

The American Sentinel 4 (1889)

January 1889

"The Illinois Sunday Convention" *The American Sentinel* 4, 1 , pp. 1, 2.

THE first annual meeting of the Illinois Sunday Association was held in Farwell Hall, Chicago, November 20 and 21, 1888. This Association was organized at Elgin about the same time last year. Of that meeting we gave an account at the time. This meeting was the genuine successor of that in every way. It was addressed by Doctors Mandeville, Everts, Foster, Henson, and Herrick Johnson, of Chicago; Doctor Knowles, of New Jersey, editor of the *Pearl of Days* and secretary of the National Sunday Association; Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, and Dr. John Hall, of New York; Mitchell, of Sycamore, Ill.; Post, of Springfield, Ill.; Mills, of Wheaton; and Hon. J. C. Lord, of Elgin, Ill.

The two points that were emphasized above all others throughout the Convention were: (1) Christians do not keep Sunday as they ought; and (2) other people do not go to church as they ought.

First: In the first speech that was made, even in the opening exercises, it was said: "We remember the corporations; the great railroads which compel their men to work and so to desecrate the holy day. But we remember that back of the officers of the companies are the stockholders *who belong to the churches*, sit in the pews, and bow down and pray in the house of God—these are equally guilty."

If, then, the railroads compel their men to desecrate the day, and the owners of the railroads are church-members, then who is it but the church-members that are compelling people to desecrate the day?

Doctor Knowles said that by the influence of William E. Dodge, even after his death, the Delaware and Lackawanna Railroad Company had resisted the temptation to run trains on Sunday until the present year. But five hundred ministers met in conference in New York and used the hands of the Sunday Observance Committee have been tied ever since. After that when the Delaware and Lackawanna directors were asked not to run Sunday trains, they replied, "How can you come to us pleading for us to run no trains on Sunday, when your preachers by the hundreds, on Sunday, use our rival lines, which do run on Sunday. If your preachers ride on Sunday trains on other

roads, we cannot see why they and other people cannot ride on our trains on Sunday. And if it is all right for these other roads to run trains on Sunday, and certainly ministers of the gospel would not ride on them if it were wrong, then we cannot see how it can be such a great wrong for us to run Sunday trains."

That is a very proper answer. No wonder the Sunday Committee's hands are tied by it. And yet that very conference of five hundred preachers, assembled in New York last summer, too the first decided step toward the organization of the National Sunday Association, of which Doctor Knowles himself is secretary.

Another speaker, whose name I did not get, said that not long ago a railroad president said to him, "We get more requests for Sunday trains signed by preachers than we do from other people."

By these facts there is presented the following condition of things: (1) Church-members own the railroads; (2) preachers sign requests for Sunday trains; (3) the church-members grant the request of the preachers for Sunday trains, and the preachers ride on the Sunday trains, and other church-members go on Sunday excursions; (4) then the whole company—preachers and church-members—together petition Congress and the State Legislatures to make a law stopping all Sunday trains! That is to say, they want the Legislatures, State and National, to compel these railroad-owning church-members for Sunday trains. In other words, they want the civil power to compel them all—preachers and church-members—to act as they all say that Christians ought to act. And they insist upon quoting all the time the commandment of God, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." But if they will not obey the commandment of God, which they themselves acknowledge and quote, what assurance have we that they will obey the law of Congress or State Legislature when they get it, especially as it will rest entirely with themselves to see that the law is enforced? Will they compel themselves by civil law to do what they themselves will not otherwise do?

Second: In complaint that people do not go to church, Doctor Crafts said: "The post-office is open at the very hour of church, and a man must choose between going to church and going to the post-office to get his mail."

And in the Association's address to the public it is said: "At this rate the time will come when our wage-workers will have to work seven days in a week, and the churches will be deserted. But let a law be enacted in favor of the Sabbath, and it will give back to

hundreds their day of rest, and to the churches tens of thousands of attendants."

Dr. Herrick Johnson delivered an intense Philippic against the Sunday newspaper. He

2

said: "It creeps into our homes on Sunday. It can be put into the pocket, and taken into the parlor and read." Then he named the matter with which he says the Sunday papers is filled, "crime, scandal, gossip, news, and politics," and said: "What a *mÉlange*? what a dish to be set down before a man before breakfast and after breakfast to prepare him for hearing the word of God. It makes it twice as hard to reach those who go to the sanctuary, and it keeps many away from the house of worship altogether. They read the paper, the time comes to go to church, but it is said, 'Here is something interesting I will read it and not go to church to-day.'" He then spoke of the *Inter-Ocean* special Sunday news train, and how the people would flock to the station to see the train, and said: "In the Sabbath lull from politics, business, etc., the people would go to church were it not for the attraction of the *Inter-Ocean* special train." And then he exclaimed, "Oh, for the breath of the Puritan! Oh, for a little of the Puritan Sabbath!"

Dr. John Hall followed this in a five minutes' speech, in which he emphasized one of Dr. Johnson's statements thus: "If the family make the Sunday paper a study, it will be difficult for them to get to the house of worship, and when there it will be harder for them to get the word of God. There is nothing better to mar worship and deaden the mind to the worship of God. And it is this sensationalism that makes up the attractions of the Sunday paper."

All these statements and arguments plainly show that the secret and real object of the whole Sunday-law movement is to get the people to go to church. The Sunday train must be stopped, because the church-members ride on them and don't go to church enough. The Sunday papers must be abolished, because the people read it instead of going to church, and because those who read it and go to church too are not so well prepared to receive the preaching. But is it right for the church authorities to wield the civil power in the interests of the church? Is that a legitimate exercise of the function of civil government? If it is, why should they stop with this? *Will* they stop with this? They will not. This is only the first step in an unlimited course of legislation in the interests of the churches and at the

expense of everybody else. If these men are allowed to take the first step, they will be sure to take all the others that they want.

And how much more will satisfy them? Doctor Post seems to have given a pretty good idea of this. His address was upon "Sabbath Recreation." It was an effort to define what is proper recreation on Sunday. And after a good deal of discussion, and what he said was a careful study of the literature and history of the subject, he laid down as the sound principle the following:—

"There is no kind of recreation that is proper or profitable on Sunday outside of the home or the sanctuary."

Only let such laws be enacted as are demanded by National Reformers, laws for bidding any recreation "to the disturbance of others" on Sunday, then anything done on Sunday outside of the home or the sanctuary, in the neighborhood of this preacher, will disturb him, and whoever does it will be prosecuted. Dr. Herrick Johnson cried for a breath of the Puritan; it seems that Doctor Post is fully disposed to give it to him.

Doctor Everts said: "The Sabbath is the test whether a man believes in God or not. It is atheism or the Sabbath." And the secretary in his report said: "The Sabbath is the dividing line between Christianity and heathenism."

According to these propositions, therefore, to compel men to observe the Sabbath *is* to compel them to accept Christianity and to serve God. But such service is not the service of God, and such recognition of Christianity at all.

The influences in favor of the National Sunday law reported in this Convention are the following:—

1. More than 50,000 blank petitions have been sent out to be signed.

2. The Society of Friends, of Iowa, numbering 10,500 people, has indorsed the petitions and the work.

3. The Society of Friends in Indiana, numbering 20,000 members, has done the same.

4. Ministers and churches in forty States and Territories have indorsed the petitions.

5. May 21 Senator Blair introduced a bill into the U. S. Senate providing a National Sunday law.

6. Petitions were sent to Canada, and Sir John Macdonald replied that they had introduced the matter into the Canadian Parliament.

7. The Methodist General Conference, two Presbyterian General Assemblies, and one Baptist Association, have all appointed committees for the organization of a National Sunday Union.

8. October 18 the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, "with much enthusiasm and with great applause," indorsed the petition in favor of the Blair Sunday Bill.

9. November 16 the Knights of Labor general Convention also indorsed it, and this action, said Doctor Crafts, carried the petitioners beyond the *five million* line.

With all this array in its favor, it is no wonder that Doctor Crafts reported that there is good prospect for the passage of the bill. Dr. Crafts said: "The labor unions and the churches were never before united. If the labor unions alone can get what they want, and if the churches alone can get what they want, how much more, and more easily, can this be accomplished when all these are united together."

The petitions are still being circulated and signed by the thousands. If that bill shall pass, that will show that this nation is ready and willing to commit itself to an unlimited course of religious legislation, and which can end only in the destruction of that liberty, both civil and religious, which has been our heritage for a hundred years. Are our readers ready to give their influences, either by signing these petitions or otherwise, to such a work? Are our readers not rather ready to sign petitions everywhere praying the National Legislature to let religion and religious observances forever alone?

A. T. J.

"The National Sunday Convention" *The American Sentinel* 4, 1 , pp. 4, 5.

THE National Convention of the American Sunday Union met in the Foundry M. E. Church, Washington, D. C., December 11-13. The auditorium was draped with long strips of red cotton, on which were pasted the petitions of about fourteen millions of alleged petitioners—over six millions of Protestants, and seven million two hundred thousand Catholics—and decorated with large and handsomely-printed copies of the cost of arms of each State in the Union.

The first meeting was presided over by Mr. Elliott F. Shepard, of the *New York Mail and Express*, and was addressed by Dr. J. H. Knowles, editor of the *Pearl of Days*, and Secretary of the National Sunday Union, Mrs. Josephine C. Bateham, of the W.C.T.U., Mr. A. S.

Diven, ex-Director of the Erie Railroad, and Mr. Shepard, the presiding officer.

Dr. Knowles's address was a brief account of the origin of the National Sunday Union, which was this: In 1887 Dr. W. F. Crafts suggested to Dr. Knowles that such a thing ought to be, and Dr. Knowles agreed with him. In May, 1888, Dr. Crafts addressed a memorial to the General Conference of the M. E. Church assembled in New York City, asking that body to take the initiative in the organization of a National Sunday Union. That body heartily responded, appointed a committee, and laid upon Dr. Knowles the duty of bringing the matter before other bodies. He did so, and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church North, and of the Presbyterian Church South, the Baptist Union, the United Presbyterian Church, the Congregationalists, the Methodist Protestant Church, and fifteen others, all cordially entered into the plan of organization. In addition to these, the W.C.T.U., the National Reform Association, the Knights of Labor, and the Catholic Church as embodied in Cardinal Gibbons, are to be counted.

Mrs. Bateham pointed to the festoon of petitions and said she was reminded of the scripture which says we are "compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses," and announced that there were fourteen millions of these witnesses in the petitions hanging upon the pillars of the building. She declared that these fourteen million witnesses refuse to surrender the richest boon granted of God and our fathers. She said that undoubtedly this was the largest petition ever presented to any Government, and that it was not yet complete; for since she had come into the room she had opened one letter containing nine hundred, and others from colleges, seminaries, etc., containing smaller numbers. She said the Blair Sunday Bill had been specifically indorsed by hundreds of thousands; but the majority of the fourteen millions had asked in general terms for a Sunday law. Through Dr. Crafts they had secured the indorsement of two hundred and forty thousand. She stated that all the States have Sunday laws, while the nation has none, which is much needed to throw the Government on the side of the Sunday. In favor of the Sunday law she reported:—

"1. The leaders of thought everywhere.

"2. All Christians *except* the *very small* sect of Seventh-day Baptists.

"3. The Roman Catholics, because Cardinal Gibbons indorsed for all his people.

"4. The laboring classes.

"5. Nearly all intelligent people except those who are blinded by business interests."

In opposition to it she reported:—

"1. Sunday papers.

"2. Railroad managers—probably.

"3. Steamboat companies and managers of Sunday resorts.

"4. Saloonists and their abettors and allies.

"5. Business men who make much money.

"6. Seventh-day Baptists—not large in numbers."

Then she said: "In the face of this opposition, can the law be secured? Certainly it can. It would be absurd to think that fourteen millions of people could not yet get what they desire. Morality must be upheld. God is behind and in it all."

The object of General Diven's address was, as a railroad expert, to show the total absence of any necessity for Sunday trains. His plan is that live-stock trains shall stop over Sunday so as to allow the stock to be let out and obtain relief from the crowding of the cars. In the case of passenger trains from ocean to ocean he would have the most attractive places fitted up at the proper points where the trains should stop over Sunday, and have the railroad companies *give* to each passenger a free ticket to hotel accommodations, meals, and the pleasures of the attractive resort. But the general did not explain just how a free ticket to an attractive resort will promote the observance of the Sabbath.

As for milk trains, he said that as a rule milk supplies were not over one hundred miles from the city; that Saturday's milk would supply on Sunday; and the whole of Sunday's milk could start after sundown and reach the cities in good time for Monday morning's delivery, for said he: "I am only contending for the suspension of trains during the *day*-time of Sunday." But he did not explain how a train is any more sinful in the *day*-time than it is in the *nighty*-time of the Sabbath. Mr. Diven himself, however, was willing to justify Sunday trains in the day-time "for the accommodation of church goers," but he said it had been suggested that he "had better leave out that part of his address." At this there was such a clapping of hands that he concluded that he "had better leave it out."

The chairman next introduced Dr. Crafts as pastor of the First Union Church, New York City, which he explained by saying that it was the first church organized after the union of the Old School and New School Presbyterians. Mr. Craft's gave way for a few minutes to allow Mrs. Bateham to answer a question that had been sent up. In the announcements that had been made before the meeting, it was stated that the church in which the Convention was to be held would be festooned with the names of six millions of petitioners; but at the very beginning of this, the first meeting, it was stated that there were *fourteen* millions of them. The question was how the number could have grown so much larger so suddenly. This was explained by the fact that Cardinal Gibbons had written a letter indorsing the Blair Bill, and solely upon the strength of his name seven million two hundred thousand Catholics were counted as *petitioners*.

This was not an entire answer to the question, because the Cardinal's letter did not authorize any such use of it as they had made, at least so much of it as was made public did not. The whole of the letter was not made public, because, Dr. Crafts said, it was for the Senate Committee. But so much of it as was read merely referred to the action of the Baltimore Council in commanding a stricter observance of Sunday, and said:—

"I am most happy to add my name to those of the millions of others who are laudably contending against the violation of the Christian Sabbath by unnecessary labor, and who are endeavoring to promote its decent and proper observance by judicious legislation."

This was all. He said, "I am happy to add *my name*," etc. He did not say that he added, or that he wished to add, seven million two hundred thousand others with his name, or in his name. But the overweening anxiety of these *Christian*, Protestant (?) Sunday-law workers for petitions was so great that, without a twinge, they could and did multiply *one* Cath-

5

olic name into seven million two hundred thousand *and one*. Yet this was not so much to be wondered at, because the same principle had been acted upon before throughout the country, and when five hundred petitioners could be made out of *one* hundred, and two hundred and forty *thousand* out of two hundred and forty, it was perfectly easy and entirely consistent to make seven million two hundred thousand and one out of *one*.

