of man's relations to his fellowman, God has set the limit to the jurisdiction of civil government. Civil government never can go beyond that limit without trenching upon ground where God has forbidden it to go. God has separated the duties which man owes to himself from those which civil government may require; and what God has put asunder let no man join together.

Therefore the SENTINEL maintains that it is the natural and inalienable right of every man to worship or not to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience; and that he is responsible to God alone for the exercise of that right. With George Washington we hold that "every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith." Any interference with this right on the part of any person or power is as unwarranted as it is unjust.

The SENTINEL maintains that its principles, as thus set forth, are strictly in harmony with the original intent of the government of the United States under its Constitution. It was plainly declared by the framers of this government that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust

under the United States;" that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" and that "the government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion." It is therefore not only as a Christian publication, but, per consequence, as a loyal American publication, that the AMERICAN SENTINEL proposes to disseminate its principles.

And the SENTINEL cordially invites the co-operation of all lovers of Christianity and of the American Constitution in the work to which it is devoted.

"Queer Ideas of Morals" *American Sentinel* 5, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

In the Iowa Sunday-law convention, President Blanchard of Wheaton College, Ill., said: "I would rather swear for half an hour than buy a Sunday paper for half a minute;" and in the annual convention of the National W.C.T.U., one of the representative speakers said: "I am a Christian, yet I would rather tell a lie than to put on a corset." It may be that both these persons are Christians according to their understanding of what Christianity is; but such statements as these certainly betray a serious confusion of ethical ideas. Yet these are the people who want the State to legislate on the subject of morals and religion, and to give legal force to their ideas of morals! When such people get control of legislation and of law their own narrow views and confused ideas of things become supreme, their will takes precedence of the will of God. Mr. Blanchard is the gentleman who some time ago announced that in this matter of religious legislation they are "the representatives of God!" With this idea the above quotations are consistent, because such has ever been the course of the self-appointed "representatives of God" in government and law.

"Pushing the Matter" *American Sentinel* 5, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

The following from the Minneapolis *Journal* of the 14th ult. is interesting reading. It shows about as plainly as anything we ever saw, the temper of the Sunday-law advocates. They are determined to succeed and will stop at nothing which promises to aid their cause. The *Journal* says:-

Within the past two weeks leading pastors of the city have been in receipt of a paper which outlines a plan whereby it is expected that better Sunday observance will be secured in Minneapolis. The Sunday newspaper, it will be seen from what follows, is the head and front of the offending.

This paper is in the nature of a solemn agreement made very binding, and it has already been signed by a large number of leading ministers of the city. The paper, or agreement, put into concise shape, is as follows:-

"In order to correct the misapprehension that there is any difference of opinion among the pastors of this city with reference to the enforcement of Sunday laws, we pledge ourselves to stand by one another in this.

"1. We believe in using every right endeavor to bring about an abridgement of Sunday work in the public as well as in the private industries.

"2. We are united in demanding persistently and continuously the enforcement of all the laws whatsoever that refer to Sabbath desecration. And this means the closing of Sunday theaters.

"3. We pledge ourselves to withhold all patronage from the Sunday newspaper both in the matter of subscription and advertisement and to persuade our people, in so far as possible, to take the same position. We do this believing that the Sunday newspaper is the head and front of all offending."

The iron-clad agreement has been signed, as noted, by a large number of ministers of the city. But the signing of this manifesto is not all that has been done. The evening of the third Sunday in the month of January next has been selected as an occasion upon which the Sunday observance question is to have the biggest clerical shaking up in the history of the city. An elaborate plan has been prepared which, outlined, is as follows:-

A large number of hacks or carriages will be retained and held for duty. Each minister in the city will have one of these three points above noted assigned to him as a text for a short, pithy address. He will make this address in his own church, for instance, will then be driven rapidly to another church nearest at hand where he will repeat the address, and then he will go to another church and another until he has used up all the evening's time. Another minister will have another topic and will follow the same plan, and still another the last topic. Thus divided up by threes the ministers will keep moving from one church to another all the evening, giving to each congregation as many addresses as possible and all of them red hot. The State organization, which has the matter of Sunday observance in hand, will soon issue the formal call for these meetings. It is the intention of the movers in this affair to attract immense audiences to the churches and to give them the most earnest and powerful talks on the subject that the ministers of Minneapolis can utter. Said a gentleman closely connected with the movement this morning:-

"We mean business. We are going to push this matter. You say that there is a leading orthodox pastor in the city, who, it is reported, likes to read the Sunday paper? All right, just let him refuse to sign this paper then. That's all. Just let him refuse to sign such a paper, and see what effect it would have. I tell you he'll have to come out of the rain."

"Prohibition" *American Sentinel* 5, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

The *American Standard* remarks that "a good deal is said about hard times in Iowa, yet the State has just paid the last dollar of her debt, and taxes are to be reduced one-third. If the prohibition has accomplished this, it's a big feather in the cap of prohibition." Whether prohibition in Iowa has reduced taxation or not, it has done one good thing: it has demonstrated, not only there but in Kansas and the Dakotas, that all hope of prohibition is not bound up in the so-called Prohibition party. It has been demonstrated in those States that when public sentiment is educated up to that point the people will adopt prohibition regardless of parties.

"Notes" American Sentinel 5, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

The field secretary of the American Sabbath Union is Rev. W. F. Crafts, of this city. Down at Washington City the other day, in a sermon on the Sunday-law question, he held up a backwards saw which he says he got at Nazareth, in Palestine, and which is emblematic of the course of certain leaders in the Sunday movement, and informed his audience that it was such a saw as that that Christ laid down "Saturday nights" at the close of his week's work, and preparatory to his weekly rest on Sunday. And everybody knows, or ought to know, that Christ never worked on Saturday and never kept Sunday while he was in this world. Everybody knows, or ought to know, that Saturday was the Sabbath in Christ's day; and that he rested instead of worked on that day. Sunday, we are informed by the theologians, is kept in memory of Christ's resurrection; and it is hardly likely that he commemorated his own resurrection *before that even occurred*. Query: In that statement did Mr. Crafts manifest his own ignorance, or did he presume upon the ignorance of his audience? If the latter, was it honest? If the former, ought he not to learn before he takes it upon himself to teach?

It is announced from Rome that Monseigneur Satolli, who recently returned to Rome from this country, has assured the Pope that "the Washington government looks favorably upon the idea of having a duly accredited diplomatic representative at the Vatican." There is little room for doubt that this is true. The cry of "rum, Romanism, and rebellion" defeated one candidate for the presidency in this country, and forewarned by that circumstance each presidential possibility is now determined that nothing of the kind shall happen in his case. But there is absolutely no reason why this country should have a representative at the papal court. The craft Leo desires it because it would be an acknowledgment from one of the greatest powers of earth that he is of right a temporal prince, and that he is unjustly deprived of his dominions. But that is something that this country has no right to acknowledge; nor would our officials so much as think of doing so were it not for the political influence exercised in this country by the minions of a foreign pretender to a usurped throne in Italy.

December 9-11, the American Sabbath Union held its first anniversary in this city. The attendance was about fifty. Papers were read, speeches were made, and eighteen resolutions were passed. One paper "prepared expressly for the occasion," but not presented, was entitled "Some Lessons Learned During the Past Year." If that paper was prepared by the field secretary we should like very much to see it or hear it read, especially if he gave an impartial account of certain things which we know that he learned. The Union decided to establish the headquarters of the field secretary in Washington City. This is in order that he may be on the spot to superintend the passing of the Sunday laws which they demand.

The statement of Dr. Schaff that Sunday laws are a connecting link between church and State is a truth that can be demonstrated by more than one line of argument embodying proofs as strong as Holy Writ. Wherever there are Sunday laws, therefore, there is a union of church and State. This is one great reason

why the AMERICAN SENTINEL is so uncompromisingly opposed to Sunday laws. Any union of church and State is only evil, and any laws or governmental forms that comprise any connecting link between the two are wrong.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

No man can ever of right make his religion the basis of any plea for governmental favor, nor the ground of any complaint of governmental discrimination. If there is not enough good in the religion to pay him for professing it then there is not enough to pay the government for taking any legal notice of it in any way whatever.

The basis of the State is the natural, its province is the temporal; the basis of the church is supernatural, its province is the spiritual. The church can never of right have anything at all to do with the State, and the State can never of right have anything to do with the church except as it has to do with any and all other bodies or corporations.

Mr. Crafts, it is said, admits that Washington is now the most orderly and quiet city on Sunday of any city in this country. "Its greatest failure is in not having a Sunday law." But why have such a law if without it better order is maintained than is had elsewhere with Sunday laws? Is not the real object to secure from Congress some acknowledgment of Sunday sacredness? So it certainly appears, and so we believe.

We are indebted to a number of our exchanges for friendly and even complimentary mention upon the occasion of our removal from Oakland, Cal., to this city. We appreciate these notices, not only because they are a substantial benefit, but because they show that our work has not been lost upon our brethren of the press. We are glad to know that our efforts are appreciated, and that, in the final "tug of war" very many of the papers of the country will be found on the side of the liberty of conscience now guaranteed by our national Constitution.

December 9, 1889, in the United States Senate, Senator Blair of New Hampshire introduced both the measures looking to religious legislation, which he had introduced in the Fiftieth Congress-the Sunday-Rest Bill, and the Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution by which the "principles of the Christian religion" shall be taught in all the public schools of the country. We have no space to notice them further this week but in our next we shall notice the Sunday bill in full and as soon as possible the proposed amendment also. It is announced that Congressman W. C. P. Breckinridge will soon introduce a Sunday bill in the House.

The Sunday-law question is again before Congress. Very early in the present session several petitions were presented on the subject, some praying for the passage of a national Sunday law, and others protesting against any religious legislation what-ever. Sunday is a religious institution, and legislation concerning it is religious legislation.

National Reformers are unhappy because President Harrison's message to Congress contained no recognition of God. In this particular it is said to be unlike

the messages of all preceding Presidents. The omission was probably due to an oversight, but it is possible that the President had the good sense to know that the Lord is not pleased with unmeaning complimentary allusions to him, and that he abhors the hollow mockery of official piety.

The AMERICAN SENTINEL maintains the inalienable right of every man to profess any religion or none just as he chooses; but it denies the right of any association of religious people to compel those who are not religious to act as though they were, or to conform to any religious observance, or to recognize any religious institution. We likewise deny the right of the State to pronounce any religious or ecclesiastical institution a civil thing and by that means compel conformity to it.

In a recent address before the New York Baptist Pastor's Conference on "The Significance of the Roman Catholic Congress and an outline of the Roman Catholic Movement of to-day," Rev. D. C. Potter, D. D., said:-

"That Catholic centenary congress in Baltimore was a jubilee, a Roman victory. Its first note was a paean, its last a doxology. Its voice was defiance, its grasp power, its purpose advance, and that, dare I say, irresistible. It evaded nothing, quibbled at nothing, but spoke out in a voice dominant and daring. The Protestant church could stand on its platform with hardly a phrase change."

This is all true, especially the last sentence. But why is the last true? Is it because Rome has changed? Nay, verily; "Rome never changes." It is because the Protestant church, so called, has ceased to be truly Protestant. We live in evil times when a union between Protestants and Romanists for the purpose of moulding legislation in the interests of "religion," as they put it, but really in the interests of the dominant churches, as such, is not only possible but when it is an accomplished fact. All "religious combinations to effect political objects are dangerous," and this one is doubly dangerous because the Protestant church of to-day can stand on a Romish platform and with Romanists advocate a papal policy.

In a recent informal talk before the W.C.T.U. of the District of Columbia Mrs. Bateham said that "the outlook for a Sunday law for the District is very hopeful. Everything is in good shape. Mr. Blair thinks that there will be little opposition this year." We believe that the Senator has reckoned without his host. There will probably be more opposition than he imagines. We are not prepared to say that Mr. Blair's Sunday-law schemes may not eventually succeed; but we do feel sure of one thing, namely, that a Sunday-law shall not be foisted upon the American people without their being fully informed concerning the nature and tendency of all such measures. The heritage of civil and religious liberty received from the founders of the republic will not be surrendered without a struggle.

Freethought, a liberal paper published in San Francisco, says:-

"Are not the Mormon Church, the Catholic Church, and all other churches perfectly consistent in claiming supreme power? If God is supreme and if the churches are the custodians of his word, why should they not speak with authority? That is the question."

No church calling itself Christian is consistent in claiming supreme power. God alone has such power and he has never delegated it to any man or to any

body of men. The church can of right, as a church, have nothing to do with earthly governments. The great Head of the church himself declared, "My kingdom is not of this world," and his followers cannot go beyond his word without forfeiting the right to call themselves by his name. Christ gave but one commission to his church, namely, to go into all the world and make disciples; this the apostles did by persuading men, and that is as far as the authority of the church extends. Any church which claims more than this is not Christian, though it may be so called, but anti-Christian. God has promised this world to his people, that is, to the meek (Matt. 5:5), but he has not yet made them lords over it, much less has he authorized them to take it for themselves. The true Christian is a missionary, not a politician.

January 9, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

The Sunday-law workers are quite accommodating. If in any of their conventions there are not enough of those who openly favor religious legislation to carry their plans and resolutions on a religious basis, they will very obligingly declare the whole thing to be civil only and secure the indorsement upon that basis. Very accommodating indeed they are; but calling a religious or ecclesiastical thing "civil" does not make it any the less religious. Sunday legislation is religious legislation under whatever name it may be proposed. And religious legislation is forbidden by the Word of God.

With the view of raising the "standard of morality of both sexes, and stimulating the fervor of their religious belief," the young emperor of Germany has, it is stated, issued an edict intended to put down dancing among the youth. Under the new order dancing is not to begin until after noon, is not to be kept up after 8 in the evening, and none except school children are to be allowed to join in the giddy round or the solemn square. Young people who are being prepared for confirmation are absolutely forbidden to appear at dances or to dance; and all parents and guardians of the young are called upon to use every means in their power to keep their children or pupils from dancing, and they are advised to substitute games for the popular form of recreation. Bismarck, it is said, opposed the ukase, saying:-

"That policy will be sure to make the young people dance all the harder. Who knows but it may come to pass that dances will be held in secret, like political agitatory exercises, and that the devotees of Terpsichore will have their heads turned with seditious politics as well as with the comparatively harmless dizziness of the waltz?"

Germany, it might be well to remember is a church and State country. Religion is taught in the public schools, and in various ways God is recognized as the source of all power; yet with the single exception of France, no so-called Christian country equals it in infidelity. It requires something more than imperial edicts, legislative action, and official red-tape to make Christians. We do think

that professed Christians should not desire to dance; but if they do, no amount of governmental interference will make the matter one whit better. There is no merit in not doing a thing when there is no opportunity to do it. Hot-house Christians have never been a success.

"Some Wholesome Suggestions to Ministers" *American Sentinel* 5, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

The drift of the age is in the direction of "morality" by civil law, and is too often to exclusion, or at least to the neglect of moral suasion. Instead of seeking to construct people in moral duties, and thus lead them to practice morality from and changes motives, even ministers are too often found appealing to the civil law to. This is a grave mistake, for while men may, and should be required under civil penalties to lead *civil* lives, it is neither proper nor possible to make them world except by persuasion. This was the method adopted by Christ and his apostles, and it is the one which should be followed what by his ministers. Directly in the line of that which we have said is the following from the Iowa *State Register*, of November 24, 1889, which contains some wholesome suggestions not only for ministers but to all who, though meaning well, are committing a grave error of attempting to reform men by making it impossible, or at least difficult, for them to do wrong. The *Register's* article relates particularly to be temperance question, but the principle is the same as applied to other questions, and is for this reason that we presented to our readers. The *Register* says:-

"We want to say to the preachers of Iowa at this crisis in public affairs, that in our judgment they are depending too much upon the law, and too little upon moral effort to bring about the condition of things we all desire. We have read with interest their letters and the resolutions they have adopted. We sympathize with them in their desire to banish the saloon and suppress the evils of intemperance. But we want to remind them that it takes more than a State statute to keep men from drinking, and reform those who are slaves to the drink have it. The law is good so far as it goes, but when a human appetite and passion is the subject, it doesn't go the whole distance. There is something for the churches, something for the preachers, something for every good man and woman who wants to make the world better, to do. We notice in some of the resolutions which have been adopted at preachers' meetings within the last few days, a disposition to look still more to the Legislature to suppress or to stamp out what ever drinking and violation of the prohibitory law still remain.

"We believe that is a mistake. The law has done, and is doing all that the law can, to close the saloons, and to keep men from drinking. Can the preachers truthfully say that they have done it and are doing all that they can? We wouldn't accuse them of willfully neglecting their duty. But have they as ministers done the best in the most the could to keep men sober, to reclaim the drunkard, to save the boys from learning to love liquor, since the prohibitory law went into effect?

"We have been watching the operation of the prohibitory law ever since it was enacted. We have been watching also the general course of the professed temperance workers toward it. We will credit the ministers with helping to enforce

the law. They have preached enforcement from the pulpit. They have talked it on the streets, most of them have voted it at the polls. But when we have said that, haven't we said it all? Haven't we summed up the aggregate work of the clergy, and to quite an extent of the temperance organizations of the State? Our good friends, the preachers, have looked to the law to make and keep men sober, and have expected that would do the work which to a greater or lesser extent must be done in every community by personal effort.

If the closing of the saloons had stopped drinking, we should have nothing more to say. But every well-informed man knows that it has not. It is true, there is not as much shrinking as there was when the saloons were open; but there is far too much now. It is vital to deny that a great many boys are learning to drink; that a great many men are drinking who would be far better off, and their families be far happier, if they would let liquor entirely alone. These are facts and stubborn ones, too. It will not do to ignore them; for they have a very disagreeable and painful way of forcing attention to themselves. Now what is being done to teach these boys to leave liquor alone? What is being done to show these men the folly and the harm of their course? What is being done to stir up public sentiment against the use of liquor? Not one single thing so far as we know except the single exhortation to enforce the law and keep the saloons close.

"When was there a temperance meeting held in Des Moines to plead with man to sign the pledge in leave their drinking ways? When have our honored clergy held gospel temperance meetings to bring all power of Christian influences to bear upon the drinking habit? When did a blue ribbon club or any other organization start out its members to find the old soaks and induce them to sign the pledge and become men again? Was any such personal work done in the last year, or the year before that? All of these good people headed by the ministers have been relying upon the law to do the work which belong never can do. They have preached sermons and held public meetings to demand that the law be enforced, but all this time there were poor fellow's sinking lower and lower, and there were young men fastening the chains of appetite about their necks, and hardly a word of public protest or private entreaty has been heard.

"We do not single out Des Moines as exceptional in this respect. We do not believe its honored ministers are any more deserving of reproached for criticism than the ministers of other cities. We mentioned Des Moines because it is the nearest example of what we have in mind, and because it has more effectual perhaps than any other large city in Iowa, close the open saloon. In calling attention to this neglect of moral effort, we are not asking for the return of the saloons, or pronounced in prohibition a failure. But we want to say that there is too much tendency to let the loss of plant the rightful work of the pulpit and the church. Our friends, the preachers, in some of the resolutions that have been adopted recently, demand that the Legislature shall pass additional laws to enforce prohibition in counties where it is not now in force. . . . But if the brethren will permit the *Register* to say it, there would be a good deal of work for the creatures in the river counties, even if the next Legislature should devise some scheme for closing the saloons. The saloons there are open because a majority of the people in those

counties believe that it is not a crime to sell liquor and not a sin to drink it. If every saloon were closed to-morrow, they would still think the same, and would seek at one some way to evade this law and satisfy their appetites.

"Now if our friends, the preachers, will allow us, we will tell them a way to close the saloons and every river county without any help from the Legislature. . . . Let them turn a phalanx of their best workers lose in those counties, and start an old-fashioned temperance revival. Preach temperance, sang a temperance, talked temperance, reach out the hand of kindness and love to the poor drunkard, teach men that the saloon is the enemy of their homes, show them that the path of sobriety seek to is the way to happiness, and just as quick as a majority of the people have been converted, the saloons will be close, will stay closed. We would recommend that the district conference that demanded more legislation stop passing resolutions and move more into Scott county and go to work.

"As we believe in short sermons, we will practice what we preach. But we would urge upon the ministers of Iowa of that they must not expect a lot to make men good, and pure, and noble. . . . Don't expect the Legislature to do with a higher authority than man has laid upon human hearts and hands to do. We are disposed to look to the Legislature to much to reform society. As Francis Murphy says, they have an idea in the East that the people of Iowa are trying to change the Lord's prayer so as to make it read, 'Our Father who art in the Legislature.' That won't do. Don't leave moral work to be done by the law. We don't want to see our ministers acting as searchers and informers. Others can do that. They have a work which others can't do. It is theirs to do the work which their great Example did. He saved men from their sins, but not with the sword of CÆsar."

"No Compromise" *American Sentinel* 5, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Baltimore American* thinks that progress and religious liberty "has been great during the present century-greater, perhaps, than in all its predecessors combined; and it has logically follow the spread of general knowledge." "But," remarks that journal, "there must be more progress-very much more, too-before men learn to respect those who differ from them in religious matters, and to refrain from damnatory criticism."

This point, it intimates, is to be reached by compromise. But this is a mistake; there can be no compromise and religion, as there can be in politics. Nothing can be hoped for in the direction of greater religious liberty, or even the preservation of the degree of religious liberty which now exists, except as it comes through the recognition of the divinely-establish principle that in matters of faith men are answerable, not to their fellows, but to God alone. The true doctrine is that all men, no matter what their faith, are entitled to equal rights, both civil and social. The man who sits in judgment on another in the matter of his religion, and then attempts to punish him for what he is pleased to term "heresy," simply usurps a prerogative of God.

"A Baseless Basis" *American Sentinel* 5, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

The second article of the American Sabbath Union declares that:-

"The basis of this Union is the divine authority and universal in perpetual obligation of the Sabbath as manifested in the constitution of nature," etc.

The Sabbath is not manifested in the constitution of nature. The statement that it is so manifested is false, and the members of the American Sabbath Union noted to be false. Rev. Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Chicago, is a member of the American Sabbath Union, and not by any means been insignificant member. If they have any such thing as representative members, Dr. Johnson certainly may be named as one. In the congressional hearing, in behalf of the National Sunday law, December, 1886, held by the American Sabbath Union, Dr. Johnson was one of the speakers, and in his speech he said:-

"This appointment of one day in seven is arbitrary. There is nothing in nature to indicate that division of time. There is the day of twenty-four hours, there is a month, there is the year, all these are natural division; but there is nothing in nature to indicate the weekly division-the observance of one day in seven. It is arbitrary, and we regard that as an evidence of its divine origin."

The statements of Dr. Johnson are evidently true upon their face, and they just as evidently prove that the statement, as to the basis of the American Sabbath Union, is false. The divisions of time into days, months, and years, is natural; there is in that in nature that clearly defines these divisions. But there is nothing in nature to mark even the weekly division of time much less is there anything in nature that would mark one of the days in the weekly division as a day to be religiously observed. The State exist and has its basis only upon the plane of the natural. The Sabbath is based only in the action of God and is manifested only in the revealed will of God. Both of which are pre-eminently supernatural. Therefore, the State existing only in the plane of the natural, and having to do only with the natural, can never of right have anything to do with the Sabbath, or with the weekly division of time which is caused by the Sabbath. That much of the basis of the American Sabbath Union is a fraud. And as the Sabbath Union exist for the purpose of securing religious legislation in behalf of the Sabbath, it follows that the basis of the American Sabbath Union rests upon nothing more tangible than does the "baseless fabric of a dream."

"The Logic of It" *American Sentinel* 5, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

If a man should ask to be admitted into membership in a Christian church while asserting his unbelief in Christianity there is not one of the ministers of the American Sabbath Union who would admit him to membership. If anyone should ask to be baptized while maintaining an attitude of positive and unbelief in Jesus Christ there is not one of these ministers who would administer to him Christian baptism. They would deny his right have any share what ever in it. It is so also in the matter of the Lord's supper. It is *logically* so also in the matter of the Christian Sabbath. But instead of standing logically to their proposition, they inconsistently

demand laws by which men, who glory in infidelity and atheism, and in their hatred to Christianity, shall be compelled to observe the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest. In other words, they demand that the United States Government shall enact laws by which all the people who are not Christians and to do not want to be, shall be compelled to act as though they were Christians. If it be the Christian Sabbath, these people have no right to consent that anybody but Christians shall keep it; and far less have they any right to compel people to keep it who are not Christians.

If the church has the right to use the power of the Government to compel men to observe the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest, has she not an equal right to use the same power to compel the same persons to observe the same institution as a day of worship? And has she not an equal right to use the same power to compel all men to observe a Christian baptism, and to belong to the Christian church? In short if she has the right to use the power, where is the limit to the exercise of that right, except in her own arbitrary will? The results here suggested will follow as surely as the power is obtained. For, although the church is always a logical and inconsistent in demanding the use of the civil power, she is always strictly logical and consistent in the use of that power to the utmost limit. The only safety is in not allowing her the use of the civil power to the slightest extent.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Nation* notices the removal of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to this city, and remarks that "the firing will now be at closer range." Possible the Nation will now be able to shoot a little closer to the mark. Hitherto its failures to hit anything have been unparalleled by any journal with which we are acquainted, with the possible exception of the *Christian Statesman*.

The ministers of Xenia, Ohio, have issued an address to their people, urging them to cease desecrating "the Sabbath" by refraining from burying the dead on that day, going to the post-office, reading secular papers, compelling servants to do household work, and traveling on Sunday, especially by railroad. This is all right; if the ministers of Xenia believe that Sunday should be so strictly observed it is perfectly right for them to persuade their people, or any other people, to keep it; but there the matter should end; they have no right to coerce people in such matters.

A Reader asks, "Can the Sunday bill become constitutional without being voted on by the people?" There is no way in which the people can ever have an opportunity to vote directly either for or against the proposed Sunday law. If Congress passes the bill and it is sustained by the Supreme Court, it will then be, for all practical purposes, constitutional. Of course we do not think that a Sunday law would be constitutional in the sense of being in harmony with the intent of the framers of the Constitution, but it is not at all unlikely that the courts would sustain such a law as that proposed by Senator Blair.

In the late convention of the American Sabbath Union in this city the field secretary denounced certain base-ball leagues as "bands of criminals" because

they play ball on Sunday, and the same convention asked Congress to pass a "civil Sabbath law." Now if the Sunday laws are "civil" statutes and forbid only that which is uncivil, then we should like very much for someone to tell what there is in the playing of base-ball on Sunday that is so intensely uncivil as to turn all who play it, into bands of criminals. In California also last summer the field secretary denounced as criminals all members of the legislature of that State who had voted against a Sunday law, and declared that every one of them "ought to be in the penitentiary." Mr. Crafts is rather too prodigal with his denunciations properly to represent a minister of the gospel of Christ. Christ came not into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved.

Let none be deceived by the plausible cry of "a civil Sabbath." There is no such thing as a "civil Sabbath," and nobody wants such a thing. A "civil Sabbath" could be nothing else than a weekly holiday, when public business would be suspended and the people be left free to do as they please so long as they are civil, just as they are upon any other holiday. But that would be the "Continental Sunday" with a vengeance; and that the Sunday-law advocates do not want. "Take the religion out and you take the rest out," says Mr. Crafts, thus showing that, in his opinion, a Sabbath to be of any value must have a religious basis; and that is the truth. But when that is admitted where is the "civil Sabbath"? The fact is, as before stated, that there is, and in the very nature of the case, can be no such thing as a civil Sabbath. It is simply chaff used to catch sparrows.

The field secretary of the American Sabbath Union should take the president of that association aside and instruct him in regard to the real object which they have in view. Mr. Crafts has been "swinging around the circle" explaining to the people that the Sunday movement is in the interest of the working men, a sort of sanitary measure as it were. But Mr. Shepard is continually saying something which, to say the least, excites a suspicion that the field secretary has been keeping something back; in short, that the real object of the movement is something else than that which he has represented it to be. One of these unfortunate "breaks" on Mr. Shepard's part was made in the recent meeting of the so-called Union in this city, when that gentleman offered some resolutions to the effect that the day of the inauguration of the president of the United States should be upon the first Wednesday of March, instead of upon the fourth day of that month. The reason for the change, as set forth in the resolutions, is that it would do away with the desecration of Sunday by enabling persons, east of the Mississippi, and those living even farther away, to leave their homes on Monday, attend the inauguration ceremonies, and return home by Saturday of the same week. This, says the resolutions, would prevent their "dishonoring the Lord's day for the purpose of honoring the president of the country."

Now the question naturally arises what possible connection this proposed change in the day of the inauguration has with a movement in the interests of the working men? It certainly looks very much as though Mr. Shephard's object is to . . . Sunday, and to promote its observance as a sacred day. And inasmuch as the American Sabbath Union adopted the resolution without a dissenting vote, it would seem that the Union is in perfect accord with its president. And thus it appears that unless Mr. Crafts is mistaken as to his real motive, he stands alone

in his efforts to preserve the health of that large and respectable class which he professes to serve.

The object of the American Sabbath Union is declared by article 3 of its constitution to be, "To preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship." This object the Union proposes by legislation. It makes no other effort than by law to do this. And granting just here, for the argument's sake their claim that they do not propose to compel everybody to worship, they do propose to compel everybody to *rest*, on what they themselves call "the Christian Sabbath." Now Christian institutions and Christian ordinances belong only to Christians. The Christian church is for Christians only; Christian baptism is for Christians only, the Lord's supper is for Christians only. If Sunday be the Christian Sabbath, it likewise is for Christians only; and they not only have no right to compel those who are not Christians to observe it but those who are not Christians have no right voluntarily to observe it.

January 16, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

It is time for the National Reformers to cry out for the restoration of papal rule in Italy. They regard Romanism as better than "political atheism," and it seems that with the mass of Italians there is no halfway ground. A writer in a religious journal says that "in swinging away from the Romish Church, comparatively few stop at Protestantism. The majority know little respecting it, and apparently care as little about it." This is not a matter of surprise since they have been religious by law so long that they naturally regard all religion as simply a synonym of tyranny, and as soon as they have the opportunity they very naturally break away from the restraint which has been so galling to them.

An exchange notes the fact that "a certain amount of religious liberty has been granted in Finland, which, though it does not go very far, is, at all events, a welcome installment. It only at present gives professed Christians of any sect the right to educate their own children, though not those belonging to members of the State Church. Marriages contracted by members of acknowledged sects will in future be legal. Different views of Christianity will no longer make any difference in the privileges and duties of the citizen, and these prerogatives are extended so far as to give Christians of any sect the right of entering Government service.

"Religious demonstrations and processions are, however, prohibited, and as the Salvation Army has gained a footing in the country, no doubt they will soon come into collision with the authorities on that point. The Government has undertaken to examine into the doctrines and beliefs of every dissenting sect, and also to keep a close account of them; it has cut a nice task out for itself and it remains to be seen how the plan will work. It appears that any members of the community not professing some form of Christianity are still to be debarred the rights of citizenship, nor are they allowed to form organized communities or educate their children."

"The Minneapolis Preachers" *American Sentinel* 5, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

The proceedings of those Minneapolis preachers, an account of which we published in the SENTINEL of January 2, is of more than passing interest to the people. It reveals some of the spirit that inheres in this Sunday-law movement all over the nation. That ironclad agreement and the boycotting action of the preachers under it, show how far they have departed from the methods and the spirit of Jesus Christ, whose ministers they profess to be. This, however, is not the beginning of that movement in Minneapolis. It has a history, and the history runs back nearly two years. In the spring of 1888, Dr. Josiah Strong, of this city, secretary of the Evangelical Alliance of the United States, visited Minneapolis and met with a committee of pastors of that place who had been appointed to confer with him upon the matter of organizing a branch of the Evangelical Alliance of that city. Several conferences were held, and plans were formed; but owing to the nearness of the summer vacation, no definite action was taken at that time. Rev. D. D. McLaurin, the Church of Immanuel, Minneapolis, was given charge of the plans formed, and of organizing the active work according to the plans. The first definite step toward

20

organized action was taken Monday, October 15, 1888, at a meeting of the Minneapolis ministers in the Y.M.C.A. parlors. There the objects and the plans of the organization were quite fully set forth. One of the objects of the organization, and the one which is of special interest in this connection, is to take "a prominent part in State and municipal politics and government, watching closely all State and city legislation. In its name, and upon its recommendation, bills will be introduced into the Legislature and such legislation as will increase the penalties for the violation of the Sunday laws of Minneapolis will be especially favored and pushed."

The plan of organization, is a central alliance governed by an executive committee, and under the direction of this, ward alliances are formed as auxiliaries. Through the ward alliances a company of visitors is organized to make a thorough house-to-house canvass. To each of these visitors is allotted a division comprising ten families. These are to be visited once a month regularly to ascertain their condition and needs with the special design of getting them to attend church. All the churches, Catholic and Protestant, of the city are united in the alliance.

Upon all this matter of the organization and the work of this alliance we should not have a word to say except in commendation if it were in fact evangelical or if there were any evangelical intent in it. But as its object is political and not evangelical, we can never have anything to say of it except to denounce it as contrary to every principle of the gospel. Evangelical is defined as being "agreeable or consonant to the gospel or the truth taught in the New Testament." The gospel is not political, it never can be furthered, but only hindered and corrupted by political methods such as are embodied in the plan of this Minneapolis political preachers' alliance. It is proper that people should attend

church, it is perfectly proper that proper methods should be employed to induce them to attend church; but when political methods are employed to get the people to go to church for the purpose of increasing the political influence of the churches, then such churches are just about the worst places that the people could be induced to go.

About the time of the organization mentioned above, Dr. McLaurin said that "The ministers of the city believe that Christian unity is strong enough now to make itself felt in ways that churches separately have little influence." But, when Christian unity is strong enough to make itself felt politically, as the purpose of this alliance is, then the more of such strength Christians unity feels, the less strength it actually has. The only strength the Christians, individually, of the Christian Church collectively, can ever have to profit is the strength of Jesus Christ. And that strength is never made manifest in a political way. The only power that Christians ever can possess for good, is the power of godliness which can never be exerted by political means.

The steps taken by the Minneapolis ministers as printed in the SENTINEL of the 2nd are the fitting sequel of the plan and object of the organization of the Evangelical Alliance of that city in October in 1888. Compulsory methods belong to the organization, compulsory religious observance is the object of Sunday laws, and that they should resort to boycotting pressure to compel both their fellow ministers and the people to conform to their wishes is only to be expected. And when such methods are so readily resorted to at the first, what will they not do at the last? The Evangelical Alliance and its secretary both had better stick to their evangelical work or else stop calling it evangelical, and give it its proper name of political at once.

"An Excellent Thought" *American Sentinel* 5, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Advocate*, of this city, has the following item which contains an excellent thought which those who want Congress and our several State Legislatures to remove by legislation all the difficulties in the way of Church work would do well to consider. The *Advocate* says:-

An attempt is sometimes made to explain the slow progress of religion in our large cities on the ground that the conditions of society are peculiarly unfavorable to evangelical Christianity. We are told that many of the inhabitants are German infidels and atheists, Italian and Irish Catholics, Jews and pagans, and that these are not easily reached by the gospel, and therefore progressive movements are not to be expected. Certainly these elements are antagonistic to Protestant Christianity, and present serious obstacles in the way of its progress; but did the gospel ever yet find a field which was free from antagonistic elements? Has the gospel any other name than to meet and overcome hostile forces and reduce a world of enemies to subjection? Human nature is one the world over, and the gospel is perfectly adapted to the work of saving men without respect to class or nationality. Wisdom to wield the sort of the Spirit is all that is wanting, and this wisdom cometh down from above.

If in harmony with this suggestion, the churches would pay more attention to wielding the "sword of the Spirit" and a little less to invoking the aid of the State, much good might reasonably be expected to result, not only to sinners but to the Church itself.

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 5, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

A writer in a religious contemporary says that Italy is a hard soil for the growth of Protestantism. On the other hand are the Romanists, upon whom no impression can be made, and upon the other the Infidels, upon whom still less impression is possible. Unbelief among the Italian men, he says, is general in Rome, and their absence from Church is conspicuous.

This state of affairs is not to be wondered at since it is the legitimate result of the Church and State *regime* which has so long cursed Italy. Men may be compelled to observe the outward forms of religion, but that does not make them truly pious, and when the compulsion is removed they will surely go farther in the other direction than though they had not been coerced. Coercion in religion breeds hatred, and hatred is a very opposite of Christianity.

The *Christian Advocate* of this city says:-

That idleness is a prolific cause of vice and crime is made clear by facts constantly coming under the observation of those who read the papers and study the condition of society.

