

Tremont Temple Lectures

A. T. Jones

Our Constitution. Shall It Be Preserved?

What Is the True Relation that Exists Between Religion and the State?

THE first of a series of lectures on our National Constitution, and Religion and the State, was delivered Tuesday, January 8, in the Temple, before a highly appreciative audience, by A. T. Jones, editor of the *American Sentinel*.

"As our National Constitution now stands, there is a total separation between church and state; as, when the proposed amendment shall have been adopted, there will be a union. Which of these shall we favor? is the question before us to-night. The amendment to which I refer is sometimes called "The Blair Educational Amendment;" but it would more properly be called "The Church and State Amendment," or "The Blair Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States," because that is what it really is.

FIFTIETH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION. S. R. 86.

In the Senate of the United States, May 25, 1888, Mr. Blair introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice, and ordered to lie on the table; and September 14, 1888, it was ordered to be printed: "Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religion and free public schools."

It will be seen at a glance that this is only to reverse the provisions of the First Amendment to our Constitution as it is: - "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Therefore our inquiry to-night shall be, Is our Constitution right as it is? or will it not be right until such an amendment shall have been adopted?

As the amendment is proposed professedly in behalf of Christianity, the words of Christ are properly the source of inquiry on the subject. This would be so in any case; and I shall never offer an apology to any audience for taking the position that the word of Jesus Christ is the supreme standard upon any subject upon which he speaks. Has he spoken anything on this question? Let us see.

"Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. We know that thou art true, and teaches the way of God in truth. Tell us, therefore, what thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cesar, or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Whose is this image and superscription? They said unto him, Cesar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's; and unto God, the things that are God's." - Matt. 22:15-21.

In these words Christ has established a clear distinction between Cesar and God, that is, between the civil and religious powers, and between what we owe to

the civil power and what we owe to the religious power. That which is Cesar's is to be rendered to Cesar alone; that which is God's is to be rendered to God alone. To say that we are to render to Cesar that which is God's, or that we are to render to God by Cesar that which is God's, is to pervert the words of Christ, and make them meaningless.

These words show, not only that there are things that pertain to Cesar alone and things that pertain to God alone, but that it is our duty as servants of Christ to know what these things are, and accordingly render to Cesar that which is Cesar's, and to God that which is God's.

As the term Cesar refers to civil government, it is apparent that the duties which we owe to Cesar are civil duties, while those we owe to God are wholly moral or religious duties. Webster defines as "The recognition of God as an object of worship, love, and obedience;" and another definition is "a man's relation of faith and obedience to God." It is evident, therefore, that religion and religious duties pertain solely to God, and that which is God's is to be rendered to him, and not to Cesar; it follows inevitably that civil government can never of right have anything to do with religion, - with a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God.

In support of the doctrine that civil government has the right to act in things pertaining to God, the text of scripture is quoted which says: "The powers that be are ordained of God." This passage is found in Rom. 13:1. The first nine verses of that chapter are devoted to the subject, showing that the powers that be are ordained of God, and enjoining upon Christians, upon every soul in fact, the duty of respectful subjection to civil government.

By those who advocate a religious amendment to the Constitution, it is argued that because the powers that be are ordained of God, it must have something to do with men's relations to God. Is it a sound argument to say that because a thing is ordained of God, it is ordained to every purpose and work under the sun? A minister of the gospel is ordained of God, - but for what? To preach the gospel; and not as too many ministers now-a-days seem to think, as ministers of the law or politics. No minister of the gospel was ever ordained as a minister of the law, either moral or civil; and when a minister enters on any such work as that, he is doing a work that Christ never sent him to do.

By reading the first nine verses of the 13th chapter, it will be seen that this scripture is but an exposition of the words of Christ, "Render to Cesar that which is Cesar's." It is God's own commentary on these words, and in them there is a recognition of the rightfulness of civil government, that it has claims upon us, and that it is our duty to recognize those claims. This scripture in Rom. 13, simply states the same thing in other words: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God; for the powers that be are ordained of God."

Again: the Saviour's words were called out by a question concerning tribute. They said to him, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cesar, or not?" Referring to the same thing, Romans 13:6 says: "For this cause pay ye tribute." In answer to the question of the Pharisees about the tribute, Christ said, "Render to Cesar the things which are Cesar's." Romans 13:7 says: Render to all their dues; tribute to

whom tribute is due." We repeat therefore that Rom. 13:9 is the Lord's own commentary upon the words of Christ in Matt. 22:17-21.

The passage in Romans refers first to civil government, the higher powers, not the highest power, the powers that be. Next it speaks of rulers bearing the sword and attending upon matters of tribute. Then he adds, "Render tribute to whom tribute is due, and owe no man anything, but to love one another, for he that loveth fulfilleth the law." Then he refers to the last five commandments, and says: "If there be any other commandment it is briefly comprehended in this saying; namely, Thou shalt

2

love thy neighbor as thyself." There are other commandments of the same law to which Paul here refers, and he knew it. Why then did he say, "If there be any other commandment" etc.? There was the first table of the law, containing the commandments which say, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" "Thou shalt not make any graven image;" "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy;" and the other commandment in which is comprehended all these, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." Paul well knew of these commandments. Why then, did he say, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying; namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"? Answer: Because he is writing upon the words of the Saviour which relate to our duties to civil government. Our duties under civil government pertain only to the government and to our fellow men; and the powers of civil government pertain solely to men in their relations one to another, and to the State. But the Saviour's words in the same connection entirely separated that which pertained to God from that which pertained to civil government. The things that pertain to God are not to be rendered to civil government, - to the powers that be: therefore it was that Paul, although knowing full well that there were other commandments, said, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying; namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" that is, if there be any other commandment which comes into the relation between man and civil government, it is comprehended in this saying that he shall love his neighbor as himself; showing conclusively that the powers that be, though ordained of God, are so ordained only in things pertaining to his fellow man, and in those things alone.

Further: as in this divine record of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no reference whatever to the first table of the law, it therefore follows, that the powers that be, although ordained of God, have nothing to do with the relations which men bear toward God.

As the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man, and as in God's own enumeration of the duties that men owe to the powers that be, there is no mention of any of the things contained in the first table of the law, it follows that none of the duties enjoined in the first table of the law of God, do men owe to the powers that be. That is to say, again, the powers that be, although ordained of God, are not ordained of God in anything pertaining to a single duty enjoined in any of the first four of the ten commandments. These are duties that men owe to

God; and with these the powers that be, can of right have nothing to do; because Christ has commanded to render unto God, not to Cesar, nor by Cesar, that which is God's.