This thing was perfectly consistent also with the principle in another point. The petition read, "We, the undersigned, *adult* residents of the United States, *21 years of age or more*, hereby petition," etc. In counting these seven million two hundred thousand petitioners in behalf of Sunday law, they thereby certified that all these were Catholics "21 years of age or more." But there is not a woman in the W.C.T.U., who does not know that there are not that many Catholics in the United States "21 years of age or more." They virtually certified that all the Catholics in the United States are "21 years of age or more," for they distinctly announced that "all the Roman Catholics" were petitioning for the Sunday law. But when they had virtually certified the same thing of the Protestant churches throughout the country, why should they not go on and swing in "all the Roman Catholics" in the same way? They could do the one just as honestly as they could do the other. When men and women professing themselves to be Protestant Christians will do such things as that to carry the Catholic Church with them, it is time they ceased to call themselves Protestants. And when they will do such things *for any purpose*, it is time they should cease to call themselves Christians. *Christianity means honesty.*

There was a question handed in on this, as follows: "Is it consistent with either Protestant principles or American principles to recognize the propriety of one man's absorbing into himself the personality of seven million two hundred thousand people, as you have granted to Cardinal Gibbons in this case?" The question was not even read to the audience, much less was it answered.

Mr. Shepard, the presiding officer, was the next to speak, and he was "glad to welcome the Roman Catholics in any work in which they could be induced to join." He said the fourth commandment is the first commandment with blessing, and, very truly, that it would be a blessing to everyone who would keep it. But, said he, many will ask, "How shall I find out whether I shall be blessed?" Answer: "Why, by keeping it, to be sure. Keep the Sabbath, and you will get the blessing, and you can't get it in any other way."

All this is true enough, but Mr. Shepard did not tell how this blessing can come upon those who will not keep it without being compelled to by the civil law, which they are seeking to have enacted. Can they compel men to receive the blessing of God?

The first speaker on Wednesday was Dr. Conrad, editor of the *Lutheran Observer*. His subject was, "The Reaction against the

Continental Sunday." He described the Sunday in European countries, and especially in Germany. He said in Europe the Sunday afternoon and evening were devoted to the theaters, which at those times have especially attractive programs, and to the beer gardens.

Bishop Hurst, on the same subject, said that in Germany the finest theatricals are played on Sunday afternoons, and "the pastors are there with their flocks;" and there the people often meet their pastor, whom they in the forenoon had heard preach.

Dr. Fernley, Secretary of the Philadelphia Sunday Association, next spoke, and heartily wished that our National Constitution "had God, and Jesus Christ, and the Bible, in it;" and complained that our foreign population demanded a Continental Sunday instead of the American Sabbath.

The statements of these last three speakers about the Continental Sunday called out the following question:—

"The Continental countries are Roman Catholic countries. The Continental Sunday is the Roman Catholic Sunday. In the petition for this National Sunday law you have six million Protestants, and seven million two hundred thousand Catholics. Now suppose the law should be passed, would you then have a Continental Sunday or an 'American Sabbath'? In other words, can the six million Protestants compel the seven million two hundred thousand Catholics to keep Sunday in the Protestant way?"

This question was likewise neither read nor answered.

Mr. George May Powell said that in this matter of Sabbath reform "there is nothing so much needed as a better observance of the Sabbath by the ministry and the laity of the churches. When the clergy and the laity come up to the scriptural observance of the Sabbath, and not till then, will the land enjoy her Sabbaths—not till there is a reform of the evangelical clergy and laity."

All of which is true. But if the clergy and laity will not reform without the power of civil law which they themselves must enforce, how in the world shall this much desired reform ever be accomplished.

Senator Hawley, of Connecticut, was to have presided over the meeting Wednesday night, but being hindered by business at the Capitol, he sent a letter in which he expressed his indorsement of the work, and his general concurrence in it.

Congressman Dingley, of Maine, was present at this meeting, and made a speech strongly indorsing the movement, and saying that "there are few more important National questions than that which had called this assembly."

Dr. Crafts next opened the question box, and answered such questions as he could. He said: "The greatest trouble on this question in this country is in the churches and among the preachers. They do not observe the Sabbath. There are some preachers in the pulpit who do not observe it."

One question was: "In view of the large number of Catholic petitioners, why was there no Catholic elected as a member of the Executive Committee of the Union?" The Doctor replied that a member of that church—a Mr. Hickey—had been that day chosen upon the Executive Committee. But Mr. Crafts did not tell the audience that he himself had done his best to prevent this. He did not tell how he in executive session had repeatedly tried to adjourn the meeting to defeat the election of a Catholic upon the Board. He was perfectly willing to use all the Catholics upon the strength of the Cardinal's name, but he was not willing to grant them representation on the Executive Committee. Mr. Hickey was elected, though, in spite of Dr. Craft's opposition.

In further talk Mr. Crafts exposed the spring of the whole movement by saying that "taking religion out of the day takes the rest out."

Meetings were held Thursday afternoon and evening, but there was nothing of importance said more than has been already reported in this, or in the report from the Chicago Convention. Dr. Herrick Johnson repeated his Chicago speech on the "Sunday Newspaper."

Thursday forenoon they had a second hearing before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Blair chairman, to present the petition of their six million Protestants and their seven-million-two-hundred-thousand-times-multiplied Cardinal. There was nothing said by them there materially in addition to what was said in Convention, except the statement of Dr. Sunderland, of Washington City—President Cleveland's pastor—who, in explaining to the Senate Committee how the change of the Sabbath came about from the seventh day to the first day of the week, declared that "Sunday is the seventh day of the Christian week"!

The managers of the movement were greatly encouraged by the work of the Convention, as they have good reason to be, and expressed themselves as very hopeful of getting the National Sunday Bill enacted into a law, and signed by President Cleveland before the expiration of the term of his office, on March 4. And it is certain that if

fallacious arguments, deceptive statements, and dishonest practices can accomplish it, their hope is not groundless.

The American people not only do not half realize the danger that there is in this movement if the law should be secured, but they do not half realize the chicanery that is being employed to secure it. The greatest danger of all is that the people will not realize it till it is everlastingly too late.

A. T. J.

Washington, D. C., December 16, 1888.

January 30, 1889

"The New Council of Nice" *The American Sentinel* 4, 2 , pp. 10, 11.

IN our discussion of the Blair resolution for the religious amendment to the National Constitution, we have shown that, in order for the National power to determine what are the principles of the Christian religion which are common to all denominations and peculiar to none, a general convention of all the denominations, Catholics included, would have to be called; and that when this general convention should agree as to what principles are common to all, the Nation would adopt that as the National creed, and enforce it in all the publics in the land. This is precisely the idea of the author of the proposed amendment. In his letter to the Secretary of the National Reform Association, Senator Blair says:—

"I believe that a text-book of instruction in the principles of virtue, morality, and of the Christian religion, can be prepared for use in the public schools by the joint effort of those who represent every branch of the Christian church, both Protestant and Catholic."

Therefore, when that shall have been done, it is certain that whatever principles are adopted as the principles of the Christian religion, they will have to be such as are satisfactory to the Catholic "branch of the Christian Church."

Nor is this all. This is only the beginning, for, when this Convention shall have been called, it will assuredly be to the interest of each one of the principal denominations to have it adopt as many as possible of the principles of that particular denomination, and the final result of the discussion will be a compromise. But this will be only for the time being, because then the standard of the religion will be an element in the political contests, and it will be an object to each one of the principal denominations to secure as much influence as possible with

the Government to get a new council called to revise the principles of the National creed, and this will be kept up interminably. As surely as any such amendment to the Constitution shall ever be adopted as this which is proposed by Senator Blair, or as is wanted by the National Reform Association, so surely will there follow with it a repetition of the course of councils, contests, and strifes that followed the Council of Nice, and the establishment of the Christian religion as the imperial religion of Rome. Compared with that which would follow this establishment of a National religion, the American people have never yet known what confusion really is.

By the above quotation from Senator Blair's

11

letter it is seen that there is no intention to have the Bible in the public schools, nor that the teachers shall be allowed to teach from the Bible the principles of virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. It is what an assembly of Protestants and Catholics shall agree to say about the Bible, or to select from the Bible—this shall be put into a "text-book," and from this the teachers shall instruct the schools. And this is only to establish an ecclesiastical supremacy here from which everybody must receive his religion ready made. If it is not proper that the religion of the whole Bible should be taught in the public schools, then this only proves that it is not proper that any of it should, as such.

A. T. J.

"National Reform (Mis-) Reading of History" *The American Sentinel* 4, 2 , pp. 11, 12.

WERE it not for the solemn ending that there is to be to the work of the National Reform party, their claims, and the arguments, speeches, and propositions by which they attempt to set them forth, would be a constant source of amusement. And we recollect no single statement in all of theirs that we have seen that is more absurdly ridiculous than the following, taken from the very first speech of the Cleveland Convention:—

"As a grain of corn does not grow but in harmony with the laws which the Creator has ordained for corn, a Nation does not prosper but in harmony with the laws which the God of Nations has ordained for Nations."

Now the veriest tyro knows that this proposition, in the sense in which it is meant, is contradicted by the unanimous voice of all

history; and the most cursory glance over the field of history will discover the strongest kind of contradictions. Take, for an instance, Frederick the Great, an out-and-out infidel, if not an entire atheist, who always spoke of Christianity in a mocking tone, and of whom it might almost be said that Voltaire was his "patron saint;" who in affairs of statecraft pretended to no form of virtue, but was moved solely by sheer, unhallowed ambition. To quote his own words, "Ambition, interest, the desire of making people talk about me, carried the day." He broke his plighted faith with the queen of Hungary, and deliberately plundered her of one of the richest provinces of her dominions, and for no purpose whatever but to "extend his dominions, and see his name in the gazettes." To more effectually accomplish his robbery, he had leagued himself with France and Bavaria; but when he had torn away Silesia, and France and Bavaria were about to help themselves as he had done, he saw that it would add too much to the strength of France for his safety, and he withdrew from the league, and concluded a treaty with the queen. When she was relieved of his opposition, Maria Theresa easily conquered both France and Bavaria; but when Frederick saw how easily she had swept them from the field, he became alarmed for his possession of Silesia, and again brokered faith with her, and allied himself closely with France, again invaded the queen's dominions, took Prague, and threatened her capital, and the very next year again broke faith with France, and concluded another, peace with Maria Theresa.

Here, then, we have four times that he had broken his plighted faith, and all inside of four years. Yet for all this his kingdom so prospered that in just two years after his last peace with Maria Theresa, through the seven Years' War, he was able to hold his own during the whole seven long years against the allied powers of the continent. France, Austria, Russia, Saxony, Sweden, and the body of German States, were all allied against him. His little kingdom, all told, contained less than *five* millions of people, and the stolen province of Silesia was the fourth part. The population of the countries leagued against him was fully a *hundred* million. His army was less than a hundred thousand. The army of the confederates was *six hundred thousand*. Yet against all this vast odds he maintained his cause, and at the end of the Seven Years' War concluded a peace in which he ceded nothing, not even a foot of the stolen province. "The whole

continent in arms had proved unable to tear Silesia from that iron grasp."

It was not alone in a military point of view that his kingdom prospered. It prospered civilly as well. At the close of the war, his kingdom was one scene of desolation, but "his energy soon brought back the national prosperity." And when he died, in 1786, he left 70,000,000 thalers in the treasury, and an army of 200,000 men, of the best soldiers of Europe. Civilly his rule was remarkable in other things. Freedom of speech and the press was so absolute that, outside of the United States, to this day it would be difficult to find its equal. "Order was strictly maintained throughout his dominions. Property was secure." "*Religious persecution was unknown* under his government. The scoffer whom the Parliaments of France had sentenced to a cruel death, the Jesuit who could show his face nowhere else, who in Britain was still subject to penal laws, who was proscribed by France, Spain, Portugal, and Naples, who had been given up even by the Vatican, found safety and the means of subsistence in the Prussian dominions. His policy with respect to the Catholics of Silesia presented an honorable contrast to the policy which, under very similar circumstances, England long followed with respect to the Catholics of Ireland."

He was one of the very first rulers who abolished the cruel practice of torture. "No sentence of death was executed without his

12

sanction, and that sanction was rarely given except . . . of murder." And so he prospered, and . . . kingdom prospered, through all his absurd infidelity as a man, and his faithlessness as a king.

Another instance we have in the Empress Catharine, of Russia, who, among the rulers of that country, may fairly rank as second only to Peter the Great. She greatly enlarged on the west, the south, and the east, the dominions which she, a foreigner, had obtained by dethroning her husband and excluding her son; she conquered her enemies by land and sea, wrought real improvement in the administration of justice, the furtherance of education, industry, and commerce. She, too, was a disciple of Voltaire, and was shamefully and systematically immoral. And, too, the Nation prospered.

Another instance we find in Henry IV. (Navarre), of France, the greatest of the Bourbon line, "who restored order, terminated a terrible civil war, brought the finances into excellent condition, made his country respected throughout Europe, and endeared himself to

the great body of the people whom he ruled." Yet he changed his religion *four times*. First he was a Huguenot; but to escape the consequences of St. Bartholomew's day (1572), turned Catholic. As soon as that danger was fairly past, and he made his escape from Paris, he was a Huguenot again; then soon after, when all that stood between him and the throne was his Huguenot profession, it was again conveniently renounced, and he was again converted to the Catholic faith. Nor in his private life was he under much more restraint from any regard to the principles of morality.

But not to multiply instances, we will come at once to the great prototype of National Reformers, the uniter of Church and State, Constantine. Surely the National Reformers will not deny that the Nation prospered under his rule. Yet he was a hypocrite from the day that he crossed the Milvian Bridge, faithless, if not a perjurer, and a quadruple murderer,—a hypocrite, as his whole future life shows; faithless, in that although he gave his solemn promise and confirmed it *by an oath*, that if Licinius would resign his claims to the purple, he should be permitted to pass the remainder of his life in peace, and this promise and this oath were made not alone to Licinius but also to his wife, the own sister of Constantine, in behalf of her husband, yet, notwithstanding all this, only a little while after Licinius reached Thessalonica, the place appointed for his abode, he was foully murdered by order of Constantine. And the circumstance that Licinius had at the time fully reached the allotted *threescore and ten* years, added to his murder the element of wanton cruelty. But Constantine did not stop with this, his first murder. This was in A. D. 324. In 326 his own son Crispus was put to death by his orders and for no other crime than his abilities; and at the same time he murdered his nephew, the son of the murdered Licinius, "whose rank was his only crime," and the obdurate heart of the emperor "was unmoved by the prayers and tears of his favorite sister, pleading for the life of a son whose loss she did not long survive."

But this is enough mention of his fearful crimes, and we gladly turn from it without narrating the bloody tragedy of his own wife. And all this while he professed to be a Christian, it was before the battle of the Milvian Bridge (312) that he professed to have had his vision of the flaming cross and its inscription. In 321 he issued his Sunday edict. It was in 324 that he murdered Licinius. In 325 he convened the Council of Nicea, presided over its deliberations, took part in its discussions, and published and enforced its decisions. In 326 he

murdered his nephew and Crispus. And in 330, May 11, his new capital, Constantinople, was dedicated to the Virgin Mary. In 337, May 22, he died, and there ended his evil life. To quote the words of another, "Tested by character, indeed he stands among the lowest of all those to whom the epithet [Great] has in ancient or modern times been applied."—*Encyclopedia Britannica, ninth edition, art. Constantine*. Yet through all this defiance of all principle, of all the laws of God, and of civilized men, he prospered as a ruler, and the Nation prospered under his shameful rule.