This is true, and being true is it not a little strange that so many of those who know that it is true or in favor of laws compelling people to be idle one day each week. There can be no doubt that Sabbath keeping is a good thing; but habitual idleness one day each week is not Sabbath-keeping; only those keep the Sabbath, in any proper sense of the Word, who observe the day on the Lord. The *Advocate* is right, "idleness is a prolific cause of vice," and therefore all laws that foster idleness foster vice.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

Owing to a lack of funds the "publication of documents of the American Sabbath Union for 1890" has been postponed.

The field secretary of the American Sabbath Union announces that he will make another lecture trip across the continent and back, starting across in April and reaching the Atlantic again in August. Definite dates and places of giving the lectures, are not yet announced.

The local Sunday bill for the District of Columbia was presented in the House of Representatives by Representative Breckinridge, of Kentucky. The Speaker referred it to the Committee on Education and Labor, but by request it was afterward referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. We hope to have a copy of the bill for comment in our next issue.

We have received a circular from the secretary of the American Sabbath Union, announcing that the Union is to hold a convention at Washington, D. C.,

January 30 and 31. "Everybody" is invited, but "especially the friends of the American Civil Sabbath in Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia." "The leading purpose of the convention" as announced "is to urge upon Congress the request of the commissioners of the District of Columbia" for a Sunday law. The circular announces that "distinguished Senators, Congressmen, pastors and others are expected to speak""besides Mr. Crafts.

Colonel Shepard of the so-called Sabbath Union, is making himself ridiculous and bringing religion, which he is supposed to represent, into contempt by such utterances as the following which is attributed to him in a speech before the recent Dominion Evangelical Alliance:-

The West Shore and Hudson River Railways, which were started for the purpose of running Sunday excursions, were driven into bankruptcy by the Lord. A new management cut off the Sunday traffic as far as possible, and now their finances are in good condition. At one time no Sunday elevated trains were run on the Sabbath, when it was arranged that a train should be asked for by a Christian minister, who, by the way, very soon was called from earth.

It may do to talk this sort of stuff to people who do not know the facts in the case, but it will not impress others much. The truth is that the West Shore Railroad was driven into bankruptcy by a most ruinous competition. Then it passed under the management of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad. The rates were increased and the number of trains reduced, and the Vanderbilts make money out of it. *And Sunday trains both freight and passenger are run*, and have been all the time, both on the West Shore and the New York Central.

It is stated that the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland has issued a pastoral address on non-church-going and its causes, which it asks to be read over the pulpits in all the churches on a convenient Sabbath. It points out that in Glasgow, the most populous city of Scotland, there are not fewer than one hundred and twenty thousand persons who are alienated from public worship. It is further remarked that there is a similar and alarming proportion of people in other towns, and even in rural parishes, who habitually absent themselves from church.

It may be interesting to remember in this connection that Scotland is probably the most strict Sunday observing country in the world; but it seems that something more than simply refraining from work on Sunday is required to make people pious, or even to insure their attendance at church. Evidently that which Scotland needs (?) is a law requiring every body to attend church who is not excused for some good and sufficient reason. The National Reformers should see what can be done for the country of the Covenanters.

We should like for some of the people who favor the suppression of base-ball on Sunday, to point out what there is about a base-ball game that is uncivil on Sunday any more than on any other day. No one pretends that the playing of a game of base-ball is uncivil in any sense. It cannot be shown that it is in any way uncivil on Sunday, and it is not because of any incivility in it that they propose to suppress it on Sunday. Nor is this all; the playing of base-ball is not even irreligious. It is true that men who are not religious play base-ball. It is equally

true that men who are religious, and strictly so, can play base-ball and still be religious. Then it is not because the playing of base-ball is either uncivil or irreligious that they propose to suppress it on Sunday; it is solely because Sunday is held by certain people to be a religious day, and that it is to be devoted to religious exercises; and as the playing of base-ball is not a religious exercise, therefore it is not consistent with the religious observance of a day. Consequently the only purpose of the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws is to enforce the observance of it as a religious day. It is to compel people who are not religious to pay religious tribute to those who pretend to be religious. But if the Government is to do this in one thing when it is demanded, why not in every else as it may be demanded, and having a thorough-going union of Church and State at once. That will be the outcome of a national Sunday law.

There was lately organized, in the City of New York, a league professedly to maintain American institutions. We have not yet seen a copy of its constitution or any official statement of its objects, but from what we can gather from the newspaper report, it seems to be more than anything else an organization to maintain American Protestant institutions as against Catholic institutions. Like most of the attempts in this line, that have lately been made, this looks too much like an attempt to put Protestantism in the place of legal recognition rather than Catholicism, and no American institution can ever be defended by any such means as that. Protestantism as an established religion, is only the Papacy in principle and under another name. We shall give our readers more particulars in this matter hereafter.

"One of the most prominent characteristics of the American Sabbath Union, says its organ, the *Pearl of Days*, is its broad basis of practical Christian union for one national, civil, and religious object. Its only 'shibboleth' is the preservation of 'the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship.' It has no 'shibboleths' no other motto upon its banner. For this supreme end Protestants and Romans Catholics can and do co-operate, even if they are not incorporated in the institution itself. Religion and patriotism combine together to keep and to hand down succeeding generations the blessing of 'the Lord's Day.'

Certainly the object of the so-called union is "civil and religious;" it is civil in that it demands that the civil power enforce a religious institution; and it is religious in that the great underlying motive of the leaders in the "union" is the exaltation of Sunday because of the sacredness which in their minds attaches to that particular day. The term "civil" which they use is simply sugar used to catch flies that might not relish the odor of Church and State vinegar.

January 23, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

In his late speech in New York City, Mr. Crafts said:-

Vermont is the only State in which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has not a Sabbath Observance Superintendent; the reason being that whatever may be the wrongs in Vermont, Sabbath breaking is not one of them.

Yes, indeed, the American Sabbath Union and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union can boast, of Vermont. Vermont is directly in their line of things. The Sunday laws of Vermont are exactly after their own hearts; for we have it upon the authority of Mr. Crafts himself that the Vermont Sunday laws require people to go to church and to religiously observe, the day.

The *Christian Nation* says:-

God, who is the source of all authority, has appointed our Lord Jesus Christ the Ruler of nations. The Bible, God's revealed will, contains law for nations, and is the standard by which all moral issues in political life are to be decided. National acknowledgement of this authority, and obedience to this law, constitute a truly Christian nation.

It is an easy matter to say that this is so, but it would be difficult to prove it by any statement of the Scriptures themselves. God has promised the world to Christ, but it has not yet been given into his hands; nor will it be till the time comes for the destruction of all earthly powers. This is clearly indicated in the second Psalm. Christ himself said that his kingdom is not of this world, and has likened himself to a nobleman going into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return. And it is at the time of his return that he will take the kingdom. But some of his professed followers not content to wait for his return are officiously trying to force the kingdom upon him in his absence, with the sense, with the evident purpose of setting themselves up as his representatives, to administer the government in his stead. It is this usurpation of power which we oppose. Christ has his representatives in the world, but the only authority ever given to them is found in Mark 16:15 and parallel texts. Working under this commission the apostles besought men to be reconciled to God, and that is all anybody has any right to do. To adopt the Bible as the law for the government of the Nation would simply be to provide that the majority should dictate to the minority in all things pertaining to religious faith and practice.

"Rome and Liberty" *American Sentinel* 5, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

This article which we clip from *Present Truth*, a religious paper published in London, shows that even in England the contest now being waged in this country between the principles of Protestantism and the principles of the Papacy, is being watched with no little interest. The fact is also recognized that the principles of the so-called National Reform Association are the principles of Rome. *Present Truth* says:-

In an Encyclical published a few years ago, the Pope said, "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. All Catholic writers and journalists should never lose, for an instant, from view the above prescriptions." It has been urged officially that this should be specially kept in mind in England and

the United States. The activity of Catholics, *as Romanists*, in the field of politics and journalism in England, is a constant reminder that the advice is being acted upon.

The recent Catholic Congress in America has drawn attention again to the work of Rome in the United States. A suspicious feature of the conference was the repeated and vociferous protestation of loyalty to free institutions. Those who are loyal at heart are content to let their lives and work show it, and do not find it necessary to multiply honeyed words. It was not many years ago that a papal encyclical anathematized "those who assert the liberty of conscience and of religious worship." Speaking of the present position of the controversy in America-and we can see there more fully developed, perhaps, the forces which are at work in this country the *Christian Commonwealth* says:-

From across the Atlantic come many ominous warnings of a great struggle soon to come. The great Republic is awaking to the prospect of a battle which can in no way be decided, for it is simply a fact of inevitable destiny that the people of America must pass through a conflict with Rome. Rome ! Name of unspeakable portent! The very word calls up a whole panorama of lurid apocalyptic visions: For ages the wave of human energy has rolled westward. And in our day the battlefield where the crowning struggle of liberty is to be fought seems likely to be found in the western Hemisphere.

But the *Commonwealth* draws inspiration from a recently published work showing the "increase of Protestantism and the decline of Popery." It says:-

The Protestant peoples are rapidly tending to out-number the Romish, and this single fact entirely settles the future outlook. As to America, when the Puritan element there is really roused the ambitious and dogmatic Romanism which is seeking to seat itself in a dominant attitude over the grand new prerogative of nations-liberty for all consciences-will quickly be convinced that it is in the minority and must never hope to emerge from such a position.

This faith as to the increase of Protestantism, is based on figures showing the increase of nominally Protestant people. But we do not forget the words, of an eminent European who said, "Protestants there are, but Protestantism is dead;" nor the words of the late Dr. Prochnow, "The land of Luther needs again the spirit of Luther;" nor the very recent remarks of Mr. J. A. Froude, "That magnificent intellectual Protestantism is forever dead. The spirit that inspired Cromwell and William of Orange, oh! that spirit has altogether died out." Were this not the truth, the children of the Reformation would do the works of the Reformation.

Even the "Puritan element" which is expected to become roused in America, has been fawning upon Romanism and begging its co-operation in powerful movement which is designed to amend a Constitution now guaranteeing freedom of conscience to all, so that it shall be what is called a 'Christian Constitution,' which "would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel," along with whom, it is declared, the Christian observers of the seventh-day Sabbath, and the Jews would have to be placed. To effect this revolution, the aid of the Romanists is necessary, and some time ago an article in the organ of this "reforming" movement, the *Christian Statesman* said, that although they might expect some rebuffs at first, the time had come "to make repeated advances, and gladly to

accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it." The same programme anticipates the confirmation of religious instruction into favor, is what she calls the "true religion." And when the tiger is unchained by the removal of those Constitutional barriers which have placed matters religious where the religion of Christ places them, outside the jurisdiction of civil government, it will need no prophet to foresee the result. We will let the *Christian Commonwealth* state it:-

The 8,000,000 of Papists in the United States are being drilled day and night to demand supremacy over the civil power in the all-important department of public education. Should the people of the United States yield the control of the schools to the Romish hierarchy, the death-knell of popular liberty would be rung.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

The American Sabbath Union officially makes the following announcement of what it wants, and it is this:-

What we want in this matter of Sunday work is total abstinence.

Mr. Crafts reports that he found a conference of ministers in New England that declined to indorse the petition to Congress for a national Sunday law. Good! May such conferences increase in number daily.

The secretary of Publications and Legislation of the American Sabbath Union, has issued a circular in which he says: "Some churches have appropriated a hundred dollars for the prevention of heathenizing America by Sabbath reform." Well, the AMERICAN SENTINEL appropriates more than twice that amount every week, for the prevention of the heathenizing of America by such Sabbath reform as is represented by the American Sabbath Union. We know of one church that appropriates yet more than this for the same purpose. And let the good work go on.

A lady writes thus from Rockport, Atchison County, Mo.:-

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL: One of your papers came to me a few days ago. I must say I like the spirit of freedom it breathes, for I see you not only wish to preserve the rights and liberties of the minority of Christians, but the free government our fathers bequeathed to us baptized in their own blood. I should consider myself unworthy of a free government or the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience except I am willing to grant to all, both great and small, the right to worship how, where, and what they please.

The American Sabbath Union says that its work for Sunday laws is "a real home missionary cause", "of like importance with the Christianizing of heathen lands." But the American Sabbath Union is attempting to do its work by legislation, especially national legislation, therefore the American Sabbath Union in asking State support thereby asks the State to take part in a missionary enterprise and do a missionary work of like importance with the Christianizing of heathen lands. This argues that the Government of the United States is a missionary society. The work of Christianizing heathen lands was committed by Jesus Christ to his disciples and not to the Roman Empire; to his Church and not

to the State; and never since that has he committed that work, nor any part of it, to the State. It is committed, and belongs, to the Church only. If the Church cannot do that work without the help of the State, she cannot do it at all. Therefore the American Sabbath Union, in asking for Sunday laws asks the State to aid the Church. It asks for a union of Church and State in the work of "Christianizing" the people. Deny it as they may, the evil that is in this Sunday-law movement will crop out, unconsciously though it be. Let everybody understand that the Government of the United States is not a missionary society; but that the American Sabbath Union proposes to make it such a thing.

The American Secular Union makes the following announcement:-

The American Secular Union, a voluntary association having for its object the complete separation of Church and State, in practice as well as in profession, and in no way committed to any system of religious belief or disbelief, acting herein by its President, Richard B. Westbrook, A. M., LL.D., as its special trustee and attorney-in-fact, hereby offer a premium of one thousand dollars (\$1,000), lawful money of the United States, for the best essay, treatise, or manual adapted to aid and assist teachers in our free public schools and in the Girard College for orphans, and other public and charitable institutions professing to be unsectarian, to thoroughly instruct children and youth in the *purest principles of morality without inculcating religious doctrines*.

The papers should all be submitted by April 1, 1890, though more time will be granted if necessary, and the committee is now ready to receive manuscripts. Each manuscript is desired to be in typewriting, or, if written with the hand, must be very clearly written. It should have a special mark or designation, while the real name and post-office address of the author should be sent separately, in a sealed envelope bearing the same mark as the manuscript. Both manuscript and envelope to be addressed to R. B. Westbrook, No. 1707 Oxford St., Philadelphia, Pa., postage or express prepaid.

The Ridgewood Amusement Company of Queens County, N. Y., leased their grounds for playing base-ball and the clubs played on Sunday. The grand jury indicted the company for maintaining a nuisance in allowing Sunday base-ball. The company made no denial of letting the grounds nor of letting them for the purpose of playing base-ball, nor that base-ball was played there on Sunday. The company denied that it was a nuisance and brought many citizens and some officials, all residents, who testified that it was not a nuisance. Of course, the prosecution failed to convict. The American Sabbath Union is considerably annoyed at this, and says, "Every lawyer knows that it is a much more difficult matter to convict for maintaining a nuisance than to convict for Sabbath-breaking. The indictment should have been for Sabbath-breaking." But Sabbath-breaking is distinctly an offense against God. It is essentially a religious offense and no man is responsible to any soul on this earth for Sabbath breaking; and when the power of the post State is employed to deal with the offense of Sabbath breaking that power is not carried entirely beyond every limit that properly pertains to the jurisdiction of civil government.

A correspondent of the *Central New Jersey Times* says in a recent communication to that paper:-

Rome does not know what liberty of soul, body or conscience is, and she never has since she claimed temporal power. Catholics, however, have rights that should be respected, and it must be a source of regret that efforts, resolutions, and discussions, even of some religious bodies, have savored of compulsion and of legislation against Catholics. That is all wrong. If a Protestant majority can legislate against Catholics, a Catholic majority have just as good right to legislate against Protestants, and as a Baptist I want Catholics to have just the same rights and privileges as myself.

Certainly Catholics have just the same rights that Protestants have, and those rights should be respected. And when Protestants forget this and seek to evade the rights of the Catholic minority they cease to be Protestants, for not all Papists are in the Papal Church. The Protestant principle is that so far as his fellow-men are concerned every man shall be left perfectly free in matters of religion, and only those who act upon this principle are entitled to the Protestant name.

The home address of Alonzo T. Jones is 75 West 100th Street, New York City.

January 30, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

It seems that some effort was made in the last Congress to have some action taken on the Sunday-Rest bill, and that even on Sunday. The secretary of Legislation of the American Sabbath Union in complaining of "the God-defying, law-defying Sabbath desecration by Congress" on the Sunday before inauguration day, says: "The Christian men of Congress did not, as on a former occasion, prevent a Sunday session by denying the right of Congress to require Sunday work of any of its members, and retiring in a body, and so destroying the quorum. Instead of such a protest, there was only a shallow jest, called up by a Sunday motion relating to the Sunday-Rest bill, that it was not proper to work on such legislation on the Sabbath." That was not a shallow jest. That was a very wise and a very pious observation. We suggest that that gentle-man be made chairman of the committee that has charge of the Sunday-Rest bill.

The Chicago News of the 6th inst., has the following item:-

Mr. Joseph W. Morton of Chicago takes issue with the statement of the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, of the American Sabbath Union, that the petition for certain Sabbath reforms which was presented to the last Congress was signed by more than ten million adults. "To contain ten million signatures," says Mr. Morton, "would require at least 166, 667 sheets, making more than 347 reams, which, at the average rate of twelve and one-half pounds to the ream, would weigh more than two and one-sixth tons. The length of the petition would be a little more than sixty-three miles." Mr. Morton is very confident that no such petition was ever presented to Congress on any subject.

Of course, no such petition was ever presented. The SENTINEL has repeatedly shown how the petitions referred to were made to represent such a vast number of petitioners, and it is certain that there has never been in any

country a greater abuse of the right of petition. Whole denominations were counted on the strength of the vote of a few men not chosen for any such purpose; and even worse than that, the whole Roman Catholic Church was counted as petitioners, simply because Cardinal Gibbons wrote a letter to Mr. Crafts, saying: "I am happy to add my name." It is true that, owing to the strenuous efforts being put forth by the friends of Sunday legislation, there is a growing sentiment in favor of such laws, but it is not true that any such number as they claim have ever petitioned for a Sunday law in any legitimate manner.

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 5, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

One of the recommendations adopted by the Paris International Sunday Congress, upon "The Weekly Rest Day from a Social Point of View," is this:-

The smallest amount of rest which one ought to have is one day in seven; we mean by that, the Sabbath day, for that which is necessary for man is not a day of relief from labor only, but a day for true moral elevation.

If it is a day of rest simply from a social point of view, what matters it which day it is. From a social point of view, one man or a thousand men can rest just as well on one day as another. But that is not what the Congress meant to recommend. The Congress "means" that the Sabbath day is the one which shall be observed for rest and which is the smallest amount of rest that any man ought to take, and that not for physical rest primarily, but for true moral elevation. In this the Congress abandons the social point of view, adopts the religious, and places the day of rest upon the religious basis, and by so doing, it contradicts itself in its recommendation. But this is not an exceptional case by any means. No argument has ever yet been made professedly from a civil or social point of view that did not in fact rest upon the religious. And no such argument never can be made. The thing is religious in itself. It cannot be made anything else and by no argument can it ever be made consistently to *appear* anything else.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Nation* criticises the SENTINEL for maintaining that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and makes an extended argument to prove that this is not true. We know that it is not true according to the National Reform religious-legislation theory; but it is true according to the American theory, and the American theory is true according to the Word of God.

The American Sabbath Union prints the following inquiry:-

Is it not time to start a righteous crusade, under the laws of God and of man, in abolition of this ruinous system of [Sunday] bondage?

Oh, certainly it is! Let the crusade be started at once. Let this cruel bondage be abolished. And in order that this may be accomplished swiftly and certainly, we suggest that the American Sabbath Union change its name to the American Abolition Union. Let slavery be abolished, say we, forever!

December 29th, Mr. Crafts, of the American Sabbath Union, delivered an address at Association Hall, 86th Street, New York City. In that address he said:-

The national Lay Congress of Roman Catholics after correspondence and conference with the American Sabbath Union, passed its famous resolution in favor of co-operation with Protestants in Sabbath reform of which the following is a full and correct copy: "There are many Christian issues in which Catholics could come together with non-Catholics and shape civil legislation for the public weal. In spite of rebuff and injustice, and overlooking zealotry, we should seek alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. Without going over to the Judeaic Sabbath, we can bring the masses over to the moderation of the Christian Sunday. To effect this, we must set our faces sternly against the sale of intoxicating beverages on Sunday. The corrupting influences of saloons in politics, the crime and pauperism from excessive drinking, require legislative restriction which we can aid in procuring by joining our influence with that of the other enemies of intemperance. Let us resolve that drunkenness shall be made odious, and give practical encouragement and support to Catholic temperance societies. We favor the passage and enforcement of laws rigidly closing saloons on Sunday and forbidding the sale of liquors to minors and intoxicated persons."

Upon this Mr. Crafts remarks:-

This does not mean that the millennium is to be built in a day. This is only a proposal of courtship, and the parties thus far have approached each other shyly.

When courtship has gotten so far along as the proposal, marriage is not far off, especially where the parties are so coy as is this species of Protestantism. And when this marriage between Protestantism and Catholicism is accomplished, what will become of the Protestant portion of the union? What kind of Protestantism is that, anyhow, which so willingly, or rather anxiously, carries on a courtship with Roman Catholics to the extent of receiving a proposal of marriage? Yes, that marriage is coming, and like every other great feature of Catholicism, it is contrary to nature-one woman marrying another. And the fruit of it will be, as pictured in the Scripture, a hideous, nondescript monster. Let there be raised up in this land a Protestantism that will assert itself not only against Roman Catholicism as such, but also against this degenerate Protestantism that has forgotten its place and its mission in the world.

The resolution "that drunkenness shall be made odious" by giving it governmental and religious sanction six days in the week, is likewise worthy of the Catholic Church.

The organ of the American Sabbath Union says that "the opposition to Senator Blair's Sunday-Rest bill, introduced in the United States Senate, December 9, and printed in the *Pearl of Days*, is based upon a false assumption. That bill does not assume, as it is claimed, that civil legislation upon this subject appeals to the divine law for its support. Nothing of this kind appears in the bill." Certainly nothing of the kind appears in the bill, for it has been omitted for the express purpose of disarming opposition to the measure. It is, however, not a false assumption to say that the bill is a religious measure and that the motives of its promoters are purely religious. A careful comparison of the bill as introduced in the Fiftieth Congress and as now pending in the Fifty-first Congress will convince

anyone that precisely the same object is to be accomplished by the bill as it now stands, as it was hoped to accomplish by it as originally framed. We print on another page an article from one of our exchanges which shows this so plainly that none can fail to see it.

We notice that some of our exchanges, as well as a number of our correspondents, make the mistake of confounding the Blair Educational Bill with the Educational Amendment. These are not identical by any means. The Blair Educational Bill is a measure that has been advocated by Senator Blair for several years, and has passed the Senate several times. The object of this bill is to appropriate a certain amount-seventy millions, we think-from the surplus funds in the public treasury to the different States of the Union according to the proportion of illiteracy. But this bill does not propose in itself to have anything to do with religion in the public schools; it simply proposes to take some of the surplus in the public treasury and divide it amongst the States for the States to use according to their own educational systems.

The Educational *Amendment* proposed by Senator Blair, is that which we have printed and commented upon in the SENTINEL. This proposes to amend the Constitution of the United States so that the principles of Christianity shall be taught in all the public schools in the Nation.

The Educational *Bill* would become a law, and of force, merely upon the action of Congress and the approval of the President. The proposed *Amendment* would be of no force until it was approved by three-fourths of the States. We shall print soon a copy of the Blair Educational *Bill* that our readers may understand just what the intent of it is. We make these remarks just now, only for the purpose of correcting the mistake that some have made, of confounding the bill with the proposed amendment. Please don't do it any more.

The American Sabbath Union complains that, "New England is in peril from Sunday work and Sunday dissipation." How can it be otherwise under Sunday laws? The effort of the Sunday-law workers is to preserve Sunday as a religious day. Secular work is not in harmony with the religious idea of the day, therefore, work is forbidden. When work is forbidden to those who are not religious they are compelled to be idle, dissipation is the sure outcome; and that also is out of harmony with the religious idea of day. As Sunday is held to be the palladium of salvation for the State; whatever State it is that has Sunday laws will always be in peril from Sunday work and Sunday dissipation.

February 7, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Advocate* of this city notices a recent case at law, in which a verdict was brought into court on Sunday, and says:-

Colonel Ingersoll, for the defendant, rose to move to set aside, for for a new trial. Judge Ingraham declined to transact any business on Sunday, beyond the mere receiving and recording of the verdict necessary to relieve the jury, and told

the anti-Christian to wait till Monday. If the latter and his abettors (some of them nominal Christians) get their way, there will be no rest-day in this country.

The SENTINEL is not an admirer of Mr. Ingersoll, nor are we in sympathy with his views upon religious questions, but we fail to see in the facts stated by the *Advocate*, any justification for the fling made at that gentleman and "his abettors." We have no idea that Mr. Ingersoll wants any judge to do business on Sunday if he doesn't want to, nor do we know of anybody who wants the laws of the land so changed that courts shall uniformly do business upon that day. If judges and other court officials want to observe Sunday religiously or otherwise, nobody ought to object, and the SENTINEL does not object; but it does object to laws requiring those to observe Sunday who do not wish to observe it, and that whether they religiously observe another day or not.

"Sunday Slavery" *American Sentinel* 5, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days* repeats its dismal wail about "Sunday slavery," and says that "if it is not abolished, it will soon number more millions than the Africans who were emancipated by the civil war and the Constitution of the United States." Why don't the *Pearl of Days* make a test and carry the case of one of these Sunday slaves to the United States courts under that amendment to the Constitution which abolished slavery in the United States? Or does the *Pearl* understand that it was only African slavery that was abolished in the United States? If that is the only way the *Pearl of Days* understands the Thirteenth Amendment, then we would say for its benefit, that neither the word "African" nor any other qualifying phrase is in that amendment. The amendment says that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a penalty for crime, shall exist in the United States." And that will cover Sunday slavery as well as any other kind. At least the probability that it does, is worth risking a case upon in the United States courts. Let the case be presented.

"Not a Valid Reason" *American Sentinel* 5, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Lever* says that "the saloon is to-day a greater hindrance to the cause of Christianity than all others;" and inquires, "What will become of the Republican and Democreatic voters for sustaining parties that keep the saloon as a stumblingblock between God and humanity?" We do not know what will become of them. But granting the saloon is the greatest hindrance to the cause of Christianity, it is not the only hindrance; and if the Government is to abolish the saloon in the interests of Christianity, and because it is a hindrance to Christianity, then having done so much, why should it not go on and abolish the next greatest hindrance to Christianity? and the next, and the next, until it has abolished every one that there is in the world? If the Government is to take away one stumblingblock between God and humanity because it is such, then why shall it not continue the work and take away every one? If the Government is to do this, what is the Church for? And if government can do this, what was the

Church instituted for? If it can be done by law what is the use of the gospel, and what was the use of instituting the gospel? The truth is that the reason which the *Lever* and the third party Prohibitionists, as a whole, present for prohibition, are not valid reasons at all. They are not worthy of recognition by government, nor are they worthy of the support of any man. They mean nothing short of an absolute union of Church and State. Of course they deny it, and we grant that many of them do not see it. It is true, however, whether they see it or not. Prohibition upon a proper basis is a proper thing, and a good thing, but prohibition upon the basis advocated by the *Lever*, the *Voice*, and such papers, would be an unmitigated evil.

"A Question" *American Sentinel* 5, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

In Brooklyn, N.Y., four persons were convicted and fined from \$100 to \$500, for refusing to give to certain children medicine prescribed by physicians, choosing rather to treat the children by other means. They were people who believe in the "faith cure," and the children died, hence, the prosecution and the punishment. This has caused much discussion in the public press, some taking one side and others the other. All that we shall say just at this time is simply to inquire, How would it do to impose such a fine upon those who do not believe in this method of treatment-the doctors for instance-every time they lose a case?

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

We have received the first number of the *Southern Sentinel*, published at Dallas, Texas. It is devoted to the same cause as the AMERICAN SENTINEL. We heartily wish it success. May such Sentinels be posted all along the line.

The "call" for that National Reform convention, lately held in Cincinnati, was signed by eighty-two persons. Seventy-three of these were preachers, the rest were made of eight laymen and one woman. And yet they try to pass that off as a representative "citizens" meeting, simply in the interests of the State!

SECTION 11, of Article 1, of the Constitution of the new State of Washington, contains this sentence: "No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or to the support of any religious establishment." Yet, as plain as that is, it was attempted when the Legislature met to have a chaplaincy established for the State and the legislative sessions to be opened with prayer. The scheme failed as it was proper that it should. The word "exercise" shut off that relic of the union of Church and State.

According to the *Colorado Graphic* of January 18, the people of Denver are losing interest in the Sunday-closing crusade, inaugurated there some months since. At a recent meeting in the interest of the crusade, which the *Denver News* described as "another of those great meetings," it is stated that only one hundred and seventy-two persons were present, by actual count, "including forty-one ladies and ten or more children." This certainly does not look very much like "a great popular uprising," especially in a city of the size of Denver. One great

trouble about this movement is, that while its real object is the exaltation of Sunday, it professes to be primarily a temperance movement. A great many temperance people see this, and hence stand aloof from the movement which would otherwise have their support. That sort of prohibition which proposes to compromise with the saloons, allowing them six-seventh of the time in which to carry on their business, is not worthy of the name of temperance, and not a few are beginning to see it.

The National League for the Protection of American Institutions, by its Law Committee, has reported the form of an amendment to the national Constitution, which it intends to ask shall be adopted. It reads as follows:-

No State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or use its property, money or credit, or any power of taxation, or authorize either to be used for the purpose founding, maintaining or aiding any church, religious denomination or religious society, or any institution, or undertaking under sectarian or ecclesiastical control.

That might be made a part of the Constitution of the United States, and yet, under the decisions religion could be taught and religious exercises conducted in the public schools in all the States where it is now done. Such, however, is not according to American principles, therefore the League's proposed amendment ought to be amended at once.

February 14, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

The Detroit (Mich.) *Free Press*, makes the following good point against those preachers who propose to have Monday morning's paper printed Saturday night, before midnight:-

"There is a minister in Minnesota who thinks a Monday paper can just as well be prepared Saturday night. His congregation should keep a sharp lookout on him. A man with a notion of that kind is quite capable of ringing in a 10-year-old sermon on his people for a fresh one."

Miss Willard finds that the non-partisan Woman's Christian Temperance Union movement is proving to be of more importance than she suspected. It seemed to be a very light thing at the time of the National Convention in November last, but now there seems to be some alarm; for she has found it necessary to issue a national address, pleading for the old organization "to be kept up," and saying that "local branches must be maintained so long as a single white ribboner is left." We wish success to the non-partisan movement, and hope that that movement may bring the temperance work back to its original intent, and to sound principles.

"For Policy's Sake" *American Sentinel* 5, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

The Freethinkers profess to be decidedly opposed to Sunday laws everywhere. Yet the *Truth Seeker* reports from "a friend" in the Washington Legislature, the following words:-

A majority of both houses are really Freethinkers but many of them are also politicians, and would make no break that would hurt their politics; but yet I am in hopes, and encouraged to think that I can get through a Sunday law that will be quite liberal. I am convinced that the majority of the members would prefer none, but for policy's sake, we will have to have something.

The politician takes precedence of the *free thinker* there. The Freethinkers are much like many other folk with whom they find so much fault. The *Truth Seeker* very properly remarks, that "comment on that state of things is almost superfluous." The American Secular Union needs to hurry along with its one thousand-dollar prize manual of "the purest principles of morality." It is much needed in the Washington Legislature right now.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

The Secretary of the Philadelphia Sunday-law Association, Rev. T. A. Fernley, reports that there are in that city "283 Personal Liberty Leagues, representing 35,000 men, who will next autumn show their hand in politics" in opposition to Sunday laws. Can the Church carry on a political contest with such an element as that and keep herself pure? Merely to contemplate such a prospect ought to convince the Church instantly and once for all that such is not the field where she is to put forth her efforts.

We have full verbatim reports of all the speeches made in the Washington City Sunday Law Convention. As soon as we can get them turned from shorthand into type-written copy, we hope to print them with comments, in the SENTINEL, if possible. The speeches are so thoroughly representative of the movement we want all our readers to have them. They may, however, prove to be too long to print in the SENTINEL, with the necessary comments. If that should be the case we hope to be able to issue them as a number of the *Sentinel Library*.

One of the chiefest sophistries of the Sunday-law advocates is couched in the would-be innocent inquiry, "If Congress has the right to say that eight hours shall be a day's work, why has it not the right also to say that six days shall be a week's work?" To this there are several answers:-

1. In making eight hours a day's work, Congress does not attempt to define what particular hours shall compose the day, as it is asked to do in the enactment of a Sunday law.

2. Congress does not declare that if anybody works more than eight hours for a day he shall be fined one hundred or a thousand dollars, as it is asked to do in the enactment of a Sunday law.

3. These men have never asked, nor has it ever been proposed by anybody, that Congress shall say that six days shall be a week's work.

Let Congress, in order to make eight a day's work, undertake to enact a law declaring that no person or corporation shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business, except works of necessity or mercy; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement or recreation; nor shall any mails or mail matter be handled or transported in time of peace; nor shall there be any military or naval drills, musters or parades, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship; before eight o'clock A. M.; between twelve o'clock M. and one o'clock P.M.; or after five o'clock P.M.; of any day-let Congress attempt to enact such a law as that, and we think the people could readily see the difference whether the preachers would or not.

It will be of interest to those who have supposed from the representations of Mr. Crafts and his co-workers that the working men were everywhere clamoring for a national Sunday law to know that instead of shouting themselves hoarse for the Blair Sunday bill, the Trades Union of Syracuse, New York, at a meeting held in that city, on the 28th ult., adopted resolutions against that measure.

We derive our information from the *Syracuse Evening Herald*, of January 29, which also states that the City Hall had been named as the place for a mass meeting in opposition to Sunday and other religious legislation, but it has been decided that a larger auditorium must be procured. The American Sabbath Union should at once send some one to Syracuse to look after their fences and instruct the laboring men more perfectly in the way of National Reform. They are evidently laboring under the impression that they can rest when tired without a law of Congress to tell them when to rest and how they shall rest.

At Ottawa, Canada, a great stir has been created among the ones who want to be religious for others as well as themselves, because of the playing of the game of "hockey" within the grounds of the Governor-General. This is a game of ball, played with a club having a curved end. One of the prominent ones of the opposition put their case in the following statement:-

As a member of the Christian religion in this city, I must enter my protest against the practice lately introduced of hockey at Rideau Hall on Sunday. The fact that young men are asked seems so like a command that it requires some fortitude to refuse, and when clergymen's sons and bald-headed old men are both seen there desecrating the Lord's day the public ought to take steps towards discountenancing such proceedings.

The other side, by one of the Governor-General's staff, state their side of the case thus:-

I do not understand why the people of Canada should interfere in what is purely a private matter. If Lord Stanley sees no harm in hockey playing on Sunday I cannot see that Canadians have any right to say what day shall be set apart for recreation at the Government House. His Excellency has English precedent that the people at home do not regard a game of hockey on Sunday as so very criminal.

We should say to the opposition there, if it requires more fortitude than your young men have to refuse to play ball on Sunday the best thing you can do is to cultivate in them sufficient fortitude to enable them to refuse.

The delegates to the World's Sunday School Convention, held in London last summer, addressed a communication to all the crowned heads of Europe, in which they "earnestly petitioned their majesties, by the use of their personal influence and constitutional power, to 'secure for the day of weekly rest the place given it in that decalogue which all Christian lands recognize, and for the good of the people, and for the glory of God, promote its recognition as a delight, holy unto the Lord.'" The Czar of Russia has his constitutional machinery in quite good working order for complying with the petition. But how will it work with the Sultan of Turkey? Is he considered a crowned head or did they leave him out?

January 27, the directors of the Young Men's Christian Association of Milwaukee, Wis., gave formal notice to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of that place, that the Union could no longer have the use of the Association building. The reason is that "having allied themselves with the Prohibition party," the women must be treated as other political organizations are and therefore must be excluded from occupying the rooms of the Association. We think that a very proper action on the part of the Young Men's Christian Association. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union has ceased to be anything but a political club, and its work anything less than a continuous political campaign. We hope that by some means the Union may be enabled to discover this, and turn once more to its proper, legitimate, and chartered object—the promotion of Christian temperance, and that by Christian methods. The management of the Young Men's Christian Association, which through all the ups and downs of the day has kept it straight on its Christian course clear of all entanglements, is worthy of the highest admiration on the part of everybody, as it has it on the part of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

February 21, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* remarks of Colonel Ingersoll's recent article on "God in the Constitution" that "the bold Atheism which it inculcates, and on which the writer rests his opposition to religious acknowledgment in political constitutions, will create a powerful revulsion of feeling in favor of the National Reform movement." It ought to do nothing of the kind. It is true that Mr. Ingersoll's hatred of Christianity is plainly shown in everything which he says, but it does not follow that because he is unreasonable and intolerant that Christians should be so too. Proper opposition to so-called National Reform rests not upon any real or supposed demerit in Christianity, but upon the fact that National Reform would, if carried out, set up men in the place of God, and thus overthrow the very religion which it is designed to maintain. The truth or falsity of the Christian religion cuts no figure whatever in the case, and the sooner both Christians and infidels come to see this fact the better, and the more hope there will be of maintaining the religious liberty enjoyed under the national Constitution as it is.