Let us look a moment at this question from a common-sense point of view. Of course, all we are saying is common sense, but let us have this additional. I will read a sentence from a judicial decision which has the honor to be, so far as I have been able to discover, and I think it is in fact the only supreme court decision that has been rendered in the United States which has attempt to lift state constitution and legislation up to the level of the National Constitution. It says: -

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

I have the right to protect my person and property against all *comers*. Every other person ha the same right, and if this right is to be personally exercised in all cases by every one, then in the present condition of human nature, every man's hand will be against his neighbor. That is simply Anarchy, and in such a condition of affairs, society cannot exist. Now suppose a hundred of us are thrown together in a certain place where there is *no established* order, each one has all the rights of any other one. But if each one is individually to exercise these rights of self protection, he has only the assurance of that degree of protection which he alone can furnish to himself, which we have seen is exceedingly slight. Therefore we all come together, and each surrenders to the whole body that individual right; and in return for this surrender he receives the power of all for his protection. He therefore receives the help of the other ninety-nine to protect himself from the invasion of his rights, and he is thus made one hundred times more secure in his right of person and property than he is without this surrender. But what condition of things can ever be conceived of among men that would justify any man in surrendering his right to believe? What could he receive as an equivalent? When he has surrendered his right to believe, he has virtually surrendered his right to think. When he surrenders his right to believe, he surrenders every thing, and it is impossible for him ever to receive an equivalent; he has surrendered his very soul. Eternal life depends upon believing on the Lord Jesus Christ; and the man who surrenders his right to believe, surrenders eternal life. Says the Scripture, "With the mind I serve the law of God." A man who surrenders his right to believe surrenders God. Consequently no man, no association, or organization of men, can ever rightly ask of any man a surrender of his right to believe. Every man has the right, so far as organizations of men are concerned, to believe as he pleases; and that right so long as he is a Protestant, so long as he is a Christian, yes, so long as he is a man, he never can surrender, and he never will.

In Jer. 27:1-8 is clearly shown that the power of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, was ordained of God; nor to him alone; but to his son and his son's son, which is to say, that the power of the Babylonian empire, as an imperial power, was ordained of God. Nebuchadnezzar was plainly called by the Lord, "my servant"; and the Lord says, "I have given all these lands into the hand of

Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon," and says that whatever nation of kingdom will not serve the king of Babylon, and will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, and will not put their neck under the yoke of the King of Babylon, that nation will I punish, saith the Lord." Now let us see whether this power was ordained of God in things pertaining to God. In the third chapter of Daniel we have the record that Nebuchadnezzar made a great image of gold, set it up in the plain of Dura, and gathered together the governors, the captains, the judges, the treasurers, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces to the dedication of the image; and they stood before the image that had been set up. Then a herald from the king cried aloud, "To you it is commanded, O people, nations, and languages that . . . ye fall down and worship the golden image that the king hath set up." - Dan. 3:4, 5.

In obedience to this command all the people bowed down before the image and worshiped, except three Jews. Atheists, they would be called now-a-days, - Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. This disobedience on the part of the Jews was reported to Nebuchadnezzar, and he commanded them to be brought before him, and asked them whether it was intentional that they had disobeyed his order, and repeated his command himself direct to them. These men knew that they had been made subjects to the king of Babylon by the Lord himself. It had been prophesied by Isaiah (chapter 39) and by Jeremiah. Yet knowing all this, and having the Scriptures in their hands, they made answer to Nebuchadnezzar thus: "O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us out of thine hand, O king, but if not, be it known unto thee, O King, that we will not serve thy Gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." Then these men were plunged into the fiery furnace, heated seven times hotter than it was wont to be heated; but suddenly Nebuchadnezzar in astonishment rose up in haste and said to his counsel, "Did we not cast three men bound into the fire?" They answered, "True O King." But he exclaimed, "Lo I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt, and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God."

The men were called forth. "Then Nebuchadnezzar spake and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who hath sent his angel and delivered his servants that trusted in him, and hath changed the King's word and yielded their bodies that they might not serve nor worship any God except their own God."

Here we have demonstrated the following facts: First, God

3

gave power to the kingdom of Babylon. Secondly, he directly subjected his people to that power. Thirdly, he directly, by a wonderful miracle, defended his people from a certain assertion of that power. Does the Lord contradict himself, or oppose himself? Far from it. What then does this show? It shows, conclusively, that this was an undue exercise of the power which God had given. By this it is demonstrated that the power of Babylon, although ordained of God, was not ordained unto any such purpose as that for which it was here exercised, that though ordained of God it was not ordained in things pertaining to men's

consciences. And it was written for the instruction of future ages, and for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come.

Another instance: we read above that the power of Babylon was given to Nebuchadnezzar and his son, and his son's son, and that all nations should serve Babylon until that time, and that then nations and kings should sever themselves of him. Other prophecies show that Babylon was then to be destroyed. Jeremiah says, (51:28) that the king of the Medes, and all his land, with the captains and rulers should be prepared against Babylon to destroy it. Isa. 21:2 shows that Persia (Elam) should accompany Media in the destruction of Babylon. Isa. 5:1-4, names Cyrus as the leader of the forces more than one hundred years before he was born, and a hundred and seventy-four years before the time. And of Cyrus, the prophet said from the Lord, "I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways, he shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives, not for price nor reward saith the Lord of hosts." Isa. 45:13. But in the conquest of Babylon, Cyrus was but the leader of the forces and the rule fell to Darius, the Mede; for said Daniel to Belshazzar on the night when Babylon fell, they kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians. Then the record proceeds, "In that night was Belshazzar, the king of the Chaldeans slain, and Darius, the Median, took the kingdom;" and of him we read in Dan. 11:1, the words of the angel Gabriel to the prophet, "I, in the first year of Darius, the Mede, even I stood to confirm and to strengthen him.

There can be no shadow of doubt therefore that the power of Media and Persia was ordained of God. Darius made Daniel prime minister of the empire. But a number of the presidents and princes, envious of his position, sought to unseat him. After earnest attempts to find occasion against him, they were forced to confess that there was neither error nor fault in his conduct. "Then said these men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except ye find if against him concerning the law of his God."

They, therefore, assembled together to the king, and told him that all the presidents of the kingdom, and the governors, and the princes, and the captains, had consulted together to establish a royal statute; and to make a decree that whoever should ask a petition of any god or man, except the king, for thirty days, should be cast into the den of lions. Darius, never dreaming what they were after, signed the decree. Daniel knew that the decree was made, and that it was signed by the king. It was hardly possible for him not to know it, he went into his house, and, the windows being opened toward Jerusalem, he knelt three times a day, and prayed and gave thanks to God, as he did aforetime. He did not even close his windows, but left them open, as before, and prayed and gave thanks as he did before. He simply paid no attention to the decree that had been made, although he knew that decree forbade his doing as he did under the penalty of being thrown to the lions. He knew that although the power of Media and Persia was ordained of God, it was not ordained unto any such purpose as that to which it was here employed.

As was to be expected, the men who had secured the passage of the decree, found him praying and making supplication before his God. They went at once to the king, and asked him if he had not signed a decree that if any one should do

any such thing as that for thirty days, except to the king, he should be given to the lions. The king replied that it was true, according to the laws of the Medes and Persians, which could not be altered. Then they told him that Daniel did not regard the king nor the decree that he had signed, but made his petition three times a day. The king saw in a moment that he had allowed himself to be entrapped; but there was no remedy. Those who were pushing the matter, held before him the law, and said, "Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is that no decree nor statute which the king establisheth may be changed." Nothing can be done, but that the decree, being law, must be enforced. Daniel was given to the lions. He stayed in the den all night. When morning came, the king came to the den, and called to Daniel, and Daniel replied, "O king, live forever. My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me; for as much as before him innocency was found in me; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt."