Again, upon their own claims, our own country is a positive contradiction of this proposition. *They* say that this Nation is, and has been from the beginning, governed by a "Constitution so very wicked, so entirely godless, that a man who fears God and honors Christ cannot support nor swear allegiance to it." Yet in spite of all this, this Nation has prospered most, has grown most rapidly, has reached the highest place in the shortest time, of any Nation that the world has ever seen.

And in the bright shining of the light of the last years of the nineteenth century, and flatly in the face of universal history, which is in itself a universal refutation, they set forth the proposition that Nations do not prosper except as they "recognize and *obey* the *moral laws* which God has ordained." We verily believe that such another set of blunders and misreading of history and human experience as is held to by the National Reform party, cannot be found outside of the history of the Jesuits. And if that party does not yet fairly *out-Jesuit the* Jesuits themselves, we shall be willing to learn that we have mistaken them. The fact of the matter is that this party utterly mistakes the functions of human government, and consequently views everything in connection therewith in its reverse. But when men deliberately turn their backs upon the nineteenth century, and seek to revive the forms and methods of *government* of the Dark Ages, we cannot expect from them any other than the forms and methods of *argument* of the Dark Ages.

A. T. J.

February 6, 1889

"How Are the Powers That Be Ordained?" *The American Sentinel* 4, 3, pp. 18, 19.

THE Scripture says that "the powers that be are ordained of God." How is it done? Is it direct and miraculous, or providential? Jeremiah 27:1-8 shows that the power of Nebuchadnezzar as king of Babylon was ordained of God. Did God send a prophet or a priest to anoint him king? or did he send a heavenly messenger, as to Moses and Gideon? Not at all. Nebuchadnezzar was king because he was the son of his father, who was king. How did his father become king? Thus: In 625 B.C. Babylonia was but a province of the empire of Assyria, and Media was another. Both revolted at once. The king of Assyria gave Nabopolassar command of a large force, 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. Assurbanipal received his 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 kingdom of Babylon and of Nebuchadnezzar the king, 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 Great Britain. How did she become so? Simply by the fact that she was the first in the line of succession 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 that 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 of Germany. How did the House of Hanover get into England? When Queen Anne died, the line of succession was George of Hanover, who became king of England under the title of George the First. How did he receive 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, son of Henry the

Proud, was a prince of the House , of Guelph, of Suabia. The father of the House of Guelph was a prince of the Allemanni, 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

19

tribes of Germany. So that in this line also the royal dignity of Queen Victoria springs from the people.

Besides this 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 Minister 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 declared she would not sign it. Gladstone replied, "Your majesty 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. The power of the people of England is above that of 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 who has justly ruled on earth, whose dignity was not derived from the people, either express, or permissive. It is not any particular sovereigns 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 within 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 powers 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.

If the people choose to change their form of government, it is the same power still, and 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 fellowmen; 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 before shown 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 those 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. 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 people shall have accomplished their purpose.

A. T. J.

"Sunday Parades" *The American Sentinel* 4, 3 , p. 20.

IN the Washington Sunday Convention Dr. Crafts in speaking against Sunday parades in the army said: "Sunday parades make Sunday the most laborious of the week."

This statement is like a good many others made by that gentleman; it is simply untrue. The writer of this note spent five years in the regular army, and he knows that Sunday *with the parade* is the least laborious day of the week. Sunday is always the easiest day to the regular soldier. But what are these Sunday parades which are such a dreadful persecution to the American soldier, and which so outrage his rights of conscience? This: Generally there is an inspection of quarters, soldiers, arms, and accoutrements at 9 o'clock Sunday forenoon. And at this the troops are generally called into ranks for perhaps a half an hour. With this exception and the exclusion of the regular guard, there is literally nothing at all for the soldier to do from sunrise till sundown on Sunday. He is not called upon to do anything. At sundown there is the regular roll-call, when every soldier must again fall into rank to answer to his name. At this time also, especially in large garrisons and garrisons near cities, there is generally a parade. The whole time occupied is not much if any more than half an hour. They have to fall into rank anyhow to answer to their names, and the parade is nothing more than all the companies in a garrison being formed into line. In breaking up to march to their quarters they are generally marched past the commanding officer.

That is literally all that there is in Sunday parades in the army. And with it all Sunday is the easiest day in the week for the soldier. On that subject Doctor Crafts does not know what he is talking about.
A. T. J.

February 13, 1889

"The Gospel of Christ Is Not a Political System" *The American Sentinel* 4, 4 , pp. 25, 26.

THE National Woman's Christian Temperance Union Convention for 1888 passed the following resolution:—

Resolved, That Christ and his gospel as universal king and code should be sovereign in our government and political affairs, and that obedience to his law is the only path to political righteousness and peace."

Is it true that Christ is a divine politician? Is it true that he is a political king? Is it true that the gospel of Jesus Christ is a political code? Is it true that political righteousness and peace are the objects of his law? It is *not* true. Not one of these things is true. The idea of the resolution is as far from the truth as anything could possibly be and not be downright blasphemy.

For the sake of illustration, let us put this resolution to the test. Suppose the gospel were adopted as the code of this land. It would then be the bounden duty of every court to act according to the code.

There is a statute in that code, which says, "If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him." Remember, they have resolved that this shall be the code in our Government. Suppose, then, a man steals a horse. He is arrested, tried, and found guilty. He says, "I repent." "Thou shalt forgive him," says the code, and the Government must conform to the code. He is released and repeats the act; is again arrested and found guilty. He says, "I repent." Thou shalt forgive him. And if he does it seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turns to the court, saying, "I repent," the court must forgive him; for so says that which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has resolved should be the governmental code.

It will be seen in an instant that any such system would be destructive of civil government. This is not saying anything against the Bible, nor against its principles. It is only illustrating the absurd perversion of its principles by these people who want to establish a system of religious legislation here. God's Government is moral, and he has made provision for maintaining his Government with the forgiveness of the transgression. But he has made no such provision for civil government, and no such provision can be made. No such provision can be made and civil government be maintained. The Bible reveals God's method of saving sinners against his moral Government; civil government is man's method of preserving order, and has nothing to do with sin, nor with the salvation of sinners.

But that such a mixture would be destructive of civil government, is not all; it would be destructive of the gospel as well. For when the gospel of Jesus Christ is brought down to the low level of politics, and is made an element in political contests, it is destroyed; its whole spirit is perverted, and in a little while the profession of it is only used

to sanctify all manner of ambitious scheming. The gospel of Jesus Christ, maintained upon the high plane where Christ has placed it, is the best thing the world ever saw or ever can see. But that gospel perverted, and degraded to the low level of human pride; made an instrument of worldly ambition, and used to sanctify human passions, human caprices, and political strife, becomes the worst evil that ever afflicted a people. The one is the mystery of godliness, worthy only of the supremest effort of the mind to understand, the most devout reverence of the soul to contemplate, and the constant, sincerest effort of the life to imitate. The other is the mystery of iniquity, worthy only of the eternal abhorrence of every intelligent creature.

In the face of the Saviour's express statement that his kingdom "is not of this world," the Woman's Christian Temperance Union declares

26

that he "shall be this world's king; yea, verily, THIS WORLD'S king;" king of its courts, camps, commerce, colleges, cloisters, and constitutions. It declares that this kingdom of Christ "must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics." The Union demands the ballot in the hands of women, in order to turn this Government into a theocracy, and have men "swear an oath of allegiance to Christ in politics, and march in one great army up to the polls to worship God." With all this, their resolution to make him and his gospel the king and code in our government and political affairs, and obedience to his law the only path to political righteousness and peace, is strictly consistent. But the Woman's Christian Temperance Union will have to go but a little farther in this direction before it will justly deserve the open and determined opposition of every person who has any regard for civil government, or any respect for Christian principles.

A. T. J.

"The United States Constitution" *The American Sentinel* 4, 4 , pp. 27, 28.

IS our national Constitution right as it is? or will it not be right until some such amendment shall have been adopted as is now offered by Senator Blair, and heartily supported by the National Reform Association and its allies? As the amendment is offered supposedly in the interests of Christianity, a Scriptural answer to these questions ought to be not only acceptable but satisfactory. What then saith the Scripture? What are the words of Christ? We quote:—

"Then went the scribes and Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. We know that thou art true, and teachest 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 image and superscription is this? They said unto him, Cesar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

In these words Christ has established a clear distinction between Cesar and God, that is, between the civil and the 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 in obedience 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 religion 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, they 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 nowadays seem to think, to minister 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 thirteenth chapter of Romans, it will be seen that this scripture is but an exposition of the words of Christ, "Render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's." It is God's own commentary on those 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 pay tribute unto Cesar, or not?" Referring to the same thing, Rom. 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." Rom. 13:7 says, "Render to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due." We repeat, therefore, that Rom. 13:0 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 powers,—the powers that be. Next it speaks of rulers bearing the sword and attending upon matters of tribute. Then he exhorts, to render tribute to whom tribute is due, and to owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another 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: "Thou shalt 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 knew all of these commandments. Why, then, did he say, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying: 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 solely 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 pertains to God from that which pertains to civil government. The things which 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: 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 comprehend in this saying, That he

28

shall love his neighbor as himself, thus showing conclusively that the powers that be, though ordained of God, are so ordained only in things pertaining to the relation of man with his fellow-men, 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 whatever 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 one 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:—

"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 has the same right, but 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 every 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 everything, 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.

The United States is the first and only Government in history that is based on the principle established by Christ. In article VI. of the National Constitution, this nation says, that "No re-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 "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 Caesar 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 alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshipping 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 God only that which is God'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 the unholy state; and so it continued till the new nature, the least defiled with the barren scoffings of the eighteenth century, the most general believers in Christianity of any people of that age, the chief oar of the reformation in its pure forms, when it came to establish a government for the United States, refused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by a corporate body, or having a headship in a monarch or a state.

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

Whoever, therefore, attempts to amend that Constitution so as to connect it in any way with any religion, not only attempts to subvert the Constitution, but also to subvert the principles established by our Lord Jesus Christ.

A. T. J.

February 27, 1889

"The New Theocracy" *The American Sentinel* 4, 6 , pp. 43, 44.

THE National Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish a theocracy by ballot in this Government. They have declared that "Christ shall be this world's king" (although Christ himself said "my kingdom is not of this world"), and that this kingdom

of Christ "must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics."
They have declared that—

"A true theocracy is yet to come, and the enthronement of Christ in law and lawmakers; hence I pray devoutly, as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women, and rejoice that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union has so long championed this cause."—*Monthly Reading, September, 1886.*

This is not the first attempt of the kind that has been made in the Christian era. The same theory prevailed among the ambitious church leaders in the fourth century, and the same kind of a scheme was set on foot there by them as is here being carried out now. Says Neander, of the time of Constantine:—

"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 unchristian opposition of the spiritual to the secular power, and which might easily result in the formation of a sacerdotal State, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way."—*Torrey's Neander, Boston, 1853, p. 132.*

Neander calls this a "false theocratical theory;" and it is rightly so called, because since Jesus Christ died, no theocratical theory of earthly government can be anything but false. There was once a true theocracy upon earth. The Government of Israel was a true theocracy. That was really a Government of God. At the burning bush, God commissioned Moses to lead his people out of Egypt. By signs and wonders and mighty miracles multiplied, God delivered Israel from Egypt, and led them through the wilderness, and finally into the promised land. There he ruled them by judges "until Samuel the prophet," to whom, when he was a child, God spoke, and by whom he made known his will. In the days of Samuel, the people asked that they might have a king. This was allowed, and God chose Saul, and Samuel anointed him king of Israel. Saul failed to do the will of God, and as he rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord rejected him from being king, and sent Samuel to anoint David king of Israel; and David's throne God established forevermore. When Solomon succeeded to the kingdom in the place of David his father, the record is: "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king, instead of David his father." 1 Chron. 29:23. David's throne was the throne of the Lord, and Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king over the earthly kingdom of God.

The succession to the throne descended in David's line to Zedekiah, who was made subject to the king of Babylon, and who entered into a solemn covenant before God that he would loyally render allegiance to the king of Babylon. But Zedekiah broke his covenant; and then God said to him:—

"Thou profane, wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, 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." Eze. 21:25-27; 17:1-21.

The kingdom was then subject to Babylon. When Babylon fell, and Medo-Persia succeeded, it was overturned the first time. When Medo-Persia fell, and was succeeded by Grecia, it was overturned the second time. When the Greek empire gave way to Rome, it was overturned the third time. And then says the word, "It shall be no more, till He come who right it is; and I will give it him." Who is He whose right it is? "Thou . . . shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke 1:31-33. And while he was here as "that prophet," a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, the night in which he was betrayed he himself declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." Thus the throne of the Lord has been removed from this world, and will "be no more, until he come whose right it is," and then it will be given him. And *that time* is the end of this world, and the beginning of "the world to come." Therefore while this world stands, a true theocracy can never be in it again. Consequently every theory of an earthly theocracy is a false theory; every pretension to it is a false pretension; and wherever any such theory is proposed or advocated, whether by the Papal Bishops of the Roman Empire in the fourth century, or by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of the United States in the nineteenth century, it bears in it all that the Papacy is or that it ever pretended to be,—it puts a man in the place of God.

All that the history of the Papacy is, is only the working out of this theory. For the first step in the logic of a man-made, or a woman-made, theocracy, is a Pope; the second step is the infallibility of that

Pope; and the third step is the Inquisition, to make his infallibility effective, as we will prove.

First, a true theocracy being a government immediately directed by God, a false theocracy is a government directed by a man in the place of God. But a man governing in the place of God is a Pope. A man ruling the world in the place of God, is all that the Pope has ever claimed to be.

Second, a false theocracy being a professed government of God, he who sits at the head of it, sits there as the representative of God. He represents the divine authority; and when he speaks or acts officially, his speech or act is that of God. But to make a man thus the representative of God, is only to clothe human passions with divine power and authority. Consequently, in order to make all his actions consistent with his profession, he is compelled to cover them all with the divine attributes, and make everything that he does in his official capacity the act of God. This is pre-

44

cisely the logic and the profession of papal infallibility. It is not claimed that all the Pope speaks is infallible; it is only what he speaks officially—what he speaks from the throne. Under this theory he sits upon that throne as the head of the Government of God in this world. He sits there as the representative of God. And when he speaks officially, when he speaks from the throne, he speaks as the representative of God. Therefore, sitting in the place of God, ruling from that place as the official representative of God, that which he speaks from the throne is the word of God, and must be infallible. This is the inevitable logic of the false theocratical theory. And if it be denied that the theory is false, there is logically no escape from accepting the papal system. The claims of the papacy are not in the least extravagant, if the theory be correct.