"Queer Christians" *American Sentinel* 5, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Mail and Express* insists that the late political campaign, in Salt Lake City, for the power of the city government, was a contest between Mormons and Christians. It calls the successful ticket "the Christian ticket." The result it magnifies as a "Christian victory." And in its pean, it says:-

It is as remarkable as creditable that the disturbances of the peace were so few and slight; but the leaders on both sides were determined to control their own forces and keep them from violence, and on the side of the Christians there was ample provision of deputy marshals, detectives and special police for the prevention of any considerable amount of either fraud or disturbance.

That doesn't look as though these "Christians" were much better than other people. When it comes about that "provision of deputy marshals, detectives, and special police" must be made to prevent Christians from committing "any considerable amount of either fraud or disturbance," then the fewer of such Christians as that there are in the world the better. And even then, it seems that the intention was only to prevent any *considerable amount* of fraud or disturbance! as though small or an inconsiderable amount of either were perfectly compatible with the Christian profession!

We do not for a moment suppose that those who ran the anti-Mormon Campaign considered that they were doing so as Christians or that Christianity entered to any extent into the contest. We only notice the facility with which Col. Elliot F. Shepard manufactures Christians. This is perfectly consistent with the theory and methods of the American Sunday Law Union, of which he is president. It is another strong reminder of the times of the fourth century when fraud and violence were commendable if only committed in defence of orthodoxy.

"The Puritan Idea" *American Sentinel* 5, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

In Dr. Herrick Johnson's address on "Sunday newspapers," which has been circulated widely as a campaign document by the abettors of religious legislation, occurred the words, "Oh, for a breath of the old Puritan," meaning that what the speaker wanted was a return to Puritan habits and customs. In the recent annual meeting of the Iowa Sabbath Convention, Mr. Gault said that what was wanted in Iowa was a wave of Puritanism. From these and other expressions we learn that the Puritan idea of government is the model for National Reformers of whatever stripe. A few quotations from a standard work may enable those who are interested to know just what kind of government a Puritan government would be. In a late work by Professor Fisk, of Harvard College, entitled, "The Beginnings of New England," is the following with the account of the exodus of the Puritans from Holland:-

All persons who came to Holland and led decorous lives there, were protected in their opinions and customs. By contemporary writers in other countries this eccentric behavior of the Dutch Government was treated with unspeakable scorn. All strange religions flock thither," says one: "It is a common

harbor of all heresies, a cage of unclean birds," says another; "The great mangle-mangle of all religions," says a third. In spite of the relief from persecution, however, the Pilgrims were not fully satisfied with their new home. The expiration of the truce with Spain might prove that this relief was only temporary, and, at any rate, complete toleration did not fill the measure of their wants. Had they come to Holland as scattered bands of refugees, they might have been absorbed into the Dutch population, as Huguenot refugees have been absorbed in Germany, England, and America. But they had come as an organized community, and absorption into a foreign nation was something to be dreaded. They wished to preserve their English speech and English traditions, keep up their organization and find some favored spot where they could lay the corner-stone of a great Christian State.

This language is not written in any spirit of captious criticism. The author manifests a spirit of fairness, and writes in an impartial manner, simply giving historical facts. That he did not charge the Puritans with inconsistency is seen from the following, which very clearly sets forth the Puritan idea:-

It is worthy while to inquire what were the real aims of the settlers of New England. What was the common purpose which brought these men together in their resolve to create for themselves a new home in the wilderness? This is a point concerning

59

which there has been a great deal of popular misapprehension, and there has been no end of nonsense talked about it. It has been customary first to assume that the Puritan migration was undertaken in the interests of religious liberty, and then to upbraid the Puritans for forgetting all about religious liberty as soon as people came among them who disagreed with their opinions. But this view of the case is not supported by history. It is quite true that the Puritans were chargeable with gross intolerance, but it is not true that in this they were guilty of inconsistency. The notion that they came to New England for the purpose of establishing religious liberty, in any sense in which we should understand such a phrase, is entirely incorrect. It is neither more nor less than a bit of popular legend. If we mean by the phrase "religious liberty" a state of things in which opposite or contradictory opinions on questions of religion shall exist side by side in the same community, and in which everybody shall decide for himself how far he will conform to the customary religious observances, nothing could have been farther from their thoughts. There is nothing they would have regarded with more genuine abhorrence. If they could have been forewarned by a prophetic voice of the general freedom or as they would have termed it, license-of thought and behavior which prevails in this country to-day, they would very likely have abandoned their enterprise in despair. The philosophic student of history often has occasion to see how God is wiser than man. In other words, he is often brought to realize how fortunate it is that the leaders in great historic events cannot foresee the remote results of the labors to which they have zealously consecrated their lives. It is a part of the irony of human destiny that the end we really accomplish by striving with might and main is apt to be something quite different from the end we dreamed of as we started on our arduous labor. It was

so with the Puritan settlers of New England. The religious liberty that we enjoy today is largely the consequence of their work, but it is a consequence that was unforeseen, while the direct and conscious aim of their labors was something that has never been realized, and probably never will be.

The aim of Winthrop and his friends in coming to Massachusetts was a construction of a theocratic State which should be to Christians, under the New Testament dispensation, all that the theocracy of Moses, and Joshua, and Samuel had been to the Jews in Old Testament days. They should be to all intents and purposes freed from the jurisdiction of the Stuart king, and so far as possible the texts of the Holy Scriptures should be their guide, both in weighty matters of general legislation, and in the shaping of the smallest details of daily life. In such a scheme there was no room for religious liberty, as we understand it. No doubt the text of the Scriptures may be interpreted in many ways, but among these men there was a substantial agreement as to the important points, and nothing could have been farther from their thoughts than to found a colony which should afford a field for new experiments in the art of right living. The State they were to found was to consist of a united body of believers; citizenship itself was to be co-extensive with church membership; and in such a State there was apparently no more room for heretics than there was in Rome or Madrid. This was the idea which drew Winthrop and his followers from England at a time when-as events were soon to show-they might have staid there and defied persecution with less trouble than it cost them to cross the ocean and found a new State.

The Puritans simply followed the customs of their time. Religious liberty was a thing unknown. Roman Catholicism and intolerance have been synonymous from the beginning. The Church of England was as intolerant as the Roman Church. The Puritans had not advanced far enough to perceive the error of the principle of religious intolerance, only they did not want the intolerance extended to themselves. They did not think that the Church of England ought to be intolerant, because they could see her errors, but, feeling sure that they themselves were right, they were equally sure that their opinions ought to prevail, and ought to be imposed upon others. In all New England, in the days of the Puritans, there was only one man who was far enough ahead to perceive that religion was a matter that rests with the individual, and not with the civil government, and that man was Roger Williams.

Although the Puritans were intolerant, and persecuted others even as they themselves had been persecuted, they are not to be stigmatized as bad men. They thought they were right. They were but little removed from the darkest period of Roman superstition and oppression, and they had before them no example of perfect religious freedom. In consideration of their circumstances we can make allowance for the ideas of government which they had, and honor them for that spirit of independence which was perpetuated in their children, and which resulted in the complete religious liberty which was finally established in this country. But while we may make allowance for those men, considering their time, what allowance can be made for men who have before them the history of one hundred years of religious liberty in the United States? and who can

compare its glorious work with the work of the religious despotism of the Old World? Those who in this age would institute the Puritan idea of government, must be either deplorably blind or else wickedly selfish.

E. J. W.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days*, in giving "Reasons for Sabbath Laws," says:-

"The powers that be are ordained of God." If "of God," why not for God?

The answer is, Because God has forbidden it by his word.

In the Washington City Sunday Law Convention, it was again stated, and the statement was let go without a sign of contradiction, that Rev. W. F. Crafts "is the American Sabbath Union." This same statement was officially made last summer by one of the District Secretaries of the Union. We knew it before, but it is well to have authoritative statements in confirmation of the fact.

We have before explained in these columns that Colonel Elliott F. Shepard, president of the American Sabbath Union, owns *the Mail and Express*, a daily evening newspaper of this city; and that that paper, through its "Pearl of Days" columns, is the official organ of the American Sabbath Union. Colonel Shepard is quite a pious man. So pious is he, indeed, that he prints a verse of Scripture every day at the head of the editorial columns of his newspaper; and occasionally, perhaps as evidence of an extra quantity, he embellishes this by printing an advertisement of an intoxicating drink at the foot of the same columns, to say nothing of the same thing in other parts of the paper. For instance, in the issue of February 10 (and this is not the first time that it has been done), at the head of the editorial columns, he printed this text:-

For he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth through the power of God. For we also are weak in him, but we shall live with him through the power of God toward you.

And the same day, at the foot of the editorial columns, stood this other thing thus:-

Piper Heidsieck Sec-The favorite everywhere. - Adv.

Now "Piper Heidsieck Sec" is a popular brand of champagne, possessing all the intoxicating qualities of champagne generally.

The *Christian Advocate* suggested, a short time ago, that the printing of texts of Scripture at the head of a daily newspaper "is a matter of taste." Yes, no doubt. And it is altogether likely that the printing of "Piper Heidsieck Sec-the favorite everywhere"-at the foot of the same columns is also a matter of *taste*.

Since this was put in type we have received the *Mail and Express* of February 12. 1 Peter 2:7, 8, is printed at the head, and "A popular sparkling wine-Piper Heidsieck Sec," at the foot of the editorial columns.

Speaking of the Chinese, the *Mail and Express* says:-

Those who are willing to become American citizens, adopting our ways, customs, religion, and language, ought to be admitted to all the rights of American citizenship.

Is "our religion," then, to be made a test of citizenship? By the way, Mr. Shepard, what is "our religion"? Is it the religion of the New Testament or of the saloon? Is it expressed in 2 Corinthians, 13:4, or in "Piper Heidsieck Sec"? The president of the American Sabbath Union ought to be able to tell, and we hope he will.

A convention of the liberal thought women of the country will be held in Willard Hall, Washington, D. C., February 24 and 25, 1890. The object of the Convention is to form a national organization for the purpose of opposing the demands for religious legislation that are already so loud, so frequent, and so persistent. The call for the Convention says: "In order to help preserve the very life of the Republic by rousing public attention to the constantly increased danger of a union of Church and State, it is necessary that liberal thought women should unite in a national society for combined work."

This is a worthy object by whomsoever it may be desired, therefore we wish the coming Convention abundant success both in the organization and in the work proposed.

All persons in harmony with this are invited to correspond with Matilda Joslyn Gage, Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., Willard Hotel will be the headquarters of the Convention; and speakers, delegates, and visitors are requested to report there, to Mrs. Gage, on their arrival in the city.

It is not alone on the question of Sunday observance that Congress is being asked to legislate in matters pertaining to religion. Representative Compton, of Maryland, has introduced a bill-Fifty-first Congress, H. R. 423-authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury "to refund the duties paid upon a clock and a chime, of bells, imported into the port of Baltimore for the use of Saint Timothy's Episcopal church, of Catonsville, in Baltimore County, Maryland." Why should the duty on this clock and those bells be refunded any more than on every other clock and every other bell or bells? The answer, of course is, that these are for a church. Then upon what principle is it that this money shall be given from treasury to this church; and not an amount of money be paid from the same source to every other church in the land. And if the national treasury is to pay for the support of the playing of the tunes and the keeping of the time, of the church, why shall it not also help support the singing and the preaching carried on by the church? If this can be granted, why should not the whole of the public funds be placed at once at the service of the church? That bill is a sneaking, unprincipled thing. Let it be killed so dead that it may never be heard of again.

The *Christian at Work* notices the fact that Pittsburg, like Boston, is stirred up over the proposition made by the Catholics that they be given a proportionate share of public taxes for the support of parochial schools, and says:-

At a public meeting just held in that city a series of resolutions was adopted protesting against any concessions to Roman Catholics by the public school authorities, and against appropriation of any money to schools which advocated principles so directly in opposition to the fundamental ideas of American Government. This is the right ground. The public schools for all, and no public moneys devoted to sectarian purposes should be the American war-cry the country over.

But if this is to be the war cry of Americans, what will become of the Educational Amendment? The only way to keep sectarianism out of the public schools is to keep religion out; but that is just what both Catholics and Protestants are determined shall not be done. They both want religious instruction, the only question between them being what religion shall be taught. Religious instruction belongs not to the State, nor to State schools, but to the home, the Church and the Church school.

February 27, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

In the Cincinnati National Reform Convention Judge M. B. Hagans said:-

The people of this city are tired of being tied to a beer barrel seven days in the week.

Therefore, that they may be loosed forever from the beer barrel, they want the saloon shut on Sunday. Certainly; they are tired of being tied to the beer barrel seven days in the week; tie them only six, and let them loose on Sunday, and they will all be happy. For our part we will have nothing to do with the wicked thing at all; and we will not compromise with it by asking that it be shut on Sunday only. The power that can shut the saloon on Sunday can shut it all the time. Therefore if they shut the saloon on Sunday and not all the time it shows that they do not want to shut it any of the time but Sunday. And the shutting of the saloon on Sunday only, is positive proof that it is not hatred of the saloon but love for Sunday which is expressed.

Poor Mrs. Mary Jones, of One Hundred and Fourth Street, was found yesterday (February 8), with a dose of laudanum in her stomach. Being a dejected and distressed creature, it was assumed that she had attempted suicide. She was seized by a policeman, dragged out of her home, sent to Bellevue Hospital, where she was pumped out, and where she is to-day a prisoner under the idiotic law which assumes to punish people for trying and failing to dispose of their lives. Mrs. Jones says that she was ill and meant to take a dose of ginger, but got hold of the wrong bottle. Perhaps the poor, unfortunate woman is fibbing, but what a ridiculous law, is that which makes an attempted suicide a misdemeanor, and thereby sets a premium upon successful self-destruction!-*New York World*.

True enough. And another ridiculous feature about such a law is, that it inflicts a heavier punishment upon the attempt to do a thing than upon the actual doing of it. That is, if a person attempts to kill himself and fails, he is fined and imprisoned; whereas if he actually kills himself, and even mangles himself all to pieces, he is let go scot free, with not the slightest attempt made to punish him in the least degree.

"The Wickedness of Church and State Union" *American Sentinel* 5, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

In the Senate document containing the hearing (December 13, 1888) before the Committee on Education and Labor, on the Sunday-rest bill, we find on pages 65 and 66 certain statements made by Senator Blair, the chairman of the committee, and the author of the bill. He first asked Dr. Lewis the following questions:-

Suppose that human beings trying to live in accordance with the will of God, re-enact his law and write it in their statute-books; is it wrong for society to put in their public law the requirement of obedience to God and his law?

And then after a few words he proceeded to answer his own question in the following manner:-

The will of God exists. He requires the observance of the seventh day just as he prohibits murder; and as we re-enact his law, in making a law and enforcing it against murder, so all the States have enacted laws against the desecration of the Sabbath, going further or not so far, according to the ideas of the various Legislatures.

Let the reader give particular attention to the idea advanced by Senator Blair, that human beings may re-enact the law of God. The same idea was advanced by Mr. Crafts in the *Christian Statesman* of May 30, 1889. Said he:-

The laws of our statute-books re-enact the seventh commandment are as distinctly biblical in their origin as the laws that re-enact a part of the fourth commandment.

In what position does this place civil government? The only answer that can be given is that it puts it in the place of God, and makes it at least equal with God. Nay, more, in putting it in the place of God, it puts it above God; for if the State re-enacts and enforces the law of God, supposing such a thing to be possible, it takes the law out of his hands, leaving him nothing to do, and requires man to give supreme allegiance to the State. This will be more apparent when we quote another statement made by Senator Blair, in the connection before referred to. Said he:-

Now the question comes right to this point: God having ordained the Sabbath, as you concede with all religious organizations, here is the national government, which alone can make that law of God operative in this sphere of national action. Why

67

shall not the civil government, then, re-enact that conceded law of the Almighty and make it effective?

Do we not say truly that the National deform idea, as voiced here by Senator Blair, puts the State in the place of God? He ignores God and his spirit entirely, in the statement that the national Government alone can make the law of God operative. We say, with as much reverence as the subject will allow, that we cannot see what use those who hold such an idea can have for God. They have usurped his prerogative.

In the second chapter of 2 Thessalonians the apostle Paul describes a certain power known as the "man of sin," the result of the working of the "mystery of iniquity." This power is described as opposing and exalting itself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, and claiming really to be God. It has generally

been considered that this language is a description of the Papacy, and we believe that that interpretation is correct; but surely it describes nothing more accurately than a government which attempts to do just what Senator Blair says this government ought to do. Therefore, everyone who believes this language of Paul to refer to the Papacy must admit that a government according to the National Reform idea would be nothing more than an image to the Papacy.

But there is another point to be noticed in this connection, and that is the inevitable result of putting such ideas into practice. If it were universally conceded that the civil government has the power and the right to re-enact and enforce the law of God, that would involve the conclusion that there is no more to the moral law than civil government can enforce. The result would be the universal prevalence of immorality, and immorality of the worst kind, inasmuch as the individuals would suppose themselves to be acting in harmony with divine law.

For example, take Mr. Blair's statement to the effect that as we re-enact the law of God in making a law and enforcing it against murder, so all the States have enacted laws against the desecration of the Sabbath. Suppose the National Reform scheme had become triumphant, and it were understood that the Government takes the place of God, and enforces the divine law against murder, the result would be that any individual who did not in his envy and hatred toward his fellows go to the extreme of depriving them of life, would consider himself a moral man, although he might be full of hatred, malice, and envy. Take Mr. Craft's idea that the State re-enacts the seventh commandment. It needs no argument to show that the State cannot punish man for vicious thoughts, or evil desires, or for any grade of licentiousness short of the overt act of adultery. But ministers and law-makers teach that the State enforces the seventh commandment; therefore the conclusion which the libertine would be warranted in making would be that he is a moral man if he abstains from violence. And so, when this National Reform idea shall be carried into effect, we shall have the State actually teaching vice and immorality.

Such a condition of things would be a union of Church and State in its fullest extent. The Dark Ages stand as the great example of the effects of the union of Church and State, yet all that was done then was the enforcement by civil government of what the Church claimed was the law of God. We think that our friends can readily see from this that when the United States or any other government, legislates concerning any one or the whole of the commandments, it effects just to that extent a union of Church and State; and the argument already given shows how dangerous to morality and pure religion is such a union. The state of morality will be just as much below the true morality as the power that presumes to enforce the law of God is below God. Are there any of our Christian readers who wish to see such a condition of things in the United States, or who will lend their influence to bring it about?

E. J. W.

"Sunday Rest Leagues" *American Sentinel* 5, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days*, official organ of the American Sabbath Union, makes the following announcement in its issue of February 7, 1890:-

The Sunday Closing Association, of Chicago, acting upon the Roman military principle of "carrying the war into Africa," has prepared "a plan for the organization of the Sunday-rest people in each ward" into Sunday-rest leagues. The Constitution thus defines the purposes and terms of membership:-

ART. 2.-The object of this league shall be to cooperate with the Chicago Sunday Closing Association in securing, by all proper means, freedom from unnecessary Sunday labor, and especially the closing of factories, shops, stores, and saloons on Sunday.

ART. 3.-This league shall be composed of representatives of the whole population of the-- ward, independent of sectarian control or party dictation. Any citizen who is in favor of the object of this Association and desires to aid in the furtherance of the same may become a member by signing this constitution.

Ward organizers will be appointed to carry out these provisions. Efforts will be paid to secure the selection of alderman at the coming city election who favor the closing of saloons on Sundays and the cessation of all unnecessary work on that day. No sect, faction, or special influence will control the ward leagues. The men who want to rest on Sunday will control the ward organizations, and they will have the opportunity of making their influence felt at the ballot-box, whether of independent candidates or four nominees of either political party who will favor Sunday rest. By this method of working the city, which is substantially after the long-established ways of the old political organizations, the Sunday Closing Association expects to develop, direct, and establish public opinion for practical advances upon the enemy's works. It is "bearding the lion in his den." The idea is novel, inspiring, and bold. Its results will be watched with interest, and example, if even partially successful on the great city of the West, will be followed in more favorable localities. It means much more than a mass meetings and strings of resolutions.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

The Nashville *Christian Advocate* says:-

The Church needs more power rather than more machinery. It is a malign paradox of ecclesiastical history that as power declines machinery increases.

True enough. And the power of the churches in the United States has declined, and the machinery has increased to that extent that nothing short of the machinery of the national Government is counted of any worth. And in the enactment and enforcement of the National Sunday-law, they demand that this machinery shall be set in motion.

A federation of the churches of the United States is earnestly advocated by Dr. McCosh, ex-president of Princeton College, somewhat after the mode of the Federal Government of the United States. We should not be surprised if some

such scheme as that would yet be entered into by the churches. The organization of the Church upon the political model of the Empire in the fourth century was the one grand step in the organization of the Papal hierarchy. "Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say A confederacy." Isa. 8:12.

Under the leadership of the so-called Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Rhode Island, the friends of prohibition in that State, are being organized into a sort of fourth-party called the "Prohibitory League," with the object of getting a prohibition amendment to the State Constitution adopted again. A prohibition amendment was adopted in 1886, and was repealed in 1889. and now the prohibition Woman's Christian Temperance Union propose to have it again enacted. At this rate the Constitution of Rhode Island becomes practically of no more weight than is any act of the legislature.

It is the just pride of the American people, that their liberties are guarded by written Constitutions. When Constitutional provisions are reduced to the level of Statute law, to be enacted or repealed at the caprice of parties, then constitutional government is gone and liberty with it; and nothing remains but an unchecked and therefore unmitigated despotism. In this way the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Third and Fourth party Prohibition parties are doing far-reaching and untold evil.

National Reform principles are gaining ground in other countries as well as in our own. The *Christian Statesman* of February 13 makes the following announcement:-

A Hindoo gentleman has called a congress of Brahmin priests and learned men for the purpose of incorporating the Bible among the sacred books of India, and officially recognizing Christ as the last spiritual Avatar, or incarnation of Brahma, the supreme deity.

When they shall have officially recognized Christ, and incorporated the Bible, India will be a Christian nation of course, just as officially to recognize Christ and the Bible in our national constitution will make this a Christian nation.

Through contentions in the Legislature New York City stood in much danger of losing the World's Fair for 1892. Mass meetings were held this week, on Tuesday, to create such a public sentiment as might bring the Legislature to concerted action. In the preliminary meeting that was held to organize for the mass meetings, the principal speech was made by Colonel Shepard of the *Mail and Express*, and one point on which he laid special stress was this:-

Ask the ministers to pray for pleasant weather on that day, and do not do any of your preparatory work on Sunday.

But Hon. Chauncey, M. Depew said that he read in the Bible "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God," and on the strength of that text he spent all day Sunday in the endeavor to bring the warring factions to an agreement, and he was successful. The mass meeting was a splendid success; but it was evident to everybody that that success was vastly more owing to Mr. Depew's Sunday work than to Mr. Shepard's Sunday rest.

Another step by Congress toward legislating in behalf of religion appears in a bill-Fifty-first Congress, S. 1748-introduced by Senator Vance, of North Carolina,

"For the Relief of the Sisters of the Holy Cross in the City of Washington, District of Columbia," which provides that-

From and after the passage of this act a certain piece of land in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, known as lot sixteen, in square two hundred and forty-seven of the plan of that city, and owned and occupied by the Sisters of the Cross, and all the buildings and grounds appurtenant thereto and used in connection therewith, in the District of Columbia, shall be exempt from any and all taxes and assessments, national, municipal, or county; and all taxes or assessments, together with the interest and penalties now due and unpaid upon said property shall be, and they are hereby remitted.

Why should the property of "the Sisters of the Holy Cross" be exempt from all taxes and assessments, any more than the property of everybody else? What is the particular benefit of the Sisters of the Holy Cross, over everybody else, to the nation, the city, and the county, that their property should be exempt from all taxes and assessments at the expense of everybody else in the nation, the city, and the county? It will doubtless be answered that this is church property, and that all church property is exempt. Then we would ask the same questions in regard to all the church property in the nation. Why should the people be required thus to pay tribute to the churches? If Congress can require that this measure of tribute shall be paid by the public to the churches, why can it not also require that all the revenues required by the churches shall likewise be paid by the public? If so much shall be done when it is asked, what is to hinder the doing of all the rest as it shall be asked? Our comments upon the bill concerning the clock and bells are to be applied to this bill also; and of this, too, we say, Let it be killed. And let every other like it be annihilated throughout the Union.

The Fresno (Cal.) *Inquirer*, a live newspaper published in the metropolis of the San Joaquin Valley, has a "Department of Church and State and Temperance," ably edited by N. J. Bowers, a former contributor to the columns of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. We are glad that the secular press not only in California, but very generally throughout the country, is waking up to the importance of this question; and this is the more encouraging from the fact that a large majority of the secular papers are opposed to so-called National Reform, and to the schemes of the American Sabbath Union. We bid the *Inquirer* Godspeed in its new departure, and trust that it will add greatly both to its popularity and to its influence.

March 6, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

We present herewith a *fac-simile* of page 26 of the latest document issued by the American Sabbath Union. The document as a whole comprises 126 pages, and entitled "Addresses on the Civil Sabbath, from Patriotic and Humanitarian Standpoint," by Wilbur Crafts. It is not at all difficult to discern the handicraft of the author in the matter of which this is a *fac-simile*.

Please observe that the impression which is plain conveyed is, not that it should be or that it ought to be, but that it is "*To be hung on the breast of every person who buys postage stamps, provisions, cigar clothing, or what not,*" on Sunday.

At this rate how long will it be before they will be proposing to paint hobgoblins and devils upon the hats and garments, and to brand with the letter S the foreheads, of those who do not keep Sunday?

Neither the spirit nor the principle of this proposal is removed a single degree from that which did paint such devices upon the garments, and brand the foreheads, of people in times past.

And we should like for the author of this production to point out where in this proposal there is a particle of either patriotism or humanity.

And the libelous thing is for sale by the hundred!! And why for sale unless it is expected that they will use it? And how can it be expected that they will be used, unless it is first presumed that the American people are of so loathsome a disposition as willingly to engage in such an infamous undertaking?

Such a presumption is an open insult to the civilization, and a cruel outrage upon the Christian sentiment, of the American people.

And the effect of it ought to be to arouse such a degree of righteous indignation as to consign the Sunday-law movement to the everlasting infamy which this badge shows that it deserves.

"Nothing but a Hoax" *American Sentinel* 5, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

The eight-hour movement is just now attracting considerable attention; but here is a bit of attention that it does not yet seem to have attracted: One of the great objects proposed to be accomplished by it is to furnish employment to those who now have no work. That is to say, there is such a vast number of men unemployed that the workday must be shortened, thus making it necessary to employ more men to do the work that there is to do, and so secure work for the army of the new unemployed. But here are the American Sabbath Union, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union carrying on a campaign to secure laws "to prevent people from being forced to labor." If now there is such an immense number of people who have no work; and if it is necessary to make such an effort as is the eight-hour movement to give them work; then how can it be that so many are being forced to labor as to make it necessary to

75

enact laws to prevent it? and how can it be that there is such an Egyptian bondage of enslaved toil as the Sunday-law advocates so lamentingly describe? In the proposed efforts in behalf of the workingman, these two movements do not fit together at all. And the reason is that one of them-the Sunday-law effort-is a fraud. It is true they claim that those are "forced to labor" only on Sunday. But, in view of the vast army of the unemployed, is it not true that there are a multitude of men who would be only too glad to have the opportunity to work on Sunday for proper wages? The fact is, that poor plea in behalf of forced labor on Sunday has not a solitary item of merit to support it. It is nothing but a sheer hoax.

"Object of the Association" *American Sentinel* 5, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

This Association exists for the purpose of advocating the principles of genuine religious liberty as declared in the words of Jesus Christ; and of maintaining the total separation of religion and the State according to the provisions of our National Constitution as it now stands.

It is an association of Christians who maintain that Christianity, to remain pure and powerful, must never be connected as such in any way with the State; and that the State, properly to fulfill its functions, must never have anything whatever to do with religion as such, or with religious observances.

United with government, religion never rises above the merest superstition; united with religion, government never rises above the merest despotism; and all history shows us that the more widely and completely they are separated, the better it is for both.-*Supreme Court of Ohio*.

Secular power has proved a Satanic gift to the Church, and ecclesiastical power has proved an engine of tyranny in the hands of the State.-*Philip Schaff*.

Accordingly we set forth the above declaration of principles.

Membership is confined to Christians, not because we think none others are entitled to religious liberty-for, as our principles declare, all men are absolutely free and equal in this,-but solely because we desire as Christians to work for these principles, and we cannot therefore be joined with those who have no respect for Christ, whom we supremely love and honor.

Membership is confined to temperance people, because temperance is a Christian principle, and as Christians, therefore, we cannot be joined with those who practice intemperance, or engage in the liquor traffic.

Membership is confined to those who believe in civil government and in submitting to its authority, because this is according to the words of Jesus Christ. Civil government is an ordinance of God, and is supreme in civil things; for God has made it so in commanding Christians as well as all others to be subject to it. Its authority, however, is over the civil relations of men; and does not at all extend to religious things. (Matt. 21:15-21; Rom. 13:1-10.) As Christians, therefore, we cannot be joined with those who despise government and reject civil authority.

This Association maintains that it is the natural and inalienable right of every man to worship, or not to worship, according to the dictates of his own conscience and that he is responsible to God alone for the exercise of that right. With George Washington we hold that "every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith." Any interference with this right, on the part of any person or power, is as unwarranted as it is unjust.

The aim of this Association is strictly in harmony with the intent of the Government of the United States under its Constitution. It was plainly declared by the framers of this Government that "no religious test shall ever be required as qualification to any office or public trust under the United States;" that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free

exercise thereof;" and that "the Government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion." It is therefore not only as Christians but as loyal American citizens that this Association proposes to disseminate its principles.

There are already in existence three powerful organizations, two of which exist for the sole purpose of securing national religious legislation, and the third of which stands distinctly pledged to it. These three are the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

The sole purpose-the reason of existence-of the National Reform Association is to secure such an amendment to the United States Constitution as will make this what they choose to call a Christian nation, and by which Christian principles may be enforced by law.

The sole purpose of the American Sabbath Union is to secure the enactment of laws both State and national, to strictly enforce upon all the observance of the first day of the week as a day of rest and religious worship.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union stands in complete alliance with both of the above organizations, with all its methods and its influence to help secure the religious legislation which they both demand.

Measures looking to the accomplishment of both these objects were introduced in the Fiftieth Congress, and have been introduced, and are now pending, in the Fifty-first Congress; and the intent is to carry both to a successful issue, if possible, before this Congress shall close.

To oppose such measures by every fair, honorable, and lawful means, and to educate the public mind on the true relations of Church and State, are the leading objects of the National Religious Liberty Association; and it cordially invites all lovers of Christianity and the American Constitution to unite with it in the work to which the Association is devoted.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

Sunday, February 16, Rev. Heber Newton considerably surprised his congregation by delivering a sermon in glorification of the Roman Catholic Church.

The *Colorado Graphic* is a live paper which is dealing out sturdy blows and sensible matter against Sunday laws and religious legislation generally.

There is a bill pending in the Legislature of this State which actually proposes to prohibit parents from teaching their own children in their own homes without State supervision.

The University of Pennsylvania is about to erect a \$75,000 theater. The University of the immediate future will embody in its plant a ball-room, an athletic field, an opera-house, a billiard-room, a few lecture-rooms, a race-track for horses, and possibly a roulette table. Then the boys will be educated.-*New York World*.

To those of our new subscribers whose papers seem to be slow in coming, we would beg to say, Please be patient with us. You will all surely get your papers. Our business has increased so far beyond our expectations in so short a time, since coming to New York, that for two or three weeks we have been fairly overwhelmed. We are now getting things straightened out, however, and shall soon be able to fill all orders promptly.

In the Washington City Sunday-law Convention, Congressman Wickham, of Ohio, strongly denounced the counter-petition to the Sunday laws and the religious amendment to the Constitution. He declared the counter-petition to be false and misleading, because there was nothing at all proposed in Congress of the kind that the petition mentions. He said no amendment had ever been proposed touching upon the question of religion, and exclaimed, "Let them send in as many such petitions as they please; they can do no harm; they are aimed at nothing." All this, and more to the same effect, in the face of the fact that there are now pending in Congress two bills and one amendment resolution relating directly to religion and religious observances. We give Mr. Wickham credit for having spoken to the best of his knowledge; but his knowledge upon a most important subject is certainly deplorably limited for one in his position. It is painful to see a member of Congress display such lack of information upon a subject upon which all the people are informed,- and that a subject with which he is specially and officially connected.

Argue as you will, Sunday legislation is religious legislation, whether it be to restrict the sale of liquors, dry goods, cigars, soda-water, food or peanuts on Sunday, "commonly known as the Lord's day." It is true that those who desire to worship God on that day should not be interfered with, but our statute books are well provided with laws which secure to the religious observer all the privileges and protection he needs.-*Colorado Graphic*.

It is probable that that bill at Albany, which proposes to obtrude the State between the parent and his child, and to have the State usurp the functions of the parent, is aimed at the parochial school and Roman Catholic teaching. But whatever it is aimed at, it embodies the principle of the most horrid despotism that ever disgraced a government. It is essentially Pagan. And the principle of this bill is identical with that of the Blair Resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States.

A Dispatch to the *World*, February 24, from Ashland, Wisconsin, says:-

This morning Edward Eells, W. W. Groves, and James Kane, Salvation Army officers, were committed to jail for one week for marching on Sunday to the music of a cornet and flute. On the same day a Young Men's Christian Association meeting in a suburb was looted by toughs and no arrests have been made.

This illustrates what we have several times pointed out, that where there are strict Sunday laws existing reverence for Sunday takes precedence of everything else, and actions which are in themselves innocent, are severely punished while crimes of open violence are passed by.

Several times lately mention has been made of the National Religious Liberty Association. We are happy to announce that the AMERICAN SENTINEL has been chosen as one of the channels through which the Association will

communicate with the public. We therefore open in this number of the SENTINEL a department for the Association. Our sixth page, or so much of it as the Association may require each week, will be devoted to the principles and the work of the Association as such. Of course the work of the Association is in the same line as that of the SENTINEL, but in this department the Association will speak for itself. The principles and object of the Association are fully set forth in its department in this issue, which we heartily commend to our readers. The Association has a membership of thousands scattered all over the country, and is doing noble work for the cause of civil as well as religious liberty. The Secretary, Prof. W. H. McKee, is stationed at Washington City, and will thus be enabled to furnish important information in regard to the efforts made there to secure religious legislation.

We referred a short time ago to the attempt to force into the Legislature of Washington a chaplain, despite the language of the Constitution declaring that no public money shall ever be paid for any religious "exercise." The House went so far as actually to select a chaplain, and set him to praying at the public expense. A protest was made and the question was referred to the Attorney-General. He rendered an opinion stating that he had made a thorough examination of the subject and had come to the conclusion that "a school board would be as much justified in employing a chaplain to open the schools with prayer as the House in electing a salaried chaplain. Therefore no money can be lawfully appropriated for any religious worship, exercise or instruction."

Sunday, February 16, in Washington City, Mr. Crafts delivered his speech in favor of Sunday laws and against the counter-petition, which he says is so treacherously written as to have deceived even the elect into signing it. There was present to hear him a certain good Presbyterian. This Presbyterian gentleman heard Mr. Crafts through his whole speech-his "counterblast" to the "Advent petition," the "Advent Sentinel," and all: he then went home and picked up one of the counter-petitions that had been left at his house, signed it himself, and then got his wife and another lady to sign it also. Many thanks, friend Wilbur. We hope you will continue to cause that counter-petition thus to "deceive the elect."

The *Kaleidoscope*, a bright 9-page college paper, comes to us from South Lancaster, Massachusetts. It is conducted by the students of South Lancaster Academy, and is an excellent paper. We wish both the *Kaleidoscope* and the institution which it represents abundant success. For terms of subscription, etc., see advertisement on another page.

March 13, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

We learn from the *London* (Ontario) *Advertiser* that a bill is about to be introduced in the Canadian Parliament with this title: "An Act to Secure the Better Observance of the Lord's Day." By the term Lord's Day is meant Sunday. What

tottering support that Sunday institution must have, when all the Governments in Europe and North America are so urgently besought to hold it up.