Thus again God has shown that although the powers that be are ordained of God, they are not ordained in things that pertain to men's relation toward God. Christ's words are a positive declaration to that effect, and Romans 13:1-9 is a further exposition of that principle. The United States is the only government in history that is based on the principles established by Christ. In article VI of the National Constitution, this nation says "No religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States;" and by an amendment making more certain the adoption of the principle, it declares in the first amendment to the Constitution that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This first amendment was adopted in 1789, by the first Congress that ever met under the Constitution. In 1796 a treaty was made with Tripoli in which it was declared Art. II, that, "The government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion." This treaty was framed by an ex-Congregationalist clergyman, and was signed by President Washington. It was not out of disrespect to religion or Christianity that these clauses were placed in the Constitution, and that this one was inserted in that treaty; on the contrary, it was entirely on account of their respect for religion, and the Christian religion in particular, as being beyond the province of civil government, pertaining solely to the conscience, and resting entirely with the individual and God. It was because of this that this nation was constitutionally established according to the principle of Christ, demanding of men only that they render to Cesar that which is Cesar's, and leaving them entirely free to render to God that which is God's, if they choose, as they choose, and when they choose. Or, as expressed by Washington himself in reply to an address upon the subject of religious legislation: -

"Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable along to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

We cannot more fittingly conclude this point than with the following tribute of George Bancroft to this principle as embodied in the words of Christ, and in the American constitution: -

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

"Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely

4

ordained of God in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several states, withheld from the federal government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power." - History of the Formation of the Constitution. Last chapter.

Thus the Constitution of the United States as it stands, is the sole monument of all history representing the principle that Christ established for earthly governments. And under it, in liberty, civil and religious, in enlightenment, and in progress, this nation has deservedly stood as the beacon light to all other nations for a hundred years.

Another important question to consider in this connection is, how are the powers that be, ordained of God? Is it direct and miraculous, or providential? We have seen by the Scriptures that the power of Nebuchadnezzar as king of Babylon was ordained of God. Did God send a prophet or priest to anoint him king? or did he send a heavenly call as to Moses and Gideon? Not at all.

Nebuchadnezzar was king because his father was king. How did his father become king? Thus: in 625 B. C., Babylonia was but a province of the empire of Assyria, Media was another. Both revolted at once. The king of Assyria gave Nabopolassar command of a large force, and sent him to Babylonia to quell the revolt, while he himself led other forces into Media, and put down the insurrection there. Nabopolassar did his work so well in Babylonia that the king of Assyria rewarded him with the command of that province with the title, king of Babylon. Thus we see Nabopolassar received his power from the king of Assyria. The king of Assyria received his power from his father, Assurbanipal; and he from his father, Esarhaddon. Esarhaddon received his from his father, Sennacherib. Sennacherib from his father, Sargon, and Sargon received his from the troops in the field, otherwise from the people. Thus we see that the power of the king of Babylon and of Nebuchadnezzar, or of his son, or of his son's son, was simply providential, and sprung ultimately from the people.

Take, for instance, Queen Victoria, Queen of England. How did she become so? Simply from the fact that she was the first in the line of the descendants when William the Fourth died. Through one line she traces her royal lineage to William the Conqueror. But who was William the Conqueror? He was a Norman chief, who led his forces into England in 1066, and established his power there. How did he become a chief of the Normans? The Normans made him their chief; so in that line it is clear that the power of Queen Victoria sprung from the people. Take the other line. The house that now rules Britain represented in Victoria, is the House of Hanover. Hanover is a province in Germany. How did the House of Hanover get into England? When Queen Anne died, the line of succession was through George of Hanover, who became king of England under the title of George the First. How did he secure his princely dignity? Through his lineage, from Henry the Lion, son of Henry the Proud, who received the duchy of Saxony from Frederick Barbarossa in 1156. Henry the Lion was a prince of the house of Guelph, of Swabia. The father of the house of Guelph was a prince of the Alemani, who invaded the Roman empire and established their power in what is now southern Germany, and were the origin of what is now the German nation and empire. But who made this man prince? The savage tribes of Germany. So that in this line also the royal dignity of Queen Victoria springs from the people. Besides, the imperial power of Queen Victoria as she now reigns, is circumscribed, limited by the people. It has been related, and we have seen it in print, although the story may not be true, yet it will serve to illustrate the point, that on one occasion, Gladstone, while prime ministers and head of the house of Commons, took a certain paper to the Queen to be signed. She did not exactly approve of it, and said she would not sign it. Gladstone spoke of the merit of the act, but the Queen said she would not sign it. Gladstone replied that she must sign it. "Must sign it!" exclaimed the Queen, "Must sign it! Do you know who I am? I am the Queen of England." Gladstone calmly replied, "Yes, your majesty, but I am the people of England." And she had to sign it. The people of England can command the Queen of England. She, as Queen, is simply the representative of their power.

They are not personal sovereigns, in themselves, who are referred to in the words, "The powers that be are ordained of God." It is the governmental power of which the sovereign is the representative, and that sovereign receives his power from the people. Outside of the theocracy of Israel, there never has been a ruler, ruling justly, whose dignity was not derived from the people, either express or permissive. It is not any particular sovereign whose power is ordained of God, nor any particular form of government. It is the genius of government itself. The absence of government is anarchy. Anarchy is only governmental confusion. But the Scriptures say, "God is not the author of confusion." God is the God of order. He has ordained order, and he has put within man himself that idea of government, of self-protection, which is the first law of nature, which organizes itself into forms of one kind or another, wherever men dwell on the face of the earth; and it is for men themselves to say what shall be the form of government under which they shall dwell. One people has one form, another has another. This genius of civil order springs from God; its exercise in its legitimate sphere is ordained of God, and the Declaration of Independence simply asserted the eternal truth of God when it said, "Governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed." Whether it be exercised in one form of government, or another, it matters not. The governmental power and order thus ordained, is of God.

It the people choose to change their form of government, it is the same power still, is to be respected still. The power is still ordained of God in its legitimate exercise, in things pertaining to men and their relation to their fellow-men; but no power, whether exercised through one form or another, is ordained of God, in things pertaining to God, nor has it anything whatever to do with men's relations toward God.

We have found that the Constitution of the United States is the only form of government that has ever been on earth, that is in harmony with the principle announced by Christ, demanding of men only that which is Cesar's, and refusing to enter in any way into the field of man's relationship to God. This Constitution sprung from the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and on this point simply asserts the truth of God. The American people do not appreciate, to the one-hundredth part, the value of the Constitution under which they live. They do not honor in any fair degree the noble men who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, that these principles might be our heritage.

All honor to these noble men! All integrity to the principles of the Declaration of Independence! All allegiance to the Constitution as it now is, under which we live, which gives to Cesar all his due, and leaves men to render to God all that they, instructed by the word of God, guided by their own conscience, enlightened by the Spirit of God, may see that he requires of them. And may the sweet face of Heaven shine in infinite pity upon the poor, deluded souls who think they are doing God service in their efforts to subvert the Constitution, and men's liberties under it, by a religious amendment. And may Heaven's twice-blessed mercy be on and about the poor people who have respect for Jesus Christ and their right to worship God, when these "reformers" may have accomplished their purpose.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

A. T. JONES, editor of the *American Sentinel*, gave the second of his able series of discourses on the relation of Religion to the State at Tremont Temple, Wednesday evening, Jan. 9. He spoke as follows: -

In considering the facts as they are, we wish, if possible, to determine whether there is any danger threatening our liberties and rights as they are now assured us under our National Constitution. Is there any attack upon the Constitution of sufficient importance to justify any defence? We gave the

5

principles last evening upon which our Constitution rests, and we found that it is strictly in harmony with the principles of Christ. It is plain, therefore, that any attempt to subvert or change the Constitution from what it is, so far as religion is concerned, can be nothing but opposition to the principles of Christ, and therefore anti-Christian.

The proposed Blair amendment to the Constitution was introduced, May 25, 1888, and provides for religious legislation.

The Amendment is as follows: -

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 learning, in virtue and morality, and in knowledge of the fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity. 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, beliefs, 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 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.