Third, God is the moral governor. His Government is a moral one, whose code is the moral law. His Government and his law have to do with the thoughts, the intents, and the secrets of men's hearts. This must be ever the Government of God, and nothing short of it can be the Government of God. The Pope then being the head of what is pretended as a Government of God, and ruling there in the place of God, his Government must rule in the realm of morals, and must take cognizance of the counsels of the heart. But being a man, how could he discover what were the thoughts of men's hearts, whether they were good or evil, that he might pronounce judgment upon them? By

long and careful experiment, and by intense ingenuity, means were discovered by which the most secret thoughts of men's hearts might be wrung from them, and that was by the Inquisition. The Inquisition was only the inevitable logic of the theocratical theory upon which the Papacy was founded. And the Papacy—infallibility, inquisition, and all—is only the logic of any theocratical theory of earthly government since Jesus Christ died. And this theocratical theory advocated by the W. C. T. U. is not an exception.

But some may say that the Union says "a *true* theocracy," while that of the fourth century, and which made the Papacy, was a false one. That one was not considered false by those who advocated it, any more than this one is by those who advocate it. To the bishops of the fourth century that theory was as truly that of a true theocracy as is this now to the women of the National W. C. T. U.; hence they, too, in their day prayed devoutly for the ballot in the hands of bishops. The theocratical theory of the bishops of the fourth century was no more false than is this one now held by the W. C. T. U. And as that one made a Papacy then, so will this one now, if it should ever become successful. A Papacy is inherent in the very theory itself; and it matters not by whom it may be advocated; that will be the result of any successful carrying out of the theory. If the W. C. T. U. should get the ballot in the hands of women, and should then control the Government of the United States, and establish their theocracy by ballot, and elect the president of the National W. C. T. U. to the seat at the head of the Government, she being head of a theocracy—a Government of God—would sit there as the representative of God, and would be a pope. But the Government of the United States never wants to see a pope, either male or female.

As any theocratical theory of government in this world is a false theory; as any such theory contains a Papacy; and as the National W. C. T. U. advocates just such a theory, therefore that much of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union should be opposed as certainly, and as decidedly, as should the Papacy itself. A. T. J.

March 6, 1889

**"The Blair Sunday Bill Unconstitutional" *The American Sentinel* 4, 7 ,
pp. 50, 51.**

THE Blair Sunday Bill proposed to "promote" the observance of the first day of the week "as a day of religious worship." It is a religious bill wholly.

The title of the bill not only says that its object is "to promote its [the Sunday] observance as a day of religious worship," but the first section defines the Lord's day; the second section refers to it as a day of worship and rest; section three refers to it as a day of "religious worship;" section four refers to it as a day of "religious worship;" and section six declares that the provisions of the bill shall be construed so as to secure to the whole people rest "and the religious observance of the Sabbath-day." The word "civil" is not in the bill. It is religious legislation, and that only. But any sort of religious legislation by Congress is unconstitutional. Therefore the Blair Sunday Bill is unconstitutional. This we shall now prove.

All the powers of Congress are delegated powers. It has no other power; it cannot exercise any other. Article 10 of amendments to the Constitution expressly declares 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."

In all the powers thus delegated to Congress, there is no hint of any power to legislate upon any religious question, or in regard to the observance of any religious institution or rite. Therefore, Senator Blair's Sunday Bill, being a religious bill, is unconstitutional; and any legislation with regard to it will be unconstitutional. More than this, Sunday being a religious institution, any legislation by Congress in regard to its observance will be unconstitutional as long as the United States Constitution shall remain as it now is.

Nor is this all. This would be true if the first amendment to the Constitution were not there as it is. But the Nation has not been left in doubt as to whether the failure to delegate this power was or was not intentional. The first amendment to the Constitution, in declaring that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," shows that the failure to delegate such power was intentional, and makes the intention emphatic by absolutely prohibiting Congress from exercising any power with regard to religion. It would be impossible to frame a law on the subject of religion that would not in some way prohibit the free exercise of religion. Therefore the first amendment to the Constitution absolutely prohibits Congress from ever making any law with regard

to any religious subject, or the observance of any religious rite or institution. Senator Blair's bill, being a religious bill, is shown by this second count to be unconstitutional.

The National Reformers know, and have been contending for twenty-five years, that for Congress to make any Sunday laws would be unconstitutional. Yet the National Reform Association is one of the most prominent agencies in urging for-

51

ward Senator Blair's National Sunday bill. And this only shows that they are willing to resort to unconstitutional means to secure their coveted power, and to accomplish their purposes. But, when they will knowingly resort to unconstitutional means to accomplish their purposes, what will they not do when they have attained their object. As for Dr. Crafts and his fellow-workers, the W. C. T. U., etc., whether or not they know it to be unconstitutional, we do not know. Whether they would care, even though they did know, we very much doubt; because, when they can make, at a single stroke, seven millions two hundred thousand and one people out of one Roman Catholic cardinal, and can make all the Roman Catholics in the United States "twenty-one years of age or more," it would not be a matter of great surprise to find that they would knowingly attempt to secure an unconstitutional enactment. A. T. J.

March 13, 1889

"The Sunday Petition Socialistic" *The American Sentinel* 4, 8 , pp. 58, 59.

A GOOD deal of *effort* is being made, especially by certain preachers, to discredit the opposition of the SENTINEL to the Blair Bill by classing us with Socialists. There probably are some Socialists who are opposed to the bill; but though the Socialists should oppose what the SENTINEL opposes, that does not make the SENTINEL a Socialistic journal. It is not a sufficient answer to our opposition to say that certain other classes oppose the bill. We know that the principles which underlie our opposition to the Blair bill are not Socialistic. We also know that the principles upon which the bill is advocated, and by which the support of certain classes is gained, *are essentially Socialistic*. This we propose to prove.

Much has been made of the petition of the Knights of Labor. But the Knights of Labor never took any such step except at the

solicitation of Doctor Crafts. The Blair bill had been scarcely introduced before Mr. Crafts made a trip to Chicago and other cities, soliciting the support of the Knights of Labor. Instead of their petitioning for a Sunday law, the object of it had to be explained, and objections answered before they could even be brought to support it. The object of the petition for the Blair bill was explained by Dr. Crafts to the Central Labor Union of New York, and its indorsement secured. The Central Labor Union embraces a number of labor organizations, and the *Christian Union* declares the Central Labor Union to be a "radically Socialistic" organization. This, in itself, would not be particularly significant were it not for the fact that the arguments which Dr. Crafts presents to these organizations to gain their support are entirely Socialistic. Nor are these confined to Dr. Crafts. Other leaders of the movement also advocate the same principles.

Dr. Crafts went to the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor at Indianapolis last November to get the delegates there to indorse the petition for the passage of the Blair Sunday bill. A report of his speech was printed in the *Journal of United Labor*, the official journal of the Knights of Labor of America, Thursday, November 29, 1888. He said to them there:—

"Having carefully read and re-read your 'declaration of principles' and your 'constitution,' and having watched with interest the brave yet conservative shots of your *Powderly* at intemperance and other great evils, I have found myself so closely in accord with you that I have almost decided to become a Knight of Labor myself. If I do not it will be only because I believe I can advance your 'principles' better as an outside ally."

The following question was asked by one of the Knights:—

"Would it not be the best way to stop Sunday trains to have the Government own and control the railroads altogether, as the Knights advocate?"

Dr. Crafts answered: "I believe in that. Perhaps the best way to begin the discussion of Government control for seven days per week is to discuss this bill for Government control on one day. If the railroads refuse the little we now ask, the people will be the more ready to take control altogether."

The Knights of Labor advocate the doctrine that the Government shall take control of all the railroads in the country, and hire all the idle men in the country at regular railroad wages, and run the roads, as it now runs the Post-office Department, without reference to the question whether anything is made or lost by the Government. This is

what gave rise to the above question. Dr. Crafts proposes to play into the hands of that kind of an element by making the bid for their support, that if they will help the Sunday workers get Government control of the railroads one day in the week, then the Sunday-law workers will help the Knights to get Government control every day in the week. Another question that was discussed both there and at the Convention of Locomotive Engineers at Richmond, Va., was the following:—

"Will not one day less work per week mean one-seventh less wages?"

The response to this was as follows:—

"As much railroad work as is done in seven days can be done in six days, and done better, because of the better condition of the men. And on this ground the engineers would be sustained in demanding, and if necessary compelling, the railroad company, to so re-adjust the pay schedule that the men will be paid as much as at present."

That is to say, that Dr. Crafts and the Sunday-law workers propose to stand in with the laboring men to compel employers to pay seven days' wages for six days' work. This is made certain by the following petition to the State Legislatures, which is being circulated everywhere with the petition for the Blair bill:—

"To the State Senate (or House):—The undersigned earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding anyone to hire another, or to be hired for more than six days in any week; except in domestic service, and the care of the sick; in order that those whom law or custom permits to work on Sunday may be protected in their right to some other weekly rest-day, and in their right to a week's wages for six days' work."

Now a week consists of seven days. A week's wages for six days' work is seven days' wages for six days' work. This petition asks the Legislatures of all the States to pass a law protecting employes in their *right* to seven days' wages for six days' work. No man in this world has any right to seven days' wages for six days' work. If he

60

has a right to seven days' wages for six days' work, then he has an equal right to six days' wages for five days' work; and to five days' wages for four days' work; and to four days' wages for three days' work; to three days' wages for two days' work; to two days' wages for one day's work; and to one day's wages for no work at all. This is precisely what the proposition amounts to. For in proposing to pay seven days' wages for six days' work, it does propose to pay one

day's wages for no work. But if a man is entitled to one day's wages for doing nothing, why stop with one day? Why not go on and pay him full wages every day for doing nothing?

But it may be argued that we have misinterpreted the meaning of the petition; that, as it asks that nobody be allowed to hire another for more than six days of any week, it may mean only that six days are to compose a week; and that it is a week's wages of six days only that is to be paid for six days' work. That is *not* the meaning of the petition. It is not the intention of those who are gaining the support of the Knights of Labor by inventing and circulating the petition. At the hearing on the Sunday bill before the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, December 13, 1888, Dr. George Elliott, pastor of the Foundry Methodist Church, Washington City, was speaking in favor of the bill. Senator Call asked him this question:—

"Do you propose that Congress shall make provision to pay the people in the employ of the Government who are exempted on Sunday, for Sunday work?"

Mr. Elliott—"I expect you to give them adequate compensation."

Senator Call—"Do you propose that the same amount shall be paid for six days' work as for seven?"

Mr. Elliott—"I do; for the reason that we believe these employes can do all the work that is to be done in six days. And if they do all the work, they ought to have all the pay."

There it is in plain, unmistakable words, that they deliberately propose to have laws, State and National, which shall compel employers to pay seven days' wages for six days' work. This is sheer Socialism; it is the very essence of Socialism. No wonder they gained the unanimous indorsement of the Convention of the Knights of Labor, and of the Locomotive Engineers, and the Socialistic Labor Union of New York City, by proposing to pay them good wages for doing nothing.

But this is not all. The Knights of Labor not only accept the proposition, but they carry it farther, and logically too. This principle has been advocated for some time by the Knights of Labor in demanding ten hours' pay for eight hours' work, virtually two hours' pay for doing nothing. The *Christian Union* and the *Catholic Review* propose to help the workingmen secure their demanded eight-hour law, and then have the workingmen help to get the six-day law by forbidding all work on Sunday. Dr. Crafts and Dr. Elliott go a step farther, and propose to secure the support of the workingmen by having laws enacted compelling employers to pay them full wages on Sunday for

doing nothing. But the Knights of Labor do not propose to stop with this. The same copy of the *Journal of United Labor* which contained Dr. Crafts's speech, contained the following in an editorial upon this point:—

"Why should not such a law be enacted? All the work now performed each week could easily be accomplished in five days of eight hours each if employment were given to the host of willing idle men who are now walking the streets. It is a excuse to force one portion of a community to kill themselves by overwork, while another portion the same people are suffering from privation and hunger, with no opportunity to labor. The speech of the Rev. Mr. Crafts, published elsewhere, furnishes an abundance of argument as to why such a law should be put in force."

So when the Sunday-law advocates propose to pay a week's wages for six days' work of eight hours each, because all the work can be done in six days that is now done in seven, then the Knights of Labor propose to have a week's wages for five days' work, because, by employing all the idle men, all the work that is now done in seven days can be done in five. And as Dr. Elliott has said, "If they do all the work, they ought to have all the pay." But if a week's wages are to be paid for five days' work of eight hours each, that is to say, if two days' wages can rightly be paid for no work at all, why should the thing be stopped there? If the Government is to take control of the railroads all the time in order to pay two days' wages for doing nothing, and if the States are to enact laws compelling employers to pay employes two days' wages for doing nothing, then why shall not the Government, both State and National, take possession of everything, and pay the laboring men full wages all the time for doing nothing? For if men have the right to one day's wages for no work, where is the limit to the exercise of that right? The fact of the matter is that there is no limit. If a man is entitled to wages for doing nothing part of the time; he is entitled to wages for doing nothing all the time. And the principle upon which Dr. Crafts and his other Sunday-law *confreres* gain the support of the workingmen to the Blair Sunday bill is nothing at all but the principle of down-right Socialism.

NOTE.—The statement of the *Christian Union* referred to above is as follows:—

"It is very clear that if our Sabbath is to be preserved at all—and we are sanguine of its preservation—the *non-religious sentiment of the country must be brought in to re-inforce the religious demand* for Sabbath rest, and it is increasingly evident that this is entirely practicable. And, curiously, what renders this practicable is that

horrid 'Socialism' which keeps some good people lying awake o' nights in fear and trembling. One of the Sabbath Committee in Philadelphia is, indeed, rep-resented as relying 'upon the law of the Sabbath as promulgated by the Creator.' But the majority of Americans, including large proportions of those who are most desirous of preserving the Sabbath, will never consent to see a purely religious obligation enforced by civil penalties. On the other hand, pure individualism affords an entirely adequate legal basis for anything like adequate Sabbath legislation. . . . Modern, and, if our readers please so to regard it, Socialistic political economy . . . holds that the community has a right to act as a unit; . . . it has a right to fix upon a legal holiday or an eight-hour standard for the normal labor day—if it judge this best. In short, no eight-hour man can consistently deny the right of society to maintain a Sabbath by legal provisions; and . . . no advocate of Sabbath laws, unless he maintains the right of the State to establish a purely religious observance, can consistently deny the right of the community to fix a normal labor day; . . . and *Christian Socialism finds a place for both.*"

The statement of the *Catholic Review*, also referred to, is as follows:—

"The time is near at hand when those who have so warmly advocated eight hours as a workman's day will find it necessary to agitate for six days as a workman's week. If the labor organizations are really anxious for an issue on which they can have the help of the vast majority of the American people, let them take up this of Sunday labor. They will find enormous obstacles to contend with in the widespread avarice of the non-Catholic workingmen as well as of the capitalists. If the limit of a day's labor to eight hours is calculated to restrain the overproduction to which they object, the cessation of Sunday labor, which is now carried on to an extent enormously in excess of what the general public is disposed to believe, would exercise a still further restraint in this direction."

A. T. J.

March 20, 1889

"The Christian Statesman Speaks Again" *The American Sentinel* 4, 9 , pp. 58, 59.