Remarking upon the phrase "secular," used in the two Sunday bills pending in Congress forbidding on Sunday all "secular work, labor, or business," a Baptist minister aptly says:-

When it finds difficulty in deciding whether one hundred and fifty men are absent or present, although they can be seen and heard, as in the recent debate concerning the quorum, how is Congress to render decisions concerning the unseen things of the world to come? Theological matters might better be left to the theologians who are so eminently successful in agreeing among themselves.

At the opening of the Woman's Suffrage Convention, held in Washington, February 18, Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who has been for many years an able and respected leader in the cause which that convention represented, said the part which so many women were taking in the Sunday-law movement, and the effort to "put the name of God in the Constitution," was calling into question what woman's influence might be in government. "I do hope," said Mrs. Stanton, "that this Association will declare that the Woman's Suffrage Association is opposed to all union of Church and State."

Such a declaration as this, from such a source, should lead the women of the country to give individual thought and study to these questions, and trust the formation of their views and opinions upon them, to their own good sense, instructed by the Bible alone.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

Our thanks are due to Hon. H. W. Baker, Superintendent of the State Documents, Albany, N.Y., for official documents furnished.

If you are interested in Arizona curiosities, subscribe for the *Moral and Scientific Companion*, published by Mr. Eugene Browne, of Florence, Arizona.

Now that the United States Senators begin to say on the floor of the Senate Chamber, that the Sunday-law petitions are "not true as stated," perhaps those who are running the Sunday-law business will discover that it would be better to be honest and state the truth as it is. See page 86 of this paper.

March 5, there was presented to the Senate of the United States a petition carrying 308,377 names in opposition to the Blair Sunday bill and the Blair resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution respecting establishments of religion and free public schools. This makes more than 658,000 *bona fide* signatures that have been presented to the Senate in opposition to these measures. Let the good work go on.

The Young People's Christian Endeavor societies of Poughkeepsie, N.Y., have started a boycott on Sunday trade. They are endeavoring to get people to sign an agreement not to patronize any stores that do not close on Sundays, only excepting drug stores. These societies would do better to spend their efforts in an honest endeavor to be Christians, than to lay themselves out in such "Christian endeavor" as this amounts to.

A gentleman who holds a proper estimate of human nature has stated to us that, though we are so strongly opposed to the work and aims of those who are seeking to secure religious legislation, we ourselves would be just as bad as they are if we had the power which they are asking for. Of course we would. And for the very good reason that we would have to be as bad as they are before we could ask for that power; and being as bad as they in asking for it we certainly would be as bad as they in the use of the power when obtained. Our constant purpose is, that by the grace of God we may be kept so good, that we will *never ask for any such power.*

We are indebted to Prof. W. H. McKee' Secretary of the National Religious Liberty Association, for a copy of the Brief submitted by him to the Congressional Committee on the proposed District Sunday law. We shall print it next week. Professor McKee is a graduate of Michigan University Law School, and a practical lawyer besides-having been regularly admitted to the bar in three different States-and we can assure our readers that in this Brief there is a treat in store for them.

In the *North American Review*, for March, there is a fine discussion of "The Limitations of the Speakership," by Speaker Reed and Ex-Speaker Carlisle. The editor of the *Review* graciously informs the public that "of all *others*" these two gentlemen could discuss this question "with adequacy in point of practical experience and contrasted principles." "Others" indeed! We had supposed that of all men in the country these two gentlemen were *themselves*. And if Mr. Bryce had only been in the gallery of the House of Representatives, January 29 last, we believe that he would be inclined to think so too. Assuredly, Mr. Editor, these two gentlemen are themselves, not "others."

The organ of the French Evangelical Publishing Society, *Semeur* (Springfield Mass.), the publication of which was suspended last fall, has again made its appearance under a new name. It is now known as *Le Citoyen Franco-American*, which means "The Franco-American Citizen." It is printed principally in French but has an English department, and has a thoroughly Protestant ring which is decidedly refreshing. The object of the paper is the promulgation of Protestantism among French-speaking people in America, and while its publishers do not wish their countrymen to forget that they are French, they do desire that they shall become thoroughly loyal American citizens, owing allegiance, not to the Pope of Rome but to the Government under which they live, and to the God who gives them their being. We trust that *Le Citoyen Franco-American* will be always and in every part thoroughly and consistently Protestant.

March 20, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

The German emperor has no small idea of his position. Nothing but his own exposition of Scripture will express it to his satisfaction. As thus set forth it is described as follows:-

I see in the people and the land intrusted to me by God, a talent which, as the Bible says, it is my duty to increase. I mean with all my strength to so trade with my talent that I will be enabled to add many another thereto. Those who help me I heartily welcome; those who oppose me I dash to pieces.

He is not the only one who holds such a view of the "talent" of government and governing. It is common to those who hold that governmental authority is of divine right. National Reformers and the American Sabbath Union in this country hold it in common with the German emperor and the Papacy in Europe.

"The Kangaroo and Other Stories" *American Sentinel* 5, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

In our report of the Washington City Sunday-law Convention a few weeks ago, we mentioned the reference of Rev. James Stacy, D. D., of Newman, Georgia, to the kangaroo. We could not, however, give the exact words. We have them now.

His address was written when it was delivered in the Convention, and it has since been printed in the *Christian Statesman* of February 20 and 27. In that of the 20th is the zoological specimen, in these words:-

The infidel cry, "Down with the Sabbath," like the, bounding kangaroo springing from his lair, has fastened itself upon an unsuspecting people, and with unyielding pertinacity and without any evidence of satiety continues to draw its life blood.

That the reader may see how perfectly exact is Mr. Stacy's figure we quote:-

The kangaroos are all vegetable feeders, browsing on grass and various kinds of herbage, the smaller species also eating roots. They are naturally timid, inoffensive creatures, but the larger ones when hard pressed will turn and defend themselves.-*Encyclopedia Britannica*.

The Sunday-law folks are as badly mixed in their zoology as they are in their Sabbath theology. And their characterization of the "infidel cry, Down with the Sabbath," is just as wide of the mark as is their zoological idea of the kangaroo. No better description was ever given of the nature of the opposition to Sunday legislation than is given in the above true statement of the disposition of the kangaroo. Yes, sir, the kangaroo is an innocent creature if you let him alone, and so are we.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

For a living illustration of the influence of ecclesiastics in legislation, please read and inwardly digest the article by our London correspondent, page 91.

A new edition of the pamphlet "Civil Government and Religion" is now ready. It contains the new Amendment resolution and the new National Sunday bill, with discussions of them which brings the pamphlet up to date. Let it have the widest possible circulation.

There was laid on our table this week a copy of a German edition, illustrated, of the pamphlet "Civil Government and Religion." We are glad to see it. It

supplies a need that has been seriously felt for some time. We hope the friends of truth and good government will bring this to the notice of the German people as promptly and as widely as possible. 229 pages. Price, 35 cents.

Sunday evening, March 9, there was a Sunday-law meeting held in Bedford Street Methodist Episcopal Church, this city, Colonel Elliott F. Shepard was one of the speakers, and his speech was characteristic of himself and of the body of which he is president, as the following extract will show. This is all of his speech that needs to be reported:-

England and the United States are the greatest Nations in the world because they keep the fourth commandment. Germany conquered France because she was a better Sabbath-keeping Nation, and by this standard a Nation's greatness may be judged.

At the annual meeting of the alumni and alumnae of Michigan University, resident in Washington, which was recently held at Willard's, Representative Allen, of Michigan, made a ringing after-dinner speech. He declared that the University owed much of the marvelous progress which it has made to the fact that it has always maintained the proper distinctions between religion and the State.

This great institution of learning has kept an even course, in respect to these questions, through much adverse criticism. But, by the character of the men whom it has sent out to participate in the public councils of the States and of the Nation, it has proved most conclusively that a noble and intelligent Christianity can be developed without a distinctive theological training. It is a fact that, in these days of increasing subserviency to man-made theology, and of dangerous tendency to centralization in Church and in State, with a view to future coalition, the broadly educated men and women of such institutions as the Michigan University are needed to maintain the social, political, and moral equilibrium of national affairs.

The annual Convention of the National Reform Association is to meet in Lincoln Music Hall, Washington City, April 1, and continue three days. Rev. Jonathan Edwards is announced as one of the speakers, and he is to speak on the same subject that he did in the Convention of 1873. Hon. W. C. P. Breckinridge, who framed the Sunday bill for the District of Columbia is to preside at one of the sessions and make a speech.

Of all days in the year, the first day of April is the only one on which that Association can with perfect consistency meet.

In a speech in the United States Senate, March 5, in opposition to the Blair Educational bill, Senator Plumb, of Kansas, gave expression to an immense truth, and as important just now as it is immense, when he spoke the two following sentences:-

Whatever domain Government invades it dominates. The jurisdiction which it takes it keeps.

Let the people attach these two sentences to the Sunday Bills that are now before Congress, then carefully study the whole, and they will get a view of what the result would be if they became laws. By this too, those who favor these measures can see what they ask when they petition for the passage of such bills.

In the United States Senate March 3, Senator Spooner, of Wisconsin, very justly remarked that "the tendency of this day is too much to paternalism in government." This is too true. The evil tendency seems to be in the very air. It crops out here and there and everywhere. It cannot be too carefully watched nor too strictly guarded against. Mr. Spooner further said that "no man can sit in Congress without being conscious of the fact that very often petitions come here for legislation on topics which are not justly the subject of legislation." Sunday legislation is a sample of this, therefore let the petitions be rolled up by the thousands of names against such legislation.

In a Sunday-law meeting in this city, Tuesday evening, March 11, Rev. R. S. MacArthur, pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, said, as to the keeping of the Sabbath, that if he were in a Mohammedan country he could observe Friday; if in a country where Seventh-day Baptists predominated he could observe Saturday, though he would prefer Sunday; and that in this country, as Sunday is the day observed, people ought not to object when required to observe it. Yet he insisted that the Sabbath is of divine and everlasting obligation.

The same day, in the City Court, a Chinaman, about to be sworn as a witness, when asked what form of oath he would consider most binding, replied:-

Here in America I believe in the Bible, but in China I would believe in idols and my ancestors.

Dr. MacArthur's views of moral obligation match quite well with those of that Chinaman.

The attempt to shut all places on Sunday except those which are run in the interests of religion and the Church, has led an enterprising proprietor in Boston to label his dime museum on Sunday as follows:-

Scientific Church. Grand concert and lecture on old maids and prize-fighters. Collection. 10 cents.

The genuine churches ought to be ashamed of such company as that. It may be replied that they are ashamed of it. Hardly; if they were ashamed of such company they would be ashamed to create it, as they do by the laws which they demand shall be enacted and enforced. So long as they are not ashamed to create such company, it cannot be said that they are ashamed of it after they have created it.

The Gospel in All Lands for March is one of the best numbers of that month which has ever been issued. Mexico is the subject of the "Monthly Missionary Concert," which is especially interesting and cannot fail to increase the interest now felt in this country in Christian missions in that republic. "The Jesuit Campaign and Our Danger," by Charles J. Little, LL.D., should be read by everybody, and the warning which it contains should be heeded. The author truthfully remarks that "the real danger lies not so much in the Jesuitism of Catholicism as in the Jesuitism of Protestantism," by which he means the adoption by Protestants of Jesuitical practices, traditions, and methods.

March 27, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

It is not the Roman Catholics alone who are complaining of the religious history that is taught in the public schools. The Presbyterians in Tennessee are at it too. They have petitioned the Legislature protesting against the introduction into the schools of the State, of a State history written by the Hon. James Phelan. They assert that in his chapter on "Churches" he has sadly "misrepresented the Presbyterian Church, and the reasons for the origin of the Cumberland Presbyterians," and that moreover, he shows too strong Methodist proclivities. We hope so.

Upon the subject of progress in the Washington Legislature, the *Spokane Falls Review* of February 20, 1890, says:-

"One would quite naturally imagine, judging from the stew that some people have worked themselves into, over the matter of prayers in the Legislature, that one element within that august body would consider life a burden, a dreary desert unrelieved by a single oasis, unless for a few moments of each legislative day they were insured the pleasing privilege of sitting within the sound of the soothing voice of a 'court chaplain.'

"The fact that a man is oppose prayers in the Legislature does not signify that he is a foe to Christianity. It seems to the *Review* that he might be a prominent member of a church and still consistently object to religious services being blended with law-making, precisely as he might frown upon any attempt to notify a preacher to appear with his Bible and prayer-book on the occasion of a gathering of citizens for the purpose of working a county road!

"If Christianity cannot stand without a State prop it is not the religion we take it to be. As a matter of fact, every effort to give it State support has had a reactionary effect that wrought more injury than benefit."

"A Movement to Unite Church and State" *American Sentinel* 5, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

In the SENTINEL of January 16, there appeared the text of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, "respecting establishments of religion and free public schools."

The resolution calls for the instruction of children in the "fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity." Now what are the fundamental principles of Christianity? It is self-evident that Christianity pertains to Christ, and that nothing can be taught in regard to Christianity without teaching about Christ. Where do we learn about Christ? and what shall we teach about him?-We learn of Christ in the Bible, and nowhere else. All we know of Christ is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and therefore that which is taught of Christ, in teaching the fundamental principles of Christianity, must be what the Bible reveals concerning him. So the very first thing in teaching Christianity is the consideration of who Christ is. And what about him? What does he do for us? What is the nature of his work? The simple answer to these points, according to the Bible, would be that Christ is the Son of God; the divine word who was in the

beginning with God, by whom all things were created; who was made flesh and dwelt among men; who died and rose again to redeem men and to save them from sin. And this brings up the fact that men have sinned against God; they have broken his law. And so, to teach the fundamental principles of Christianity is to teach the law of God, which points out sin, and to teach Christ as the Saviour from sin; to teach his power and majesty as the one who is able to save from sin; in short, the fundamental principles of Christianity is all there is of it. You cannot teach anything

100

about Christianity without teaching these very things. For Christianity may be summed up in a word as the way of salvation from sin, through Christ.

Suppose now the State enters upon the work of giving this instruction to all children within its borders. What is it doing?-It is doing the very work for which the Church of Christ exists. Christ instituted a church here upon earth that it might be the light of the world, that it might spread abroad in the earth a knowledge of him and of his truth. This is all the church is for. Now when we have the entire Government doing this work in every school district, we have simply the State organizing itself into a universal church. That would be a State Church, a union of Church and State. Nothing less than this can be made of it.

Again, the bill says "the fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity." By that is meant those principles which are not peculiar to any sect, but which all denominations can unite upon. Please consider the fundamental principles of Christianity, as we have referred to them, and see upon which one all denominations are agreed. Christianity means the doctrine of Christ. Who is Christ? Some say he is the divine Son of God, and others deny this. Some say that his work was vicarious, others that he simply lived and died as an example. There has been disagreement upon the very first principles of Christianity ever since the Church existed. So that if the public schools are to teach the principles of Christianity, they must teach principles that are held by some denominations and disbelieved by others.

In his book, "Romanism versus the Public-School System," page 170, Dr. Daniel Dorchester says:-

It is plain that in all classes are to use the public school, there must be no specific religious instruction. It cannot be imparted consistently with the American system of government; if religious instruction is given, it will be almost certain to savor of some particular sect.

The same thing is put more forcibly by the Honorable Stanley Matthews, in a speech in reference to the Bible in the schools of Cincinnati. Said he:-

The gentlemen on the other side say they limit the religious instruction demanded to what they call a "broad Christianity." I have already once or twice adverted to the term. I do not know that I understand it. If I do, it is a "broad" humbug. The Christian religion is not a vain and unmeaning generality. It is a definite and positive thing. It means something, or it means nothing. In my view it is a supernatural scheme of redemption—a revelation from God of his gracious purpose and plan of salvation to a race "dead in trespasses and sins," through the mediation and atonement of Jesus Christ, who, being God from eternity,

became incarnate, and by his death upon the cross became a sacrifice for sin, made expiation for it, and, having risen from the grave, ascended into heaven, and there sitteth on the right hand of the Father to make intercession for his people. The whole character and value of such a religion consists altogether in being, as it claims to be, a supernatural plan of salvation from sin. Otherwise it is irremedial. Strike out from the Bible the parts which disclose, reveal, and teach that scheme, and the rest is insignificant. And any instruction or education in religion which does not teach the facts which constitute that scheme, and which cannot be stated even, except as conveying dogma, is no instruction in the Christian religion whatever.

This is the truth clearly and forcibly stated. If the principles of Christianity are to be taught at all, the whole must be taught. Christianity is a unit, and the whole of it is contained in the fundamental principles. If the State is going into the business of teaching this, then we ask, How will the work of the school-teacher differ from that of the Sunday-school teacher and the minister of the gospel? And the only answer is that their work will be a little more comprehensive. They will be doing the work of the minister and the Sunday-school teacher, and, together with that, will be giving instruction in the sciences. So that, as we said before, for the public schools of the United States to teach the fundamental principles of Christianity would be to establish a State Church, to effect a union of Church and State in the most complete manner possible.

We have already shown that non-sectarian instruction in religion cannot be given. Such instruction will necessarily savor of some particular sect, as Dr. Dorchester says. And this, it is admitted, would be to effect a union of Church and State. Thus, in the book before referred to, on page 65, Dr. Dorchester, in referring to an appropriation by the State of New York to certain Catholic schools, says:-

The people thus found themselves taxed for the support of sectarian education, the Roman Catholic faith being taught in the schools thus supported. The State and the Church were then virtually united.

It is plainly evident that whatever way we consider this proposed amendment, it is really an amendment to effect a union of Church and State. We have not in this article touched upon some of the pernicious results that would necessarily grow out of the adoption of the amendment, except as the readers may infer for themselves some of the evils that would result from a Church and State union. In another article we shall show some of the wickedness that would follow its adoption.

E. J. W.

"Notes" *American Sentinel* 5, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

In the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, March 15, the Rev. P. H. Whisner asked for the appointment of a committee of five on Sabbath observance, saying that "there is a great struggle going on between those who wish to see the Christian Sabbath kept sacred and those who wish to

do as they please on that day." Well, if a man is not a Christian, has he not the right to do as he pleases on the Christian Sabbath? Why is it that those who profess to be Christians, persist in the effort to compel those who are not Christians to act as though they were? Such a proceeding is a reproach and only causes reproach to Christianity.

"Lathrop Riots" *American Sentinel* 5, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

The act of those riotous women at Lathrop, Missouri, the *Union Signal* approves as "a temperance crusade with practical features and speedy results." We do not believe in intemperance nor in rioting. Riotous "temperance" is intemperance none the less dangerous than saloon intemperance. These women ought to have been more both womanly and more temperate. They should not have allowed their zeal to get the better of their judgment.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

The Supreme Court of Wisconsin has decided that the reading of the Bible in the public schools is sectarian teaching, and therefore unconstitutional. Judge Bennett's "representative" decision is therefore reversed.

The Blair Educational bill was defeated in the Senate March 20, by a vote of thirty-one to thirty-seven. Senator Blair changed his affirmative vote to no and gave notice of a motion to reconsider.

The article in this paper on the bill was in type and "made up" before the bill was defeated; and it will help more to show how richly the bill deserved the everlasting death which we hope has been dealt to it by this vote.

Our readers will remember that two weeks ago we published a letter from our California correspondent criticising a sermon on Sunday work in one of the California prisons. Referring to this same sermon the San Francisco *Alta* says:-

A good many interior journals are commenting admiringly on the energetic and righteous indignation with which Rev. Dr. F. A. Horton, of Oakland, recently denounced the practice of working the San Quentin convicts on Sunday. Only one fault can be found with Dr. Horton's denunciation. The convicts in San Quentin are not worked on Sunday.

This is indeed a serious fault, but we think that our correspondent showed very plainly that it was not the only fault in that sermon.

We learn from the *Territory Enterprise* that a large and enthusiastic meeting of the citizens of Virginia City, Nevada, was held in the Opera House at that place on the 10th inst., to protest against the pas-sage of the Blair Sunday-rest bill, the Breckinridge Sunday bill, and the proposed Educational amendment to the Constitution of the United States. A part of the resolutions were as follows:-

Resolved, That . . . it is not and never should be within the province of the national Congress, or the Legislature of any State in the Union to prescribe for the free public schools what are and what are not the "fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity."

"*Resolved*, That religion is beyond the purview of human government, and from it is essentially distinct and exempt from its cognizance. That any connection between them is not only injurious to both, but is destructive of personal liberty, freedom of conscience, and the public welfare; and with the patriot soldier, Grant, we affirm that all religious should for all time, be left to the family altar, the church, the private school, supported entirely by private contribution, and that the State and the Church should remain forever separate.

The senators and representatives from that State were requested to oppose the adoption of the Blair and Breckinridge measures. The work of the National Religious Liberty Association was heartily approved.

Dr. Gossler, Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs and Public Instruction of the German Empire, has, it is said, expressed his approval of the views of Dr. Windhorst, the Catholic leader, that the Church, school, and State ought to work together. Radical changes, he declares, are impending in the field of education. In view of the fact that the late elections in Germany have given the Papists a strong hold upon the Government, enabling them to dictate their own terms to the emperor, the world need be surprised at nothing which may happen in Germany in the way of a return to the methods of the middle ages.

Rev. Joseph Cook is quoted by the *Christian Statesman* of Feb. 27, as criticising Edward Bellamy's Nationalism, in his first Boston lecture for 1890, and saying: "It has elements in it that are very Christian; but the Christianity is in the voluntary co-operation, and not in the compulsory Nationalism." Very true Mr. Cook! The principle of voluntary co-operation, and not of national compulsion, is at the root of all Christianity. In that expression, you have stated a truth of universal application, and one which bears just as hard upon the methods and purposes of the National Reform Association, and Sabbath Union, as upon the doctrines of Mr. Bellamy. Why, then, do you affiliate with these advocates of nationalism in religion?

The *Christian Statesman*, of March 6, contains the following: "We regret to note that Sabbath, the 23rd inst., was openly devoted to lobbying among the members of Congress in favor of the rival cities. The amended Fair bill, imperilled by a shameful struggle for political advantage, passed the New York Legislature on Wednesday, the 19th. Until this was done, New York's representatives at Washington could do nothing. The Sabbath was one of the four days left before the vote was to be taken. Chauncy M. Depew, Ex-Senator Warner Miller, Elliott F. Shepard and others, hastened to Washington. We cannot say to what extent the Christian men in this delegation were responsible for the fact, or were implicated in it, but the newspapers of Monday bore evidence that no other day of the four was more diligently employed in pushing the claims of New York, than was the Sabbath. On the evening of that day, a dinner was given by Representative Flower, where the plans for the week were carefully looked over again, and close calculations made, as to the result of the vote."

Already it seems the religious press has begun its censorship, and among those who fall under its displeasure, is the unfortunate president of the Sabbath Union itself. Elliott F. Shepard has been in bad company, and the *Christian Statement* throws the first stone. He has soiled the immaculate dignity of his

office by coming to Washington on the same train with Chauncy Depew and others, who, according to the newspapers, must have talked about the World's Fair on Sunday. A New York Representative gave a dinner too, and these bad men all ate together on Sunday, and planned how to get the World's Fair. If only the Breckinridge Sunday bill had been a law, the *Statesman* might have had legal redress for the "disturbance" of its Sunday rest in Philadelphia, by these New York Sunday breakers in Washington.

A gentleman in Florence, Ontario, sends us a postal card, from which we make the following extract:-

You seem to think that God requires some help from some of his creatures to maintain his kingdom upon earth. I pray that the United States may be so fortunate as to get a civil statute to protect the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath.

We cannot see why the gentleman should imagine that we think that God needs some help "to maintain his kingdom upon earth." That is the position occupied by those who are endeavoring to give him the help of the civil law. The Sabbath is a divine institution, and it belongs to God. If Sunday is the Sabbath, it certainly needs no other law than the law of God to maintain it. God needs no aid from the civil power to maintain the dignity of his government. But the National Reformers are insisting that he does, and that this Government shall give it to him.

The member of Congress who presented the local Sunday bill for the District of Columbia, in the House of Representatives, said, in an address quoted in New York, as quoted in "Sabbath Reform Document" of January 9:-

The State owes it to itself and to its present citizens, and to the generations that are yet to come, to protect this day, on grounds that they protect the grounds that they protect the marital relation.

This member proposes to protect the day, by a law "to prevent persons from being forced to labor on the Sunday." At the next session of Congress, then, we may expect him to introduce a bill "to prevent persons from being forced to violate the marital relation."

April 3, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

At a meeting of the school teachers of Douglas Country, Kansas, lately, there was "an animated debate" upon the following question:-

In the provision made in the Constitution, for the separation of Church and State, does the word Church mean or include Christianity?

This seems to imply that the Constitution which they had in mind makes use of the word Church; but neither the United States Constitution nor the Constitution of Kansas uses the word in any such connection. But whatever the teachers meant it was finally concluded by them that "the word Church does not mean or include Christianity." We should like those teachers to tell us what

Christianity is, or amounts to in this world, without the Church of Christ. There may be a church without Christianity, but it is impossible to have Christianity without a church. Those teachers need to be taught before they discuss such a question again.

The *Christian Nation* wants a "Protestant university" at Washington, and what is more, it wants the Government to build it, or at least contribute liberally toward the enterprise. In its issue of March 19 that paper says:-

Since the Catholics made a successful venture in founding a University at Washington, various projects for a great national university under Protestant auspices have been suggested and discussed. Every one seems ready to admit that the national capital is an ideal strategic point for the location of such an institution, and every one is in favor of it. But it requires something more than good wishes to endow a university, and while Uncle Sam has millions of surplus stored away in his great money vaults, it is not an easy matter to get their doors opened by those who have the power to do so, namely our legislators.

"Straws," it is said, "show which way the wind blows," and this item shows just as plainly the direction which the National Reform mind is taking. It would require only the adoption of the Blair Educational amendment to make a "Protestant university" at Washington, endowed with Uncle Sam's surplus millions a possibility. But desirable as a great university may be at the national capital, we hope never to see a dollar of Government money appropriated either to a Protestant university or to a Catholic university. The revenues of the country are for quite another purpose than that of endowing denominational institutions of learning, whether Protestant or Papal. The Government should know no Protestants and no Catholics, but only citizens.

"Religion and the Church" *American Sentinel* 5, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

When so much is said *pro* and *con* about a union of Church and State, it is fitting that we know exactly what is meant by "the Church." Many people erroneously suppose that the term refers to some particular denomination, as the Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian. But this is not the case. To use the term in that sense would be manifestly unfair. If, in speaking of "the Church," we should refer to some special denomination, we would hereby imply that no other denomination could be a part of "the Church." With the exception of the Catholic, nobody uses the term "the Church" with reference to any particular sect.

In the Bible "the Church" is declared to be the body of Christ. In one place Paul says of Christ that "he is the head of the body, the Church" (Col. 1:18); and again he says that God "hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body" (Eph. 1:22, 23). Baptism is universally recognized as the entrance to the Church, as Paul says, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body," and that this body is Christ, is shown by the words, "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."

"The Church," then, in the strict sense of the word, is composed of those who are "in Christ," who have been converted, "born again," and are consequently "new creatures." From this it is very evident that, strictly speaking, no one religious sect, nor all of them together, can be called "the Church." Everybody is willing to admit that in every denomination there are those who are really members of "the Church," because they are united to Christ; but nobody will claim that all of any denomination are truly Christian.

Since we cannot always distinguish the true professor from the false one, it is evident that the extent of the Church is known only to him who can read the heart; but it is not convenient always to make this fine distinction in our conversation, neither is it possible; and therefore we speak of all who profess the religion of Jesus as members of his Church. Thus we assume, since we cannot decide, that each individual's profession is an honest one.

Now mark this fact: the religion of Jesus, or the profession of that religion, is the distinguishing characteristic of the Church. It is that which makes the Church, and without that there is no Church.

With this matter clearly in mind, we are prepared to decide for ourselves whether or not the Religious Amendment party is in favor of a union of the Church and State. And this decision shall be made from the published statements of that party. In the New York Convention of the National Reform Association, held in 1873, Dr. Jonathan Edwards, of Peoria, Ill., said:-

"It is just possible that the outcry against Church and State may spring rather from hatred to revealed religion than from an intelligent patriotism. But where is the sign, the omen of such Church and State mischief coming upon us? Who will begin and who will finish this union of Church and State? If you think the Roman Catholic can do it in spite of the watchfulness of the Protestant, or that one Protestant sect can do it amid the jealousy of all the other sects; or that all these sects would combine to affect a joint union with the State, you have a notion of human nature and of church nature different from what I have. Church and State in union, then, are forever impossible here, and, were it never so easy, we all repudiate it on principle. There are enduring and ever valid reasons against it. But religion and State is another thing. That is possible. This is a good thing-and that is what we aim to make a feature in our institutions."

Exactly, and right here do we see the omen of a union of Church and State. We do not expect that in this country the Catholic Church will be the State Church, nor that any one of the Protestant sects will be honored by an alliance with the State. Neither do we look for all the sects to combine and sink their individual names and thus form a union with the State. But we do look for a desperate effort to unite Church and State, and we claim that this effort will be made by the so-called National Reform Party. And further, we claim that Dr. Edwards has admitted, even while denying it, that such union is the avowed object of that party. We leave it to the candid reader if the short argument at the beginning of this article, defining "the church," taken in connection with Dr. Edwards's positive declaration, does not prove that a union of Church and State is the grand object sought by the Amendmentists.

"But," says one, "do you not teach that a man should carry his religion into his business? Why then should you object to religion in the State?" We do believe that if a man *has* religion he should manifest it in his business transactions as well as in church; but if he has it not, we would not have him simulate it. So likewise we believe in religion among individuals everywhere, for only individuals can be religious. No man can be religious for another, neither can one man or any number of men make any man religious. And therefore we are not in favor of upholding religion by the laws of the State.

Perhaps it may be made a little plainer that religion in the State is Church and State united. We say that the possession of true religion marks one as a real Christian—a member of the church of Christ. The association together of a body of people professing religion constitutes, outwardly at least, a branch of the church of Christ. And so likewise the profession of religion by the State, constitutes a State church. It is all the union of Church and State that has ever existed. And when such a union shall have been affected, what will be the result? Just this: Religion and patriotism will be identical. No matter how pure some of the principles upheld by the laws may be, they can have no vitalizing, spiritual effect on the hearts of the people, because they will stand on the same level as the law defining who are eligible to office, and regulating the length of the presidential term. In short, the incorporation of religion into the laws of the State, marks the decline of religion in the hearts of the people. And this is what the Religious Amendment Party is pledged to bring about.

Ought not all lovers of pure Christianity to enter a hearty and continued protest against such a proceeding?

E. J. W.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

The day following the defeat of his Educational bill, Senator Blair moved a reconsideration. His motion was promptly tabled. The next day Mr. Blair re-introduced the bill, and it is again on the calendar as a portentous piece of unfinished business for next year.

In a recent article in the *Christian Nation*, Rev. J. M. Foster gives a new version of the fable of the goose which laid the golden egg. He says: "To take the Sabbath for popular temperance meetings is killing the hen which lays the golden egg, as the foolish woman did in the fable story." We presume that he must have read the "fable story" of this remarkable hen and of the foolish woman, in the same book out of which Dr. Stacy obtained his information regarding the "bounding kangaroo," which he described as "springing from his lair" and drawing the life-blood from his victim.

The statement is made in the *Pearl of Days* of March 21, that a man has just been fined twenty dollars in Washington City for violation of the Sunday law. How does this correspond with the statement so confidently made only a few weeks since by the friends of the Breckinridge Sunday bill that the District of Columbia had no Sunday law? As was plainly shown in the SENTINEL recently, the District

has a very rigid Sunday law, and the purpose of the Breckinridge bill is not to supply such a law where none now exists but to get Congress to take the first step in religious legislation.

A conference is called to meet in Dayton, Ohio, May 21, 22. The call is to those "who sincerely desire a real and visible union of all true followers of Christ;" and the object is to express "the growing conviction that the existing divisions into sects and denominations is contrary to the spirit and letter of the Gospel, the primitive order of the Church, and the prayer of Christ himself, and is a great hindrance to the world's conversion." The union here desired can never be effected by conventions, conferences, or comparisons of errors. It can be accomplished only by the genuine influence of the Spirit of Christ calling together those that are his. And when it is done the world will not be converted. "The world's conversion" is a will-o'-the-wisp that deludes most of the churches and distracts them from the real sober work of God, to the mechanism of conventions, legislative enactments, and constitutional amendments. This world will never be converted.

A gentleman wishes space in this paper to prove that Jehovah, the God of the Jews, is not the same Being whom Jesus worshiped. We know that such a proposition cannot be maintained from the Scriptures; and as we recognize no other authority on such questions we cannot consent that our columns shall be used in any such way. The Bible, by which we mean the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, reveals but one God, the Creator of the heavens and the earth, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, and "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." To attempt to make it teach anything else would be worse than useless.

Senator Blair feels considerably put out about the failure of his Educational bill. He blames the Republican party for its defeat, and therefore serves the following notice:-

I place it on record that there is an end of its political supremacy in this country, and there ought to be. I owe no allegiance to a party that lies in its platform to a Nation, and which chooses to go now and henceforth to its doom as a falsifier.

We do not know whether the Republican party is thus responsible or not; but accepting it as true, the defeat of that bill was one of the most meritorious acts that a party ever performed. It is to the honor of every senator who voted against it that he did so vote; and it may be spoken to his honor by his children and his children's children.

Secretary Crafts, of the American Sabbath Union, so-called, is about to start upon another transcontinental lecture tour in the interests of compulsory Sunday observance. The dates are not positively fixed, but are proposed as follows:-

April 6, Annapolis or Frederick, Md.; April 7, Hagerstown or Cumberland, Md.; April 8, Parkersburgh, W. Va.; April 9, Portsmouth, or some other city in southern Ohio; April 10, Evansville, or some other town in southern Indiana; April 11, Cairo, or some city in southern Illinois; April 13-16, Arkansas, (Little Rock, Fort Smith, etc.); April 17, Vinita, Ind. Ter.; April 18, Carthage, Mo., or Parsons, Kan.; April 20, 21, two of the following Kansas cities-Lawrence, Leavenworth, Atchison,

Topeka, Emporia; April 22, Salina, Kan.; April 23, Newton or Winfield, or Arkansas City or Anthony, all in Kan.; April 24, Hutchinson or Great Bend, both in Kan.; April 25, Trinidad or La Junta, both Col.; April 27, Los Vegas, N. M.; April 28, Santa Fe, N. M.; April 29, Albuquerque, N. M.; Los Angeles, Cal. The return from California will be in June, through Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Nebraska, Iowa, the two Dakotas, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and northern Ohio.

We will as soon as possible publish the definite appointments.

The *Houston Post* asks: "When will these good Sabbatharians learn that in attacking the Sunday paper they are barking up the wrong tree; that it is the Monday paper which [it is supposed] collides with the Decalogue?" And the *Galveston News* responds: "Just as soon as they discover that it is the Monday paper which causes people to stay at home and read all day instead of going to Church." This answer is undoubtedly the truth, for it has more than once been publicly stated in Sunday-law meetings and conventions that the greatest evil of the Sunday paper is not the work which it causes to be done upon that day, but the fact that it keeps people away from church and destroys their interest in spiritual things. This may be true, but it does not follow that the State ought to abolish the Sunday paper any more than it should abolish infidel papers and prohibit all men from speaking against the religion of the majority.

April 10, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days* demands the closing of Castle Garden upon Sunday, and gives seven reasons why, in the opinion of the American Sabbath Union, the landing of immigrants should be suspended upon that day. The reasons are of course "civil," as are all the considerations urged by the Union and its friends in behalf of Sunday laws. But notwithstanding the "civil" gloss with which they seek to cover their demands for governmental recognition of Sunday sacredness, the covering is not thick enough to conceal the fact that the real ground of their demand is that the landing of immigrants involves "secular work" upon a religious day. It would seem to the ordinary mind that it would be a work of mercy if not of necessity to release from the crowded steerage the women and children who have been cooped up there for a week or more. But these self-constituted censors of the Government and of everybody else, say, No.

The National Reform Association is making a strong effort now to get Congress to commit itself by legislation the sacredness of Sunday, by the World's Fair bill a provision that will not allow the fair to be open on that day. The Secretary of the Association has interviewed some members of the committee, and other members of the House upon the question, but he gets little satisfaction, and it is to be hoped that whatever efforts they make in this direction may meet with much less satisfactory returns. Sunday is the very day when thousands upon thousands could visit the fair who could not visit it on other days; but that

consideration is of little consequence compared to the immense consequences that would follow to the Nation if Congress is once committed to the guardianship of the sacredness of Sunday. That step once taken would be made the precedent for crowding upon the Government further recognition in the same way, and introducing other religious observances and practices to be enforced by the national power. We hope Congress will show even less favor to this than has been shown to any of the Sunday measures that have yet been brought to its attention.