This amendment to the National Constitution has been offered by Senator Blair, and is now pending in Congress. It is a singular sort of 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.

Section 1 says: -

"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, says: -

"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 learning, in virtue and morality, and the principles of the Christian Religion."

That is to say, no state shall ever make or maintain a law respecting an establishment of religion; but every state in the Union shall make and maintain laws establishing the principles of the Christian religion. And to make assurance doubly sure, Section 3 declares -

"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.

And that is to say that the United States Government pledges itself that every State shall establish and maintain 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 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, beliefs, 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 common to all denominations of the Christian religion, it follows 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 by the 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.

Now let us see how much influence there is being exerted in the country in favor of this amendment, and its accompanying religious legislation.

There is in the country an organization called the National Reform Association. I read what that association thinks of the Constitutional amendment offered by Senator Blair. The Christian Statesman is the official organ of the Association, and in its issue 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 minds of the people."

Then after meeting "Christianity, the religion of the National Reform Association familiar to the minds 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 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?"

I read from the Statesman of July 26, from Rev. J. C. K. Milligan - John Calvin, Knox Milligan, that means - a leading man of that Association, who says to the editor: -

"Your editorial of July 12 on a Christian constitutional amendment pending in the Senate is most gratifying news to every Christian patriot. It seems too good to be true. It is too good to

prevail without a long pull, a strong pull and a pull altogether on the part of its friends; but it is so good that it surely will have many friends who will put forth the necessary effort. True, the pending amendment has its chief value in one phrase, 'The Christian religion,' but if it shall pass into our fundamental law, then our phrase will have all the potency of Almighty God, of Christ the Lord, of the Holy Bible, and of the Christian world with it. By letters to senators and representatives in Congress by petitions numerous, signed and forwarded to them, by local, state, and national conventions held and public meetings in every school district, such an influence can quickly be brought to bear as will compel our legislators to adopt a measure, and enforce it by the needed legislation. The Christianiaian [*sic.*] pulpits, if they would, could secure its adoption before the dog days end. The National Reform association, the Christian Statesman, and the secretaries in the field are charged with this work, and will not be wanting as leaders in the cause."

6

John Alexander, the father of the movement, who gives five hundred dollars every year to its advancement, and in his will has provided that the same amount shall be paid every year from his estate until the movement shall have proved a success, and who gives a thousand dollars at times on the side, in the Christian Statesman of September 6, congratulating 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."

This is how the Blair Constitutional Amendment is viewed by these people. What do they propose to do with it when they get it?

The Christian Stateman [*sic.*], of Oct. 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 means, our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution. Enforce upon all who come among us the laws of Christian morality."

To enforce upon men the laws of Christian morality is nothing else than an attempt to compel them to be Christians, and does in fact compel them to be hypocrites.

It will be seen at once that this will be but to invade the rights of conscience, and this, one of the vice presidents of the Association declares, civil power has a right to do. Rev. David Gregg, D. D., new 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 Associations says: -

"Our remedy for all these malefic influences is to have the Government simply set up the moral law, and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it."

Rev. 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."

How much is that different from the Russian despotism? You remember in the April Century, Mr. Kennan gave a view of the statutes of Russia on the subject of crimes against the faith. Quoting statute after statute providing that whoever shall censure the Christian faith or the orthodox church, or the scriptures, or the holy sacraments, or the saints, or their images, or the Virgin Mary, or the angels, or Christ, or God, shall be deprived of all civil rights, and exiled for life to the most remote parts of Siberia. This is the system in Russia, and it is in the direct line of the wishes of the National Reformers, with this difference, however, that Russia is content to send dissenters to Siberia, while the National Reformers want to send them to the devil, straight.

In a speech in a National Reform convention, held in New York city, Feb. 26th and 27th, 1873, Jonathan Edwards, D. D., said: "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."

According to their own definition, then the National Reform Association intend that the state shall obtrude itself into every man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God. Mr. Edwards proceeds: "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." He then defines the terms, Atheist, Deist, Jew, and Seventh-day Baptist, and counts them all Atheists, as follows: -

"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."

What now are the rights of the National Reform classification of Atheists? Mr. Edwards asks the question and answers it thus: "What re 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."

Let *us* inquire for a moment, what are the rights of Atheists. So far as earthly governments are concerned, has not any man just as much right to be an Atheist as any other man has to be a Christian? If not, why not? I wish somebody would tell. Has not any man just as much right to be an Atheist as Jonathan Edwards has to be "Doctor of Divinity"? Can you compel him to be anything else? But how long does he propose to tolerate him? "So long as he does not rave." A lunatic may be harmless and may be suffered to go about as he chooses; yet he is kept under constant surveillance because there is no knowing at what moment the demon in him may carry him beyond himself, and he become dangerous. So it has been proposed to treat these men who disagree with them. So long as dissenters allow themselves to be cowed down like a set of curs, and submit to be domineered over by these self-exalted despots, all goes very well; but if a person has the principle of a man, and asserts his convictions as a man ought to, then he raves, then he becomes dangerous, and must be treated as raving, dangerous lunatics are.

Next, dissenters are to be tolerated as conspirators are. A political conspirator is one who seeks to destroy the government itself; he virtually plots against the life of every one in the government; and in that he has forfeited all claims to the protection of the government or the regard of the people. And this is the way dissenters are to be treated by the National Reformers, when they shall have secured the power that they want. And these are the men to whom Senator Blair's proposed constitutional amendment is intensely satisfactory, as that which assures them in the end that which they want.

Mr. Edwards proceeds: -

"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."

Remember that these men propose to make this a Christian nation. These are they who propose themselves as the supreme expositors of Christian doctrine in this nation. What a beautiful harmony there is between these words of Mr. Edwards and those of the sermon on the mount. The Saviour said, Hate them that hate you: despise them that will not tolerate you and persecute them that do not smile upon your faith. Didn't he? Don't you remember the words? Is not that the sermon on the mount? It is not the sermon on the mount. Jesus said, "Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you; and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you, that you may be the children of your Father which is in heaven. But this National reforms style of christianity would have it, "Hate your enemies: oppose them that hate you; and perse-

7

cute them who will not smile either in pity or scorn upon your faith, that you may be the true children of the National Reform party," and that is what you will be if you do it.

But Mr. Edwards is not yet done in displaying his tolerant ideas; he says: -

"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."

Worse than Russia again. Russia will suffer dissenters to dwell on the same continent with her, though it be in the most remote part of Siberia, but these men to whom Senator Blair's religious amendment is so satisfactory, purpose to go beyond that, and not suffer dissenters to dwell on the same continent with them. Is it necessary here to say that Senator Blair's religious amendment to the Constitution is directly in the line of a religious despotism more merciless than that of Russia, and paralleled only by that of the papacy in the supremacy of its power? Please do not think that because this was spoken fifteen years ago that it is now out of date, for the association this day advertises and sells this speech as representative National Reform literature, and the pamphlet in which it is contained can be had by sending 25 cents to Christian Statesman 1520 Chestnut street, Philadelphia.

But as though this were not enough, and as though their tolerant intents 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."

What does Pope Leo VII command all Catholics to do? This: -

"All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of the State and Legislature to be modeled on the principles of the true Church."

The National Reformers are doing precisely what the Pope has commanded all Catholics to do; and why shouldn't they gladly join hands with them? And we may rest assured that Rome will accept the National Reform proffer just as soon as the influence of that association becomes of sufficient weight to be profitable to her.