THE *Christian Statesman* of January 10 criticises the course of the SENTINEL under the heading, "An Unfair Critic." The SENTINEL does its very best to be fair all the time; we can afford to be fair; and

so far as we know, we have never yet taken an unfair advantage in any argument, or in any way.

The *Statesman* says it admires the consistency with which the SENTINEL "follows out its own premises to their uttermost conclusions;" but that it does not admire the SENTINEL'S "disposition to impute wrong motives to its opponents." We do not impute motives; nor do we judge men's motives. We not only follow our own premises to their utmost confusions, but we follow the premises of the *Statesman* and the Sunday-law workers, and the workers of religious legislation generally, to *their* uttermost conclusions also. And when, by logical deduction, following these premises to their inevitable conclusions, we find iniquity involved in it all, and expose it, that is neither imputing motives nor judging motives. It is simply reasoning from premises to conclusions. If their premises are sound, they ought not to flinch from the conclusions. As for ourselves, we are perfectly satisfied to be measured by every conclusion from every premise which we lay down. If the *Statesman's* premises are correct, its conclusions cannot be wrong. And, therefore, it ought not to flinch, nor complain, nor charge us with imputing wrong motives, when we take its own premises and carry them to their inevitable conclusion, and then, finding the conclusion to embody the very principles of the Papacy, condemn the system as wicked.

Further: The *Statesman* says of the SENTINEL:—

"It has charged the National Reform Association with duplicity, with the cherishing of evil purposes which it dares not avow, and with the use of dishonorable means to accomplish the ends it seeks. A case in point is its charge that the Association is in league with the Roman Catholic power in the United States, and favors the designs of the Papacy. One ground of this accusation is the remark made by the corresponding secretary in the Saratoga Conference of 1887, in answer to a question, to the effect that an effort might well be made to find a common ground between the Protestants and the Romanists in relation to the work of education."

We do not remember ever to have charged the National Reform Association with the cherishing of evil purposes which it dares not avow. We have found ample employment in exposing and publishing as widely as possible the evil purposes which it *does* avow. There is no need of inventing charges of evil purposes which it dares not avow. The evil purposes which it does avow, and upon which it seems to pride itself, are enough, it seems to us, to satisfy any reasonable person for a life-time. It avows its purpose of enforcing

upon all in this country "the laws of Christian morality," which is only an attempt to force men to be Christians; it avows that the civil power "has the right to command the consciences of men;" it avows its purpose to tolerate only as "lunatics" and "conspirators" all who oppose its aims. These things, with scores of others in the same line, are avowals of the evil purposes which it does cherish. To discuss these things, and to show the evil that is in them, is what the SENTINEL has done; and it has been so fully employed in this that it has not had time, even if it had the disposition, to invent evil purposes which it might imagine that the association dares not avow. As to the charge of duplicity, we shall here present two extracts from the *Christian Statesman* itself; and we leave it for the *Statesman* or anybody else to judge what it reveals: In the Saratoga Convention, to which the *Statesman* refers, the editor of the *Statesman*, in arguing against the secular program of education, said:—

"It does not satisfy the Roman Catholics, or conciliate them to our school system. Their special outcry is against the atheistic tendencies of public education, and the exclusion of religious

66

worship and instruction from the schools gives color to the charge."

Then the question was asked,—

"If we put the Protestant Bible in the schools where the Protestants are in the majority, how could we object to the Douay Version in schools where the Roman Catholics are in the majority?"

And the editor of the *Statesman* said: "We would not object."

Then again the record says:—

"*Rev. Dr. Price, of Tennessee*—I wish to ask the secretary, Has any attempt ever been made by the National Reform Association to ascertain whether a consensus or agreement could be reached with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, whereby we may unite in support of the schools, as they do in Massachusetts?"

"*The Secretary*—I regret to say there has not. . . . But I recognize it as a wise and dutiful course on the part of all who are engaged in or who discuss the work of education, to make the effort to secure such an agreement.'

"*Dr. Price*—I wish to move that the National Reform Association be requested by this Conference, to bring this matter to the attention of American educators and of Roman Catholic authorities, with a view to securing such a basis of agreement, if possible.'

"The motion was seconded and adopted."

There the editor of the *Statesman* argued in favor of securing the cooperation of the Catholic Church in forcing religious instruction into the public schools. He agreed that the Catholic Bible and Catholic

instruction might be given in the public schools where the Catholics are in the majority. He, in behalf of the National Reform Association, accepted a commission to bring this matter to the attention of Roman Catholic authorities with a view to securing such a basis of agreement, if possible. That was August 15 to 17, 1887. Within less than two months after that, a School Board in Pittsburg elected a Catholic priest principal of a public school in a ward in which the people were almost wholly Catholics. The editor of the *Statesman* in his issue of October 20, 1887, said:—

"Of course the priest will now feel it his duty to introduce religion into the school; and the country will watch with interest to see what kind of religion it will be."

Well, what kind of religion could it be expected to be, but the Catholic religion? And this is precisely the thing that the editor of the *Statesman* accepted a commission to secure; this is the very thing to which he said he would not object. He agreed that where the Catholics were in the majority, the Catholic Bible should be used, and Catholic instruction should be given, in the public schools. The Catholics were in the overwhelming majority in that ward in Pittsburg. The priest was hired as principal of the school; and if he taught the Catholic religion, the editor of the *Statesman* said at Saratoga he would not object. And now, not two months afterward, what does he say? In the same editorial, the very next paragraph, after mentioning the appointment of the priest in Pittsburg as principal of the school, he says this:—

"The writer of these lines has recently been in a New York town where one of the two public-school buildings has been given over to the Roman Catholics, who furnish the teachers, and teach the doctrines and worship of their church, including prayers to the virgin and the supremacy of the Pope over all men and all government, the whole being supported out of the public funds. Could anything be imagined more unpatriotic or unreasonable?"

At Saratoga he said he would not object to the Catholic Bible being used and Catholic instruction being given in the public schools where the Catholics were in the majority. He accepted a commission to secure the agreement of the Catholic Church upon that basis. But yet when, in Pittsburg and in New York, the very thing was done to which he said he would not object, and which he had accepted a commission to secure, he innocently inquires, "Could anything be imagined more unpatriotic or more unreasonable?"

What has the *Christian Statesman* to say to these facts as recorded in its own editorial columns? Upon the question of duplicity we leave it to the unbiased judgment of any intelligent person. If the editor of the *Statesman* shall still insist that that is not duplicity, we sincerely desire that he will print in his editorial column his opinion of what would constitute duplicity.

Further: The *Statesman* says of the Saratoga proposition to secure the co-operation of the Roman Catholic Church in public schools:—

"We still maintain that such an effort might well be made, not that we have hope of conciliating the Roman Church to the American system of education, but because their refusal to confer, or their refusal to accept American ideas when fairly and kindly and accurately stated in such a conference, would put them still more clearly in the wrong before the American people."

Remember that the *Statesman* is defending itself against the charge of duplicity; and to escape that charge it says that the Saratoga proposition was made with the expectation that the Catholics would refuse it, and because such refusal would put them more clearly in the wrong. In other words, it defends itself against the charge of duplicity by virtually confessing that that Saratoga proposition was a piece of duplicity. We hope the *Statesman* will try again; and we sincerely wish it better success next time.

A. T. J.

"Army Chaplains" *The American Sentinel* 4, 9 , p. 67.

THE *Christian Statesman* of January 24 announces that a bill is now before Congress, providing for the increase of the corps of army chaplains to one hundred—the number now allowed by law being only thirty-four. Instead of increasing the number to one hundred it ought to be reduced to none. The thirty-four chaplains in the army now are thirty-four too many. Army chaplains are supposed to be for the spiritual benefit of the soldiers. But they are no benefit at all, either spiritually or otherwise, to the soldiers. We know whereof we speak. We were in the regular army five years, and received a "most excellent" discharge. We have been in different garrisons where chaplains were stationed, and never in the whole five years did a chaplain visit the quarters where we were, or any of the men in the company to which we belonged; unless, perhaps, in company with the officers at Sunday morning inspection. Never was there a visit made by a chaplain to the company in which we served, for any

spiritual purpose, or for any purpose, in the due exercise of the duties which he is appointed to perform.

The fact of the matter is, chaplains cannot work for the spiritual interests of the soldiers in the regular army. They rank as commissioned officers, and are to be held, in the estimation of the men, with the same deference and military respect that is due to the officers. He has an officer's uniform, an officer's insignia of rank, and whenever he appears the soldier has to strike an attitude of attention and salute as he would any other commissioned officer. Thus, the very position which he holds, making as an officer, places an insurmountable barrier between him and the soldier. He cannot maintain the dignity of his rank and meet the common soldier upon the level where he is, and approach him upon that common level as every minister of the gospel must do with those whom he is to help spiritually. He cannot enter into the feelings, the wants, the trials, the temptations, the besetments of the common soldier, as one must do to be able to help spiritually, and as the minister of the gospel must do in the exercise of his office anywhere, with any person in the wide world.

Jesus Christ set the example; he did not appear in the glory, the dignity, the rank, and the insignia of his office which he bore as the King of eternity. He laid this aside; he came amongst men, meeting humanity upon humanity's level. He, though divine, came in human form; made himself subject to all the temptations which humanity meets. This he did in order that he might be able to help those who are tempted. The great apostle to the Gentiles, following the way of his Master, became all things to all men, that by all means he might save some. To the weak he became as weak, that he might save them that are weak; to the tempted and tried, the same, that he might save them, and bring them to the knowledge of Him who was tempted and tried for their sakes, that he might deliver them from temptation and give them strength to overcome in time of trial. This is the divine method; it is the only method.

The appointment of chaplaincies in the United States army, with the rank, the dignity, and the insignia of superior office, is contrary to the principle illustrated by Jesus Christ in his life, and taught in his word, and frustrates the very purpose for which professedly they are appointed. The money that is spent by the United States Government in paying chaplains could scarcely be spent in a way that would do the soldiers less good. We said once before in these columns, that

unless the chaplains of the United States army whom we did not see while in the army, were vastly more efficient than those whom we did see, all of them put together did not do the soldiers as much good in the five years we spent in the service, as would a single bag of white beans. In the nature of the case, as we have shown, it is impossible that they could benefit the men. They, having it devolved upon them to maintain the dignity and respect that is due to their rank, do not make any strenuous efforts to help the men. It is difficult to conceive how any man who has the Spirit of Christ, and who really has the burden to help the enlisted men of the army, could ever think of accepting such a position; because the acceptance of such a position becomes at once the greatest hindrance to his helping the men at all.

We have said nothing upon the constitutional aspect of the question; and it is certainly an open question as to whether the payment of chaplains from Government funds is constitutional. We have discussed the question wholly upon the merit of the case. The principle shows that in the circumstances of their appointment, army chaplains cannot benefit the men; and practice shows not only that they do not, but that *they do not try*.

A. T. J.

April 3, 1889

**"The Columbus Sunday Convention" *The American Sentinel* 4, 11 ,
pp. 81-83.**

THERE was held at Columbus, Ohio, February 21 and 22, what was called the Ohio Inter-denominational Sabbath Convention, held in the interests of Sunday legislation, and was supposed to represent all the denominations in the State. About fifty ministers were present.

The convention was addressed by Dr. Anderson, of Denison University; Sylvester F. Scovel, President of the Wooster University and Vice-President of the National Reform Association; Hon. Thomas McDougall, of Cincinnati; Dr. J. W. Hott, editor of the *Religious Telescope*, Dayton, Ohio; Dr. G. W. Lasher, editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, Cincinnati; Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, and Dr. Washington Gladden.

Dr. Anderson spoke on the subject of the scriptural doctrine of the Sabbath and its observance. His argument was wholly to prove Sunday a divine institution, applying to Sunday all those scriptures

which speak of the Sabbath, quoting the fourth commandment, which commands the observance of the seventh day, as authority for keeping the first day of the week. He applied to Sunday the passage in the second chapter of Genesis, which says that God rested in the seventh day from his work which he had made. The purpose of his speech, of course, was to prove the Sabbath to be a divine institution; but it is difficult to see how anyone can prove Sunday observance by passages of Scripture that speak of nothing else but the seventh day. And even granting that that could be proved consistently, still the query is, What place could that have in civil statutes, unless the object be to enforce by civil power the observance of religious institutions?

It is deception for any advocate of Sunday laws to plead that they require the observance of that day only as a civil institution. If they have in view the observance of the day only as a civil institution, why do they always trace it to divine source, support it by Scripture, and advocate its observance as a duty to God? Their arguments from beginning to end show that the real object of the Sunday-law movement is to control the civil power for religious purposes. No man ever yet argued three minutes in favor of a civil Sabbath, without his argument showing it to be religious. That is all that it is, and all that it ever can be made. And any civil law for the enforcement of the Sabbath is only for the enforcement of religious observance, and opens the way for the enforcement of any other religious observances which the church may choose. It is but the first step to an endless line of religious legislation, all in the interest of the church.

Dr. Scovel's subject was our Sunday laws. He, being a National Reformer, and believing the State to be a moral person, of course put Sunday laws at once upon a moral basis, and argued in favor of the enactment of laws by the State, to apply to the moral nature of the individual, and that such laws have a tendency to make men better, purer, and worship also purer. He declared the only thing that tends to complicate the question at all is the question that grows out of the plea of individual liberty,—liberty of conscience. But the way he met this idea and avoided any complication was by quoting from Blackstone, John Ruskin, and others in favor of Sunday laws, and asserting that such laws must be right, and the State has a right to enact such laws, and if it has a right to enact it has a right to enforce them, and such laws when enacted and enforced are simply laws protecting the majority.

Dr. Hott spoke on the Sunday newspaper. The same objections were presented by him that generally are by others in this line against the Sunday newspaper—that it keeps people away from church, and church members will read it, etc. The substance of it all was, that all business on Sunday that is not necessary is wrong. The Sunday newspaper is not necessary, therefore it is wrong.

Dr. Lasher spoke on the Sabbath and the working classes, saying that the Scripture describes the Sabbath as a day of rest, not of worship, worship being the result of rest, and that to the working classes Sunday is a very important institution, necessary to their health and prosperity, a proper observance of which places them in a better position to do efficient service, etc.

Dr. Gladden spoke on the authority of the civil Sabbath, saying that the Sabbath is literally a day or sign of rest; and the civil Sabbath is that day or sign of rest designated or recognized by the laws of the State,—the laws of the United States, and of all the States in the Union; and the laws of all Christian countries recognize the first day of the week as the day of rest, and make certain provisions with respect to it. The day thus received by law is the civil Sabbath. He then traced the Sunday legislation to Constantine, referring to his edict as the first Sunday law. But Constantine's Sunday law was only an ecclesiastical thing, or perhaps civi-ecclesiastical. It was made to please the bishops, and the day was ordered to be observed because it was a church day, just as Friday was also. So that, in fact, whatever way it be looked at, wherever it be traced, and by whatever means, there is no such thing as a civil Sunday law: it is ecclesiastical wholly; and if it be a Sabbath law it is religious.