"Good Words in a Sunday Convention" *American Sentinel* 5, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

In the previous numbers of the SENTINEL we have shown the fallacy of the idea that civil government may enforce any portion of the moral law, and we have also shown the evil consequences which would necessarily result from an attempt to put such a fallacious idea into practice. We are glad to present in this number a corroboration of our views by a minister of the gospel. And we are the more glad because the argument which we shall quote was made in a Sunday convention, in the second annual meeting of the Sabbath Association of Iowa, which was held in Des Moines, November 12 and 13, 1889. Rev. J. K. Fowler, of Cedar Rapids, gave an address on "The Basis of the Civil Sabbath," which was printed in full in the Iowa State Register, of November 13, from which we quote. Speaking of the laws already existing, and of the Sunday laws which the association is seeking to make, he said:-

If these laws are right, why are they right? There needs to be a clearing up on this point. The ideas of many are vague and faulty as to the genius and intent of these Sunday regulations prescribe in the Church and out imagine that they prescribe a precept of the Christian religion; that they are simply a transcript of the fourth commandment to our statute-books. More than that, many ardent defenders of the Sabbath, justify them on that ground. They say, God has enjoined the observance of the Sabbath, and the State should do the same. But God has demanded that we be good stewards of his bounty, and give liberally to him. Is the State therefore to command this? God has commanded that we be given to hospitality. Is the State to see to it that this be accomplished? God has commanded that we honor one another and in honor prefer one another. Shall the State undertake the enforcement of these divine laws? It is time we had done arguing for Sabbath legislation before Congress or other legislative bodies on plea of its divine authority institution and scriptural authority. It is utterly untenable according to the spirit of our charters of government.

In this paragraph the question is fairly stated, and the statement in the closing sentence is correct. After referring to certain judicial decisions on certain laws against crime, the speaker continued as follows:-

The civil law forbids these, not as offenses against God, but as crimes against man. The law has to do with the relations of men to each other, and not with the relations of men to God. To base these Sunday laws thus upon a divine

command, as the civil ground, is to that extent to join Church and State, and to violate the fundamental principles of the State and federal governments.

In the above paragraph we have a just distinction made between sin and crime. Sin is the violation of the moral law. Crime is a violation of human law. We wish the reader to notice the latter part of the paragraph just quoted. In agreement with arguments we have before presented, he shows that for the State to base its law upon divine command, or to attempt to enforce any one of the divine commands, is the union of Church and State. This was wholesome truth to present before a Sunday convention. We wish every Sunday convention could listen to similar talk. Mr. Fowler continued as follows, concerning the idea that the State could enact a Sunday law on the basis of the divine commandment:-

But such a basis of the Sunday law is not only illegal, but it may be even unscriptural. The Bible itself does not warrant us in inscribing upon the civil statute-books whatever we find to be the mind of the Lord. The Bible does give us a divine standard of moral duty, by which we may discriminate between right and wrong. But it also gives a divine model of wise legislation. It shows there are some things reasonable and some unreasonable to under-take by the civil statute, that statutory law is not to be framed always into exact correspondence with the criterion of individual duty. And this scriptural lesson is one of the very first importance for a Christian citizen of a republic like ours to learn.

We wish every citizen of this republic might learn this scriptural lesson. The fact that the great body of the National Reformers desire to have the State attempt to re-enact and enforce the law of God, shows, according to Rev. Mr. Fowler, of Cedar Rapids, that they are very deficient in scriptural knowledge; and in this we agree with him. Again Mr. Fowler said:-

If our zealous, well-meaning, but deluded friends of the Sabbath, desire to defeat the very ends they aim at, they want to push to the front, and press upon the law makers this scriptural command for the basis of Sunday laws, until a furor of public' feeling like that of 1826 again sweeps the country and takes with it every vestige of Sabbath legislation. Many good people, even in these boasted days of religious liberty, fail to understand that the State is not competent to enact divine precepts because they are divine. The law against murder is not on the civil statute-books because it is in the decalogue, but because society could not exist without such a law. The law against stealing is not in the civil code because it was found essential to maintain the rights of property. Government exists to secure to men life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, to maintain a peaceful and orderly, a mutual, helpful condition of society. Hence its laws simply aim at these ends. They are passed because of some supposed public need, because it is believed the general good requires them. We are bound thus in the matter of the Sunday laws to stand outside of the Bible and argue for them on the same line as all the other laws, because the public need and advantage require them. If we cannot indicate them on these grounds, then they can claim and deserve no place on the statute-books.

With this also we heartily agree; only one statement might have been made a little stronger, and that is, that laws passed to secure men life, liberty, and the

pursuit of happiness, are passed on account of some supposed public need. There can be no supposition about it. If there is to be any public at all, it is an actual necessity that life and liberty be preserved. But in all these paragraphs which we have quoted the speaker has shown a clear perception of the limitations of human government, and we would that all could read his argument and see the force of it, and agree with him that, if Sunday laws are made to stand, it must be because the public good requires them. The next and closing paragraph of this speech shows how impossible it is to make it appear that the public good requires a Sunday law, and that the Sunday should be enforced for the same reason that laws are enacted against stealing. Said he:-

That a law-guarded rest-day is one of these agencies will hardly be questioned by any reasonable man. On that day peace of God settles down over Sabbath-keeping land. The din of labor ceases, and the din of strife and merry-making, and a few quiet hours are given in which the most engrossed and toil-burdened soul may at least have the opportunity, if it will, to worship God and learn of truths that bear upon a right life. Remember that the law makes no attempt to enforce religion, or even religious observance, on Sunday. It simply institutes a weekly civil holiday, and surrounds it with safe-guards such as subserve the interests of morality and make as favorable as possible.

In this last paragraph the speaker went against all he had so clearly stated before. His attempt to show that society requires such a law, by stating that on Sunday, if enforced by law, peace settles down over the land, and a few quiet hours are given in which all may have the opportunity to learn of God and truths that bear upon a right life, shows that such laws are at least an attempt to enforce morality. There is not the slightest ground on which a so-called civil Sunday law can be based consistently with justice. If it is said that man needs one day in seven for rest, then we will point to the thousands who are observing the seventh day of the week, and to the scores of thousands who are observing the first day of the week, without any law compelling rest. That is sufficient evidence that no such law is needed. If the law is asked only in order that man may have one day in the week to rest, why is it that many who have strictly and quietly rested on the seventh day have been persecuted for not resting on the first day? They have surely rested one-seventh of the time, and nobody can claim that resting upon the first day of the week will do a man more good than resting upon the seventh. Of course it will be said that the seventh day is not the day that the law recognizes; that the great body of Christians recognize the first day, and therefore the law should demand rest on that day. So then the whole question of the civil Sunday law is given up, and it is admitted that the basis of the law is some supposed superiority of Sunday over other days.

It needs no argument to show that all the physical good that may be gained by

resting on Sunday is gained to an equal extent by resting on Saturday, and as to the good of society we challenge anyone to demonstrate that a society observing the seventh day is not outwardly, to say the least, as good as one which observes the first. But in spite of Mr. Fowler's little defection at the close of his

speech, we think it is a good one, and commend it to the careful perusal of all our readers.

E. J. W.

"A Shaky Foundation" *American Sentinel* 5, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

We are not the only ones who are curious to know how the American Secular Union is going to get a Manual of the purest principles of morals, without inculcating religious doctrines. One of their own number, Mr. Edward S. Stark, of this city, published an article in the *Truth Seeker*, of February 22, in which he said:-

In its invitation to the contest for an Agnostic Manual of Morality, the Secular Union leaves us in the dark as to whether Agnosticism is meant in its narrow sense, as merely rejecting the religious belief, or that it applies also to the scientific field, in the sense of its purity from prejudices and obscurantism. Science, namely, is apt to produce objectionable consequences the same as religion, if it is not purified from superstitions, servility, and the worshiping of spurious authorities. Without such a purification it may bring about very deplorable results, particularly in such a delicate and entangled question as that of morality, which, while losing its transcendental foundation in religion, is bound to look for a basis elsewhere, and may obtain from the science such a shaky one that the whole structure would not be able to stand on it for a moment. . . The principal points at issue are: 1. Shall the manual adopt the unscientific hypothesis of a separate soul, existing person, and, under certain aspects, completely independent of the body? Those who may think that it is a question of psychology and not of morals, and that therefore it can be easily avoided, will soon change their mind about it if they try to write upon ethics. This or that hypothesis will, against their wish, transpire through the wording of every sentence. The author will find himself under the necessity of speaking about some sort of immaterial entity underlying moral actions, their righteousness or viciousness.

These points are well taken. Morals must have a basis. If it is proposed to remove ethics from a religious basis, some other basis must as certainly be supplied; and when any other basis is found, as Mr. Stark says, it will be such a shaky one that the whole structure would not be able to stand on it for a minute. Mr. Stark truly says, the author of such a scheme "will find himself under the necessity of speaking about some sort of material entity underlying moral actions their righteousness or viciousness," and just as soon as the subject of righteousness is touched, the realm of religion is entered. The fact is, as we proved in our article before on this subject, it is an utter impossibility to inculcate morality without at the same time, inculcating religious doctrine. Morality has no basis other than the religious.

As time goes on we become more and more curious to see that Manual.

"Sunday Legislation in Canada" *American Sentinel* 5, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

March 5 "An act to secure the better observance of the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday," was introduced into the Dominion Parliament, and read once. On the following day it passed a second reading, and is in a fair way to become a law. The provisions of this bill are as follows:-

Whoever on the Lord's day, shall either labor, himself, or shall compel his apprentice, servant, or other person under his control or charge, to labor, or perform any other work than the household offices of daily necessity, or other works of necessity or charity, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Whoever on the Lord's day sells, or publicly shows forth or exposes or offers for sale, or purchases, any goods, chattels, or other personal property, or any real estate whatsoever, or does any work or business of his ordinary calling, works of necessity and charity only excepted, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

8. Whoever shall on the Lord's day, be guilty of promoting, directing, or causing horse-racing, foot-racing, cock-fighting, or dog-fighting, or shall engage in any noisy public game whereby the peace and quiet of the Lord's day is disturbed, and manual labor made necessary in preparing for and conducting the same, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

4. Whoever shall on the Lord's day, tittle in any inn, tavern, or house of public entertainment, or shall allow or permit tipping in any such inn, tavern, or house of public entertainment, or shall revel or publicly exhibit himself in a state of intoxication, or shall brawl or use profane language in the public streets or open air, so as to create any riot or disturbance or annoyance to Her Majesty's peaceable subjects, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

5. Whoever shall on the Lord's day, hunt, shoot, or pursue or take or kill any game or any Wild bird or animal, or shall discharge firearms, except in the just defense of person or property, or in the performance of military or police duty, or shall use dogs, net, trap; or other appliance for the above-mentioned purposes, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

6. Whoever shall on the Lord's day, go out fishing, or shall take, kill, or destroy any fish, or use any gun, fishing-rod, net, or other appliance for that purpose, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

7. Whoever shall on the Lord's day, either as proprietor, publisher, or manager, engage in the printing, publication, and delivery of a newspaper, journal, or periodical; and whoever shall, on the Lord's day, engage in. the sale, distribution, or circulation of any newspaper, journal, or periodical published on that day, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Sections 8, 9, 10, and 11 deal with traffic on the canals and railways, which is limited to cases of necessity and carriage of perish-able goods, under restrictions. The clause in regard to Sunday excursions is as follows:-

Excursions on the Lord's day by steamboats plying for hire, or by railway, or part by steamboat and part by railway, and having for their only principal object the carriage of passengers for amusement or pleasure, and to go and return the

same day by the steamboat or railway or any other owned by the steamboat or railway or any other owned by the same person or company, shall not be deemed a lawful conveyance of passengers within the meaning of this act; and the owner or corporation, superintendent, or person by virtue of whose authority and direction such excursion is permitted or order on the Lord's day, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor.

The penalties are defined as follows:-

12. Any person convicted before a justice of the peace of any offense declared in sections 1 to 7 of this act, inclusive, to be a misdemeanor, upon the oath of one or more than one credible witness, or upon view had of the said offense by the justice himself, shall for every offense be fined a sum not exceeding fifty dollars, nor less than one dollar, together with the costs and charges attending the proceedings and conviction, and such prosecution shall be commenced within one month of the commission of such offense and not afterwards; and shall be laid and tried in the county or municipality where the offense was committed.

13. The penalty for any offense committed under sections ten and eleven of the act shall be the imposition of a fine not exceeding four hundred dollars for each offense, to be recovered in any court having jurisdiction in civil cases to that amount, to be recovered by any person suing for the same under this section and for the purpose!

14. All sums of money awarded or imposed as fines or penalties by virtue of this act shall be paid, one moiety to the party charging and prosecuting the offense, and the other moiety to the treasurer of the county or city wherein the offense was committed.

It is further provided that "a conviction under this act shall not be quashed for want of form; nor shall any warrant of commitment be held void by reason of any defect therein." Persons accused of felony may still have the benefit of all doubts and errors, but violators of the Sunday law, should this bill pass, will not be permitted to escape through any error, no matter how glaring.

The bill provides no exemptions for any class except Indians, and for no work except "works of necessity and charity." And no pretense is made that it is a "civil" measure. On the contrary, its author urges its passage because it is demanded by certain religious bodies. Nobody pretends to deny that it is religious legislation, and that it is designed to promote the religious observance of a religious institution. But such a law is no more religious in Canada than are similar measures in this country. And the motive underlying the demand for such legislation is a spirit of intolerance, wherever found.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

We will in our next number give our readers some account of the late National Reform Convention in Washington City.

Romanism is said to be making considerable headway in Japan, being favored by the emperor because of "its important influence on the civilization of the nation over which he rules."

The Rome correspondent of the *Catholic Review* states that South America is soon to have a Plenary Council of all its Catholic prelates. This simply means that Rome, warned by recent events in Brazil, is about to tighten her grip upon the entire continent.

It seems that strict Sunday observance under stress of civil law is not the sum of all virtues, nor even a virtue at all; for in Scotland, the country in which they have the strictest Sunday laws, the most rigidly enforced, illegitimacy is greater than in any other civilized country. This shows that something more than civil law is required to make people moral.

It is announced by Mr. Crafts in the *Christian Statesman* of March 20, that:-

The fight against the mighty evils in this country seems to many of us an unfinished Waterloo. Reinforcements from the religious press must come, or "night."

It is to be hoped that that which comes to this fight of the American Sabbath Union, may be "night," and everlasting night at that.

The *Union Signal* speaks of President Harrison as "the ruler of forty-four States." He is no such thing. He is the servant of the people of forty-four States. The people are the rulers here, and no countenance should ever be given to those people who, imbued with foreign ideas, want to teach that those are rulers, who are only chosen to execute the will of the people. This is sound American doctrine.

The National Reform position is that Christ is the ruler of nations and that the moral law is the law of nations. But as nations are ruled by men, it follows that men must exercise authority in the name of Christ and interpret and administer the divine law. And as that law is spiritual, it follows that of necessity men must rule in spiritual things. And that is putting men in the place of God, which is the essential principle of the Papacy. Hence the principle of National Reform is identical with that of the Papacy.

An attorney-at-law in Grand Rapids, Michigan, says:-

"Some friend of mine is sending me the SENTINEL, and I wish to thank him for it. You are laboring in the right direction, for it is all nonsense, this trying to compel people to observe Sunday as a rest-day. Have not we, as a Nation, outgrown such nonsense? Do not the laboring people know when they are tired and need rest, without the appointment of the Nation as a guardian to tell them when they should rest?"

In the Methodist ministers' meeting in Chicago, on the 31st ult., there was a lively discussion on the question of "The Attitude of Rome toward Our System of Education." Rev. D. R. Shepard, professor of political economy in the Northwestern University, attacked the parochial-school system and said that it appeared to be the design of the Catholic Church to incorporate into the very systems of the children its dogmas and beliefs. He denounced the Romish system of education as "mediÉval, inadequate, and weak." He thought, however,

that there was little danger from the fact that the American Catholics are not in hearty sympathy with their own system.

Rev. Mr. Foster took a different view of the matter and asked: "Does the gentleman mean to say that there is no danger when we see \$12,000,000 poured into the coffers of the Roman hierarchy in the city of New York alone, to carry on the work and the policy of that church?" He thought the danger a grave one.

Dr. W. C. Bennett, professor of the Methodist Institute at Evanston, Indiana, defended the Catholic Church and declared that it did not differ so much from the Methodist Church. He said:-

The Catholic Church has been criticised for having a supreme head, but the Methodist Church and every other church which is not bound to disintegrate, must have a supreme authority, as well as the Catholic Church, and it is nonsense to deny it. The only difference between our church and the Catholic Church on that head is, that the Catholic clergy keep their pledges of obedience to their supreme head better than ours do. There are some things, brethren, from which we might derive useful lessons, in the Catholic Church.

And this is the attitude of very many Protestants. They are learning of Rome. There is danger in Romanism in this country, but it is more in the fact that Protestants are adopting Romish methods than in the aggressions of the Roman Catholic Church itself. Rome has ever appealed to the civil power for the help which she should have sought from the great Head of the Church, and the tide is setting very strongly in the same direction among American Protestants.

The Pennsylvania *Miners' Journal* has the following excellent item:-

The man who believes in the thorough separation of Church and State, cannot approve of reading the Bible in the public schools. They are essentially a part of the State institution. The Bible is even more a part of our religious structure. These facts render the two incompatible under the spirit of our Constitution, and make it possible for even our most sincere Christians to consider all religious exercises in school, out of place. Religion should be taught in the Church and at home, not in the schools. Our Constitution guarantees freedom of religious faith to all, and we hope the day will never come when that guarantee is nullified even in the slightest degree.

It is not alone the fact that the giving of religious instruction by the State is incompatible with our institutions by that should cause Christians to consider it "out of place." Every Christian should oppose even the slightest State interference in things religious because such interference is an infringement of the rights of conscience. The moment we concede the right of the State to require the reading of the Scriptures in the public schools, we admit its right to introduce any other religious instruction which the majority may wish to impose upon the minority.

The Better Day is a new temperance paper published by Funk & Wagnalls, of this city. In introducing to the public this new journal its publishers say:-

We offer you something new in the history of the world. Temperance papers of every style are happily numerous, and many of the highest ability. But never

yet has one appeared devoted directly to the great work of temperance education, which more than all else holds the future.

The temperance cause has reached a point where systematic study of its vast and rich literature is imperatively demanded. We propose a course of study which shall do for temperance what the Chautauqua course has done for literature and science. This plan is not partisan nor political, but simply an attempt to form an intelligent, public sentiment on the subject, on the importance of which all friends of temperance are absolutely agreed.

We are most happy that a paper of this kind has been started. Such a publication is much needed, and if properly conducted ought to command a good support. We wish *The Better Day* success in its educational temperance work. And we trust that it will succeed in avoiding the fate of all other so-called temperance papers, namely, that of becoming the mere adjunct of a political party, or the organ of an association or society.

April 17, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 16.

E. J. Waggoner

The organ of the American Sabbath Union say:-

Judge Hutchins, acting police magistrate, Cleveland, Ohio, recently discharged Barber Charles Schuler, one of the Weddell House men arrested in January for violating the State law against common labor on Sunday, on the ground that Sunday shaving is a work of necessity. It is expected that all the hotel barber shops, and most of the others whose proprietors do not favor Sunday closing, will be thrown open Sunday, as the barbers are satisfied that no convictions can follow their arrest for violating either the State or city ordinance upon the subject.

This is a little more liberal than the decisions of some of the southern courts. In Tennessee and several other southern States quiet, inoffensive men have been fined and imprisoned for no other offense than that of working upon Sunday for the support of their families, and that after having conscientiously kept the seventh day according to the strict letter of the divine law. If shaving is a work of necessity in Ohio, certainly the cutting of wood ought to be a work of necessity in Georgia, and plowing corn ought not to be a punishable offense in Tennessee. The whole thing goes to show the injustice of treating as a crime on Sunday that which would be considered perfectly proper and even commendable upon any other day.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 16.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Colorado Graphic* remarks that "fortunately for the dignity, intelligence, and discretion of Denver's Christian clerical force, only a minority has taken active part in the Sunday-legislation movement."

The report is being circulated to some extent that some of the judges on the Supreme Bench of Wisconsin are Roman Catholics, and hence the late decision on the question of the Bible in the schools. We have it upon good authority, and direct, that not one of the members of that court is a Roman Catholic. The decision would be just and right, however, even if every one of them were a Roman Catholic.

The report of the Treasurer of the National Reform Association, at its recent annual meeting, shows that the receipts of the society for the past year were \$7,179.13. Of this amount \$5,374.61 had been expended, mostly in salaries to District Secretaries. The work of the society is not however represented by this sum, for a good deal has been accomplished by special secretaries who work without remuneration. Secretary Weir reported that he had preached one hundred sermons on National Reform topics to audiences aggregating twenty-one thousand persons.

The following paragraph, in a private letter from Baltimore, Maryland, is evidence of the rapid tendency toward strict formality in Sunday observance, and the readiness of municipal authorities to undertake its enforcement by city ordinances:-

The ringing of milkmen's bells, and street-car bells has not been stopped in the city of Baltimore, on Sunday, as yet. But there is a city ordinance pending (introduced at the last sitting of the city council) which does call for the bells on horses attached to street-cars, to be removed on Sunday. Also, that milkmen's bells are not to be rung on Sunday. This ordinance has had its first reading, and been referred to a committee.

The city Comptroller furnishes this information, and gives it as his opinion, that the ordinance will pass, in due time. He also informed me, that this was in accordance with the best wishes of the Protestant ministers and their congregations of the city of Baltimore. By request of the ministers of the city in the form of a petition to street-car managers, nearly all the street-car bells have been left off the horses on Sunday, voluntarily, but not by city ordinances, as yet.

It seems, at first thought, peculiarly inapt, that Baltimore, the earliest home of knightly aristocracy, should be the first, in this millennial dawn of the new era of municipal religion, to undertake the enforcement of a Puritan Sunday. That such should be the case, is food for thought.

Had the "wise man" lived in this age, he might have added to the four things which were too wonderful for him, a fifth,-"the way of a politician with the Church."

Rev. R. M. Somerville, of New York, an ardent National Reformer, likens Christ when excluded from civil government to a captain at sea, having a vessel and a crew, but being prohibited from entering any harbor. He does not explain wherein the likeness consists, but as a vessel in such a condition would be liable to be wrecked, Mr. Somerville must regard the Lord as in imminent danger of losing his craft (the Church) because civil governments deny him the aid of their puny strength. This is only to say that without the aid of the civil power, Christ's mission must fail.

In a speech in Congress a few days since, Representative Dorsey, of Nebraska, said that the only opposition to the admission of Idaho was on the part of Mormons, who objected to the provision in the Constitution disfranchising them. This is not strictly correct. The National Reformers also object to the admission of Idaho, but for a different reason, namely: because the Constitution under which the State is seeking admission forbids religious instruction in the schools. The hope was expressed in the Washington convention that Congress would not admit Idaho with such a constitutional provision.

The *Weekly Witness*, a religious paper of this city, remarks that

As a meddler in politics the Church of Rome is always and everywhere an unmitigated curse; just as any Protestant church would be which should insist on being reckoned with, as a church, in all matters of administration, and especially in the dispensing of public moneys. We are very decidedly opposed to the religious teachings of the Church of Rome, but in so far as it limits its teaching and claims to matters of religion we are prepared to treat it with respect as an institution which has as good a right to exist as any Protestant Church. When it steps out of its proper sphere, however, to make money out of politics, then it is time for Protestants of all denominations and of all parties to unite in opposition to it. If any Protestant Church should take a similar position it should meet with the same condemnation. But no Protestant Church would dare to do so, or could obtain the support of its own members if it did. The Roman Catholic Church is different from all others in this country, except the Mormon Church, in that it is essentially a political institution; always has been so and always must be, because it claims absolute and universal sovereignty as the authorized representative of Christ the true King and Ruler of the world.

This criticism is certainly just, as applied to the Romish Church. Any political church is a curse whether it be Rome everywhere or the Mormon Church in Utah. And yet this is just the position National Reformers and are determined that the Protestant Church as a whole shall assume. They demand that the several Protestant bodies shall make common cause and insist on being reckoned with as churches in all matters of administration. If the Protestant churches shall do this, as they seem inclined to do, will they not then be just as much of a curse as the Papal Church, and for the very same reason? The question admits of but one answer. Does it not follow that the real friends of Protestantism are those who desire that the Protestant churches shall have nothing to do with politics"?

The true spirit of National Reform, though carefully concealed in the Washington Convention by most of the speakers, cropped out in President Sylvester S. Scovel's address on the "Limitations of Liberty." Referring to our foreign population he said that if necessary they should "be educated with the bludgeon, and if the offense was repeated, with the blunderbuss." It was formerly considered necessary to kill people in order to save them, but that method of preaching the gospel has not been much in vogue for some time. It is evident however that the National Reformers hope to be able to revive it.

The Associated Press of Reforms is the name of a new quarterly publication which the "Reform Syndicate" of this city has just launched upon the treacherous sea of polemic journalism. The whilom field secretary of the American Sabbath

Union is the manager of the syndicate, and as the new paper is a "special publication for publishers and editors of periodicals," and as the matter which it contains is secured by copyright, and as the copyright articles are to be released for re-publication for twelve dollars per year, or furnished in plates at very reasonable rates, it seems that the principle object of the syndicate is to get their "reform" matter into country papers which are printed largely from plates, Mr. Crafts is, it must be admitted, fertile in expedients.

April 24, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

The decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court against the Bible in the public schools is called a victory for the Catholics. Strictly speaking this is not true. It is a victory for everybody who loves justice and the rights of men. Yet in a certain sense it is a victory for the Catholics, that is, in the sense that they are the ones who had the courage to fight the battle by which the victory was won. In this sense it is a victory for the Catholics. It is an honorable one too and they are justly entitled to the credit of it. But it is a shame to the Protestantism of Wisconsin, that the fighting of such a battle and the winning of such a victory had to be by Roman Catholics.

The Emperor of Germany, when getting up his labor conference, appointed a Roman Catholic Bishop as one of the German delegates and at the same time announced to the Pope that he relied upon the support of the Catholic clergy in settling the questions involved, and the Pope, in reply said that this question "would be best solved by the application of Sunday rest and religious education." Thus, as the Sunday-rest movement spreads, the Pope comes more and more into prominence in the matter; and when that movement becomes universal, as these international efforts will make it, the Pope will be, in that matter, again the recognized universal head. This is very becoming. Universal Sunday laws before were synonymous with the Papal headship of the world, and when they become universal again, the same thing will be again. The two belong together.

"A Fair Proposition" *American Sentinel* 5, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

To those people who are making such strenuous efforts to have a general religion "a broad Christianity," adopted by the United States Government, we have a proposition to make, which, if accepted and carried out, will demonstrate the virtue of their professions.

There is just now considerable talk about the establishing of a National University. The Roman Catholics have established a university at the national capital. Now it would do no good, even if it could be accomplished, for each one of the different Protestant denominations to establish a university also at Washington; therefore, what we propose is this: Let all the Protestant denominations, those broad Christians, those who think that religion and

sectarianism are distinct and separate things,-let these unite in that blessed harmony which they advocate, and go to Cardinal Gibbons, and his associate authorities in this country, and, by a general consensus of opinion, reach a harmonious view of God and religion and morals. Then by generous contributions let them secure proportionate shares in the property of the university al-ready established; and make it indeed a national one, in which they can set before the Nation a living actual illustration of that all-absorbing charity and unity in Christian graces, principles, and methods, which they profess.

This is a fair proposition. The way is open for them to show that their professions are genuine; that their views of the relations between State and religion are sound, and that it is the easy task which they profess, to make it a success.

Or, if it be too great a task for Protestants thus to unite with Roman Catholics at the very first effort, then we submit this proposition-that they establish for themselves: a national Protestant university at Washington city. Let them decide just what principles shall be taught there, as the principles of genuine Christianity. Let them agree upon the true basis of morals; let them choose a board, settle the faculty, and illustrate upon a national plane the virtues of that broad Christianity, that unsectarian religion, and that standard of general morality which they profess and advocate, and which they claim it would be so easy for the State to adopt and enforce. If they will do this to their own satisfaction, and to the satisfaction of the people of the Nation, then their movement to have the State do likewise would have so much, at least, in its favor, that they could point to the actual facts in the case, and show that agreement in these things were possible. But until some such effort as this shall have been made, some attempt at least to do or show that that can be done, which they demand the State shall do, their professions and their pretensions that such a thing can be done will lack that force by which alone arguments can ever be made to carry conviction. Will they try it?

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

It is a standing reproach to the sober sense of the American people that there have been found amongst them 330,000 persons who would buy Edward Bellamy's nonsensical book "Looking Backward."

Says the *Union Signal*: "Time was when a large proportion of the Christian world would have looked upon any marked observance of Lent as a relic of Popery, and while we gazed with interest upon Easter ceremonies, we nevertheless regarded them as spectacular and unnecessary." Yes, that is so. It would be a good thing if that time would come again and continue indefinitely.

Miss Willard announces that "there is to be a party that will combine the farmer and the wage earner, that will make its force felt in the next campaign, and the Prohibition Party will form the nucleus. When that time comes, we will side with it and will take the consequences." If she means indeed "the

consequences," then if that party wins, we pity her. It would be worse consequences than we should ever wish to see befall a human being.

Of the Nationalistic theories set forth by Edward Bellamy the *Voice* says: "The millennium lies somewhere in the direction this movement is heading." As to whereabouts in this direction the millennium probably lies, the *Voice* allows that "it may be ten thousand years distant." That is a very safe estimate. It is certainly not any nearer than that, and how much further off it is does not materially concern either the present or the rising generation.

The Presbyterian Synod of New York has, for several years, been working in behalf of religion in the public schools. A committee is appointed each year to have charge of the matter. This year again this committee on religion and public education has been appointed to confer with other denominations and seek their co-operation in the effort to introduce in the public schools some positive religious teaching as an essential part of the curriculum. Amongst the members appointed to confer with the several conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, we find the name of Dr. Howard Crosby. That is a very appropriate appointment. We hope all the others are of the same kind, because Dr. Crosby is openly and decidedly opposed to any religious instruction what-ever in the public schools. We are not acquainted with the position of any of the other persons named, but we hope they are all of the same mould of thought and opinion on this subject as is Dr. Crosby.

If the Sunday newspaper is such an outrageously wicked, such an all-polluting thing, and if it is such a heinous sin to read it, it is a query with us how in the world all the Sunday-law preachers know so much about it? Although they warn everybody against it under penalty of the imputation of a great sin, yet they them-selves seem to know all about it; they can tell exactly how many columns of gossip, how much scandal, etc., different editions of the Sunday paper contain. How can these things be?

A statement that is quite often made, and which seems to be considered of much weight, by the workers for religious legislation is that "your rights end where mine begin." This statement has not a particle of truth in it. It is simply another form of expressing their arrogant assumption of all rights. For if your rights end where mine begin, then it is for me to decide where mine do begin, and wherever that may be, there your rights must end. Don't you see? In other words, all the rights that you have are just such as I choose to allow. The truth of the matter is that rights are perfectly equal. Your rights begin where mine begin; and end only where mine end.

That Wisconsin decision has caused wide-spread discussion, but none too wide. It is interesting to see the course that the discussion takes. The great majority of the secular papers indorse it. In fact, we have found but one that does not indorse it, and that is the *Inter-Ocean*. On the other hand, the religious papers and preachers, especially the Methodist, strongly disapprove. The New York *Independent* unqualifiedly indorses it. The *Christian Advocate* is the representative journal of all Methodism in the United States. It decidedly disapproves of the decision. It says:-

It seems very odd that the Bible should be gravely pronounced a sectarian book by the chief tribunal of one of the States of this eminently Christian country and so does the argument by which the court sustains that pronouncement.

This position of the Protestant preachers and religious papers only goes further to show what the wide-spread demand for religious legislation had already made manifest, that in what passes for Protestantism, there is no disposition to recognize any such principle as equality of rights before men. And just as surely as that Protestantism should ever secure control of the civil power, it would be as cruel and unrelenting as ever a religious despotism was. That which professes to-day to be representative Protestantism has forgotten both what Protestantism is and what Christianity is.

The *Union Signal* of April 3, announces Senator Blair's re-introduction of his educational bill, and says:-

Now let every white ribboner bestir herself writing letters on behalf of our local unions to the Senators of the respective States, urging the adoption of this bill, and let us set at work, and in this difficult emergency, having done all, stand. Mrs. Mary H. Hunt is in Washington to forward the new movement, and will wisely direct our forces as heretofore Mrs. Bittenbender will also work unceasingly for the measure.

Yes, Senator Blair's theory of government and the purposes of his legislation are directly in the line of things of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. As we have shown in the *SENTINEL*, the theory of government contemplated in that legislation is directly the reverse of that of the United States Government, and it is directly opposed to Christian principles, and, in short, aims at the subversion of Christianity itself.

There is opposition also in Canada against the Dominion Sunday Law that is proposed for enactment. A correspondent of the *Moncton Times* says:-

A reaction has set in against Charlton's Sabbath observance bill and petitions against its passage headed, "A Plea for Religious Liberty," and praying the Commons not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of Sabbath or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution, or to favor the adoption of any legislation to conflict with the rights of conscience, were presented to-day from Westmoreland, Scots' Bay, Tiverton, Digby, French Village, Halifax, Dartmouth, Indian Harbor, Moncton and Truro.

That is right. Let the good work go on. Call the attention of legislators to the essential evil that belongs with such legislation. Our friends in Canada have not the constitutional basis for their opposition that we have in this country, but they have all the basis of inalienable civil and religious rights that we have in this country, or that people have anywhere else, and that is the strongest basis that any argument can have. This proposed legislation gives to the friends of liberty of conscience an excellent opportunity to make known to the people of Canada what are the sound principles of Christianity upon the separation between religion and the State. We hope they will employ the opportunity for all that it is worth.

May 1, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

It is said that the Catholics of Manitoba have a grievance, the Legislature of that Province having passed an act forbidding the Catholics to have separate schools, and requiring all classes to patronize the national secular schools. This is certainly an infringement of religious liberty. People of any religion, or no religion, certainly have a right to educate their children in their own faith, and in their own schools, if they see fit to do so. It seems clear that the State should make it possible for all children to obtain an education, the same as it provides means whereby they may, if other sources fail, obtain food and clothing, but it would be just as consistent for the State to insist that all children shall eat certain things and be clothed in a certain way, as to insist that they shall be educated in a certain way. The Catholic opposition to public schools is certainly unwise and wrong, but Protestants should not go to the other extreme and deprive Catholics of their right to maintain their own schools. Catholics have rights as citizens, as well as Protestants.

In the *Christian Nation*, of March 26, Rev. John A. Dodds discusses the Wisconsin Supreme Court decision on the Bible in the schools. He declares that according to this decision "Wisconsin is well on the way toward the religion and morality of the Hottentots and of the French revolutionists;" and that, "if the Supreme Court of Wisconsin has interpreted the Constitution aright in this respect, it is certainly a covenant with death and an agreement with hell." He says, "It is un-American, unchristian, and in the light of our past history, it is a falsehood." He announces that the "condition of things in that State will bring the wrath of Almighty God on the whole Nation if it be allowed to continue," and quotes "Shall not my soul be avenged on such a Nation as this?" He calls it "The surrender of the Inagua charta of our American Protestant Christian liberty." He supports his statement by the following piece of logic:-

Bible morality and Bible religion is the parentage of every State in the Union, therefore the command to honor thy father and thy mother is binding on all the States individually and unitedly. "He that wasteth his father and chaseth away his mother, is a son that bringeth reproach." Prov. 19:26. Reproach in this case attaches to all the members of the family.

And upon this he calls loudly for the removal of this reproach, by having the Constitution of the United States "so amended as to give an undeniable legal basis" to Christianity, or rather to what the theological instructors shall declare is Christianity.

"Special" *American Sentinel* 5, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

To all to whom the SENTINEL comes we wish to say this word. The SENTINEL is invariably discontinued at the expiration of the time for which it is paid, unless it be requested to be continued. Many of the friends of the

SENTINEL send copies to their friends. Sometimes those to whom it is sent do not want it, and write to us to discontinue it; but we are helpless in the matter for we do not send it. Then when those persons find it is not stopped they send another order sharply reproving us for not stopping their paper; whereas we not only do not send it but we do not know who does send it. Sometimes friends of the SENTINEL order from this office copies sent to individuals. In such cases when we receive word to stop sending it we can comply, and we invariably do comply promptly. No paper is ever sent to any person from this office after that person has notified us that he does not want the paper.

Therefore, dear friends, if the SENTINEL continues to come to you after you have asked us to stop sending it, you may know that we do not send it, do not know who does, and therefore cannot stop it, and that it is useless to write to us a second time on the subject.