Now the question may be asked, whether we mean soberly to say that an association in this enlightened age that sets forth such a proposition can have any influence at all, or can be counted worthy of recognition or the fellowship of respectable people? Well let us see. Joseph Cook the Boston Monday lecturer, is a vice-president of that association. Pres. Seeley of Amherst College, is also one of their vice-presidents. Bishop Huntington of New York, is another. The president of the W. C. T. U., Mrs. J. C. Bateham of the National Union is another; Mrs. Woodbridge, of the same Union is another. Miss Mary A. West, editor of the Union Signal, is another; Mrs. Hoffman, Pres. of the Missouri Union, Mrs. Lathrap, Pres. of the Michigan Union, Mrs. Sibley of the Georgia Union - all these are upon the printed list of vice-presidents of that association for the present year, and all these are eminently respectable people. They are people of influence.

In the Christian Statesman of Nov. 15, I read the following from a report of labor by Secretary M. A. Gault: -

"The four weeks I spent recently in the eighth Wisconsin district lecturing under the auspices of the W. C. T. U., were among the most pleasant weeks since I went into the lecture field. The weather was unusually fine, and there were but very few meetings in which everything was not in apple-pie order. Ladies wearing the significant white ribbon met me at the train, and took me often to the most elegant home in town. . . . The W. C. T. U. affords the best facilities for opening for such workers more than any organization. It is in sympathy with the movement to enthrone Christ in our government."

The National Reform Association proposes to turn this government into the kingdom of Christ; and the W. C. T. U. in National Convention, 1887, said, "The Women's Christian Temperance Union, local, state, national, and world wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be this world's king. Yes 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 constitutions. . . . The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics."

In conformity with this idea the National Reformers have bestowed upon the Saviour the title of "The Divine Politician." The Saviour himself said, "My kingdom is not of this world." These two organizations declare that Christ shall be this world's king. I have not the slightest hesitation in deciding on which side of this question the truth lies.

I know that not one tenth of the great body of the W. C. T. U. has any idea of what this alliance with the National Reform Association Party amounts to. I know that there are multitudes of women in the Union that have sympathy at all with the political workings of the leadership of the Union. I personally know that there are scores of women who have separated from the Union on account of the political workings and alliances of the National Union. There is no one who has more respect or more good wishes for the W. C. T. U. in the line of its legitimate work than I. I am heartily in favor of union, of temperance union, of Christian temperance union, and of woman's Christian Temperance Union; but I am not in favor, of any kind of a political Christian temperance union, nor of a theocratical temperance union. Would, that the W. C. T. U. would stick to their text and work for Christian temperance by Christian means! The Iowa Union has done itself the credit to separate from the political workings of the National Union, and all the rest of that body would do well to protest against the political workings of its present leadership, and especially to protest against the union's any longer being made a tool of the National Reform Association. By means of the W. C. T. U. that association is having a thousand times as much influence as it could have if left to itself to make its own way and secure a hearing.

Nor is this all. This third party, prohibition party, is another all in this attack upon the Constitution. George W. Bain is a vice-president of the Association.

Opposition to Church and States was hissed and yelled down in the California Prohibition Convention last summer. Sam Small was Secretary of the National Prohibition Convention held at Indianapolis, and what he wants to see 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."

What more was the papacy ever than that? What more did it ever claim to be?

(Have we a right to close their parochial schools? from the audience.) We have no such right. (But I understand they are unlawful.) If they are, it's a bad law. We must be careful that in the reaction against Catholicism we do not make Catholics of ourselves. We want to be careful that in opposing the progress of Papacy we do not turn ourselves into Popes. (Applause.) We must not forget that any Catholic in the world has as much personal right as any other man in the world. (And no more: from the gallery.) No more, of course not. You, my friend, have just as much right to be a Methodist, as I, or any one else, has to be a Baptist; but you have no right to seize upon the civil power in order to force me to act as though I were a Methodist. Any man has a perfect right to be a Catholic; but he has no right to force me to act as though I were a Catholic. (What will we

do with the Catholic's false system? from the audience.) He is responsible to God for his system. If you by law attempt to abolish his system of worship, that makes a pope again. (Applause.) A Protestant pope is no better than a Catholic pope. He is a pope anyhow. (Applause.) We don't want any kind of a pope in this country. (Applause.) We want Americans to have the rights of American; and that is all any man

8

is entitled to. We must not forget the glorious principles embodied in the American Constitution, - the right of a man to be a man, to worship as he pleases, or not at all if he pleases. You can not compel a man, by law, to be a Christian; but you can make a fine specimen of a hypocrite.

Sam Jones is another ardent Third Party Prohibitionist. The latter part of July he 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, is 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.

Now my friends, when it is seen that this legislation is the first step toward the establishment of religious despotism modeled upon the principles in the dark ages, and when this legislation is supported by such men as Joseph Cook, President Seeley, Bishop Huntington, and the others named, and by the W. C. T. U., and the Third Party Prohibition Party, the Knights of Labor, and when this legislation is already pending in the United States Senate and only waits to be put upon its passage with the promise of Senator Blair that it should be brought forward as soon as possible, - is it not high time that somebody was saying something in behalf of our constitution as it is, and of the rights of men under it?

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY-LAW BILL

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: - First, I wish to apologize to Dr. Gregg for the Boston Herald. The Herald pretended to give a report of my speech last Wednesday night. You remember I read Dr. Gregg's statement that "the civil power has the right to command the consciences of men." The Herald made it appear that I quoted Dr. Gregg as committing himself to the doctrine of "centralization of power." These two statements which I made were almost as far from each other as the end of my address was from the beginning.

If the Herald has reporters who cannot report, it ought to get some who can. If it has reporters who can report, and the Herald can only garble and misrepresent

them, then that is the misfortune of the reporter and the fault of the Herald. We went to the Herald editorial rooms no less than three times, to get a report inserted. We offered to write it ourselves; but we could not get a word but this piece of misrepresentation. I noticed, however, that last Sunday morning the Herald devoted two whole columns of solid matter to a glorification of the Catholic Church and the blessings of membership in it. These facts make it quite clear that the Boston Herald is more in favor of the Catholic Church and membership in it, than it is in favor of the American Constitution and the liberties of men under it. But, of course, the Herald has the right to be so, if it chooses.

I suppose the friends here who heard the other two addresses will have discovered by this time that it is not religious legislation by any one religious party that I am opposed to, but religious legislation of any kind, by any party, sect, or church. A total separation between religion and civil legislation is the principle upon which we stand. It is not against any denomination or church that these speeches are made, but against religious legislation by any church whether Protestant, or Catholic, or both together.

In the Senate of the United States the following bill has been introduced: -
50 Congress, 2nd 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 agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation, or in the service of the United States in time of peace, except in the necessary enforcement of the laws, shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity and 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, common known as Sunday, 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 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 Post-master-General shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter and shall make regulations for 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.

SECTION 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 employee 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.

SECTION 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in the time of active service or immediate preparation therefore, 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 first day of the week.

SECTION 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.

SECTION 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 object of this Bill is to secure to the public, rest from toil during the first day of the week, mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of Sunday. That is, it provides for religious legislation. Its object is to protect the observance of Sunday as a day of religious worship. If Congress can legislate to that extent on religious subjects, it can legislate to any extent.