Dr. Crafts attempted to comment on the words of Christ, "Render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's," to show how that which pertains to God shall be rendered to Cesar, saying that "if the ten commandments be divided into two tables,—the

duties to God and the duties to men,—it would have to be divided at the word 'holy' in the first sentence of the fourth commandment, because the next sentence says, 'Six days shalt thou labor,' and there are laws in the United States on the subject of labor. And secondly, another clause of the commandment refers to the stranger within thy gates; and the United States has laws about aliens; and this makes that part of the commandment to consist of duty toward man, and

that, therefore, civil government may legislate upon it." But this makes the commandment speak to the Nation instead of the individual, and entitles the Nation to compel men to render obedience to God, and virtually demands of men that they render to the civil government what belongs to God, and makes Christ contradict himself. Next he declared that man has re-enacted six of the commandments. It is not to be wondered at that this statement should be made by Mr. Crafts in this connection, because if it be right for man in the form of civil government to exact of men what belongs to God, then the government usurps the place and the authority of God; and having so done, it becomes necessary, of course, to re-enact such commandments as the government may deem necessary to its work. This is all perfectly consonant with the whole system of things that is represented in the Sunday-law movement, and which Dr. Crafts is seeking to establish here, that is, human government in the place of the Government of God. But so long as the Lord shall remain supreme, so long it will remain unlawful for civil government to exact of men that which pertains to God; and so long it will be blasphemous usurpation for any Government or any society of men to attempt to re-enact any of the commandments of God. It shows a deplorable estimate of the institutions and Government of the Lord when men professing to be ministers of the gospel will talk about any of God's statutes being re-enacted by anybody in any way.

There was a committee appointed on organization; and one of the recommendations of the committee was that the society should be called "The Christian Sabbath Association of the State of Ohio." Another was that the object of the association should be "to promote in every legitimate way the observance by all classes of people of the Lord's day in accordance with its import as defined by Christ in Mark 2:27." When this was read, the Rev. Mr. Jefferson, of Cincinnati, objected to the name, and proposed to substitute "The Sunday Association of the State of Ohio," and asked that the reference to Mark 2:27 be stricken out of the recommendation entirely. The reason which he gave for these changes was that in the words of Christ in Mark 2:27 there was no reference whatever to Sunday or the first day of the week, but that Christ was referring to the Sabbath of Mosaic institution, which had been abolished. After a good deal of discussion Dr. Crafts suggested that the name be "The Ohio Sabbath Association;" and with reference to striking out the text Mark 2:27 he said: "As the people are not given to having their Bibles at hand, and

not everybody is familiar with that term, it would be better to stop with the term Lord's day, as everybody knows what that means." For himself he supposed the text Mark 2:27 was "the Sabbath was made for man." But he was not quite sure. Dr. Crafts's suggestions were accepted, and the association was called "The Ohio Sabbath Association," and the reference to Mark 2:27 was stricken out. A secretary was appointed for each county in the State.

Next came the report of the Committee on Resolutions. These excited considerable discussion, especially one proposing to indorse the movement in favor of a Saturday half-holiday for working-men. Dr. Lasher said: "I do not see why they should say anything about the Saturday half-holiday. I have not as much interest for the laboring man on the six days as I have on the Sabbath-day; so I move that we strike out that part of the resolution." Another said the Saturday half-holiday had a good deal to do with the Sabbath question. Dr. Crafts said there could be no objection to it, and this resolution was only to commend. Dr. Lasher replied: "I know it is only commendatory, but it is a question with me whether it is best to commend." When the question came to a vote it was defeated by twenty-four to seventeen.

Another resolution rejoiced in the growth of the literature for the defense of the Sabbath, and urged its increased circulation, especially the new series of documents issued by the American Sunday Union. This gave an opportunity for Dr. Crafts to urge them to call for the hearing on the Sunday question before the Committee on Education and Labor, telling all to write to the representatives now instead of to the senators, because the senators had been overwhelmed with orders, so that they could not fill them. Another resolution indorsed heartily the petition to Congress for the passage of the Sunday-Rest bill, asking immediate effort for the multiplication of signatures, and resolved that the President of this convention be authorized to sign the petition for the whole of the members. This resolution, of course, was adopted.

Next came a paper by Rev. James Brand, on the subject, "To What Extent Are the Christians Responsible for Sabbath Desecration?" He cited, as in the case of the Elgin, Ill., convention, the fact that Christians buy Sunday papers, and do business on Sunday, and live carelessly in many things. And when it came to the discussion of the paper, one gentleman said he would like to find out by what means he could get the church-members to attend church, especially the railroad men. Another, in answering this, said he

thought the reason why they had gotten into this difficulty was because the church has got away from the fourth commandment. At this the Rev. Mr. Jefferson, of Cincinnati, said he did not believe in the perpetuity of the ten commandments, but abided by the teachings of Christ, and that there was "no commandment today requiring the Sabbath to be kept."

Here he was interrupted by one, who said that "Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfill." Mr. Jefferson replied: "That is all right; and he did fulfill it. And, therefore, it no more remains to be fulfilled, because he fulfilled it once for all, and it is gone." He said he was in favor of the object for which the convention was called together, but he was opposed to the use of the term "the Sabbath-day" in the sense in which they were using it there. This created a great stir; about a half dozen members were on their feet at once, and several of them talking at once. Somebody cried, "Put him out!" The tumult finally subsided without any violence being done.

The convention closed with the speech by Dr. Crafts on the subject of "The Sabbath from a Patriotic Standpoint." It is the same speech, only with slight variations, that he delivered at Washington City, Chicago, and to the Knights of Labor at Indianapolis. He referred to the counter petitions that are being circulated against the Blair Sunday bill, and said that those who were securing those petitions sometimes take tables in the streets upon which to write, and then bring up every gambler and harlot that they can find to sign the petition. We have had considerable to do with getting signatures to that counter-petition, and we know a good many others who have also, and we do not know of any such characters as these that have signed it, nor do we know of anyone who does know, unless it be Dr. Crafts. His acquaintance with that kind of characters may be sufficiently broad to justify him in making the statement. As for us, we know nothing about either the characters or the fact. In answer to the argument that is made that the Blair Sunday bill is unconstitutional, he affirmed that it is constitutional, because the Constitution itself embodies a Sunday law. He referred to this part of the United States Constitution which provides that the President shall have ten days (Sunday excepted) in which to sign a bill, or to keep it without signing it, and then exclaimed: "What is that but a Sunday law? That is the acorn."

Hon. Mr. McDougall's speech opened up a scene that was not on the bills, although it was the best speech in the whole convention. It was as follows:—

"Being in full sympathy with every well-directed and reasonable movement for a better observance of the civil Sabbath and a belief in the Christian Sabbath, I respond to your call on me to speak. In 1880 the laws of Ohio for the protection of the Sabbath imposed as the highest fine the sum of five dollars. To-day the legislation is as stringent as in any State in this Union. If the Sabbath is not observed as you desire it, it is not the fault of legislation. No additional legislation is needed to secure what you desire. What then needed? The solution of this problem is deeper than legislation. Legislation does not change character, and its fiat will not bring the millennium. In this State we had a population in 1880 of about 3,200,000. Of that number not quite one-fourth is to be found in all of our cities having a population of 10,000 and over. So that we have an orderly civil Sabbath in at least four-fifths of the State. The evils existing and complained of are in our large cities, whose number may be counted on your ten fingers. How is existing law to be enforced in them. Their welfare is the problem of the statesman and the Christian. We have said legislation which has a limited mission for good in securing social order does not change character, and we may add, Its enforcement depends on the public sentiment behind it. Any law on this subject which depends for its enforcement on a resort to a jury, in the existing state of public sentiment in our large cities, must be of necessity a failure under any fair system of selecting a jury which represents the community from which it is drawn; from our experience in Cincinnati, we affirm you cannot convict for selling liquor on Sunday. Just as an Ashtabula jury of members of the church would refuse in the days of the fugitive slave law to convict a citizen of that place of crime for feeding and clothing, at the command of Christ, a slave, fleeing for freedom to Canada. What then is to be done? Seek the highest good attainable. The redemption of the masses in our large cities and their elevation to a better observance of law is to be sought through the gospel of Jesus Christ."

"Ministering in his name, go to their homes, seek their welfare, educate them by the power and teaching of Jesus Christ, and there will come to you that reform you seek. They are waiting for this service, this education. Not in convention; not in resolutions; not in the fiats of legislation,

83

but give your time, money, prayer, and service to carrying to the homes of the toiling masses the beneficent gospel, and you will elevate and reform, as nothing else can or will, those whom you now regard as the enemies of the Sabbath. I am opposed to the

social ostracism that too often accompanies movements of certain kinds of reform. Bitterness never wins any man, never secures reform. The saloon keeper is not a criminal, nor the liquor business a crime. Tens of thousands of the best people of our land, men of wealth and character, many of them belonging to our churches, use liquor, and do not regard its purchase or use a crime or a sin. The co-operation of these men is essential to the enforcement of law.

"Tens of thousands of the working people in our large cities live in homes of one and two rooms. Whole families cook, eat, wash, sleep in such rooms. They toil from early morning till late in the evening. What are you to do with them? They are citizens; they are elements of the problem. Unless you can reach, educate, reform those masses, how are you to secure in our large cities a more orderly Sunday? Are we in a position to sit in judgment on them? How do we observe the day? How many of us do the very things on Sabbath we are here condemning in others? What about the use of liquors in the houses of many church people, traveling on railroads on Sunday, etc. Let us learn that this is an intensely practical question, presenting questions for our consideration difficult to solve, and which no legislation can solve. The roots of the evils are deeper; they need the gospel of Christ as the power to give us what we desire. Abandon agitation and service for the unattainable and consecrate your time, money, prayers, and service to carrying to those for whom Christ died, his gospel of love and his ministry of service. Thus only may we successfully secure to our cities and its needy masses the blessings of a well-ordered Sabbath, the foretaste of the eternal Sabbath."

In the next meeting after this speech was made a motion was made "that this convention is not in accord with Mr. McDougall's speech, and utterly repudiates it." The motion was parried unanimously and without debate. But this was not the end of the story; a self-appointed "committee of five hundred" in Cincinnati had already made arrangements for a meeting to be held in that city, Saturday night, February 23, and had invited Mr. McDougall to speak there. But after they learned in Cincinnati what Mr. McDougall had said in Columbus, the managers of the Cincinnati meeting waited upon him and asked him if the speech that he made at Columbus embodied the sentiments he expected to express in Cincinnati. And when he answered that it did, that those were his views and the ones that he proposed to advocate, he was requested not to come to the meeting, "as discord might be created by it" Mr. McDougall replied that he was not in the habit of going where he was not wanted; and consequently, he who had been advertised as "the speaker of the

evening" was conspicuous by his absence, at the request of the managers of the Sunday-law meeting, because the speech that he would have made insisted upon the power of the gospel of Jesus Christ as the only effective means of securing religious observances, and because he told the political preachers that this was the best thing that they can engage in to make their work successful. Let it be understood, therefore, in all future references, that the Ohio Sabbath Association "utterly repudiates" the use of the gospel of Jesus as a means of securing the proper observance of the Sabbath. If the convention had repudiated the *sentence* in Mr. McDougall's speech, which spoke of the liquor business not being a crime and the saloon keeper not being a criminal, no objection could be made, although it is true in Ohio. But this they did not do. They "utterly repudiated" the whole speech.

In fact, this is the proper thing to do if they are going to keep on in the line in which they have started, because if they can make people righteous by legislation they do not need the gospel. And, on the other hand, the Saviour is not a politician, and does not intend that his work shall be done in a political way. More than this, the leading Sunday-law workers confess that there is no commandment of Christ for keeping Sunday; and, therefore, it is an appropriate thing for those Sunday-law workers of Ohio to repudiate any effort to secure Sunday keeping by setting forth the word of Christ. Yet we cannot help wondering whether it would not have been a good deal better for this convention to adopt Mr. McDougall's suggestion, and repudiate their political action and their political scheming, rather than the preaching of the gospel and the means which Christ has employed for making men religious. But whatever they should have done, the fact is that the thing they *did* do was to declare by unanimous vote that that convention "utterly repudiates" Mr. McDougall's speech; and "the committee of five hundred" of Cincinnati indorsed the action by repudiating both Mr. McDougall and his speech.

The gospel of Christ does not consort well with political scheming; and suggestions to preach the gospel and to work by gospel methods and means are not palatable to political preachers.

A. T. J.

"Sunday and the Catholic Church" *The American Sentinel* 4, 11 , p.

WHEN the announcement of the Columbus Sunday Convention was made, the following notice of it was given by the *Catholic Columbian* of that city:—

"A meeting of all denominations in Ohio is called to be held at Columbus, February 20 and 21, to consider the advisability of a thorough organization in the interest of a better observance of the Christian Sabbath.'

"We Catholics are always in favor of that day being kept sacredly and strictly, though without the gloomy countenance or the ashes of woe; yet the first thing the members of this convention ought to do would seem to us to be to show any scriptural command whatsoever to observe the 'Christian Sabbath'

"There is authority for the change from the Sabbath to Sunday—ample authority; but it is the authority of the Catholic Church, the only one reaching back to the time of Christ. Fallible churches could make no such a change."

That shows what there is in the indorsement of the Sunday bill by Cardinal Gibbons; it is as a tribute paid by Protestants to the authority of the Catholic Church, that Cardinal Gibbons indorsed it, as it is also of all the Catholics who do indorse it. In his letter to Dr. Crafts in which he indorsed the Blair Sunday bill, Cardinal Gibbons cited the plenary council of Baltimore as authority for keeping Sunday. The Roman Church recognizes no other authority for keeping Sunday than the authority of that church. And whenever they indorse the Protestant movement to obtain a law for the enforcement of Sunday observance, they know it is a tribute paid by Protestants to the authority of the Catholic Church. And when the Protestants get a law by the help, as they themselves say, of all the Catholics in this country, that will not be the end of the matter; the Catholic Church will see that the Protestants pay the tribute which Catholics say is due to that church.

To those so-called Protestants who are so anxious to make religion a subject of legislation, it now appears a very pleasant thing to secure the alliance of the Papacy. But when they shall have accomplished the feat, and find themselves in the midst of a continuous whirl of political strife and contention with the Papacy, not alone for supremacy, but for *existence*—then they will find it not nearly so pleasant as it now appears to their vision, blinded by the lust for illegitimate power.

And when they find themselves compelled to pay more than they bargained to, they will have but themselves to blame; for when they make religion a subject of legislation, they therein confess that it is

justly subject to the rule of majorities. And then, if the Romish Church secures the majority, and compels the Protestants to conform to Catholic forms and ordinances, the Protestants cannot justly complain. For our part we want no rules of majorities in religious observances, either Protestant or Catholic.

A. T. J.

April 17, 1889

"The Constitution and Sunday" *The American Sentinel* 4, 13 , p. 98.