Also it is well to bear in mind that, although the SENTINEL may come to you without your having subscribed for it, you will never be asked to pay anything for it. We do not send any SENTINELS anywhere except those which are paid for. If you have not subscribed and yet receive the paper, you will understand that somebody is either sending it to you himself, or has sent money to us to pay for sending it to you.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

A New Orleans paper states that the Mayor of that city regards the Louisiana Sunday law as objectionable, and a hardship upon poor people. He favors its strict enforcement, however, as the best means for securing its repeal.

China ought to be the ideal National Reform country. A Chinese mandarin can order a man's head to be cut off at any moment. But within three months he must forward to the Emperor an affidavit from two persons declaring that the execution *was in the interest of religion and morals*. He has no difficulty in getting such affidavits, as he can cut off the heads of any who refuse to make them.

Rev. Dr. Howard Crosby has recently published a volume of lectures on the book of Revelation, in which he says that the spiritual ruin noticeable in so many countries where Christianity was once the prevailing creed, or where a nominal adherence to it is still the rule of the majority, is due to the admission of the world into the Church-"of joining the Church to the State; of forming alliances and friendships with the world; of compromising and thus letting down the standard of holiness and separation between Christ and Belial."

By means of a "decoy" letter the *Voice* obtained an interview with the manager of last year's anti-Prohibition campaign in Pennsylvania; and in the interview it got a great host of matter that with great delight it published to the world. In the interview certain prominent and responsible men of Philadelphia were named, and certain things were said about them; but these men unanimously declare the statements to be without a particle of foundation in fact. Now the question presents itself, Who was it that was decoyed, the *Voice* or the other man? The *Voice* confessedly worked a deceitful trick to obtain information.

How does the *Voice* know but what the other party did the same in giving the information? We confess that on reading the *Voice's* account, there was a certain air of open innocence amounting almost to verdancy, which is very seldom found amongst men of such political experience as the gentleman who was interviewed. It is certain that names were given, and statements were made, with such an air of recklessness as to cast doubt upon the whole thing by reason of its very extravagance.

Taking the whole case as it stands, so far, we cannot help wondering whether the *Voice's* decoy did not partake somewhat of the character of a boomerang. And the question is, Who was it that was decoyed?

In an article entitled, "Thoughts on Conscience," in *Word and Work*, Rev. E. Bailey says:-

A conscience illuminated and instructed by the word of God is free from condemnation, and is strong to bear the reproaches of men and the accusations of Satan. . . .

Such a conscience is above the laws of men, and is not amenable to earthly tribunals. No civil power can have any control over the conscience. . . In secular things we are to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, but in all religious things we are left to God and our conscience.

This is true, and it does not alter the case a particle to call civil that which is religious.

The best method of opposing error is by the advocacy of truth.

The *Kansas Worker*, the organ of the Kansas Tract Society, says "A true advocate of temperance will want the saloons closed every day in the week, and a law to that end can be enforced as well as a law that only closes them on Sunday. Such a law, instead of being in the interest of *temperance*, is in the interest of *Sunday*." The *Worker* tells the truth, as all religious papers should. Of course all papers, and all persons, too, ought to tell the truth; and we wish they would.

The first item in the editorial columns of the *Christian Statesman* tells us that "Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts has resigned his position as Publishing Secretary of the American Sabbath Union, which he found would confine him to New York and vicinity, in order to be free to make a transcontinental trip, in the interest of Sabbath reform. . . . In the autumn, he expects to return to the pastorate."

Thus we are quietly told that the Sunday Union, as represented in the person of Mr. Crafts, expects to die in the autumn. Is this latest off-shoot of the National Reform Association to be uprooted in its early youth? Possibly the Sunday Union has become irrevocably wedded to the civil Sabbath, and the parent organization has decided that it is wiser to await the slower but surer appeal to religious prejudice. At the late convention in Washington, it was decided to eliminate the term "civil" Sabbath from the National Reform vocabulary. Perhaps, as its occupation is gone, the organization which was the exponent of the idea contained in that expression, is to go with it.

Bound volumes of the *Pacific Health Journal* for 1888 and 1889, Oakland, California, have found their way to our table and are most welcome visitors. These volumes are neatly and substantially bound in half roan, and present a

very neat appearance. But it is the contents of the volumes which make them valuable. They abound in useful information and practical every-day hints which cannot fail to be exceedingly helpful to every one who cares to profit by them. The volumes are well worth the price at which they sell. They may be order together, or singly, from the Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal. Price, post-paid, \$2.25 per volume.

May 8, 1890

"Front Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

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

The public school fund is drawn from the whole people, without discrimination or preference, and with no reference whatever to any question as to either religion or the Bible. Therefore the same fund should be used and applied for the benefit of the whole people as it is raised, without discrimination or preference. As the money is raised without reference to those who believe in the Bible or religious instruction, so it should be expended and used. If the money when raised is to be applied according to the dictation and the religious wishes of those who believe in the Bible and religious instruction, then justice demands that it shall be raised by taxation only upon those persons. Justice will never allow religious exercises or religious instruction in the public schools.

All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets.

One of the greatest sophistries with which those please themselves who are in favor of religion in the schools is that in which they speak of the reading of the Bible "without note or comment." The truth is that the Bible, precisely is, without a single note or a word of oral comment, may be read in such a way that the mere reading of it will be the strongest comment that could possibly be made.

The public reader of Dickens reads that author without note or comment, but the impression made upon those who hear is deeper than all the commentators in Christendom could make upon those same persons. Edwin Booth reads Shakespeare without the slightest note or comment, and yet it would be impossible for any commentator to convey the depths of meaning, or to make the strong impressions that are made by his mere reading of the plain words of the author.

It is so with the Bible. The one who reads the Bible to the pupils in the public schools may do so "without note or comment," and yet he may so read what he reads as to make a stronger impression than could be made by any comment that he himself might make. It is hard to believe that those who make such a plea as this in the defense of the reading of the Bible in the public schools, can be sincere. It is equally difficult to understand how those who make this plea can deceive themselves with such sophistry, even though they may hope to deceive others.

*It is not Christianity to teach the children "Be virtuous and you shall be happy."
It is Christianity only to teach them "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."*

"The Baptists of Canada on Religion and the State" *American Sentinel* 5, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

There is just now in Canada, considerable agitation of the same questions that are fast becoming so prominent in the United States, namely, the union of Church and State, Sunday laws, and religion in the public schools. On the question of religion and the public schools, as well as on that of the total separation between Church and State in everything, the following petition of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec, is of interest. We wish the Baptists of the United States were as outspoken on these questions as are those of Canada. We know that in this country there are individual Baptists who have as clearly defined views on these questions, and as much readiness to express them, as the Baptist of Ontario and Quebec have shown themselves to have; but we have not yet heard of a single Baptist Association in the United States, which as a body has taken such a position. We should be glad to learn of scores of them. This report is taken from the *Canadian Baptist*:-

To the Honorable the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario.

The petition of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec humbly showeth:-

1. That the denomination of Christians called Baptists stands historically identified with, and has always been foremost in, maintaining certain principles touching civil and religious rights, which may be summarized as follows:-

That the State is a political corporation simply; that freedom of religious opinion and worshipped is inherently a vested right of the individual conscience, and not a grant from the State; that parliament may not prescribe any form of religious belief for worship, nor may it tax in any form any citizens for the support or teaching of religion.

2. That in harmony with these principles the following resolution was passed at the annual meeting of your petitioners, held in the city of Ottawa, in the month of October last: Moved by Rev. R. G. Boville, M. A., seconded by Rev. J. Dempsey, that,-

Whereas, The historic believe the Baptist Church has always been that Church and State should be separate, and that all citizens and denominations should be equal in every way before the law and,-

Whereas, Said principle is being violated in all key ecclesiastical exemptions, whereby in favor of Baptists or of other denominations: in the continuance of the mediÉval tithing system of the Roman Catholic denomination in Quebec; in the existence of separate schools supported out of public rates; in State provision for religious instruction and public schools; and in public grants for denominational purposes, as well as in other respects; therefore,-

Resolved, That we hereby declare our conviction that the only permanent and sufficient remedy for these evils that are subversive of the principles of Religious Liberty and equality, and therefore a hindrance in the development of our national life, is the absolute and final separation of church and state, and the revision of our constitution in harmony with the same.-Carried.

3. Believing that in all regards in which the State violates the principles above the summarized, it transcends its rightful power and unjustly infringes on individual rights; and believing further, that nothing short of the thorough and consistent application of these principles throughout the whole Dominion will produce harmony and secure the welfare of the people of Canada, your petitioners pray-

That your Honorable Body may be pleased to speedily adopt measures,-

1. To absolutely abolish all exemption of ecclesiastical property and persons from their do share of municipal taxes and burdens.

2. To effectually prevent the making of gifts or grants from the public funds to denominational institutions purposes, whether charitable, educational, or otherwise.

3. To abolish all laws providing for the importing of religious instruction if in the public schools.

4. To bring about entire abolition of separate denominational schools supported by rates levied by the process of law.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Witness hands of the President and Secretary of your petitioners, subscribed at Toronto this 17th day of March, A.D., 1890.

(Signed) D. E. THOMSON, President.

(Signed) JAMES GRANT, Secretary.

"Back Page" *American Sentinel* 5, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

The Wisconsin decision has awakened such widespread discussion of the subject of Religion and Public Education, that we have made this number of the SENTINEL somewhat of a special upon that subject. We give to our readers some of the most valuable matter to be found upon this subject. The argument of Mr. Wigman, in the Wisconsin case, is a powerful and noble vindication of the right of the parent to instruct his own child. Judge Orton's opinion in the same case is an excellent statement of the case of the common school. The article by Rev. Owen James is a masterly statement of the impossibility of the States ever having anything to do in any way, with religious instruction. And it is difficult to see how the Presbyterian Church can favor the teaching of religion in the public schools in the face of its own Confession of Faith, as so eloquently expounded by Stanley Matthews.

All these articles are most worthy of acceptance for all that they say, and for all that they mean, and in view of the condition of things in this Nation to-day, and in view of the powerful influences that are at work to secure action by the State which shall commit it to the cognizance of religious things, it is important that the

principles so well set forth in the articles which we have the pleasure of presenting to our readers in this number of the SENTINEL, should be made known everywhere.

We hope all to whom this paper comes will give it the widest possible circulation.

The Presbyterians throughout the whole United States are now discussing the question of the revision of their Confession of Faith. A great majority of those Presbyteries which have already expressed themselves, are in favor of revision. But there is one point in the Confession which we have not yet seen mentioned by any one of the Presbyteries, which will need to be revised if the position of the Presbyterian synod of New York is orthodox. That is, the article which declares that "civil magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the word, or in the least interfere in the matters of faith." If the State is to teach religion as this Synod demands that it shall, then that part of the creed needs to be so revised as to declare it to be the duty of the civil magistrate to administer the word and regulate matters of faith.

Resolutions are being adopted by ecclesiastical bodies, and many petitions are being sent to the United States Senate, urging the passage of the Blair Educational bill.

The teaching of religion belongs to the Church, and to the Church only. God has committed to the Church this work, and endowed her with the power to do it effectively. The State has no authority to do it, nor has it the power by which, alone, the attempt to do it can be effective. This work then, having been committed to the Church, when the Church passes it over to the State and the State assumes the task, what then is the Church to do? What is there left for her to do, and what further use is there for her in the world? More than this, the Church will not stop at that. When once the State has assumed the task of carrying on and supporting the work of the Church, the next thing it will have to do will be to support the Church itself, and that in idleness, as every State has ever had to do, and will ever have to do, which takes upon itself the task of teaching religion. Therefore if the Government of the United States, or of any State, wants to keep forever clear of the galling burden of a lazy, good-for-nothing Church, let it keep forever clear of any attempt to teach religion.

Apparently with some surprise the question is asked, Would you object to the use of the Bible in the public schools merely as a reading book? We answer decidedly, Yes. We object to the Bible's being made less than it is, or to any impression being conveyed that it is less than that which it is. The Bible is the word of God and that is all that it is. In it is the revelation of the eternal purpose of God which he purposed in Christ Jesus for the redemption of the race of man lost and ruined by sin. It is that and that only, and to make it less than that is to make it worse than nothing. And to use it in the public schools, or anywhere else, merely as a reading book, is to put it upon a level with all other mere reading books, and is to make it less than that which it is. Such procedure conveys the impression to the minds of the children in school that the Bible is no more, and of no more worth or authority, than any other reading book; and to do that is to destroy in their minds the true idea of what the Bible is, and of what its worth and

authority is. Therefore everybody who has any regard for the Bible for what it is, ought to object to its being put to any use that will convey to anybody any idea that it is less than that which it is-the word of God.

The Presbyterians and the Methodists of New York,-the Calvinists and the Arminians-have heartily joined together in denouncing the Wisconsin decision and demanding religious instruction in the public schools. Yet if the State should decide to establish religious instruction in the public schools and should leave it to these two denominations to decide just what form of religion should be taught there, and to what degree, it would be difficult to find any two denominations in all the land between which there would be a wider divergence of view, or a more bitter contention.

The New York *Herald*, not long since secured an interview with the Pope, in which that dignitary expressed great hope for America and the Americans. He expressed great anxiety over the "discontent, disorder, hatred, and profound unhappiness" that is seen in the present condition of society; and says he has studied how to bring about a change, and that, while he lives, he will labor to relieve the world of this terrible confusion. These good professions of the Pope had the effect of greatly pleasing the *Christian Union*, and it gives vent to its delight in these words:-

We cordially greet the Pope as an honored leader of a great international community in the work of industrial and social reform, no less than as a witness of the first importance to the fact that such a reform is the imperative need of our time.

Yes, we are perfectly satisfied that in the settling of this social confusion, the Pope will have much to do, and with the result that when it is settled, it will be to the advantage of the Papacy, and with the Pope as the head over all and supreme arbiter for the world.

American Sentinel, Vol. 8 (1893)

April 13, 1893

"Opposed to the Gospel" *American Sentinel* 8, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

When there is legislation in regard to matters of religion, there must of necessity be the use of force, for a law without a penalty is no law at all. Now, legislation upon matters of religion is sinful, not only because force is utterly foreign to the spirit of the Gospel, but because it tends directly to lower the standard of religion.

Thus: When men are brought to think that the State has a right to legislate upon matters of religion, to enforce its observance, and to punish for acts of disobedience, then religion is brought down to a merely human level. The State then teaches that there is nothing more to religion than it can enforce. But it cannot read a man's heart, and therefore the idea is spread that religion consists merely in a outward forms. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14:23. Now

there is no power either on earth or in heaven that can compel a man to believe. Faith works by love; but that which is of force is not of love; therefore that which is not of love is sin. And therefore that service which is forced is sin. So then, when Government enacts and enforces laws pertaining to matters of religion it is simply using its power to compel people to sin. Religious legislation is therefore directly opposed to the gospel.

The Apostle Paul writes of those in the last days who have "a form of godliness, but deny the power thereof." 2 Tim. 3:5. The gospel is the power of God. But when professed Christians appeal to the Government to enforce certain things that are wholly religious; when ministers plead for Sunday laws, so that they can have "fair play one day in the week," they thereby admit that the Gospel which they preach has not the power of God. The form is there, but by their appeal to human power they deny the power of God; for no one who is conscious of the power of God to back his message, and who knows in his own person what that power is, would insult God by asking for human power to supplement the power of God.

Again: we have read that there is one lawgiver and one judge, namely, God, and that whosoever judges another is really sitting in judgment on the law, and judging the law. But religious legislation calls for human judgment upon law of God. For men to incorporate the laws of God in the human codes, is to usurp the place of God as lawgiver, and therefore His place as judge. But this is the characteristic of "the man of sin." It is the acme of apostasy, for the apostle said that the apostasy that was working in his day would culminate in the man of sin, "the son of perdition, he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God." 2 Thess. 2:4, 5. This man of sin is the same as the "little horn" of the fourth beast of Daniel's prophecy, which is thus described: "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." Dan. 7:25.

The Roman Catholic Church is the result of the attempt to build up Christianity by means of the State. Religious legislation asked for and received by the church, made the Papacy. Therefore whenever any man, professed Protestant though they be, ask for legislation in behalf of religion, no matter to what degree, they are simply following the steps of the Papacy.

Nay, they are doing more than simply following in the steps of the Papacy; they are joining it, and becoming a part of it; because religious legislation is the very essence of the Papacy. And this is still further emphasized by the fact that it was legislation upon the Sunday that made the Roman Catholic Church. It is that which is the Catholic Church's boast, and showing its power. In "Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day," from the French of Mgr. Segur, we find the following:-

"It is worth its while to remember that this observance of the *Sabbath*,-in which, after all, the only Protestant *worship* consists-not only has no foundation in the Bible, but it is in flagrant contradiction with its letter, which commands rest on the Sabbath, which is Saturday. It was the Catholic Church which, by the

authority of Jesus Christ, has transferred this rest to the Sunday in remembrance of the resurrection of our Lord. Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants, is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves to the authority of the church."

Any amount of history might be quoted, if we had space, to show that the adoption of Sunday instead of the seventh day, as the Sabbath is the distinguishing mark of the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore when professed Protestants not only follow the practice personally, but fall into line and enforce its observance by law, they are identifying themselves with the Papacy.

And now read the warning against doing such a thing, and against in any way recognizing such laws when they are made. He who will read the whole of the fourteenth chapter of Revelation will see that it deals with the time reaching down to the coming of the Lord. It presents the last proclamation of the Gospel, in these words:-

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come; and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication. And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." Rev. 14:6-12.

This warning against the worship of the beast, or of his image, which is the union of any professed Protestants with the civil power, is the proclamation of the gospel, because as we have shown, religious legislation is the deadly enemy of the gospel. It is the denial of Christ as the power of God. It is the denial of God as the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and as the Creator, by that same power, of men in Christ to do His will. Therefore wherever there is any movement towards getting the State to help the church along in its work, the voices of all who would have the gospel of Christ preserved in its purity must be raised in protest and warning. This is the message for these days. It is to present Christ as the power of God, and the righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ as the only righteousness which will cover men from the wrath of God. Who will heed it, and say, "In the Lord have I righteousness and strength." "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory."

E. J. WAGGONER.

June 22, 1893

"The Basis of Sunday Laws" *American Sentinel* 8, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

Those who have read the papers to any extent cannot have failed to notice that the enforcement of Sunday observance is increasing. In Birmingham, in Southampton, in Belfast, and at various other places in the Kingdom, crusades have been carried on against those who have ventured to take Sunday as a business day, instead of a day of rest and worship. These things are becoming so common, and are done so much as a matter of course, that it is necessary again and again to call the attention of the people to the basis upon which Sunday laws rest.

First, however, let us recall a statement concerning the action taken in the Isle of Man. A correspondent of the *Christian Commonwealth* said:-

"The Sunday trading question is becoming a vexed one in the Isle of Man. For some time past the sale of newspapers in the streets, and Sunday trading generally, have become distasteful and intolerable to the majority of the Manx people; and on the introduction of the Local Government Act into the House of Keys, Mr. John Thomas Cowell, the member for North Douglas, moved the insertion of a new clause, to the effect that any person publicly crying, showing forth, or exposing for sale any wares, merchandise, fruit, newspapers, or any chattels whatever, on the Lord's Day, shall at the instance of a constable, be liable to a fine of 40s. for each offense.

The clause was carried by a vote of fifteen to five, but was thrown out on being sent back to the Legislative Council. One member declared that he would rather lose the whole Bill than consent to such a piece of legislation. The writer above referred to says: "This will undoubtedly be the case, as the Manx ire is now fully aroused, against the wholesale Sunday desecration of recent years, and things are gradually growing worse. The Council may play the part of obstructionists for a time, but the voice of the people must ultimately be heard, and a strong measure be passed prohibiting Sunday trading."

NO CONNECTION WITH TEMPERANCE

In this connection it may be well to note the fact that the Bishop of Sodor and Man said that during his twelve months' residence on the island, he has been favorably impressed with respect to the temperance question. "So far as he could recollect, he had observed only one case of drunkenness in a Manxman." So it will be seen that it cannot be claimed that Sunday legislation is necessary on the ground of temperance.

We have already repeatedly shown that the Sunday observance question cannot in any sense be considered a temperance question. The same number of the *Christian Commonwealth* which contained the item in regard to the Isle of Man, had an editorial on the drink question. From that editorial we quote the following:-

Most temperance advocates believe that Sunday closing ought to be national, and not local. But why do they think so? Simply for the reason that the country is

ripe for a national Sunday Closing Bill, and that such a Bill is right in itself. Undoubtedly these are weighty considerations. But we fail to see why Sunday Closing should be made national, and total closing local. The evil influence of the drink traffic for six days in the week must be more than for one day; and yet some who are comparatively indifferent to the former, are sticklers for the latter.

This should be sufficient to settle the question as to the connection of Sunday closing with temperance. There is none whatever. "The whole country is ripe for a national Sunday Closing Bill," but not by any means for national prohibition seven days in the week. Sunday closing would make but little appreciable difference in the amount of liquor consumed, for the workingmen are as idle on Saturday nights as they are on Sundays, and there is ample time then for them to get rid of their wages, even if they did not lay in a supply of drink for the next day.

NOT A PHYSICAL NECESSITY

We may therefore leave the question of temperance entirely out of our study of the basis of Sunday laws. There are only two other possible grounds on which compulsory Sunday observance may be based, and they are (1) the physical benefit to be derived, and (2) the religious character of the day. We will consider them. But first, again, let us see how much importance is attached to this matter of Sunday observance. The *Christian Commonwealth* of March 20 said:-

If shopkeepers persist in needless Sunday trading, they must be stopped by the strong arm of the law. In Birmingham the nuisance has become so intolerable that a Watch Committee has been formed, and is making a crusade against Sunday trading. . . . We should prefer Sunday closing to be voluntary, but if this cannot be realized, the only alternative is to make it compulsory.

Take now the idea that Sunday observance is necessary for the physical well-being of people, especially of the workingmen. At the most that can be claimed for a weekly physical rest it is of far less importance than many other things. For instance, it is far more necessary that a man should have a regular amount of sleep in every twenty-four hours. A man may work every day in the week for an indefinite time, if he has sufficient regular daily rest; whereas if he is broken of his rest at night for a few nights, he will be totally unfitted for work. But we never hear of a proposition that laboring men should be compelled by law to sleep seven hours every night, and nobody will ever be foolish enough to advocate such a

195

thing. Laws are not needed to compel people to rest when they are tired; nature will attend to that.

Again, if enforced Sunday rest is only for the physical well-being, then it is most absurd, not to say tyrannical, because all persons do not become weary and in need of rest at the same time. Different kinds of labor induce different degrees of weariness; and to say that all men shall take exactly the same amount of rest, and at the same time, is as absurd as to say that they shall all eat the same amount of the same kind of food, and at precisely the same time. One man's work does not make another man tired, neither does the fact that a hundred men are working hinder one from resting, and therefore there is no

reason why every man shall rest at a given time, simply because a few wish to do so.

But it is often urged that the Government has the right to set apart certain days as holidays. Very true, but that is not what Sunday is desired to be. A holiday is a day on which people are permitted to cease labor if they wish; on Sunday it is desired to force people to cease work whether they want to or not. If a man wishes to dig in his garden on a Bank Holiday, instead of going to the parks, he is at liberty to do so. If there were an attempt to force everybody to stop all kinds of work on a Bank Holiday, there would be such a protest as would put an end to the attempt. Pleasure cannot be forced, and neither can rest.

E. J. WAGGONER.

London, England.

November 2, 1893

"The Lord's Day" *American Sentinel* 8, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

The beloved disciple had been banished to the isle of Patmos "for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." Just when this took place is not known with positive certainty, but it was certainly many years after the ascension of Christ. While there he had wonderful visions, and this is how he begins the account of them. "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice." Rev. 1:10.

From this we know that there was a certain day known at that time as the Lord's day, and that John, as a faithful follower of Christ, observed it. We also know that if the Lord had a special day for His own then, He must have it still. Let us see if we can find out what day it is. The only place where we can surely find it is the Bible.

In the fifty-eighth chapter of Isaiah we find the Lord's day mentioned in those words: "If thou turn away thy foot from 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 thine 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 on 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." Verses 13, 14.

Here the day which the Lord Himself calls, "My holy day," is "the Sabbath!" Now what day is the Sabbath? The Lord Himself tells us this, also: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, 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." Ex. 20:8-10.

It is plain that the Sabbath-the seventh day-is the same day that in Isaiah is called by the Lord, "My holy day." With these two texts alone we have found that the Lord's day is the Sabbath-the seventh day of the week. Therefore the day on which John was in the Spirit, and received visions from God, was the seventh day, the Sabbath. Thus, to put the matter into compact form: The seventh day is

the Sabbath; it is the Sabbath of the Lord; it is a holy day, and is to be kept holy; the Lord Himself calls it "My holy day." John was in the Spirit on the Lord's day; therefore John was in the Spirit on the Sabbath day.

We have further evidence. At one time Jesus and His disciples went on the Sabbath day through the corn; and His disciples being hungry began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. The Pharisees, who were ever on the watch to find something against Jesus, accused His disciples of breaking the Sabbath. There can be no question as to what day of the week this was, for the Pharisees observed the seventh day of the week strictly, that is, in outward form. So when they said, "Behold, Thy disciples do that which it is not lawful to do upon the Sabbath day," they had reference only to the seventh day. This is of value, incidentally, as showing what day of the week it is that is called the Sabbath day in the New Testament.

But Jesus would not allow that His disciples had done wrong in plucking and eating corn on the Sabbath day. Still later, on that same day, when about to heal a man, He said, "It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days." To the Pharisees He said, in defending His disciples from the false charge of Sabbath-breaking: "If ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath day." Matt. 12:7, 8.

Since it was the seventh day that the Pharisees professed to keep, and which they charged the disciples with breaking, it was of the seventh day that Jesus declared Himself to be the Lord. For "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." How did Jesus come to be Lord of the seventh-day Sabbath?—By making it, and setting it apart for man's use. Thus, after the account of the six days of creation, we read:—

"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." Gen. 2:1-3. The One who created was the One who rested on the seventh day. But the Lord Jesus Christ is the Creator of all things, as we read in John 1:1-3; Col. 1:12-17, and many other places.

Christ is the Lord of the seventh-day Sabbath, therefore, by virtue of His being Creator. He says of His people, "I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Eze. 20:12. So the Sabbath is a sign that in Christ as Creator we have "wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption." Consequently the Sabbath must endure as long as the facts of creation endure; as long as it is a fact that Christ is Creator, and that He has power to redeem. Hear His words on this point:—

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5:17, 18.

"And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail."
Luke 16:17.

And though the present heaven and earth pass, they will be created new, and the promise is: "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord."
Isa. 66:22, 23.

E. J. WAGGONER.

American Sentinel, Vol. 9 (1894)

May 17, 1894

"The True Reason" *American Sentinel* 9, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

The Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, U.S.A., has decided that a law compelling barbers' shops to be closed on Sunday is within the police power of the State. It holds that "the best reason for maintaining the police power of the State to prohibit citizens from engaging in secular work on Sunday, is that experience has shown that one day's rest in seven is necessary to the physical welfare of the individual."

But the fact is that experience has shown nothing of the kind. There have never been any better specimens of manhood, physically, than the ancient Greeks and Romans, who knew nothing of a weekly recurring rest day. In a time when nations existed only by the power of the sword, and fighting was little more than an athletic contest between the individual soldiers of two armies, the physical welfare of citizens was the chief concern of governments; yet no pagan nation has ever known any such thing as a weekly rest day. That is sufficient to disprove the fallacy so widely spread, that the physical welfare of man is the chief object of the Sabbath rest.

But even suppose it were, why should the State interfere in the matter? It is certain that regular nightly rest is far more necessary to one's physical welfare than a weekly rest, yet no nation thinks of enacting laws requiring that all the people shall sleep from 10 P.M. till 6 A.M., or from midnight till eight o'clock in the morning. If any legislative body in the world should presume to pass such a law, there would be a general protest against such an arbitrary exercise of power.

But no such law will ever be passed, because, although the securing of a sufficient amount of sleep every night is very essential to the health of the body, it has nothing to do with any system of religion; while Sunday laws are in the interest of religion. The claim that they are a physical necessity is nothing but an excuse that has been devised in America to conceal the fact that Church and State are united there as well as in the Old World.-*Present Truth, London, Eng.*

American Sentinel, Vol. 10 (1895)

December 12, 1895

"Enforcing the Law of God" *American Sentinel* 10, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

"For we know that the law is spiritual." Rom. 7:14. Then there can be no fulfilling of the law save in the Spirit. "God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in Spirit and in truth." Sometimes people talk about keeping the spirit of the law without the letter, but there is nothing in the Bible about keeping the spirit without the letter. By that expression men mean that they will keep what they think the law means, regardless of what it says. But God knows that the thoughts of man are vain. We are to forsake our own thoughts, as well as our own way. "For My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways My ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts." Isa. 55:8, 9. God is Spirit; therefore they that worship Him must do so in the Spirit which He supply. He provides the means, and does not ask us to worship Him in our spirit, or in our conception of His law.

We are not to worship God as we think Him to be, but as He is. And no one, as stated in the text just quoted, can comprehend God, or define the bounds and limits of His will. Then no man can lay down a rule for another, or even for himself. Here is the unlimited word. No man can put a limit on the word of God, or say of any text that he has fathomed its depth, and that he has all the truth there is in it. No; the word is spiritual, and no man can fathom the depth of the mind of the Holy Spirit. For this reason no man, and nobody of men, is at liberty to put any construction on the word of God, or to change it, or to hold or teach that it means anything different from exactly what it says.

The knowledge of this shuts out everything like religious coercion, persecution, or the laying down of rules for people to follow; for true worship must be rendered in the Spirit which God alone gives. The word must be taken, not in our own spirit, but in the Spirit of God, and that must lead us into larger and larger ideas, and worked in us that which we do not know ourselves. Men have secret faults of which they are utterly unconscious. Not only so, but no man knows the depth of any sin which is brought to his attention, or the fullness of any command which is in joined upon him.

It is plain, therefore, that no man can measure his own righteousness, nor his own sin. He can simply know that he is a sinner, and that the righteousness of God is given to him. The more of the Lord he knows, the greater sinner he will realize himself to be. Therefore no man or body of men, whether in Church or State, can lay down rules by which a man must live; because the field of God's requirements is as unbounded as His own life, and must therefore ever keep increasing to our vision; and though men filled the world with books in the attempt to define everything, there still would be something omitted.

The Spirit of God must work its own life in every man. This takes the matter out of the realm of civil government entirely. No human authority whatever can impose the Spirit upon any man, or define the mind of the Spirit. The law of God, which is His righteousness, is the one thing which men are to seek. Christ said, "I know that His commandment is life everlasting." John 12:50. We also are to know the same thing. The law itself is spiritual; it is life everlasting. But life is not a figment, a fancy; it is real, and wherever there is life there must be something living. When we read the commandment is life everlasting, it does not mean that the written characters are life. They simply declare the fact. Everlasting life is in Jesus Christ. "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself." John 5:26. He is the fountain of life. Ps. 36:9; Jer. 2:13.

The commandment or law of God is everlasting life because it is his own life. Then is the life of the Spirit of God; and putting the Spirit of God into the hearts of men puts the life of God there. It is the law of the Spirit of life in Christ, it gives freedom and peace with God. "The Spirit is life, because of righteousness;" and "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. 8:1, 2, 9, 10. Nothing less than the life of Christ is the law of God; and anything contrary to the life of Christ is condemned. Then we can leave the *right* of any body of men to enforce the law of God entirely outside of the question. It is merely a question of *power*. Has it the power to enforce the law of God? Has any government on earth power to take the life of God and put it into the hearts of its subjects? Certainly not.

Then when men do make religious laws, and in force religion upon people, it is certain that they are not enforcing the religion of Christ. Therefore when they do that, those who are loyal to Christ can have no complicity with it whatever. It is paganism, no matter what form of truth there may be. It is but the former without the power or life. If such enforcement is put in the very terms of the Bible, it is only the more thoroughly pagan; for it is paganism trying to palm itself off as Christianity.

The attempt to enforce the ten commandments, even just as they read, would be the greatest dishonor men could offer to the Lord. It would be saying that the law of God is no better than any man may be of himself. It is the same as saying that a man is all right if he keeps the law so that no man can find fault with him. But the man he merely refrains from the outward violations of the law may be worse than the man who utterly disregard it, and knows he is guilty. In the latter case the man has nothing more in to trust, while in the other, the man is building himself up in his own righteousness, and things that he is all right as long as he keeps a letter so far as men can discern.

But the law is spiritual, and only the power of the Spirit can work righteousness in an

individual. The recognition of civil government as having anything to do with the law of God, is directly opposed to the idea of justification by faith. To lay down a rule or law requiring obedience to the law of God, with a penalty for disobedience, is to say to a man, "You could keep it if you would try; but you will not try, and so we will compel you to do it." This is putting man on and equality

with God. Anything less than the life of God is sin, and therefore for any power to attempt to enforce any of the precepts of Christ is simply an attempt to compel people to sin, and to hold them in sin.

American Sentinel, Vol. 11 (1896)

April 23, 1896

"A Pernicious Fallacy" *American Sentinel* 11, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

VOX POPULI, VOX DEI.-"The voice of the people is the voice of God,"-is a very popular saying. This might be expected from the very nature of the case; for anything which tends to give the people a good opinion of themselves is sure to be popular. At the same time, no saying was ever invented that was farther from the truth. It is one of the most dangerous of Satan's lies. Its effect is to lead people to ignore the plain commandments of God, which are revealed in His Word, and to put themselves in the place of God. It is taken for granted that what "the people" say and do must be right, even though there may be a command of God to the contrary. And thus this mischievous saying leads "the people" to exalt themselves above God, by making them think that by their united action they can change the decrees of God.

Men ought to be able to learn something from history; if they do not, history is written in vain. The lessons which we learn from the history of the past are equivalent to lessons concerning the future, for, "The thing that hath been," said Solomon, "it is that which shall be; end that which is done is that which shall be done." This is true because human nature is the same among all people, and in all ages. Let us recall a few of the things that have been.

The People Corrupted Their Ways

Within a thousand years after the creation, God saw that "the people" had corrupted their way on the earth, and so nearly universal was the downward tendency, that only one man was found who followed the expressed commandment of the Lord. Yet, although the people were so nearly unanimous in their choice of evil, it did not cease to be evil, neither did they change the mind of God. Every man who followed the way that was "right in his own eyes" was destroyed by the flood.

It was "the people" who, shortly after the flood, thought to make a name for themselves by building a city and a tower whose top should reach to heaven; but God frustrated their plan to exalt themselves above Him, and their city was destroyed and they were scattered.

God Selected a People

Coming down to later times, we find that when God would have a people for Himself, who should honor Him and keep the knowledge of His will alive in the earth, He found only one man, Abraham, whom He could select as the father of His people. And when that people had become great and were being conducted to the land which God had given to them, they were told, "The Lord did not set His love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people, for ye were the fewest of all people." Deut. 7:7. The majority of "the people" ignored God, and did as they pleased. Surely, if it were true that "the voice of the people is the voice of God," God would not have rejected the bulk of mankind for a comparatively insignificant race.

Leaving out the great world who had rejected God, and had in consequence been rejected by Him, we find that "the people" whom God chose as His own peculiar people were, as a people, more often in opposition to God than in harmony with Him. It was "the people" who said to Aaron, "Make us gods, which shall go before us;" and when the golden calf was made, "the people" worshiped it. It was "the people" who said, "Let us make a captain, and let us return into Egypt;" and it was "the people" who time and again murmured against the Lord's chosen prophet, and were often on the point of stoning him to death.

The People Cry, "Crucify Him."

In the days when Christ was on earth, it was His own people to whom He came, who rejected Him. When He was accused before the Roman governor, it was "the people" of Israel-God's own chosen people-who cried, "Crucify Him!"

Still later, when the disciples of Christ were many thousands in number in Jerusalem, they were still a poor, despised sect, and so few in number in comparison with "the people" who constituted the Church, that they were compelled to flee for their lives. Then Herod the king stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the church. And he killed James with the sword; and when he saw that "the people" were pleased, he proceeded to take Peter also. This same Herod it was who a short time afterwards made an oration to a vast concourse who had assembled to do him honor, "And 'the people' gave a shout, saying, It is the voice of a god, and not of a man." In this case "the voice of the people" was immediately shown to be not the voice of God for God rebuked their impiety, and caused the vile creature, whom they called a god, to die a loathsome death.

Still later we find that "the people" whom God had taken out from among the Gentiles, became so great that they were deemed worthy of State recognition.