The Bill, in the first place, is unconstitutional; not only because the first amendment to the Constitution says that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," but if that amendment were not there, Congress would have no power to legislate upon any such question. All the powers of Congress are delegated

9

powers. Article X. in amendments to the Constitution states that, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The people have not delegated to Congress the power to legislate upon religious questions. Congress has no power in itself; the states have, unless forbidden by their own constitutions. As the people have not given to Congress the power of religious legislation, this bill of Mr. Blair's is unconstitutional, and consequently un-Christian; for, as we have proved, the Constitution of our country is founded upon the principles laid down by Christ; viz., the separation of religion from legislative power.

A gentleman in the hall below asked me if government should not be founded upon Christian principles. I answered him that it ought, most assuredly, and those are just the principles upon which our government is founded. Christ said: "Render therefore to Cesar that which is Cesar's, and to God that which is God's." And when the State attempts to legislate upon things pertaining to God, it is acting in an anti-Christian manner. The Blair Bill then is unconstitutional and anti-Christian.

Let us read Section 1 again, and then put Section 5 with it.

SECTION 1. That no person or corporation, or agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation, or in the service of the United States in time of peace, except in the necessary enforcement of the laws, shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity and 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, common known as Sunday, 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 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.

Do you see what is in that? If you work for me on Sunday, and I pay you for it, whether at the time, or six months after, the first man that finds it out can sue you and get the money, no matter if he lives on the other side of the continent. That is the kind of legislation that is now pending in the United States Senate! It seems to me that when men who are sent to the United States Senate to guard the interests of the people, and maintain their liberties and rights, spend their time in such stuff as this, that it is time the people were opening their eyes to see who they are sending. This should somewhat concern the people of New Hampshire.

Do not misunderstand me here. This bill can not affect the people of Massachusetts, only in this way: the influence of such a thing being national; and the people who have the power of making it national, have also the power of making it local. If that bill be allowed to pass, the influence of it will soon spread to all the States; and we will then have a national religion anyhow.

Again: this bill proposes to promote the observance of the Lord's day, or Sabbath, as a day of religious worship. Let us ask the question in another form which was asked the Saviour in his day. They asked him whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Cesar or not. He said, Show me the tribute money. They did so. Then, said Jesus, Whose image and superscription is this? and they answered him, Cesar's. Then said he unto them, Render, therefore, unto Cesar, that which is Cesar's, and unto God, that which is God's. Christ virtually told them, You have said that it belonged to Cesar, therefore render it to him.

The question now is, Is it lawful to render Sabbath observance to Cesar? And every citizen has a right to ask it. Well, what says the Saviour? - Show me the Sabbath. Whose is this image and superscription? You all know it is "the Sabbath or the Lord thy God." It is the Lord's day, as Senator Blair's Bill itself says. Then render to God that which is God's, and to Cesar that which is Cesar's. (Applause.) It is just as certainly true as that the Saviour's words are true; and being true, no civil power has any right to enforce the observance of a Sabbath, and no Sabbath law ever made was Christian. It is Cesar interfering with that which pertains to God, and demanding of men that they render to him that which belongs only to God. It is the usurping of God's power by the civil government. Then the Sabbath bears the image and superscription of God, and not of Cesar, it never can pertain to Cesar, and is never to be rendered to Cesar. Suppose a man does not, and will not, keep the Sabbath. God has commanded it to be kept. Then suppose the civil government compel him to keep it. Is that rendering it to God or to the civil government? - To the civil government, of course. Then the civil government is in the place of God. But that never can be right. Consequently Senator Blair's Sunday Bill is contrary to the principles of Jesus Christ, and is anti-Christian.

There is another clause of this bill which I will notice here. It is the first section, and reads: -

"Now 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, etc."

That leaves it entirely with the other man to say whether what you do disturbs [*sic.*] him or not. If he has a spite against you, if he envies you, or if he is jealous of you in any way, then it will take a very slight thing to disturb him; especially if it is done by you. Any innocent game or recreation has a tendency to annoy your envious neighbor, and he may have you arrested. All he has to do is simply to say that it disturbs him; and to jail you go, or pay your fine of not less than ten dollars and not more than one thousand.

More than this, some people have very strict ideas in regard to just what is proper recreation for the Sabbath day. One of their leading men says that "Nothing is proper recreation for the Sabbath outside of the home or sanctuary." Then, if on Sunday you are not found in one of these two places, you may be fined anywhere from ten to one thousand dollars. (It's all a humbug: from the gallery.) A humbug! It's worse. It's wickedness. A humbug is something harmless. This is not harmless.

In San Francisco, about a year ago, there was an ordinance identical with this in principle. I will read it: -

"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."

Senator Blair's Bill says that you shall indulge in nothing at all on Sunday to the disturbance of others. A man was standing on the sidewalk in San Francisco distributing circulars. It had a tendency to annoy some one; and the man was arrested. He applied to the Supreme Court for a writ of *habeas corpus*, claiming that the offence charged against him did not constitute a crime, and that the ordinance making such action an offence 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 before Henry Hulton in behalf of the imprisoned offender." Disposing of the case, 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 the prisoner. The judge said: -

"If the order be law, forcible by fine and imprisonment, it is a crime to indulge in any conduct, however innocent and harmless in itself, and however unconsciously done, which has a tendency to annoy other persons. . . . 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 him whose honesty or integrity 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 offence, it sets a very severe penalty

of life 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 a seal of condemnation upon unoffending citizens, and to unjustly deprive them of their liberties, and brand them as criminals. The law countenances no such dangerous doctrine, countenances no 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

10

come within the inhibition of 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, jury 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 is a dangerous doctrine. It is subversive of liberty. And the language and doctrine of the Blair Bill is no less dangerous or subversive of liberty. Religious legislation always runs into persecution. The Blair Bill is uncertain and unreasonable, and savors all over of tyranny. "Any condition of law which allows the test of criminality to depend upon the whim or caprice of judge or juror savors of tyranny." That is what the Blair Bill is. Then we have found that that bill is unconstitutional, anti-Christian, embodies dangerous doctrine, is subversive of liberty, and savors of tyranny. If you want that kind of doctrine carried into effect, sign the petitions so zealously circulated in favor of the Blair Bill. If you do not, give them the wide berth that belongs to them.

Any bill that embodies such doctrines is in the direct line of religious despotism. Now I want to prove that that is what it is. It is the same sort of a movement that had in the fourth century. I will read some extracts from history on that subject. A union of Church and State was formed, out of which came the Papacy. I want you to see what the theory was then upon which a union of Church and State was based. I want you to see also how the Church secured control of the civil power, and compelled people who did not belong to the church to act as though they did. I read from Torrey's translation of Neander, edition of 1852. You will find that Houghton and Mifflin's edition has been doctored considerably. By comparing their edition with this, you will see that some important statements are left out, and some are put in. Neander says: -

"There had in fact arisen in the church a false theocratical theory, originating not in the essence of the gospel, but in the

confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments, which brought along with it an un-Christian opposition of the spiritual to the secular power, and which might easily result in the formation of a sacerdotal state, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way."

There was a theocracy once in the world, and God made it himself, and he himself was king over it. He made known his will through the prophets. It was a union of Church and State, - a government of God; but when the Saviour came, it ceased. That nation is no more. "Thus saith the Lord God, Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is: and I will give it him." - Ezek. 21:26, 27. You well know whose right it is to sit upon the throne of David. It is Jesus Christ's. When it was announced that he was to be born, they called his name Jesus, and the throne of his father David was to be given to him. But when the Saviour came, he did not receive that throne; so it must be at the end of the world that he receives it. Therefore a theocracy established between the death of Christ and the end of the world would be a false theocracy.