DR. CRAFTS wrote to the Detroit *Free Press* February 17, stating some of the objects of the National Sunday bill, and the *Free Press* replied:—

"If our correspondent will bear in mind that in the eye of the federal law, as well as of the Federal Constitution, Sunday has no other status than Saturday, or any other day of the week, he will possibly see what the assumption of power for which he asks would involve. It would involve the possibility of prohibiting the running of trains between States on any day in the week, and, consequently, upon all days in the week, which is an absurdity. It involves another, and, if possible a greater absurdity—the power to compel the running of inter-State trains upon every day in the week, and as many times a day as Congress may direct.

"There has never been, that we are aware of, any serious claim that the congressional power referred to extended thus far, and we have no fears that Congress will make any such claim. That body is quite as likely, we should think, under the pretense of regulating inter-State commerce, to prohibit the running of smoking-cars on inter-State trains, or the chewing of gum by passengers thereon, or the sale of peanuts for more than five cents a pint. We do not mean to intimate for a moment that these subjects have any natural affinity for, or connection with, Sunday rest. But we do mean to assert that it would be just as ridiculous for Congress, under the pretense of exercising its regulative power over commerce between the States, to prohibit the running of trains on Sunday as it would to enact the other prohibitions suggested."

Further, Dr. Crafts had said that the Constitution contains a Sunday-Rest law for the President. The *Free Press* made to this the singular reply that the Constitution makes no mention of Sunday, and commended to Dr. Crafts a re-examination of the Constitution. We approve of the recommendation of the *Free Press*, that the Doctor should examine the Constitution more closely; but if the *Free Press*

had examined the Constitution as closely as it asks Dr. Crafts to, it ought to know that it does make mention of Sunday. True, it does not make mention of Sunday in any such a way as Dr. Crafts would make out, as enacting a Sunday law; but it does mention Sunday, and says that "if any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sunday excepted) after it is presented to him, the same shall be a law in like manner as if he had signed it, unless Congress by their adjournment prevent its return." But so far from this intending to be a law regulating the rest of the President, it is simply a recognition of the right of the President to keep Sunday religiously if he choose. In this they Constitution recognizes the fact that the President may be one who regards Sunday as a holy day, and respects his conscientious convictions, as it now does of every man, by providing that he shall not be compelled to count Sunday amongst the number of business days. The Constitution of the United States recognizes the right of every man to observe Sunday if he wishes, and it recognizes the right not to keep it if he choose. It respects a man's conscientious convictions, whether he be a Christian or not a Christian. This is the sole meaning of the expression, "Sunday excepted." But the query is, How could the *Detroit Free Press* ever have made such a mistake as to say that the Constitution makes no mention of Sunday? The Constitution of the United States is worthy of a good deal more study than ninety-nine out of every one hundred people in the United States ever give to it. A. T. J.

April 24, 1889

"Why the People Do Not Go to Church" *The American Sentinel* 4, 14 , pp. 105, 106.

SOME time ago there was a large conference of the principal clergymen of New York City to consider the question of why the people do not go to church. The great object of the Sunday laws that are so much demanded is that the people may be able to go to church. It is claimed that without a Sunday law people are compelled to work, and so have no chance to go to church, and, therefore, Sunday laws are sought, to stop all work on Sunday; and that then the churches will be filled. The New York conference continued three days, and the preachers discussed the subject quite largely. While they were theorizing about the matter, the New York *World* sent out

reporters to the people themselves, to find out why they did not go to church; and in its issue of Sunday, December 9, the *World* devotes four columns of space to the replies made by all classes of people to the question put to them by the reporters. The answers of seventy-five different persons are given, and only six out of the seventy-five gave answers which by any proper construction make it appear that being compelled to work on Sunday keeps them from church.

One said if they would give him permission to talk back to the preacher he would like to go; when the preacher had all the say he would rather stay at home. Another said if he should go there was danger of the church falling on him, and so he would stay away. Another said his conscience would not allow him to go, because he did not take any stock in the things the preachers were preaching about, and he would be more interested in looking at the girls in the other pews, and that would not be right. He said it is all well enough for the rich people who have time for that sort of thing, but for a poor fellow like him—well he "did not need it." Another one declared he did not go to church because he did not believe what the preachers teach. Another said the preachers did not preach sensibly, and he would not go to church till they did. Another said he did not go to church because the one to which he belonged was about two or three miles from home, and besides that it was good enough to interest the old men and women, but for him it was about as entertaining as a funeral. A young lady said she did not believe in churches, but yet she was not willing to say she was an unbeliever, but she was not satisfied with the way a good many of the ministers act. Another said he was not dressed well enough. Another, that she was poor, and when she did go she was always received with such a patronizing air—was given to understand that a great sacrifice was being made for such as she, and that she ought to feel thankful for the efforts that were made to save the poor—that she did not feel as though she was welcome. Another one said she did go, but she was poor and poorly dressed, and the usher stared at her and told her she would find a seat in the gallery; she went up there and into a pew, and those who were there drew away from her, because their clothes were nicer than hers; and she chose to stay at home after that. Another one said it would not put fine clothes on his back, nor money in his pocket. Another one said he had gone to church many years, and was not entirely out of the habit, yet he was afraid he would soon be, because of the monotonous humdrum order of the service and sermons.

Another one said the preacher was too far away from the common people, and liked the society of fashionable and rich people too much to welcome the common people.

A number of persons who were Catholics were asked why they did not go to church, and the answers were much of the same sort. Four did not like the priests; another had no belief in religion; one had taken a vow that he would never enter church again; two found more pleasure in going to other places than to church; another said he was asked ten cents at the door every time, and he stopped going; another said he was asked five cents a head every Sunday for himself and family, and he could not afford it.

One of the reporters met another gentleman in the city, who was working in the same line, to solve the problem as to why people do not go to church. He was working especially among the laboring classes, and he gave six reasons of all he had found amongst the working people as to why they did not go to church: First, was need of recreation after the hard work of the week, so they would take that rather than go to church; second, secret societies helped them

106

more than the church did; third, they were unable to pay for church privileges—seats, pews, etc.; fourth, lack of confidence in the preachers; fifth, poor clothes; sixth, the great power of capitalists in the church. He had found that Catholic workingmen are found to be the best church-goers amongst the laboring classes.

The whole list of cases given by the *World*, with the exception of the sixth referred to, is of the same order as embodied in this classification. And the report was gathered from interviews with all classes of the people except the extremely wealthy, embracing firemen, cabinet makers, brokers, factory girls, hotel employes, men of all work, lawyers, theatrical people, street-car conductors, merchants, saleswomen, bar tenders, and even tramps. One of the saleswomen said she did not go to church because her employer did, and that when a man who treated his employes as her employer treated his, was honored by the church, she considered it an honor to herself not to go there. Of the six who gave Sunday work as a reason why they could not attend church, one was a bar tender, who said he was "so busy on Sunday watching the side door and handing the stuff over the bar" that he did not have time to go to church; one was a gatekeeper at the Staten Island ferry; another was a ticket seller on

an elevated railroad station; one was a conductor on a Broadway car; and one was a druggist.

By this account it is seen that not one in a dozen of the people who do not go to church are kept away by work. Therefore, when the Sunday-law workers get the law which they seek, stopping work on Sunday in order for the people to go to church, they will have to follow it up with some other kind of a law by which they can persuade people to go to church, or else the purpose of the Sunday law will not be effected.

Further; the reasons given by those who were interviewed show that something more is needed to get these people to go to church than merely the adoption of a civil statute. These reasons show that the difficulty is deeper seated than can be cured by any such remedies as that; and not the least of these difficulties is the lack of real Christian effort and Christian principle on the part of those who do go to church, who do make a profession of Christianity, and even those who preach it; and the whole account published by the *World* shows conclusively that there is no remedy that can ever reach the case but the genuine preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ. If those ministers, instead of agitating for Sunday laws, would step down from their \$5,000 or \$10,000 pulpits; take off their gold rings; go amongst the people; swing wide open their church doors; make their pews free; strip off the gold, silks, and satins, and the grand finery of the millionaires who sit in the pews; show by genuine kindness and Christian ministrations that they have a real interest for the working classes and the masses who do not attend church, and a living interest for the salvation of their souls—then the gospel of Christ might reach the working classes and find a response in their hearts. If half of the Sunday-law preachers would do this, they could do ten thousand times more than can all of them together by their agitation for Sunday laws. The common people heard Christ gladly, and so will they always hear those who preach him.

A. T. J.

May 15, 1889

"An Open Letter" *The American Sentinel* 4, 16 , pp. 121, 122.

To the Rev. J. H. Knowles, Secretary American Sabbath Union—

DEAR SIR: In your *Monthly Document*, edited by yourself, you have chosen to charge me with insincerity; and you have also done your best to make it appear that I "admit all that the friends of the Sunday-Rest law generally claim,—the right of the Government to make Sunday laws for the public good." You have garbled extracts from the report of my speech before the Senate Committee on the Sunday law, and then have italicized certain words and sentences in one passage to make it appear that I admit the right of the Government to make Sunday laws for the public good.

You have quoted from my speech the following words in the following way:—

"Whenever any civil Government attempts to enforce anything in regard to any one of the first four commandments it invades the prerogative of God, and is to be disobeyed (I do not say resisted, but disobeyed). . . . The State in its legislation can never legislate properly in regard to any man's religious faith, or in relation to anything in the first four commandments of the decalogue; *but if in the exercise of his religious convictions under the first four commandments he invades the rights of his neighbor, then the civil Government says that is unlawful. Why because it is irreligious or because it is immoral?—Not at all; but because it is uncivil, and for that reason only.* (Italics ours.—ED.)"

It is in the italicizing of these words that your effort is made to make me admit what I continually and consistently denied before the committee, and do deny everywhere else. You have inserted in the above quotation three periods, indicating that a portion has been left out; and you know full well, sir (you must know or you could not have left it out), that in the portion which is there left out there is the following:—

"*The Chairman*—'You oppose all the Sunday laws of the country, then?'

"*Mr. Jones*—'Yes, sir.'

"*The Chairman*—'You are against all Sunday laws?'"

"*Mr. Jones*—'Yes, sir; we are against every Sunday law that was ever made in this world, from the first enacted by Constantine to this one now proposed.'

"*The Chairman*—'State and National alike?'

"*Mr. Jones*—'State and National, sir.'"

Not only were these words there, but in that portion which you have printed, following the italicized words, you yourself have printed my plain denial of the right of any nine hundred and ninety-nine

people out of a thousand to compel the thousandth man to rest on the day on which the majority rest, in the following form:—

"*Senator Blair*—'The majority has a right to rule in what pertains to the regulation of society, and if Cesar regulates society, then the majority has the right in this country to say what shall be rendered to Cesar.'

"*Mr. Jones*—'If nine hundred and ninety-nine people out of every thousand in the United States kept the seventh day, that is Saturday, and I deemed it my choice and right to keep Sunday, I would insist on it, and they would have no right to compel me to rest on Saturday.'

"*Senator Blair*—'In other words, you take the ground that for the good of society, irrespective of the religious aspect of the question, society may not require abstinence from labor on the Sabbath if it disturbs others?'

"*Mr. Jones*—'No, sir.'

"*Senator Blair*—'You are logical all the way through that there shall be no Sabbath.'"

The last expression of mine, saying, "No, sir," is in accord, and was intended when spoken to be in accord, with Senator Blair's inquiry, whether society may not require abstinence from labor on the Sabbath. My answer there means, and when it was spoken it was intended to mean, that society may not do so. As to its disturbing others, I had just before proved that the common occupations of men who choose to work on Sunday do not disturb, and cannot disturb, the rest of the man who chooses to rest that day.

Again: A little further along you print another passage, in which are the following words:—

"*Senator Blair*—'You would abolish any Sabbath in human practice which shall be in the form of law, unless the individual here and there sees fit to observe it?'

"*Mr. Jones*—'Certainly; that is a matter between man and his God.'"

Now, sir, I should like for you, in a *Monthly Document*, or by some other means, to show how, by any fair means, or by any sincere purpose, you can, even by the use of italics, make me in that speech admit the right of the Government to make Sunday laws for the public good. You know, sir, that in that speech I distinctly stated that any human laws for the enforcement of the Sabbath, instead of being "for the good of society, are for the ruin of society."

Again: You know, for you printed it in your. *Monthly Document*, that Senator Blair said to me: "You are logical all the way through that there shall be no Sabbath." You know that in another place he said

again to me: "You are entirely logical, because you say there should be no Sunday legislation by State or Nation either." Now, sir, I repeat, You have charged me with in-

122

sincerity; and the one making such a charge as that ought to be sincere. Will you therefore explain upon what principle it is that you claim to be sincere in this thing, when, in the face of these plain and explicit statements to the contrary, and Senator Blair's confirmation of them to that effect, you can deliberately attempt to force into my words a meaning that was never there, that was never intended to be there, and which never can by any honest means be put there?

More than this: It can hardly be thought that Senator Blair will very highly appreciate the compliment that you have paid to his logical discernment, when, in the face of his repeated statements that I was logical all the way through, you force into my words a meaning that could have no other effect than to make me illogical all the way through.

I have no objection whatever to your printing my words as they were spoken; but I do object to your forcing into them a meaning directly contrary to that which the words themselves convey, and which they were intended to convey; and I further object to your disconnecting my statements so as to make it possible for you to force into them a meaning that they never can honestly be made to bear.

In that space also I said that if an idol worshiper in this country should attempt to offer a human sacrifice, the Government should protect the life of its subject from the exercise of that man's religion; that he has a right to worship any idol that he chooses, but that he has not the right to commit murder in the worship of his idol; and the State forbids murder without any reference at all to the question as to whether that man is religious, or whether he worships or not. I stated also that if anybody, claiming apostolic example, should believe in and practice community of property, and in carrying out that practice should take your property or mine without our consent, the State would forbid the theft without any reference at all to the man's religious opinions. And you know that it was with direct reference to these words that I used the words which you have italicized. I there distinctly denied that the State can ever of right legislate in relation to anything in the first four commandments of the decalogue. But if any man in the exercise of his right under the first four commandments

should invade the right of his neighbor, such as I have expressed, by endangering his life, his liberty, or his property, or attack his reputation, the Government has the right to prohibit it, because of the incivility; but with never any question as to whether the man is religious or irreligious.

This is precisely what every State in this Union does already do by statutes which punish the disturbance of religious meetings or peaceful assemblies of any sort. But there is a vast difference between such statutes as these and the ones which you desire shall be enacted. And this is the only thing that I had in view, and is all that I meant, in the words which you have italicized; for immediately following them I proved that one man's work on Sunday cannot disturb another's rest if that man chooses to rest. And I denied then, as I do forever deny, that any man's work at any honest occupation at any time can ever properly or safely be put by civil Government upon a level with murder, theft, or perjury. So much for myself and my position, and your *sincerity*.

Now, I have a few words to say to you about your position. You say that the "friends of the Sunday-Rest bill *deny* that the Government should compel a religious observance of the day."

And yet, in your *Monthly Document* for February you print the following question to Dr. Crafts, asked by the Knights of Labor, and his answer:—

"*Question*—Could not this weekly rest-day be secured without reference to religion by having the workmen of an establishment scheduled in regular order for one day of rest per week, whichever was most convenient—not all resting on any one day?