In the Great Empire of Rome,

which filled the world, the "Christians" were so numerous that the crafty and worldly-wise Constantine saw that it would be greatly to his advantage to favor them rather than his pagan subjects. So "the church" was "recognized" by the civil power. Thus the sect, which in the days of Paul was "everywhere spoken against," now sat in the high places of the earth, and all nations were flowing unto it. See Isa. 2:3, 3. Surely now the voice of the people must have been the

voice of God, because Rome, which was then only a synonym for "the world," was a "Christian nation." This had not been brought about by a mere legal enactment without the concurrence of "the people," but Christianity was exalted to the throne of the world because the majority so willed it. Constantine was too wise a ruler to make laws that would not receive the commendation of the majority of his subjects. The voice of the people was to him the voice of God, and when Christianity became the religion of the empire, it was simply the recognition of the prevailing sentiment.

But was the voice of the people in that case really the voice of God? Far from it. This expression of the will of "the people"-the church-was only the last step but one in that great apostasy of which Paul had written (2 Thess. 2:1-8), and which culminated in the

Establishment of the Papacy,

establishment of the Papacy, that "man of sin," "the son of perdition," who opposed and exalted himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he as God sat in the temple of God, showing himself to be God. This was the practical working of the adage, "The voice of the people is the voice of God." The falsity of that claim is shown by the fact that "the people" who have impiously exalted themselves above God by claiming that their voice is His, are to be consumed with the spirit of the Lord's mouth, and destroyed with the brightness of His coming.

In the brief description of the rise of the Papacy, the reader cannot fail to recognize the words which the "National Reformers" use to describe their movement. It is a significant fact that the same language which they use to describe what they are working for, most accurately describes the establishment of the Papacy, that professedly Christian power that persecuted Christians to the death. There is not a plea which the National Reformers use in behalf of their proposed Amendment to the Constitution, which will not apply exactly to the setting up of the Papacy. They say, This movement is wholly in the hands of the Christian Church; so was the great apostasy of the first three centuries. National Reformers say, We do not want an Amendment to the Constitution until it will be the natural outgrowth of the sentiment of the Christian people of the country; all Constantine and his successors did was to make laws voicing the sentiments of "the Christian people" of the empire. Say the "Reformers," "The success of this movement will make the United States a Christian nation; that is what Rome became. Say they, *We* will never persecute; so said "Christian" Rome under similar circumstances, but time will in this case demonstrate the fact that like causes always produce like effects.

"Woe unto you, . . . because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the

sepulchers of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them

which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers." Matt. 23:29-32.

And like effects bring like punishments. Let those who are inclined toward so-called "National Reform" take heed and beware.

May 7, 1896

"The Papacy's Growing Power" *American Sentinel* 11, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

[Present Truth, London.]

The *Chronicle's* special correspondent from Rome continues to mingle with his eloquent description of the Papal pomp and circumstance of the events, at the Vatican and St. Peter's, much that is of great political significance. He refers to the old contest between the Vatican and the Quirinal and dubs it "a controversy which goes down to the roots of the European situation, which troubles the peace of king and cardinals, and affects the alliances and estrangements of the great States of the world."

After enumerating various local incidents which have caused friction between the representatives of the Papal court and the State, and have given some new prominence, within the very precincts of Rome itself, to the persistent seclusion of the "Prisoner of the Vatican," he says:-

And above all the crushing blow which the House of Savoy has received in Africa, the relations of Italy to the Triple Alliance, the Pope's leaning toward France-all the pressing problems which during the last few weeks have centred in Rome and made her the "hub" of diplomatic Europe, the centre of the modern as she was of the ancient world-have swept this "Roman question" to the front.

And yet, he asks himself, why should there be any desire to see this question raised at this time?-for, "not for years-I had almost said for centuries-has the moral and political influence of the Vatican stood at so high a level." In his view too the very disabilities under which the Pope has chafed so impatiently have been to the advantage of the Papacy, "and the Holy See has gained enormously by its dissociation from the responsibilities of secular power." So that now it is a fact "that the Papal chair is raised in the eyes of the Roman Catholic world above the throne of Kaiser and Czar and King, that it is in a sense protected and guaranteed by Europe, that it has founded a new empire in the new world, that it is sustained by an acute and active diplomacy, and yet is free from actual responsibility, and, like Hamlet's Ghost, possesses a certain majestical invulnerability of its own.

Yes, all this is true,-the papal power is a creature of destiny and of prophecy. Until that destiny and that prophecy are fulfilled it does possess a certain invulnerability. But when that time has come when she shall feel no longer these disabilities and shall say, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow,"-then, "shall her plagues come in one day, death and mourning, and

famine: and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her."

American Sentinel, Vol. 12 (1897)

January 21, 1897

"The Law Is Spiritual" *American Sentinel* 12, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

E. J. Waggoner, in Signs of the Times

"For we know that the law is spiritual." Then there can be no fulfilling of the law save in the Spirit. "God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in Spirit and in truth."

God is Spirit; therefore they that worship Him must do so in the Spirit which He supply. He provides the means, and does not ask us to worship Him in our spirit, or in our conception of His law.

We are not to worship God as we think Him to be, but as He is. And no one, as stated in the text just quoted, can comprehend God, or define the bounds and limits of His will. Then no man can lay down a rule for another, or even for himself. Here is the unlimited word. No man can put a limit on the word of God, or say of any text that he has fathomed its depth, and that he has all the truth there is in it. No; the word is spiritual, and no man can fathom the depth of the mind of the Holy Spirit. For this reason no man, and nobody of men, is at liberty to put any construction on the word of God, or to change it, or to hold or teach that it means anything different from exactly what it says.

The knowledge of this shuts out everything like religious coercion, persecution, or the laying down of rules for people to follow; for true worship must be rendered in the Spirit which God alone gives. The word must be taken, not in our own spirit, but in the Spirit of God, and that must lead us into larger and larger ideas, and worked in us that which we do not know ourselves.

Men have secret faults of which they are utterly unconscious. Not only so, but no man knows the depth of any sin which is brought to his attention, or the fullness of any command which is joined upon him. It is plain, therefore, that no man can measure his own righteousness, nor his own sin. He can simply know that he is a sinner, and that the righteousness of God is given to him. The more of the Lord he knows, the greater sinner he will realize himself to be.

Therefore no man or body of men, whether in church or state, can lay down rules by which a man must live; because the field of God's requirements is as unbounded as His own life, and must therefore ever keep increasing to our vision; and though men filled the world with books in the attempt to define everything, there still would be something omitted.

The Spirit of God must work its own life in every man. This takes the matter out of the realm of civil government entirely. No human authority whatever can impose the Spirit upon any man, or define the mind of the Spirit.

February 18, 1897

"'Enforcing' the Ten Commandments" *American Sentinel* 12, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

E. J. Waggoner, in Signs of the Times

The law of God, which is His righteousness, is the one thing which men are to seek. Christ said, "I know that His commandment is life everlasting." John 12:50. We also are to know the same thing. The law itself is spiritual; it is life everlasting. But life is not a figment, a fancy; it is real, and wherever there is life there must be something living.

When we read the commandment is life everlasting, it does not mean that the written characters are life. They simply declare the fact. Everlasting life is in Jesus Christ. "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself." John 5:26. He is the fountain of life. Ps. 36:9; Jer. 2:13.

The commandment or law of God is everlasting life because it is His own life. Then is the life of the Spirit of God; and putting the Spirit of God into the hearts of men puts the life of God there. It is the law of the Spirit of life in Christ, it gives freedom and peace with God. "The Spirit is life, because of righteousness;" and "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." Rom. 8:1, 2, 9, 10.

Nothing less than the life of Christ is the law of God; and anything contrary to the life of Christ is condemned. Then we can leave the *right* of any body of men to enforce the law of God entirely outside of the question. It is merely a question of *power*. Has it the power to enforce the law of God? Has any government on earth power to take the life of God and put it into the hearts of its subjects? Certainly not.

Then when men do make religious laws, and in force religion upon people, it is certain that they are not enforcing the religion of Christ. Therefore when they do that, those who are loyal to Christ can have no complicity with it whatever. It is paganism, no matter what form of truth there may be. It is but the former without the power or life. If such enforcement is put in the very terms of the Bible, it is only the more thoroughly pagan; for it is paganism trying to palm itself off as Christianity.

The attempt to enforce the ten commandments, even just as they read, would be the greatest dishonor men could offer to the Lord. It would be saying that the law of God is no better than any man may be of himself. It is the same as saying that a man is all right if he keeps the law so that no man can find fault with him. But the man he merely refrains from the outward violations of the law may be worse than the man who utterly disregard it, and knows he is guilty. In the latter case the man has nothing more in to trust, while in the other, the man is building

himself up in his own righteousness, and things that he is all right as long as he keeps a letter so far as men can discern.

But the law is spiritual, and only the power of the Spirit can work righteousness in an individual. The recognition of civil government as having anything to do with the law of God, is directly opposed to the idea of justification by faith.

To lay down a rule or law requiring obedience to the law of God, with a penalty for disobedience, is to say to a man, "You could keep it if you would try; but you will not try, and so we will compel you to do it." This is putting man on an equality with God.

Anything less than the life of God is sin, and therefore for any power to attempt to enforce any of the precepts of Christ is simply an attempt to compel people to sin, and to hold them in sin.

February 25, 1897

"Priestism in Power" *American Sentinel* 12, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

" Present Truth ." (London, Eng.)

It is said that the witch doctors, or Fetish priest, rule over the King of Benin, and that their influence is responsible for most of the human sacrificing and slaughtering in that country. Go where one will in the world, or look through secular history, and it will be found that wherever a priestly caste has most influence in government there has been the greatest wickedness. Many think that this is solely because it is bad religion that gets into power, and that if only good religion could be lifted to the authority in the councils of State it would be a desirable thing. But good religion asks for no authority or power from man; it rests upon the power of God and preaches a gospel of divine power. Whenever religion forsakes this in order to secure power in the State it becomes bad religion, and its whole influence is evil, whether among whites or blacks, civilized or uncivilized.

March 4, 1897

"Religious Coercion is Antichristian" *American Sentinel* 12, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

" Present Truth ." (London, Eng.)

Why is it that those who have passed under the name of Christian, and whom the world at large accounts as representative of Christianity, have, so universally, sought temporal power?

He who is really Christian follows in the footsteps of Christ, does he not? But Christ avoided even the slightest assumption of temporal authority. He even refused to be an arbitrator in a simple dispute as to the division of property, saying to the one who sought his intervention, "Man, who made Me a judge or a divider over you?"

The persistent and fatal error with which so many of His personal followers were possessed was that He was about to set up an earthly kingdom. But Christ combated this error continually, taking every occasion of reproving them for their worldly ambitions, and of setting before them the contrast between the futility of all earthly things and the eternal stability of the mansions of that kingdom eternal in the heavens, which He went to prepare.

The follower of Christ must follow Him in truth, or else he is not a disciple and a follower, but a pretender and a traitor. Christ sought no temporal authority over men. He strenuously refused even the smallest opportunity for the exercise of such power. Is it then consistent with the life and example of the Master, for those who claim to be His disciples, to seek to dominate over their fellow-men?

If the example of Christ is followed, those who carry His Gospel will use no authority in religious things, other than the persuasion of the Word. Christ judges no man. He Himself said so. He permits all men to judge themselves, to choose that which they will, whether it be life or death. This being so, it is impossible for men who claim to speak for Christ, and exercise authority from Him, to coerce men into accepting and receiving eternal life. Spiritual coercion is futile. It even goes beyond futility, it defeats itself, and becomes an active agent in the opposite direction to that in which it purports to work.

The fact that this is so marks the origin of this great deception, and its masterly development to the present hour, as coming from the arch-enemy of God and mankind. When the teachings of the Word of God, and the example of Christ, are so plain, and the evidences of the destructive working of Satan's deceptions so evidently seen, it is indeed a "mystery of iniquity" that man should choose the antichristian way and call it Christian.

March 18, 1897

"Politics and Religion" *American Sentinel* 12, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

" Present Truth ." (London, England.)

Why is it that this society which considers itself cultivated two tabooed subjects are "religion" and "politics?" No doubt because so many people, who are admitted even to the best society, are unable to control their tempers, or speak with calmness and moderation respecting subjects in which their personal interests are involved, or concerning which their personal prejudices are crossed. In discussing politics it certainly is quite natural that there should be heat and rancour. Here individual prejudices are likely to hold sway and to govern more or

less the language and demeanour of those who indulge in political conversation. But in the realm of true religion, the religion of Jesus Christ, prejudice has no place.

There must be, it is true, assured and fixed conviction. But that is quite a different thing from prejudice. Conviction is indeed the natural foe and conqueror of prejudice. Two persons whose hearts are filled with the conviction of the eternal truths of true religion pure and undefiled, may talk together of the hope that is in them with joy and delight. Nothing in word, or act, or look, would pass between them which could mar the amenities of any social gathering. In their hearts prejudices do not exist,-they have been driven out by the conviction and acceptance of religious truth.

Politics cannot exist without prejudice. Indeed it is nothing else than the personal and individual interests, desires, and feelings, of different men and bodies of men, countries and sections of countries, brought into activity and antagonism. It is unavoidable that the partisanship here should be intense. But in the realm of true religion there is no room for partisanship, there can be no selfish interests or desires. Politics, it is evident, cannot be

173

otherwise than disturbing in its tendency, it is inevitable from its very nature. But the very contrary is the fact in the case of true religion from *its* very nature.

What then is the trouble? Why should these two things, direct opposites-the one which makes the most for war, and the one which makes the most for peace-be classed together as the two greatest elements of disturbance, and equally denied admittance to the drawing room? The one, it is true, contains every uncomfortable and disagreeable possibility, but the other contains none. The reason of this strange and ill-assorted companionship in exile is that true religion is utterly misapprehended. That which is thought to be religion, and discussed as religion, is not the Word of God and the Gospel of Jesus Christ, but the visionary politics of an unknown future.

June 3, 1897

"The Pope's Army" *American Sentinel* 12, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

" Present Truth ." (London, Eng.)

The Pope's kingdom, unlike Christ's, is altogether of this world, and hence do his servants fight. An Italian paper says that he has just reorganized his personal forces. The worst of it is that his influence is able sometimes to set greater armies in motion than this little one which guards the Vatican and keeps up the semblance of his temporal sovereignty. This alone, however, ought to teach his followers that the Papacy is an anti-Christian power. An evening paper, quoting from the Italian Catholic journal, thus describes the army:-

"It is divided into five separate bodies, which are known as the Noble Guard, the Swiss Guard, the Palatine Guard, the Gendarmes, and the Fire Brigade. The first

341

of these, that is, the Noble Guard, is commanded by Prince Altieri, and is composed of fifty young members of the Roman nobility. Each member of the corps receives from three to four hundred lire a month, and a special club is maintained for their use and amusement. The Swiss Guard numbers one hundred strong, and the men are specifically selected for their youth and strength. Their duty is to guard the doors and entrances to the Vatican, and they are armed with the Remington rifle. As under the old regulations they will still carry the halberd while on parade. The Palatine Guard is divided into two companies, commanded by General Erostarosa, who has under him a staff of two majors and four captains. This corps raised from among the citizens of Rome, is called out only on special occasions. The gendarmes number one hundred, under the command of Colonel Taglifletri, and are recruited from ex-soldiers of the Italian army, specially recommended by Italian Bishops for their religious fidelity and fervour. The firemen, or pompiers, number thirty, and are always in the Vatican."

July 1, 1897

"The Sabbath: What Its Reception or Rejection Involves" *American Sentinel* 12, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

" Present Truth ." (London, Eng.)

In the beginning "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it," and thus made it a blessing and a channel of sanctification or holiness to man. He then taught man to "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," or to sanctify it. God made the day holy and He instructed man to treat it as holy that he might thus receive the blessing of holiness through it; but when man treats the day as common time he fails to receive the Sabbath blessing through God's appointed channel.

It is not in the power of man to make a day holy, neither can we receive the blessing of holiness through a day which the Lord has not made holy. So when we turn away from the day which the Lord has made holy and accept any other day in its stead, we are thus turning away from the Lord's own channel of holiness for us. This is the great loss with which we meet in following the traditions of men instead of obeying the Word of God.

So intimately related is the "holy Sabbath" to "the holy Scriptures" and to the "holy child Jesus," that it cannot be consistently disregarded by those who profess to receive the other two for what they really are, and it is worth noting that professes to have changed the Sabbath has practically put itself above the

Bible and Christ. So long as the Bible is received as the Word of God, and the example and instruction of Jesus is followed, so long the seventh-day Sabbath will be observed, and when the seventh-day Sabbath is knowingly disregarded, the logic of this act really demands that the Bible and the work of Jesus should be set aside.

The Roman Catholic church in its teaching openly states that the Bible commands the observance of the seventh day and no other, and that there is not a word in the Bible authorizing a change of the day, and it just as openly teaches that the church changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, and that there is no other authority for the change. It is only consistent therefore for it to treat the Bible as of secondary importance as compared with its own traditions, and to make the intercession of the Virgin Mary of more value than the intercession of Christ.

In all this the Roman Catholic church puts itself above God, but it is consistent in the way in which it does it. so long as one receives the Bible as the Word of God, and acknowledges its authority as supreme, so long will he see that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and that the intercession of Jesus is all that is needed for man or that can avail anything for man, and when one rejects the Lord's Sabbath, the logical result will be to reject the authority of the Word of God, and to receive the word of man instead, and to accept a supposed human helper as of more value than is the help of Him who alone is able to save.

But this is not a question simply of cold logic. And thus turning from God's appointed blessings and channels of blessing man meets with an irreparable loss. If we receive the salvation of God at all, we must receive it through the channels which He Himself has established, and the blessing of holiness should be so highly prized that we should be glad to receive it in any way which the Lord may appoint.

The original Sabbath still remains as a sign and a pledge of God's power to make holy, and the true keeping of the Sabbath, the entering into His rest, is the experience of His presence who only can make and keep its holy. God's purpose in the gospel has always been the same, that we should be "created in righteousness and holiness of truth," and His means of accomplishing this result have always been the same in making us "partakers of the divine nature," and so the Sabbath remains unchanged and unchangeable, a channel for this blessing of holiness to man.

July 7, 1897

"Papal Lutheranism" *American Sentinel* 12, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

" Present Truth ." (London, Eng.)

The Norwegian constitution has had an article to this effect:-

The Evangelical-Lutheran Religion is and condemns the Public Religion of the State. The citizens, who profess the same, are obliged to see that their children are educated in it. Jesuits, and orders of monks and nuns are not to be tolerated.

The other day the Norwegian Storting discussed an amendment proposing to expunge the last clause. The debate resulted in striking out all of the clause save the declaration that Jesuits are not to be tolerated. As these pioneers of Rome are accustomed to working in secret the clause will not shut them out. The pity of it is that the Storting did not see that the first clauses only establish a papal system under another name.

Wherever the Lutheran Church is established, as in Scandinavia and Germany, it differs very little in the spirit from the Roman Church. The Word which Luther preached was the power of the Reformation. In harmony with the Gospel, Luther declared:-

It is by the Word that we must fight; by the Word overturn and destroy what has been established by violence. I am unwilling to employ force against the superstitious and unbelieving. Let him who believes approach. Let him who believes not stand aloof. None ought to be constrained. Liberty is of the essence of faith.

After the initial victory of the Reformation had been won by the power of the Word, Luther was persuaded to depart somewhat from these principles, and the work of reform ceased in the hands of his followers. Religion was put into a creed, and supported by the sword of the prince. So it comes that Lutheranism now is not reformed, and is an opponent of the very Gospel by which the great Reformer shook the foundations of the papacy.

July 29, 1897

"A True Theocracy" *American Sentinel* 12, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

It is quite common to speak of Israel as a theocracy. This is indeed what God designed it to be, and what it should have been, but what in the truest sense it never was. Least of all was Israel a theocracy when the people demanded an earthly king, "that we also may be like all the heathen," for in so doing they rejected God as their King. It is passing strange the people will refer to what Israel did in direct opposition to the wishes of God, as a warrant for similar action on the part of the church now, and to their rejection of God as evidence that they were ruled by His power.

The word "theocracy" is a combination of two Greek words, and means literally, "the rule of God." A true theocracy, therefore, is a body in which God is sole and absolute ruler. Such a government has rarely been seen on this earth, and never to any great extent. A true theocracy existed when Adam was first formed and placed in Eden, when "God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good." Gen. 1:31. God formed Adam of the dust of the ground, and set him over the works of His hands. He was made ruler "over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the

earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." Gen. 1:26. He therefore had all power given to him. But at his best state, when crowned with glory and honor, Adam was but dust, with no more power in himself than the dust on which he walked. Therefore the mighty power that was manifested in him was not his own power at all, but the power of God working in him. God was absolute Ruler, but it pleased Him, so far as this earth was concerned, to reveal His power through man. During Adam's loyalty to God there was therefore a perfect theocracy on this earth.

Such a theocracy has never existed since, for man's fall was the acknowledging of Satan as the god of this world. But individually it existed in its perfection in Christ, the second Adam, in whose heart was God's law, and in whom dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. When Christ shall have renewed the earth and restored all things as in the beginning, and there is but one fold and one Shepherd, one king in all the earth, that will be a perfect theocracy. The will of God will be done in all the earth as it now is in heaven.

But now is the time of preparation. Christ is now gathering out a people in whom His character will be reproduced,

471

in whose hearts He will dwell by faith, so that each one of them, like Himself, may "be filled with all the fullness of God." Eph. 3:17-19. These gathered ones constitute the church of Christ, which, as a whole, is "the fullness of Him that filleth all in all." Eph. 1:22, 23. So while the true theocracy is first of all in the heart of individuals who day by day sincerely say to their heavenly Father, "Thine is the kingdom," the multitude of them that believe-the church-when perfectly joined together in the same mind by the Holy Spirit, constitutes the only true theocracy that has ever existed in this earth. When the church is apostate, it seeks by alliances with the world, by assuming kingly power, to exhibit a theocratic form of government, but it is only a counterfeit form, with no Divine power, whereas God's true followers, few in number, scattered throughout the world, and unknown to the nations, furnish an example of a real theocracy.

Through the prophet who opened his mouth to curse, but who instead uttered blessings, God said of His people Israel, "The people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." Num. 23:9. The people of God are in the world, not of it, for the purpose of showing forth the excellency of Him who has called them out of darkness. But this they can do only as they acknowledge God to be supreme. The church is the kingdom in which God rules alone, and its only law is God's law of love. It is God's voice alone that it hears and follows, and it is God's voice alone that speaks through it.

September 2, 1897

"Official Religion. 'Converted by Mistake'" *American Sentinel* 12, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

"Present Truth." (London, Eng.)

It is well known that the larger part of the population of Europe that turned from their native paganism to the papal church in early times were converted in the mass; that is, the chief of the tribe, for political or other reasons, cast in his lot with the imperial religion, and his people followed him in religion as they followed him in war. This notion of religion, which left no place for a change of heart and life, was thoroughly papal and has always been the religion of the natural man. It was against this religion of lifeless form that the Protestant Reformation lifted the standard, calling men to personal faith and to the new birth by the incorruptible word. To the survival of that old idea of religion is due the crusade in all Christendom for religion and morality by politics and religious legislation. Men whose religion is but a cloak easily conceive the idea of forcing others to wear the same cut of garment.

Apropos of this subject of official religion, the *Echo* has recently reminded us that a Tartar tribe in Russia was last century "converted" to Mohammedanism by an official's blunder:-

"They were converted by mistake-by a slip of the pen-in a fit of absence of mind. Up till then the Kirghiz Tartars were Shamanites-worshippers of nature, spirits, and ancestral ghosts, as all the Central Asiatic tribes

533

were before the advent of Mohammedanism, as some of them in obscure regions still are. In communication with the Kirghiz chief, he was addressed as Mohammedan by the Russian Minister. His tribe was supposed to be Islamic, and was officially described as such. After a time the St. Petersburg officials discovered that they had made a mistake. 'You might have made Christians of them, once you were about it,' exclaimed the Head of the Orthodox faith. They might. But there the Mohammedan designation was in the official records of the Empire, and Mohammedans the Kirghiz had to be, willy nilly.

"The spectacle presented by a Christian State persuading a nation to embrace Islamism was curious. Of course, there was no compulsion. The Kirghiz Khan, being a polite man, made no bother about the affair. He became a passable Mohammedan. And of course, his tribe gradually followed his example. They are not very strict Mohammedans. Much of their old Shamanic faith still survives.

"A still more curious example of chance in religious acceptance is that of Russia herself. When Vladimir sent envoys abroad-to Byzantium, among other places-in search of a new religion for his subjects, he was induced to become a Christian because of the splendor and the riches of the Christian capital. God must have specially favored a State so opulent, he argued. So his heathen Muscovites were officially informed that Christians they must become. But there was another Mohammedanism which was then competing with Christianity. But abstention from strong drink was one of its commands. It is historically known that this was the Russian peasants' objection to embracing the prophet's faith, then triumphant in Central Asia and Asia Minor."

September 30, 1897

"Divine and Human" *American Sentinel* 12, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

The demand for Sunday laws illustrates just the difference between the Sabbath and Sunday. Sunday was made a rest day by human authority, and human authority is resorted to in order to make men keep it. The Sabbath of the Lord is the Lord's day, made the day of Sabbath rest by Divine authority.

The Word maintains the Sabbath, and all the powers of earth cannot overthrow it. Of Sunday it is freely said that it is endangered if not protected by human law.

Religious people testify in court that they are, disturbed if they see some one working on Sunday, especially if he keeps the Sabbath; while one who keeps the Sabbath may enjoy perfect Sabbath rest in the Lord with all the world at work.

The difference is that, between purely human religion and Divine religion. One day is God's appointed rest, and the power of the Gospel is sufficient to establish it in the hearts of all who desire it. The other day belongs to the Papacy by best right, and has to be enforced by papal methods. One is the sign of God's power to save, the other of man's assumed power to save himself. The Sabbath stands for justification by faith, the Sunday for justification by works.

October 14, 1897

"Blind Humanitarians" *American Sentinel* 12, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

"Present Truth." (London, Eng.), September 23

No one can rightly question the sincerity of those seeking social reform who do not acknowledge God's authority as the first step toward true reform. They merely do not know. But not to know is sinful, for men might know. When Jesus was condemned it was from this "general humanitarian" point of view. "It is expedient for us," said Caiaphas, "that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." But their rejection of Jesus and, in that, of God's law and rulership brought swift ruin upon people and nation. Paul was denounced as a "pestilent fellow" and Christians were a sect "everywhere spoken against" because they were preaching the Gospel in a society that men were trying to bind together by universal ties of trade and common religion, enforced by civil law. But the Gospel of liberty which they preached was the only hope of society. Just so Papal Rome for many centuries tried to compel uniformity in error for the general good and peace of society. But Rome corrupted and ruined the world.

THE TWO GOSPELS

In the beginning Satan persuaded Eve that he stood for the interests of humanity as against God's commands. All the trouble that floods the world and is hastening it to destruction was in that substitution of Satan's way for God's. the enemy has ever since posed as a humanitarian, working to persuade men that liberty and the general good are to be sought in rejecting God's authority. The result is the bondage of sin. God's Gospel calls men to liberty in Christ, which is the freedom of the obedience of love. This Sabbath question is but the test as to whether God's way or Satan's shall stand. The Sunday law advocate says that the general day of rest must not be God's Sabbath, but Sunday, and to secure it to those who wish to keep it, those who do not must be forced to observe it. God's Sabbath rest cannot be enforced by human law. Only faith establishes it. But it stands in the power of God as the sign of His power. And He will show that not only can men keep it and enjoy His rest when others do not, but that they can keep it when all the world seeks by force to compel them to reject it and accept the papal substitute.

October 21, 1897

"Signs of the Times in the Business World" *American Sentinel* 12, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

"Present Truth." London, Eng

It is an age of confederacies and "trust." The rich form them to add to their riches, and the poorer are joining together for common action against those holding the means of production. In it all, the rights of the individual are not considered, and the tendency is toward the tyranny of the combination over the individual. The Scripture foretells the troubles that will come in the last days because of the rich heaping together their riches. In the end they will be for "booties" unto the oppressed, Habakkuk warns them, and the prophet James pronounces the woe upon them for their covetousness, at the same time showing that all the Lord's people will keep clear of both sides in the controversy, and wait patiently for the coming of the Lord.

The signs of the coming struggle are apparent everywhere, but in America they are most plainly to be seen. An American correspondent of the *National Review* says that the commercial world is-

"full of rumors of the creation of new trust so gigantic and so far-reaching in their cope that those trusts already in existence are mere pigmies compared to them."

One trust now controlling the oil, iron ore, and sugar industries of America, purposes adding several other businesses, having so great an income that it can easily buy the industry. Thus business and wealth in the United States are coming more and more into the hands of a few. The *National Review* says of this:-

"It is difficult to see what the end will be when this process of absorption will end. There are perhaps two solutions which may be looked forward to during the next quarter of a century. One is a universal trust with a few men controlling all the industrial activities of the United States, and with the bulk of the American people its employees. The other is a repetition of the French Revolution, but the revolution of 1825, if it comes, will be more terrible in its consequences and more destructive in its results than that of 1793, because to-day the people are more numerous, more determined and more intelligent, and their power to work good or evil has increased tenfold since the days of Robespierre and Danton."

The one thing that would hold in check these elements of violence, both as to the lawless greed of the capitalists and the lawless covetousness of the poor, is the Gospel. But the world does not want this generally. And too often the churches-and this is the general tendency in America-distrusting the power of the Gospel, are going in for political reform. But the more the churches enter the arena of political strife the less power of God for righteousness will they have to wield for peace. One of the signs of the Lord's coming was to be the "distress of nations, with perplexity." We see it in more directions than one, and men's hearts are alarmed as they look into the future. It is a good time to persuade men to put their trust in God. He has a care for the individual.

November 11, 1897

"Sunday Closing and Temperance in England" *American Sentinel* 12, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

Speaking recently of the Sunday-closing Bill, which is now the chief object of "temperance" zeal, the Bishop of Norwich, while favoring it, did not think that at present it is practicable, in that it is "one-sided and partial legislation," applying only to the poor, and leaving the rich free to drink as much as they please. He said, moreover, that his personal experience taught him that "no person would more heartily welcome a very great restriction on Sunday opening-say to quite a short period in the middle of the day-than the great bulk of honest and right-thinking publicans themselves."

But nobody ever yet heard of a publican of any kind who was in favor of a diminution in the drink traffic, any more than of a clothing merchant who was in favor of people wearing less clothing and a less expensive sort. So the very fact that publicans can be cited as favoring the Sunday closing of public-houses, shows that it is in no sense whatever a temperance measure.

Instead of being a temperance measure, the Sunday-closing effort is in reality an attempt to build up Sunday observance at the expense of temperance reform. The whole tendency of the agitation is to teach people that there is nothing inherently wrong in the liquor traffic, but that the evil consists in carrying it on on Sundays. To illustrate: A mother sees her little boy playing ball on Sunday, and being a devout Sunday observer, says, "John, you must not play ball to-day; it is Sunday." John understands perfectly well that his mother has no objection to ball-

playing in itself, but only to Sunday play. But suppose John were worrying a kitten, and his mother should say, "You ought not to worry that kitten to-day, my boy, it is Sunday;" could he think anything else than that it was perfectly allowable to worry kittens on other days than Sunday?

It may be urged that if the public can be educated up to the point of accepting the restriction of the liquor

696

traffic to the last six days of the week, it will be a long step towards getting them to see that it should be suppressed altogether. If this were true, then it would apply to all other business. No; all that can be won by the Sunday-closing agitation is more homage to the Sunday. If there were in it any real recognition of the evil of the liquor traffic, then the man who saw the point would be opposed to the traffic every day. Sin is sin, no matter on what day of the week it is committed. If a man commits a murder, the sin is not enhanced by the fact that the deed was done on the Sabbath. It is a fact that many things are lawful on the six working days of the week, which are not lawful on the Sabbath day, and many of those who believe that Sunday is the Sabbath are laboring hard to put liquor-selling in that list. If they wish to teach the stricter observance of Sunday, they have that right, but let them not delude themselves with the idea that they are furthering the cause of temperance. *London, Eng.*

November 18, 1897

"A Sign of the Times" *American Sentinel* 12, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

(Present Truth.) London, Eng

"One of the most notable signs of the times," says the current *Review of Reviews*, was the action at the Zurich Socialist Labor Congress in favor of making Sunday the universal compulsory day of rest.

"There were two propositions before the Congress, both insisting on one day's rest in seven, but the English Socialists objected to stipulating that this day must be Sunday. Their Continental brethren-owing largely to the influence and numbers of the Catholic Socialists-would have no other day but Sunday, and after an animated debate voted down the English opposition by a large majority."

The Catholics were only standing by the papal principle of enforced religious observances, by the institution which Rome in all her teaching claims as the mark of her authority. She boasts of having substituted Sunday for the Sabbath without Bible authority, and whatever builds up her substitute adds to her prestige.

Mr. Stead thus commends these Catholics for outvoting the English delegates, who seem to have stood for that freedom of choice which even God will not take from them:-

"This was well don't! If the rest day is to be generally observed, there must be a general agreement as to what day it shall be. That is why, from the general

humanitarian point of view, the Seventh-day Adventists, etc., have always seemed to me to be among the most pernicious of Protestant sects."

If so, it is because they are the most Protestant, and the more scripturally Protestant and Christian a movement is the more pernicious will it be considered by any who stand for the papal principle of state-enforced religion of human invention. This issue is of tremendous importance to humanity.

What is humanity's need?-It is salvation from sin. God only has power to save men from the greed and selfishness and oppression eating into the vitals of society. He only can save men from lawlessness by writing his law in their hearts. But when would-be social reformers shut away his power from men, and teach the world to reject his word and commands, they are shutting away the only hope and Saviour of humanity. And God declares that his Sabbath is the sign of his power to save and sanctify. It is a question of loyalty to God, in which way alone is there hope for men.

December 2, 1897

"The Sabbath the Sign of the Cross" *American Sentinel* 12, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

Jesus says, "Come unto Me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Matt. 11:35. He gives rest because in Him the works of God are perfect. "We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." In Him "we have our redemption, the forgiveness of sins, . . . for in him were all things created." Redemption through Christ is nothing else than creation-a new creation. Just before His crucifixion, Christ said to the Father, "I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do." John 17:4. And when He hung on the cross He cried, "It is finished; and He bowed his head, and gave up the ghost." John 19:30. Thus He indicated that in the cross are to be found all the perfect, finished works of the new creation.

Now the Sabbath was given as the sign of a perfect creation completed; therefore it is the sign of those perfect works restored by the cross of Christ. That is to say: Since the Sabbath is the sign of a perfect creation completed, and by the cross of Christ a new creation is accomplished, the Sabbath must be the sign of the cross. Try it and see if it is not.

A GIFT, NOT A TASK EXACTED

Here is where so many people mistake: they think that the Sabbath is a hard requirement that God lays on men, and then they soon get in the way of thinking that God cannot require it of us, since He does not desire his people to be burdened, But salvation is not a thing required of us, but a gift to us; and the Sabbath is the sign of Christ's saving power: He saves by the power by which He creates. Rest is not a burden, it is a pleasure. Nothing more absolutely delightful can be imagined than rest in the consciousness of work all done and well done, and this is the privilege of the people of God: "All Thy works shall praise Thee, O

Lord, and Thy saints shall bless Thee. They shall speak of the glory of Thy kingdom, and talk of Thy power; to make known to the sons of men Thy mighty acts, and the glorious majesty of Thy kingdom." Ps. 145:10-12. "One generation shall praise Thy works to another, and shall declare Thy mighty acts." Verse 4.

The Sabbath is the pledge and assurance to us, that the power by which the worlds were made has wrought good works for us in Christ, and that these works are all ours if we believe. This is the rest prepared for us from the foundation of the world.

December 23, 1897

"Two 'Rusty' Weapons" *American Sentinel* 12, 50.

E. J. Waggoner

"Present Truth" (London. Eng, November 15

Here are two bits from the *Methodist Times* which suggest a lesson that may be read over and over again in the story of the struggle of religious factious for worldly power. The Mayor of Lancaster was recently threatened with the penalties of an ancient religious law. Mr. Hugh Price Hughes thus commented on the affair:-

"Some Anglican bigot unearthed an ancient Act of Parliament by which any municipal officer was liable to a fine of £100 if he appeared in the robes and regalia of his choice in any place of worship except the Established Church. . . . Mr. Kelly and Mr. Bunting, have shown that the intolerant Act has been repealed during the Queen's reign. Thus one more rusty weapon is taken out of the hands of intolerant schismatics."

Surely the writer of this vigorous comment is ready to cry "hands off!" whenever anyone resorts to old religious laws as a means of promoting religious observances. But no; there are other old religious statutes still unrepealed, and Mr. Hughes sees in them a weapon which he thinks should not be allowed to get rusty. Of course people who want to keep Sunday keep it; but those who do not, Mr. Hughes would force to act as though they did. He says:-

We do not suggest anything unreasonable. All we suggest is that the law should sternly prohibit anything and everything of the nature of trade or money-making on Sunday.