I want to show you now what there is in a false theocracy. The Papacy is in it! A theocracy is a government of God. If you have an earthly form of a theocracy, whoever sits at the head of it is in the place of God, and sits there as the representative of God. And that is a pope. Then the first step in the logic of a man-made theocracy is a pope.

The second step is in the infallibility of that pope; he sits at the head of that government in the place of God. But when you put a man in the place of God, you clothe the corrupt passions of apostate humanity with divine power, and divine attributes. Most of the time he will act just like apostate humanity, and some of the time he is in danger of acting like the devil. If he acts wickedly while sitting in the place of God, that would seem to show that he was not the representative of God; so to make his way consistent, he must be infallible. The inconsistency is not in the claim, but in the theory that makes such a claim necessary. You know that is the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. The Ecumenical Council declared that when the Pope speaks *ex cathedra* in matters of faith, he is infallible. What does *ex cathedra* mean? - From the throne. Then when the Pope is in bed, he is not infallible. When he is out walking in his garden, he is not infallible; but when he takes his seat upon the Papal throne, then he is sitting in the seat of God, then he is speaking as the representative of God, then he is infallible. If you allow the theory, you must admit the conclusion. (We don't believe him, all the same.) Glad you don't. The claims of the Papacy, however, are not at all extravagant if the theocratical theory be correct.

The third step in this logic is the Inquisition to make the infallibility effective; and that is just as easily proved. The government of God is a moral government. The moral law is the rule of his government; and moral rules pertain to the heart, - the thoughts and intents of the heart. Consequently a theocratical government must have to do with the secrets of men's hearts, and the only way a human government can do that is through the tribunals of the Inquisition. Now we have

the three steps in a theocratical theory of government: first, the Pope; secondly, the infallibility; and thirdly, the Inquisition to make the infallibility effective. You cannot escape the logic of it if you accept the theory.

It is not the peculiar people of which the Catholic Church is composed that make it what it is; but in the theory that underlies it the wickedness lies. If Protestants take the same steps, then you have a Protestant pope. Catholics are no worse than other people would be in their place. Then we should not condemn them when we favor the same principles in others. Let us say again that any man has just as much right to be a Catholic as any other man has to be a Protestant. That is certain. Catholics can be good citizens. But a Catholic has no right to seize upon the civil power, to make other people act as though they were Catholics; nor has any Protestant the right to compel Catholics to act as though they were Protestants. What we want is American principles, and the rights of men under the Constitution as it is, - as Jesus himself gave them. But the theocratical theory of government is becoming very popular in the United States; and I repeat, the claims of the Papacy are not extravagant when you admit the theocratical theory. Think of this. And you will have need to think of it too.

But what means did the bishops of the fourth century take to get control of the civil power? I will read from Neander, page 298. "The emperor Constantine enacted a law that on Sunday there should be a suspension of business at the courts and in other civil offices, so that the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purpose of devotion." This law was made for the bishops: for Constantine did not care for devotion. We have also the record of the second Sunday law. "Let the judges, towns-people, and such as work at trades rest on the venerable day of the sun," but those who live in the country, and followed the business of agriculture were to keep on at work. It was only to shut the courts, and keep the towns-people and machinery from work, that the day might be devoted to the purpose of devotion.

Let us examine the character of some of those bishops who were engaged in securing this law. Eusebius was one of the best bishops of his time. At the close of the Council of Nice the emperor made a banquet; and at that banquet this good bishop exclaimed that one might easily imagine that the kingdom of God was come. Ten years after, the emperor made another banquet, at which Eusebius said that the palace in which the banquet was eaten was what John saw in the Revelation represented by the New Jerusalem. If he, being the best of bishops, could see the kingdom of God in one banquet, and the New Jerusalem in another, what could not the worst of them see? He also claimed that Constantine gave out his orders of battle by special divine inspiration. James of Nisibis, one of those monkish fanatics

who lived on grass saw angels standing around Constantine; and Constantine, not to be outdone, saw angels standing around James. Thus they flattered one another. The bishops wanted the favors that Constantine could bestow, and Constantine wanted the support that the bishops could give him. This made the union between Church and State. This was the man who gave the first Sunday

law that was ever enacted, and that allowed the country people to go on with their work. But when they had succeeded in stopping them from work, they went to theater, and the circus, and the bishop's congregation would be rather slim. He wanted a full church. Then came a petition up from Carthage in the year 401, asking that the public shows might be transferred from Sunday and from feast days to some other days of the week.

The reason given was, "The theater and circus were vastly more frequented than the church." If both were open at the same time, the people preferred the theater to the church. They had no enough religion to do what they themselves thought to be right; consequently the civil power must take away every opportunity to do wrong. Then they would all be good Christians. Well, in a few years they got a law, so that the people would be compelled to attend to things divine and be devoted anyhow.

This brings us to a striking parallel in the nineteenth century. The National Reformers' ideal government is based on a theocratical theory. At their convention in Cincinnati in 1872, they said that this government would be as real a theocracy as the commonwealth of Israel was a theocracy. And the Women's Christian Temperance Union has committed itself to the same purpose; for in their Monthly Reading for September, 1886, they say: "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 Nation W. C. T. U. has so long championed this cause." Again, the National Reform Association proposes to turn this government into the kingdom of Christ; and the W. C. T. U. in the national convention of 1887 said: -

"The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, state, national, and world wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be this world's king. Yea, verily, this world's king in its realm of cause and effect, king of its courts, its camps, its commerce, king of its colleges and cloisters, king of its customs and its constitutions. . . . The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics."

Christ says, "My kingdom is not of this world." The National Reform Association and the W. C. T. U. declare that "Christ shall be this world's king." I am inclined to believe the Saviour was right. (Applause.) The National Reformers, taking up the refrain of the W. C. T. U., call the Saviour "the divine politician." Did you ever! (Laughter.) And the kingdom of Christ entering the realm of law through the gateway of politics! ! Just think of the polls of Boston on election day, as a place to worship God! What conception of the salvation of Jesus Christ can such people have who call Christ a divine politician, and march people up to the polls to worship him? What is Christianity coming to when this passes for Christian doctrine?

Now let me say I have no opposition to the W. C. T. U., as long as they stick to their text. (Applause.) I am free to say that outside of the church there is no organization, or ever has been, that has accomplished more good than the W. C. T. U. But let them secure Christian temperance by Christian means. But when

they go off on that other issue of establishing a theocratical government, then they shall receive my uncompromising opposition. (Applause.) In that theocratical theory is embodied the principles of the Papacy. I do not care if it is advocated by the W. C. T. U.; it is the essential principle of the Papacy, and a pope is the inevitable logic of it. And we do not want any pope in this country, either male or female. (Laughter and applause.) We want American citizens to have the rights of men, - to believe as they choose, or not at all if they choose, without any disturbance by the civil law.

The Third Party Prohibitionists are into it also. I will read what Sam Small wants, and he was secretary of the National Convention at Indianapolis. He says:

-

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 power will respect it and enact it into laws."

What more did the Papacy ever see than that? What more could it wish to see? The Papacy did see the time when it could issue its edict, and John Huss could be burned to the stake; and Sam Small wants to see the same thing repeated here!

Sam Jones is another one of the same class. I will read a passage from him: "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. (They didn't.) 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 ripe up the ground with the Democratic party, and let God rule America from that time on." This was preached in a revival sermon. When such stuff as this gets to be revival doctrine, and the Saviour gets to be a "divine politician" what is Christianity coming to? Its time to get back to the Bible, and genuine faith in faith Christ. (Applause.)

It is because they are men that we do not want them to have irresponsible power. It is not safe to trust man with divine power. That makes a pope again. We want nothing of the kind. If they get the power they will use it. If they are not going to use it, why do they want it? Why do they make such strenuous efforts to get it?

What does the Prohibition party say? - They are in favor of the enforcement of the Sabbath as a civil institution. What does the commandment say? "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it civilly"? - No sir. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Holiness is not an attribute of civil government; it is the attribute of God, and it can be promoted only by God. When these men attempt to make a civil institution out of the Sabbath which the Lord himself has made holy, they are perverting the ordinance of God, and putting themselves in the place of God.

There is an exemption clause in one of their would-be laws to the effect that those who keep another day as the Sabbath shall not be oppressed. But why do

they wish to oppress the man who does not observe any day of the week? An open letter was written to some who keep the seventh day stating that if they would help in securing a Sunday law, they would have an exemption clause for them. This was the reply: "We will not help you put upon others what we do not want upon ourselves." They said they believed in the golden rule, Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them, and not in the National Reform W. C. T. U. rendition of it, Whatsoever ye would *not* that men should do unto you, do that to them. (Laughter.)

A little over a year ago there was held in Elgin, Ill., a Sunday law convention. The first resolution passed was this: -

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

Let us read the commandment: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it civilly. The first day of the week is the American Sabbath, and you shall keep it civilly, because in six days the Americans made the heavens and the earth, and on the first day they rested. Wherefore they blessed the Sabbath day and civilized it." "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," is what the commandment says, and he is the One to whom it belongs, not the Americans. Again I read: -

"RESOLVED, That we look with shame and sorrow on the non-observance of the Sabbath by many Christian people, in that the custom prevails with them of purchasing Sabbath newspapers

12

engaging in and patronizing Sabbath business and travel, and in many instances giving themselves to pleasure and self-indulgence, setting aside by neglect and indifference the great duties and privileges which God's day brings them."

Well they ought to be ashamed of it. But how do they do about to rectify the matter? Do they resolve to preach the gospel better? to be more faithful themselves in bringing up the consciences of the people? - Not much. They do this: -

"RESOVLED, That we give our votes and support to those candidates or political officers who will pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the civil Sabbath."

They are so sorry that Christians will not act like Christians; they want a law to compel other people to act as though they were Christians. That is what they want, and that is what we don't want them to get. (Applause.) If you think that when they get it, they will not use it the same as they did in the fourth century, then you must think human nature has changed wonderfully. Religious bigots are the same in every age of the world and bigotry knows no centuries. (Applause.)

Dr. Herrick Johnson gave a perfect Philippic against Sunday newspapers at Chicago, the 21st of last November, and in comparing them with the saloon, he said that the saloon could not come into our homes, but the Sunday newspapers can be put in the pocket and carried right into our parlors. It seems to me that if he should put the saloon into his pocket, he could take that into his parlor too. I wonder how the paper could get into his pocket if he did not put it there.

Then, too, they have joined hands with the Catholic Church. Dr. Crafts received a letter from Cardinal Gibbons endorsing [*sic.*] the Blair Sunday Bill for the compulsory observance of the Christian Sabbath. Of course the Cardinal will join hand with them. He knows what they did with the same thing in the fourth century. And he says, "I am happy to add my name to the petition in favor of the law." People will talk about danger from the Catholic Church; but there is no danger if Protestants will attend to Protestant business. (Applause.) The only danger is from miscalled Protestants joining hands with the Catholic Church. (Applause.)

Senator Blair's Amendment and Sunday Bill is in direct conformity to the command of Leo XIII. This common interest makes it necessary that they they [*sic.*] seek the aid of the Catholic Church, as they themselves say, "In any way that she may choose to show it." People calling themselves Protestants appealing for aid to this mother of harlots and abomination of the earth! The time has come when there should be some Protestants protesting against that kind of Protestantism. When they got the Cardinal's name they added with it 7,200,000 Catholics or all the Catholics in the United States. He did not tell them to do that, or that his name was equivalent to the names of 7,200,001. But they did it. Is it exactly according to Protestant Christian principle, or American Constitutional principles that one man shall be allowed to absorb into himself 7,200,000 others? That looks like centralization of power with a vengeance. If they act like that to get power, what will they not do when they get it? Dr. Crafts went down to an assembly of the Knights of Labor in Indianapolis and got about two hundred and forty of their representatives to endorse his petition, by trading off with them and agreeing to help them secure what they desired. And from these two hundred and forty names he reckons 240,000 Knights of Labor as signers of his petition.

The signing of the petition by churches is done in a similar manner. We will suppose a church has a membership of five hundred, and three hundred of them are present when the petition is presented. All those who favor the petition are asked to rise. Perhaps two hundred of those present do so. Then the whole membership of five hundred are reckoned as signers. That is the way they did it in California. There are on that petition the names of individuals who never heard it read, and know nothing about what it contains, in fact do not know their names are there. I know of Catholic priests who have signed a remonstrance against it, and say they do not want a union of Church and State.

A preacher in California said to the State, "You relegate moral instruction to the church and allow everybody to go as they please on Sunday, so we cannot get at them." My friends, it is time Christians began to talk less about legislation, and get back to the plain, simple truths of the Bible. There is a void in every soul that nothing can fill but the gospel of Jesus Christ. Oh, that men would preach

the gospel with power Christ has given! Then they could get at the people. But they cannot get at them with their preaching, hence they want the civil power to corral them so they can get at them anyhow. Just as soon as they lose the power of the Holy Spirit, then they want to enlist the civil power. This reaching of the church for civil power is nothing but wickedness. It ought to be opposed and exposed upon the very first appearance of it. While they were simply discussing it, I staid at home; but when they proposed an Amendment to the Constitution taking away the liberties of the American people and establishing a government here on the principles of the Papacy, then I felt it was time to take the field, and stay at home no longer. (Continued Applause.) And we want to see ten thousand times ten thousand in the same business. I would rather stand alone on this platform in behalf of the rights of men, and the religion of Jesus Christ, than to stand here with ten million advocates of a doctrine so subversive of liberty as the Bill contains. I respect the work of Christ, the Constitution of our country, and the rights of men under it. They may call me an infidel if they choose; but I know whom I believe. Their calling me an infidel does not make me one, nor prove that I am unacquainted with Jesus Christ or the wonders of his love. Allegiance to him demands that I tell to men their rights and their liberties. They must and shall be preserved!

I am circulating this kind of a petition: -

"THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION MUST BE PRESERVED"

"Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience." - *George Washington*.

"Religion is not in the purview of human government. Religion is essentially distinct from government and exempt from its cognizance. A connection between them is injurious to both." - *James Madison*.

"Leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the church, and the private school, supported entirely by private contribution. Keep the State and the Church forever separate." - *U. S. Grant*.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." - *U. S. Constitution*.

"My kingdom is not of this world." "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." - *Jesus Christ*.

"TO THE HONORABLE, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 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 give any preference to the principles of any one religion above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion: but that the total separation between religion and the state, assured by our National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it."

I have some respect for Washington, Madison, Jefferson, U. S. Grant, the American Constitution, and the teachings of Jesus Christ. (Applause.) We do not take one man and multiply him into seven million two hundred thousand and one; we do not ask you to sign it until you have read it. And we will see that it goes to the proper place. Sign it yourself; pass it to your friends and neighbors and get everybody to sign it; and I pray you all to jealously watch the American Constitution because it is your liberty, and believe in Jesus Christ for he is your life.