That is all. To such rusty old weapons men resort when they forsake the "Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God."

American Sentinel, Vol. 13 (1898)

January 27, 1898

"Superfluous 'Explanation'" *American Sentinel* 13, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

A thing that is plain cannot be explained, that is, it cannot be "made plain," since it is so already. Thus: "John goes to school" is a simple statement of fact, and it cannot be made any plainer. All attempts to "explain" the statement would simply be aggregations of words which would either have no meaning at all, or else would serve to bewilder the listener. The only possible result of any attempted explanation of such a simple proposition is to call the attention away from the fact stated.

The fourth commandment is composed of a series of just such simple statements of fact. After the commandment proper, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," we have these statements: (1) The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. (2) In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, etc. (3) He rested the seventh day. (4) Therefore He blessed the Sabbath day, and sanctified it.

These are as plain statements of fact as is the statement that "John goes to school," or that "the sun shines." They cannot be made any plainer. All that can properly be done with them is to believe theirs, since "the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Every so-called "explanation" of the commandment is either a direct contradiction of it or else such a mass of verbiage as serves to confuse the unfortunate person who is persuaded to put confidence in it. If anyone knows where the fourth commandment is stated in plainer terms than in Ex. 20:8-11, we should be glad to have it shown to us.

May 26, 1898

"The Seed of Popery" *American Sentinel* 13, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

"Present Truth," London. Eng

"Let us not be desirous of vainglory, provoking one another, envying one another." Gal. 5:26. That is to say, Let us have done with emulations and strife. Emulation and strife are the natural outgrowth of self-righteousness, the exaltation of self above God's law. This is the very essence of popery. If there were no emulation, no strife, there would be no pope. The papacy, -the existence in the world of such a thing as a pope, -is the result of the strife for the supremacy among the early bishops. At first all bishops, or elders, or presbyters, or pastors, for all mean the same thing, were equal. "All ye are brethren," said Christ, and for a little while they lived as brethren. But soon there was a strife as to who should be the greatest and the streets of more than one city, Rome especially, ran with blood which was shed in these contests. The final result was the recognition of the bishops of Rome as supreme.

"But how can it be that so many acknowledge the pope's supremacy, if the popish spirit is inherent in human nature?" Thus when the popish principle is

admitted, some one must be chief, or else there will be a war of extermination. So the others unite in homage to the fortunate one, in hope that their turn may come next, or in the knowledge that they will at least be popes of lesser rank, exercising lordship over those who are beneath them.

325

Wherever there is emulation, there is the Papacy; and wherever the Papacy is, there is every evil work. The Spirit of God casts out the Papacy from the individual human heart, by producing meekness, faith, goodness. He who knows that from self only evil can come, and that all good things come only from the Spirit, is made humble by that very knowledge. Knowing that he is nothing, he gives place to the Spirit, and the fruits of the Spirit grow in him. Such an one is truly happy, because he is, through the Spirit, "perfect and entire, lacking nothing."

July 14, 1898

"Three Sabbaths. The Lord's Sabbath—The Jewish Sabbath—The Pope's Sabbath" *American Sentinel* 13, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

One can in truth speak of sabbaths in the plural only as one can speak of many gods. "There is no god but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or on earth; as there are gods many and lords many; yet to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we through Him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through Him." 1 Cor. 8:5, 6. So, though there be various sabbaths, so-called, there is but one true Sabbath, the Sabbath of the Lord.

THE LORD'S SABBATH

The word Sabbath means <http://nc.st> *rest*. It is a Hebrew word transferred into the English language. When the Hebrews used the word "Sabbath," it conveyed the same idea to them that the word "rest" does to us. The fourth commandment therefore really says to us: "Remember the rest day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the rest 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 *rest* day, and hallowed it."

We must not make the mistake of judging of the Lord's rest from what men are accustomed to call rest. God is not a man. We should rather learn from God's rest what rest really is. God's rest is not mere physical rest from weariness. This we know from two facts. First, "God is Spirit." John 4:24. Not "a spirit," as though He were one of many; but He is Spirit, as it is rendered in the margin of the Revision. Second, "The everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the

earth, fainteth not, neither is weary." Isa. 40:33. The Lord therefore did not rest because He was tired, and His rest is not physical, but spiritual, since He is Spirit. "They that worship Him must worship Him in Spirit and in truth."

God rested, not because He was weary, but because His work was finished. When work is finished, and is well done, nothing but rest remains. In six days God finished His work, and as He surveyed it, He pronounced it "very good." There was no flaw in it. It was without fault before Him. Therefore since God's work was done and well done at the close of the sixth day, "He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made." He had no sad reflections, no regrets. His rest was not marred, as what man calls rest so often is, by any such thought as, "To-morrow I must go at that work again;" nor, "I wish that I had done this portion a little differently;" nor, "If I could do that over again, I could make an improvement;" nor, "That last day's work is so bad that I cannot bear to look at it; I was so tired when I got to it that I couldn't half do it." Nothing of the kind. Every portion of the work, even man, was as perfect as it was possible for it to be, and God took pure delight in contemplating the work from which He was resting because it was complete and perfect.

This is the rest which He offers to us. It is not something that He imposes on us, but which He in everlasting love and kindness gives to us. Rest is not a task that is laid on one. It is not a burden. They who look upon the Sabbath as a burden, have no idea of what the Sabbath of the Lord is. It is rest, perfect, unalloyed rest.

Jesus Christ is the One by whom the worlds were made, "for in Him were all things created, in the heavens, and upon the earth," therefore He is the one who offers us this rest. To every soul He cries, "Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Matt. 11:38. The rest is found in Him, because in Him the works of God are completed. In Him is the new creation, and if any man be in Him, he is a new creature. On the cross Jesus cried, "It is finished," thus showing that in His cross we find that perfect rest that comes alone from the finished work of the Lord.

This rest is gained by faith. "We which believe do enter into rest." How so?—Because by faith we have the finished, perfect work of the Lord as our own. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent." John 6:29. Believing Him means receiving Him; and since in Him the works of God are complete, it follows that by believing on Him we find the rest.

The rest that Jesus gives is rest from sin. The heavy laden whom He calls to Him are those who are burdened with the weight of their sins. All men are thus burdened, "for all have sinned." Our best works are utterly worthless. Christ will have a people who are "zealous of good works" (Titus 2:14, 15), but the good works must be those which God Himself has wrought for us in Christ. Only His work is enduring. "His work is honorable and glorious; and His righteousness endureth for ever." Ps. 111:3. Therefore, "by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast; for we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before prepared, that we should walk in them." Eph. 2:8-10. It is "not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to

His mercy He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He poured out upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour." Titus 3:5, 6.

It is by the works of God, therefore, that we are saved, and not by our own. Good works there are in abundance, and they are for us too, but through no work of our own; solely through the perfect work of God in Jesus Christ. If the works were our own, then the rest would be our own; but God gives us His rest, not ours, because only His works can yield perfect rest. "He hath made His wonderful works to be remembered" (Ps. 111:4), or, literally,

422

"He hath made a memorial for His wondrous works." That memorial is the seventh day, the day on which He rested from all His works. That day He has blessed and sanctified, made holy. Its holiness has never departed from it, for "whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever." No matter what man does, nor how man regards the day, its holiness remains.

"There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God;" and the seventh day, which God for ever declares to be His rest, is that by which He makes known to us the perfection of His rest, because it calls us to contemplate a finished and perfect new creation. It reveals to us the everlasting God, the unwearied, almighty Creator, who has wrought and laid up great goodness for them that trust in Him before the sons of men. Ps. 31:19. It reminds us that we are "complete in Him, which is the head of all principality and power." It tells us that, although we have sinned, and brought the curse upon God's perfect creation, the cross of Christ, which bears the curse, restores and perpetuates the perfect work of God, so that through it we may stand without fault before the throne of God, just as when man was first made. "Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift."

THE JEWISH SABBATH

There is such a thing as "the Jewish Sabbath," or the Sabbath of the Jews, but it is a far different thing from the Sabbath of the Lord. Many people imagine that if one observes the seventh day he is keeping the Jewish Sabbath; but that does not at all follow. No one keeps the Jewish Sabbath if he keeps the Sabbath "according to the commandment." There is the same difference between the Jewish Sabbath and the Sabbath of the Lord, that there is between a man and God. Let us explain.

"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord;" but we have seen that the Lord's rest is spiritual rest, which the seventh day commemorates. A man may cease from physical toil on the seventh day of the week, and not keep the Sabbath of the Lord. If a man stops work on Friday evening at sunset, and abstains from all labor until the next day at sunset, merely as a form of worship, and in order that he may be physically better able to go at his work again, or with the thought that he is thereby discharging a duty, and gaining the favor of God, that is not keeping the Sabbath of the Lord. To keep the Sabbath of the Lord is to delight in the Lord. Those who do not delight themselves in the Lord, do not keep His Sabbath, no matter when they abstain from labor.

It is absolutely impossible for one who is not a Christian to keep the Lord's Sabbath; for, as we have seen, God's rest comes only from His perfect work, which is found only in Christ. "We which believe do enter into rest." Therefore no Jew, so-called, as distinguished from a believer in Christ, keeps the Sabbath of the Lord, even though he apparently rests on the seventh day of the week. His rest is his own rest, and not the rest of the Lord.

Do you see the difference? The Jewish Sabbath falls on the same day of the week as the Sabbath of the Lord, but it is not by any means the same thing. It represents only the man himself, and his own work. Instead of being the sign of justification by faith in the work of the Lord, it is the sign of self-righteousness, as indicated by the question which the Jews asked of Jesus: "What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?" They counted their own works equal to God's works. Their obedience was not the obedience of faith, but only of form. From such a Sabbath may the Lord deliver us. It is from it that we are delivered in the Sabbath of the Lord, for we are saved from our own works, and given the perfect works of the Lord. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," but let us beware of making it a mere caricature of rest. Let us take it for what it is: the rest of the Lord.

THE POPE'S SABBATH

This is something entirely different from the Sabbath of the Jews, and infinitely different from the Sabbath of the Lord. The Sabbath of the Lord is the acceptance of God's own works, and rest in them alone, allowing Him to work both to will and to do of His good pleasure; the Jewish Sabbath represents the vain attempt of zealous and self-confident men to do the works which God Himself does, and which God alone can do; but the Pope's sabbath signifies the substitution of man's work for God's work, as being not only as good, but even better. It dispenses with even the form of the commandment of the Lord. Let us see how this is.

The Lord's Sabbath has been sufficiently dwelt on for the present. We know what it is. We have seen that the Jews' sabbath is the observing of the *form* of the Lord's Sabbath, without the substance which can come only by faith. It falls on the same day, but is man's Sabbath, not the Lord's. The Pope's Sabbath has nothing in common with the Sabbath of the Lord, not even in form, but utterly repudiates it. Thus, a papist book, entitled, "A Sure Way to Find Out the True Religion," says:-

"The keeping holy the Sunday is a thing absolutely necessary to salvation; and yet this is nowhere put down in the Bible; on the contrary, the Bible, says, Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy (Ex. 20:8), which is Saturday, and not Sunday; therefore the Bible does not contain all things necessary to salvation."

This is only one out of many similar citations that might be given, but is sufficient to show that in the observance of Sunday the Catholic Church deliberately repudiates the Word of the Lord, and sets itself above it. It has placed its sabbath on an entirely different day from the Sabbath of the Lord,-a day which even God Himself could not possibly have made His Sabbath, since

on it He began His work, in order to emphasize its claim to be above God. It would teach men that they are to obey the church rather than God.

Notice that the citation speaks about the necessity of "keeping holy the Sunday." But God has not made the

423

Sunday holy. In fact, the Bible knows nothing about such a day. It does know the first day of the week, which it calls a working day, but the Sunday, a day composed of parts of two days, was made in Rome. The only day that God has ever spoken of as holy is the seventh day of the week. That day He Himself has made holy, and all He asks of us is to *keep it holy*. But since God has not made the Sunday holy, it follows that if man is to keep it holy, man himself must make it holy. All the sacredness in the world that Sunday has is that which man gives to it. The Sunday-sabbath, therefore, stands as the sign of man's pretended power to make things holy. For if man can make one thing holy, it is evident that he can make anything holy. If man can make and keep a day holy, then he can make and keep himself holy. The Pope's Sabbath is thus the sign of his claim to take the place of the Lord as the sanctifier of sinners.

While the seventh day is the sign of God's power to save by His own works, the Sunday is the sign of man's assumed power to save himself by his own works, entirely apart from, and in spite of the Lord. It repudiates the Lord, in repudiating His Word. Take notice that this is said of the Pope's Sunday, and not of all those who regard it as a holy day. There are thousands who are keeping the Pope's day, honestly supposing it to be the Sabbath of the Lord. Such of course believe in justification by faith, although they unwittingly observe the sign of justification by works. It is for the benefit of such that this article is written, that they may be wholly consistent in their profession of faith. We are dealing with facts, regardless of how men may stand related to them; and the facts are that the Lord's Sabbath is justification by faith; the Pope's Sabbath means justification by works, and that man's own works. On which side will you stand?

July 21, 1898

"The Wisdom of Solomon" *American Sentinel* 13, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

Solomon wrote, "He that passeth by, and meddleth with strife belonging not unto him, is like one that taketh a dog by the ears." Bishop Thomas W. Dudley, of whom the following story is told, had evidently learned some lessons at the same school that Solomon did:-

When it was first known in the city in which he was settled that he was to go to Kentucky, some of his friends were disposed to be critical.

"You are not going to Kentucky, are you?" asked one.

"Yes, indeed."

"Do you know what kind of a State that is? I saw in the paper that one man killed another in a Kentucky town for treading on a dog."

The bishop said nothing, and the man continued, impatiently, "What are you going to do in a place like that?"

"I'm not going to tread on the dog!" was the calm reply.

The quarrelsome man is the one who is always in difficulty. A man of peace can live peaceably even among ill-disposed people. No man ever has any use for weapons, except the man who always carries them.

American Sentinel, Vol. 14 (1899)

March 2, 1899

"True Sabbath Observance" *American Sentinel* 14, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

When the Jews persecuted Jesus for the good deed done to the impotent man, He justified Himself by saying, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." That was a real justification of His act, for to do that which God does is the most perfect righteousness. Moreover, the acts of Jesus were not simply copies of what the Father did; if they were, then there would be in them no lessons or help for us, for it would show no connection between Him and frail human beings. But He said, "I do nothing of Myself;" "but the Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works." John viii. 28; xiv. 10. There is no man so weak that he cannot let God work in him to will and to do of His good pleasure.

Jesus was accused of violating the Sabbath, and He did indeed break the Jewish Sabbath, but not the Sabbath of the Lord. The Jewish Sabbath consisted in formal cessation of all labour on the seventh day of the week, even though human life was lost thereby. It was simply a yoke, a burden, an act of penance by which they thought, to make themselves righteous. It had nothing in common with the Sabbath of the Lord except that it was kept on the same day of the week. The Lord's Sabbath is absolute rest in Him and His word,-dependence on His life; and since His life is activity,-service for others,-it follows that true Sabbath-keeping may sometimes involve severe physical labour. How can one tell what works are lawful on the Sabbath day, and what are not?-No list of lawful and unlawful works can be given, but this principle will guide whatever labour is necessary for the welfare of suffering humanity, whether the disease be of body or of soul, and from which the labourer derives absolutely no profit or benefit except the consciousness of God's presence, is proper Sabbath labour. True Sabbath keeping is rest in God,-absolute and unqualified acceptance of His word.

"My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." How does God work, and how had Jesus done the work for which He was now persecuted?-By His word. Mark this: it was not as a man works by giving orders to another. No man may flatter himself that he is keeping the Sabbath while others are labouring in his employ. Whosoever does a thing by another does it himself. It is not the way that God works, and it was not in that way that Jesus healed the impotent man. He did not speak the word which set somebody else to work, but *His word itself did the*

work. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth." "He spake, and it was." Ps. xxxiii. 6, 9. This miracle of Jesus was therefore simply a manifestation of the creative power of God's word.

In six days God created the heavens and the earth; and then He rested on the seventh day, not because to

133

have continued the work of creation would have been a sin, but for the good reason that it was all done. The word, however, continued to work in upholding that which it had created. All the works of God since that time (so far at least as this earth is concerned) are simply to uphold or to restore, and the works which He does for us and through us are to the same effect. Keeping the Sabbath of the Lord is simply the absolute resting in God's finished work, and allowing Him to put them into us. The absolute ceasing from all our own works on the seventh day,-from everything by which we may get gain,-is an indication of our trust in God for "life, and breath, and all things." If one dare not trust God to keep him if he should rest on what is to all the world (and even the greater part of the professed Christian world,) the busiest day of the week, how can he persuade himself that he is trusting for eternity?

April 6, 1899

"Spiritual Impotence of Civil Government" *American Sentinel* 14, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

"Present Truth." (London, England.)

A motion was lately made in the House of Lords that a report be provided showing the number of cases in which confessional boxes have been introduced into the Church of England. Lord Salisbury, while agreeing to the request, pointed out that whatever steps were taken by the government, they were powerless to deal with any spiritual evil. He said:-

"If there are any means of repressing or discouraging the practice of habitual confession, they would deserve all our consideration. I fear, however, that you are undertaking an effort to *coerce consciences*, which greater powers have failed to effect, and that you are more likely to increase the disease than to stop it. but allow me to point out that this return will not tell you one hundredth part of the evil.

"If there is to be confession, which I most earnestly deprecate, I would rather have the open box in the church than the secret interview in the vestry. It is between

212

these two that you have to choose, and my fear is, in the first place, that you will not get an accurate return of the boxes there are, because everybody who returns the existence of a box returns a confession that he has broken the law. You will not get people to do that; they will simply put your circular in the fire. And

beyond that you will be giving a vicious stimulus to a certain mistaken spirit of religious courage which will most undoubtedly, and I think unfortunately, induce a more extended practice of the evil which you so justly deprecate.

"I greatly fear that if men wish to confess to men or-perhaps I should put it more accurately-if women wish to confess to men, all the power this Parliament possesses will not avail seriously to arrest the process. The power of arresting it lies with the organization over which the right reverend prelates preside. It is for them to teach their flocks-they cannot do it too earnestly and too often-the evils which may attend habitual and systematic secret confession. But let us be careful lest we hinder their work, and prevent them from doing that which it is their proper charge to carry out, by bringing in the arm of the flesh which never yet beat down a religious error, and has often made the evil worse than before."

Lord Salisbury recognizes that it is the work of the church to attend to matters of religion, and that the "arm of flesh" never yet mended matters. If the church is corrupt and powerless for good, it is only by reason of its unlawful connection with the world, and the first step in reform must be a separation from this entangling and corrupting alliance. If the church neglects its work, the State cannot take it up. It should not be necessary for a statesman to remind the church of this truth.

A merely political disestablishment will not suffice to correct the evil. The forbidden connection with the State arises out of a lack of faith in the power of the Word, and a sinful yielding to worldly influences. The friendship of the world is enmity with God (James 4:4), and the duty of every believer in the church is to repent and do the first works, not trusting in the arm of flesh, but returning to his first love. Rev. 2:4, 5. Christ loved the church and gave himself for it, and the church which loyally recognizes its obligation to its Lord will, forsaking all other, cleave only to him, content with the riches and the power which he bestows.

April 27, 1899

"A Frank Admission" *American Sentinel* 14, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

"Present Truth." (London, Eng.)

A gentleman who has recently visited Rome writes as follows in the *Christian World*:-

Rome would, if she had the power, still force her creeds by fire and faggot. I was talking one day while in Rome with a prelate of the Church on the question of heresy. "As a matter of fact," I said to him, "I could not believe many of your doctrines. They are to me simply unbelievable." "Ah, well," he replied, "we distinguish in cases of heresy." "In what way?" I asked. "Well," he said, "there are two kinds of heresy-there is passive heresy and active heresy. Passive heresy is simply to doubt, but active heresy is to propagate the doubt. In the former case the Church is very merciful." "But," I asked, "suppose you as a Church had

supreme power to-day as you once had, and suppose I felt it my duty to openly oppose certain articles of your faith. What would the Church do?" "*It would stop at nothing to stamp out the heresy,*" was his reply.

There is nothing to be surprised at in this, but there is danger that men will regard Rome as having a monopoly of the persecuting spirit. Persecution began with Cain. It was seen in Ishmael, and it will appear in everyone who is not born of the Spirit. As then, "he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even suit is now." People may think that they will never persecute, but they certainly will unless they be born of the Spirit. Those who do not gather with Christ scatter abroad, and this is persecution. There is no such thing as "passive heresy" against the false doctrines of Rome.

May 18, 1899

"A Divine Protest Against War" *American Sentinel* 14, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

"Present Truth." (London, Eng.)

"Then Simon Peter having a sword, drew it, and smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear. The servant's name was Malchus. Then said Jesus unto Peter, Put up thy sword into the sheath; the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?"

Jesus had said to his disciples, and to us as well, "I say unto you, That ye resist not evil," and here he showed that his words are to be taken in their plainest signification. If there was ever a place in the world when right was oppressed by might, here it was. If ever in this world the sword was drawn in a just cause, this was the time; yet Jesus rebuked it. Nothing else can be learned from this occurrence than that there are no possible circumstances under which it is justifiable to use weapons of warfare. Such sentiments as the following we find given very frequent and prominent place in religious journals:-

In the last resort,-when insult has been wantonly inflicted, when the obligations of honor have been wilfully repudiated, and when every resource of peaceful diplomacy has been exhausted,-no self-respecting nation will be found unprepared to maintain its dignity and enforce its rights by appeal to arms.

Let that serve for those nations and peoples who have no other method of maintaining their honor and dignity than that which is common to the brutes. Jesus showed that there is a better way to maintain one's dignity. He was insulted and abused, yet never did the native dignity of His character assert itself and shine forth more conspicuously, and so victoriously, too, than when He reproved Peter for using the sword. Unarmed, He stood before that crowd of armed men, and demonstrated Himself to be their Master. Every Christian who is such indeed, has the same armor that He had. Read Eph. 6:13. For professed Christians, therefore, to take the sword in self-defense, or for any other purpose, is to

admit that they know nothing of "the power of Jesus' name."

July 13, 1899

"The True Peace Conference" *American Sentinel* 14, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

There is a council of peace continually in session, and it is the only council that can accomplish definite results. "Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the Man whose name is THE BRANCH; and He shall grow up out of His place, and He shall build the temple of the Lord; even He shall build the temple of the Lord; and He shall bear the glory; and shall sit and rule upon His throne; and He shall be a priest upon His throne; and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." Zech. 6:12, 13. The true counsel of peace is between God and Christ on the throne of God in heaven. The God of peace has sent Jesus, "the Prince of peace," who is "our peace," preaching peace, "peace to him that is far off, and to him that is near." Isa. 57:19.

Christ has left His peace with men, but not as the world gives it. Whoever will let the peace of God rule in his heart (Col. 3:15), by receiving and trusting absolutely in the Word of God, will be kept by "the peace of God which passeth all understanding." Phil. 4:6, 7. This is the peace of righteousness, which comes from hearkening to the commandments of God. Isa. 48:18; Rom. 5:1. Only God can impart this peace, and it is the only peace that is peace indeed. It is perfect peace, and it is as lasting as eternity.

Now it is not this peace that the delegates of the nations have met to confer about at The Hague, and consequently they are imagining a vain thing. If it were the true peace that they were conferring about they would be having a religious meeting pure and simple seeking the blessing of the fullness of the Holy Spirit. "What a strange thing that would be for a congress composed of delegates from all the nations," all will exclaim. Indeed it would be a strange thing, and an impossible thing; for if they were assembled for that purpose, their action could not be representative. Each one could secure peace for himself only, as an individual. Their action would bind nobody else. It would be a grand thing, however, if they would seek peace in that way, for then something would be accomplished; a few men, at least, would secure peace.

"There is no peace, saith my Lord, to the wicked." Isa. 57:21. It is only by personal faith in Christ that righteousness comes; therefore it is evident that to nations on this earth there can never be peace. Only by submitting to the mild sway of Him that sitteth on the throne in the heavens, and acknowledging and keeping His laws, can there be peace. That would result in there being only one King over all, which will be the case in the world to come, when "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign forever and ever." Rev. 11:15.

It is not necessary, therefore, not even profitable, to call a conference of all the nations, in order to have peace. Each person may have a successful peace

conference by himself, wherever he is God has spoken peace, and Christ has been sent with the message. We have only to listen and accept. "I will hear what God the Lord will speak; for He will speak peace unto His people, and to His saints."

"Paganism and Sunday" *American Sentinel* 14, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

"Present Truth." (London, Eng.)

The *Church Family Newspaper* of the 16 June contains the following bit of information appropriate to the season:-

"The near approach of Midsummer Day calls to mind the fact that that day and the preceding eve, now dedicated to St. John the Baptist, have been regarded as a holy season even from remote pagan times. There seems to be little doubt that one custom which was observed in our own time, and may he still in remote parts of Ireland and Scotland-that of lighting, fires on the hills on Midsummer Eve-had come down to us from the time when the sun-god Bel, or Baal, was worshipped in these islands. Such fires were common over the greater part of Europe-from the cold borders of Lapland to the Levant."

The same custom is continued till the present time in Norway and Sweden, where Midsummer Day is quite a holiday. In connection with the foregoing, the following from the same paper, with regard to Stonehenge in Salisbury Plain, fits very well:-

There is now no doubt of the character of this mighty ruin. Baal worship was at one time almost the universal religion, and this was one of the great temples. It was oriented so that the rays of the rising sun at midsummer should fall upon its sacred altar. It would be rash to guess its age for it may be older than the time of Elijah. Very little is known of the religious teaching of the Druids, but they were believed to have been Baal, that is, sun worshippers. . . . Sixty years ago I heard boys sing in the streets a song which is a portion of a Druidical hymn to the rising sun. In English it sounds like nonsense, and they had no idea what they were saying; it was a wonderful survival of pagan Britain, and Elijah may have heard this chorus, sung by the priests of Baal, three thousand years ago. In one or two remote parts of Britain, the custom of commemorating the triumph of the sun on June 21 still continues, with dancing and bonfires. The peasants are probably innocent of the origin of this custom.

Many people are observing pagan customs, wholly ignorant of their origin, thinking indeed that they are Christian because "the Church" has adopted them and sanctions them. How many realise the connection between Christmas and Midsummer Day? The observance of the latter is admitted to be solely of pagan origin Sun worshippers celebrated it as the day of the greatest triumph of their god, the day on which the sun was longest and highest above the horizon. Just six months later, after a period of progressive daily decrease of sunshine, when

the sun seemed to be going away, they celebrated the time of the beginning of its return, its birth, as they called it.

Now when the bishops of the early church, more anxious to secure a large following than to win men from the superstitions of paganism, saw how firmly the heathen were wedded to these sun-festivals, they resolved

423

to adopt them, so that the heathen could profess Christianity without making any violent change in their habits and customs. But of course it would not do to continua them as emblems of the worship of the ruler of the day. So, remembering that Jesus was just six months younger than John the Baptist, they hit on the plan of calling Midsummer Day the birthday of John the Baptist, and the winter celebration the birthday of Jesus, quieting their consciences, if they had any conscience in the matter, by the fact that Jesus is "the Sun of righteousness." So we have Christmas, a purely heathen festival, firmly fixed in the Church. When so much of sun worship had been adopted, it was but a short step to the adoption of Sunday, "the venerable day of the sun."

October 26, 1899

"How to Change a Bad Law" *American Sentinel* 14, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

[This question, which engages so much attention here among promoters of reforms in political and social life, is ably discussed and clearly answered in *Present Truth*, of London, Eng., as follows:-]

By a bad law we do not mean a law that some people do not like, but a law that requires something that is wrong. Many people dislike that which is good; and human nature is ever inclined to make itself the standard of goodness, and to say that whatever is opposed to its desires is bad; but our tastes and inclinations are not to be taken into account at all; there is one standard of right, and that is the law of God-God's own life. Whatever is contrary to God's Word-the word of life-is bad, and should be shunned as one would shun the plague. To obey a bad law is identical with breaking a good law.

Now there are laws that are bad. They are found to a greater or lesser extent in every nation. Such are the laws that are directly opposed to the law of God, although they may be in harmony with the sentiments of the majority of the people. In every nation there are also to be found men who are sorely distressed over the existence of such laws, and to exert themselves in various ways to have them repealed. This opposition usually takes the form of political agitation, of the same nature as that by which the laws were enacted, sometimes going even to the extent of armed rebellion and revolution. In some instances the opposition is apparently successful, but in most it is an open failure, and in no case is the success real and lasting.

At the present time in this country the burning question is that of ritualism in the Church. Inasmuch as the Established Church is in reality a State institution, so long as it remains an established church, dissenters as a rule feel that they

have as much interest in the controversy as have Churchmen. Accordingly both Protestant and Catholic journals discuss the question freely, but there is a great difference of opinion among anti-ritualists as to how the swelling flood of sacerdotalism in the Church is to be checked.

In the *Contemporary Review*, Dr. Guinness Rogers has an article on "The Archbishops and the Ritualists," in which he says, "I do not believe in coercive legislation, even in the interests of Protestantism." To this statement the *Methodist Times* takes exception. It should be stated that Dr. Rogers declares that "we shall resist all efforts to Romanize the establishment-that is, we shall do our utmost to prevent the present compromise from being altered in a sacerdotal direction." Whereupon the *Methodist Times* responds thus:-

668

But how does he propose to resist the Romanizers except by "coercive legislation"? At every period of history the only kind of suasion that has any effective influence over clerical extremists is legal suasion. In the last resort, as in the days of the Reformation, the House of Commons, representing the laity, must compel lawless priests to obey or resign.

It is not our purpose to enter into the controversy; but it is a duty to point out that since State legislation-politics in the Church-brought about the present state of things, State legislation, even though it be called into requisition for the purpose of reformation, can only perpetuate the existing evil, possibly under another form.

How then can any reform ever be effected? This is what we propose to show; and since nothing is so convincing as a case already worked out, we shall content ourselves with referring to an instance where a bad law was effectually changed.

Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, the greatest king that the world ever saw, made a great image of gold, ninety feet high, and set it up in the plain of Dura, and then gathered the chief men from all parts of the world to come and fall down before it. Under threat of the most terrible death if they disobeyed, all were commanded to fall down and worship the image at a given signal.

Here was a law directly contrary to God's law, which says: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." It was therefore a bad law, although the most of the people had nothing against it. At least they obeyed it without question.

But there were three men who knew the law to be bad, and who knew that to obey it would be to sin against God; so while the others fell down and worshiped, they stood upright. We all know the story well. The king was very gracious toward them, and though they had not heeded his law, he was willing to give them another chance. But they gave him to understand that they were fully decided, and did not need any time to think over the matter. They said, "Be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up."

This was not disobedience but obedience. They were not law-breakers, but lawkeepers. The true law was, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve;" the king's law was in itself an act of despite to the law, so that when the three men refused to regard it, they were only showing their faithfulness to law.

Let it be noted, however, that these man were not rebellious. They did not attempt to raise any insurrection. They did not harangue the people about the injustice of the law, and the wickedness of the threatened punishment. They made no appeal for sympathy, but simply proclaimed the power of their God. They were not there to oppose the king, nor to defend themselves, but to honor God. So they refused to be disobedient to their Creator, and willingly allowed themselves to be bound and cast into the burning furnace.

Everybody knows the result. They fell down in the furnace, bound hand and foot, but immediately stood up again, for the fire destroyed their bonds, and set them free. Rather, it demonstrated their freedom. It had no power over them. They walked about in the fire, with the Lord by their side, as comfortably as though they were promenading in the cool of a summer evening.

Then the king called them out, and bore witness before all the assembled rulers that these three men had changed the law. "Nebuchadnezzar spake, and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who hath sent His angel, and delivered His servants that trusted in Him, and have changed the king's word." Dan. 3:28. There is no doubt but that the law was changed, abolished, for nobody was again commanded to worship the golden image. Nebuchadnezzar himself recognized God as the only One to be worshiped, and declared that these three captive Jews had changed his decree. Surely this was a wonderful deed.

How did they do it? As we have seen; they made no stir, they did not appeal to the people, they circulated no petitions, they did not plead, and they did not threaten. They used no coercive legislation, nor any other kind. How then did they succeed in getting the law changed? King Nebuchadnezzar himself tells us. He said, "They have changed the king's word, *and yielded their bodies that they might not serve nor worship any god, except their own God.*"

This confirms what we have said. They were not disobedient, but obedient. They were not rebellious, but yielding. They changed the laws by yielding their bodies to death, rather than do wrong. That was all, but was sufficient, for there is almighty power in righteousness.

November 23, 1899

"The Trust about Infallibility" *American Sentinel* 14, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

"Present Truth." (London, Eng.)

The infallibility of the Pope of Rome is claimed by Monsignor Vaughan partly from the following text: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28:20. "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive." John 16:16, 17. "When He, the Spirit of truth is come, and He will guide you into all truth." John 16:13. "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." John 14:26.

But all these things were spoken to all the disciples-to all believers, the church as a whole. There is no room for a pope of any kind, for the Holy Spirit is Christ's representative, and He is sent to the whole church, and to each individual impartially. The humblest believer is therefore far better qualified to declare the truth than the Pope of Rome is, for each believer has all the advantages that the Pope can possibly have, with this additional advantage, that he does not profess to be pope. Self-exaltation shuts away the revelation of the Holy Spirit. Christ is meek and lowly in heart, and the truth of God is revealed unto babes. Matt. 11:25, 29. "If *any man* willeth to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." John 7:17.

December 21, 1899

"A Proposed Christmas Truce in South Africa" *American Sentinel* 14, 50.

E. J. Waggoner

"Present Truth." (London, Eng.)

The incongruity of two "Christian nations" engaged in deadly conflict at the same time celebrating what they suppose to be the birthday of the Prince of peace, and listening to the message, "Peace on earth, goodwill to men," appeals very forcibly to some people, and accordingly it has been suggested to the authorities in South Africa, both at Cape Town and the Transvaal, that "on that day, at any rate, there should be peace from midnight to midnight."

It is sad that any Christian should have so little knowledge of the Gospel as not to see the incongruity of such a proposal. What a caricature of peace it would be, what a travesty of upon the Gospel of peace, for two armies to cease all hostilities on midnight of the 24th of December, expecting to resume them at midnight on the 25th, and in the meantime solemnly to announce that they were celebrating the birthday of the Prince of peace! It would be awful mockery.

The proposal, evidently made in all sincerity, shows how much the Gospel has come to be considered as a mere form and ceremony, as satisfied by the observance of certain days and certain ceremonies. Such religion is essentially heathenism, differing from that which is ordinarily known as such only in kind. If the suggestion were adopted, it would doubtless be hailed as an evidence of the hold that Christianity has on the people of the world, whereas it would simply show how greatly people are controlled by superstition in spite of centuries of

Gospel preaching. We are reminded of the man who reckoned himself a good Christian, for while he would

797

usually swear till the air was blue with oaths, he never swore on Sunday!

Even supposing that the 25th of December were the day on which Jesus was born in Bethlehem, which it most certainly is not, the mere observance of that day, in any way whatsoever, would have no element of Christianity in it. Christianity is a life, and if it exists at all in any person, must be the whole of his life. People often have enough perception of the fitness of things to say that it is useless to give one day of the week to God and all the rest to the world and the devil; but the fact is, such a thing is impossible. Such an idea is on a par with the stories of dead men who on certain occasions come out of their graves and walk about. It is just as impossible for a man to render real acceptable service to God on only one day in the year, or in the week, and to serve himself and the devil all the other days, as it would be for a man to come from the grave in full vigor one day in each year or each week, and lie lifeless all the rest of the time.

God can raise the dead, but when He does it, it is to the end that death shall no more have dominion over them. The Spirit of God can quicken into life those who are "dead in trespasses and sins;" but He does not do this periodically. Christ "ever liveth," but His life is nothing to us unless He lives in us; and while He is longsuffering, and will come back even after having been received and again thrust out, it is not conceivable nor possible that any soul should open the door at midnight to receive Him, with the express understanding that He must leave at the next midnight to come again if called for at any time. That would be but to make a plaything of the Lord.

The birth of Christ must be regarded, but not by celebrating a day. We are left in utter ignorance of the day when Jesus was born in Bethlehem, so that there need be no temptation to substitute the celebration of it for real acceptance of Him; just as God did not allow the Israelites to see any form when He talked with them from Sinai so that they could not attempt to make a likeness of Him, and substitute that for Him. Deut. 4:15-19. Yet men have presumed to do both. The birth of Christ is to and for each individual. If Jesus be not born in a man's heart and life, it will be of no avail to him that He was born in Judea nineteen hundred years ago.