"*Answer*—A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land *except on the basis of religious obligation*. Take the *religion* out and you take the *rest* out."

You propose to compel all people to take a day of rest; you publish to the world that such a day of rest can be secured only on the basis of religious obligation; the logic of this is that you propose to compel all men to recognize a religious obligation.

Again, it is there definitely stated that to take the religion out of the day is to take the rest out. You propose to compel all men to take the rest, but religion is essential to the rest: without the religion they cannot have the rest. The logic of this is, therefore, that you propose to compel men to take religion.

Joseph Cook is a friend of the Sunday-Rest bill; he says likewise "that you will in vain endeavor to preserve Sunday as a day of rest

unless you preserve it *as a day of worship*." Accordingly, the object of the American Sabbath Union is declared by its constitution to be "to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and *worship*." Mr. Cook likewise says that, "for Sabbath observance to be maintained at a high standard it must be founded upon *religious* reasons." You yourself, sir, have written in the *Pearl of Days* these words:—

"It will become more and more apparent that the real defenders of the day are among those who regard it a divine, not merely a human, institution."

And the president of the association, of which you are secretary, said:—

"We do not put this work on mere human reasoning, for all that can be overthrown by human reasoning; we rest it directly and *only* on the *divine* command."

From first to last, these statements are from fast friends of the Sunday-Rest bill. And similar statements might be quoted almost indefinitely from the friends of the Sunday-Rest bill. Therefore, you with the rest of the friends of the Sunday-Rest bill, may deny till doomsday that the Government should compel a religious observance of the day and it will amount to nothing. The constitution of the association to which you belong, your own words, the words of the president of that association, and of the chiefest leaders in the work in which you are engaged, all show that the denial is simply a contrivance to save appearances, and demonstrate conclusively that the denial amounts to nothing in fact. The enforcement of the observance of a religious institution is the enforcement of a religious observance. The enforcement of the observance of a divine institution is the enforcement of a religious institution, because divine institutions are religious institutions.

You likewise deny that the "friends of the Sunday-Rest bill are in favor of a union of Church and State." But this denial is just like the other one. No man can be in favor of any Sunday-Rest law without being in favor of a union of Church and State. A union of Church and State is inherent in the thing itself, and it is impossible to have Sunday-Rest laws without having a union of Church and State just that for.

Dr. Phillip Schaff plainly declares Sunday laws to be one of the "connecting links between Church and State." And Dr. Schaff is one of the friends of the Sunday-Rest law. Therefore, in the face of such declarations as these, is the face of such plain statements from yourself and your associates, a simple denial is not sufficient. When

proofs so strong and in such abundance as these are presented something more is required when charged with meaning what you say, than to deny it. In the face of such proofs denial can never pass for disproof.

Please present to the public an *argument* upon these quotations which I have here presented that will show that you do not propose to enforce religious observances. The friends of the Sunday-Rest bill are not *ignoramuses*; the most of them are college graduates, and even doctors of divinity. If it be true that they do not propose not intend to enforce religious observances, or the observance of religious institutions, it ought not to be difficult for them to construct an argument that would show it. It is true, it would be somewhat difficult, in the face of these statements which I have presented in this article. But let them say that they did not mean what they said, let them repudiate these statements, and leave them all behind, and start new, and from the premises of a Sunday-Rest law, or of the American Sabbath Union, let them construct an argument which shall show by logical course and conclusion that they do not propose to enforce religious observances. Then your denials will amount to something. There is no danger, however, that you will ever get any one of them to do it. Every one who undertakes it and carries out a consistent and logical line of argument will find himself on my side of the question every time.

You say that "California's best people do not like the working of the plan of no Sunday law, and are seeking to be rid of it." California's best people, sir, are the people of California themselves. And in 1882 the people of California declared by a majority of 17,517 votes directly upon this issue that they would not have a Sunday law. By their representatives they have repeated this declaration twice since, and California's best people do like it. And more than this, California's best people appreciate to its whole value the crocodile sympathy of the Eastern Sunday-law crusaders.

Here I will close for this time by merely saying again that you are at liberty to reprint my words, statements, and arguments *as they are*, and spread them abroad as widely as you please; but I insist that you shall refrain from garbling them, and forcing into them a meaning that is contrary to everything in them. Good-bye, sir.

I remain yours sincerely, ALONZO T. JONES.

June 5, 1889

**"Let Moral Government Remain Moral" *The American Sentinel* 4, 19 ,
p. 146.**

THE eighth Wisconsin district of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union passed this resolution:—

"WHEREAS, God would have all men honor the Son even as they honor the Father; and,

"WHEREAS, The civil law which Christ gave from Sinai is the only perfect law, and the only law that will secure the rights of all classes; therefore,

Resolved, That civil government should recognize Christ as the moral Governor, and his law as the standard of legislation."

What does a civil government want with a moral governor? civil governments have only civil governors; moral governors belong only with moral governments; there cannot be a civil governor in a moral government; nor can there be a moral governor of a civil government. But this is not all; that resolution says, "The civil law which Christ gave from Sinai," etc. But the law which Christ gave from Sinai was not a civil law at all; it is the moral law; it is the law of the Government of God. If that law is a civil law, then God is only a civil governor, and there is no such a thing in this universe as moral government, or moral law, and no such thing as morality, no conduct can go deeper than civility, and no obligations can rest upon men beyond the restraint of outward actions.

This is the logic of that resolution; this is precisely the mistake that was made by the Pharisees in the time of Christ. 'The moral law was generally applied as the civil law, not to the acts of the spirit, but to the acts of the body. It was applied to the external conduct of men, not to the internal life. If there was conformity to the letter of the law in external manners, there was a fulfillment, in the eyes of the Jew and the Gentile, of the highest claims that God or man held upon the spirit. No matter how dark and damning were the exercises of the soul; if it only kept its sin in its own habitation, and did not develop it in action, the penalty of the law was not laid to its charge. The character of the spirit itself might be criminal, and all its exercises of thought and feeling sensual and selfish, yet if it added hypocrisy to its guilt, and maintained an outward conformity to the law—a conformity itself produced by selfishness—man judged himself, and others adjudged him, guiltless."

But Christ came as the instructor and exemplar in morality; the law which he gave from Sinai he carried to the thoughts and intents of the heart,—laid bare the soul itself before the great moral eye of the universe; flashed the light of the divine law upon the awful scene known only to the soul itself," and showed that these it is that constitute the transgression of the law of God. In this system of government that is advocated by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the National Reform Association, and in principles sustained by the whole Sunday-law movement, there is just such an attempt to reduce the moral law only to the . . . of outward actions—make it only a standard of civility—as there was by the Pharisees to whom Christ spoke, and to whom he said, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and the platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchers, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto me, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity."

This is the only condition to which men ever can be brought by the application of the law from Sinai as a civil law, making it the standard of civil government.

Such ideas as are here embodied in this resolution and such resolutions as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union adopted, and such work as they do in this line, will never do. The women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and all other people, want to understand that civil government is civil, and not moral; that civil government is based only upon civil law and is governed only by civil governors; that it does not aim at securing morality, but only civility. Such confused ideas of government and law divine and human; moral and civil, clearly show that the women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union are not in any sense fit to be trusted with the ballot, or with the legislative power in any degree. That these confused views of government and law prevail to such an extent as they do, even amongst men who have the ballot and the legislative power committed to them ought to awaken every American citizen to the most sober consideration of the fundamental principles of American liberties,—which are the true liberties of man.

A. T. J.

June 12, 1889

"Trusts" *The American Sentinel* 4, 20 , pp. 154, 155.

THE "Trust" is now the favorite scheme by which the greedy increase their gains. There is the Whisky Trust, the Sugar Trust, the Coffee Trust, the Oil Trust, and Trusts of all kinds too numerous to mention. A Trust is formed by the leading dealers in a certain article of trade laying together all their interests in that line, making a combination so strong as to control the market, and then putting up the price to the highest possible point. If a dealer refuses to join the Trust and does not follow the rise in price which is laid upon the article by the Trust, then the Trust takes steps to compel him either to join the Trust or go out of business. If the Trust cannot so fully control the market as to keep him from buying from anybody but them, at their own price, then they will run down the price so low that he cannot afford to sell at such a rate, and in one way or the other the object of the Trust is accomplished,—he is either forced into the Trust or out of the business,—and then the Trust, having the field entirely to itself, puts up the price to the highest possible point, clears immense sums, pays its trustees enormous salaries, and divides the profits amongst the managers of the combination, making them, many times, millionaires in a very few years. The Standard Oil Trust, for instance, has nine trustees who are paid a salary of \$25,000 a year, and divides among its managers profits amounting to millions every year.

It will readily be seen that the word "Trust" is but another name for an organized monopoly, but with this characteristic: it is wholly irresponsible. A corporation, a railroad or steamboat line for instance, may secure a monopoly of the traffic in a certain locality, but being a corporation, receiving its charter from the State, it is responsible to the State, and the State may put a check upon its exorbitant greed. But a Trust is not incorporated, is responsible to nobody but itself. The following from the *Christian at Work* fitly describes the Trust:—

"What after all is a Trust? Well, for one thing it is neither a corporation nor a well-defined common-law Trust; it avoids the checks and safeguards which a wise public policy has thrown around corporate acts; its articles of agreement are secret and jealously guarded even from the investor himself; no charter nor statements need be filed for public inspection; no reports need be

made or published; it may carry on any business it desires; the principles of *ultra virce* acts do not check it; no limit is placed by statute on its capital stock; no law prevents an increase or decrease of its Trust certificates; no qualifications are prescribed for its trustees; no tax is levied on its charter or franchises or capital stock; no limit is placed by the public on the power and discretion of its trustees; no publicity is given to its acts. It may move from State to State; it may evade taxation and defy the powers of courts; it wields vast sums of money secretly, instantaneously, and effectively to accomplish its nefarious ends; and it does all this not for the advancement of the community and the Nation, but for the purposes of extortion and for the annihilation of independent firms. Such a trust is the Sugar Trust; such are the four great Oil Trusts—such in short are almost all the Trusts."

It is evident that, in its accepted use, the word "Trust" signifies a combination of capital for the formation of an irresponsible monopoly to rob the consumer of the extra price which he can thus be

155

forced to pay. This is the one extreme. There is another monopoly, although not called a Trust, at the other extreme, which is as irresponsible, and consequently as despotic, as any Trust in existence can be. Although not called a Trust, to all interests and purposes it is a Trust. Although, by those who compose it, it is not granted that it is a monopoly, yet a monopoly it is. Instead of calling this a Trust it is called a *Union*. Instead of a monopoly in certain lines of trade, it is a monopoly of labor. What we refer to is the trades-union. It is as really a Trust, and as certainly a monopoly, as any Trust or any monopoly that was ever formed. And, like any other monopoly, its greed grows by what it feeds upon.

An instance in point (if any instance were needed to show what is palpable to all) will show that the action of the Union is identical with that of the Trust: In the fishing season of 1888 the Fisherman's Union in the Columbia River formed a combination so strong that no outside fisherman was allowed to enter the Columbia to fish. Then, having secured control of the river, they forced up the price of fish so that each fisherman of the Union made from seven to ten dollars a day. The only difference between this and the Trust is in the amount scoured to the parties interested in the monopoly.

More than this, the trades-union not only assumes the monopoly of work within the trades, it monopolizes the trades themselves. This combination that is responsible to no law, presumes to make and enforce the law that nobody shall learn any trade without the consent

of the Union; and that consent is granted only to a limited number. Under this "law" of the trades-union Trust a manufacturer cannot apprentice his own son, at his own trade, in his own shop, without the consent of the labor Trust. Some months since a young man wrote a letter to Mayor Hewitt, of New York City, asking to be directed to some place where he could learn some mechanical employment. He said that he had applied to more than fifty employers to be received as an apprentice, but could not find an entrance anywhere. The mayor replied, regretting that he could not give him a favorable answer, and said:—

"In this great city there ought to be abundant opportunity for every young man to learn a trade. Under the regulations adopted by the various trades-unions, the number of apprentices is limited, so that there is growing up in our midst a large number of young men who cannot find access to any mechanical employment. This is a lamentable state of affairs, because these young men are turned loose upon the streets, and grow up in habits of idleness, resulting in vice and crime. If this action of the trades societies in this matter really limited the competition for employment which they experience, it might be defended, at least upon selfish principles; but inasmuch as foreign workmen are free to come to this country in unlimited numbers, the only effect of these regulations is to keep our own young men out of useful employment, which is freely open to those who are born and trained in foreign countries. The evil is of the most serious character, and I trust that this statement of it may lead to a reconsideration on the part of the various trades organizations who now restrict the right of employment without benefit to themselves, but to the great injury of the rising generation."

We seriously doubt whether this statement, or any other, will ever lead to any such reconsideration as the mayor suggests. Monopolies never voluntarily loose their grip.

Only lately some boys in Chicago made application to the Police Court to be sent to the Industrial School, or House of Correction, that they might become sufficiently acquainted with some trade so as to enable them to follow some useful occupation. We are not informed whether their request was granted or not. But even if it were, we know that even this refuge is not long to be left them; for the despotism of the labor Trust is controlling the State, and is already declaring that the trades shall not be followed to any material extent even in penal institutions, but that all criminals shall be supported in comparative idleness.

The third week of last July, the Legislature of New York, in response to the "labor" agitators, enacted a law which provides that no manufacturing machinery shall be used in any of the penal institutions of that State; that hand labor only shall be employed; that only such articles shall be made therein as can be used in the penal or public institutions of the State; and that none of the prison products shall be sold to the public. And why is this? Because, it is said, articles manufactured in prison by convict labor and sold outside, come into competition with articles manufactured outside by "free labor," thus lowering the prices of the outside articles, which tends to reduce wages and degrade "labor"!

Is it necessary to point out to any man who thinks, the blind fallacy of such an argument? Do these men not know that if the State is not allowed to make the convicts support themselves, they will have to be supported by taxation? And if the manufacturer has to pay increased taxes, wages will be lowered accordingly. But the labor monopoly may say, We will not allow him to lower the wages. Very well, he will then add to the price of his goods the extra tax which he pays to support idle convicts, and when the laboring man buys any manufactured article he will pay the tax. And if the merchant or the grocer has to pay an increased tax for the support of convicts, he will add the amount to the price of his goods, and when the laboring man buys a piece of muslin, or a pound of coffee, he pays the tax which the State is compelled to levy to support the criminals, whom he himself has declared shall not be allowed to do enough to support themselves. The whole subject then resolves itself into this simple question: Shall the convicts be made to do enough work to clear the expense which they cause, or shall the laboring man support them in idleness so that the proper dignity of labor may be maintained?

Thus the labor monopoly forces the youth into idleness rather than to allow them to support themselves by honest trades. Through enforced idleness they are led into vice and crime, and by that into jails and penitentiaries; and even there the labor monopoly compels him to dwell in idleness. Therefore of all Trusts the labor Trust is the most heartless; of all monopolies the labor monopoly is most wicked. To say that such organizations are in the interests of labor, is a perversion of language. Their principal effect, if not their direct aim, is solely to promote idleness, with its inevitable consequences,—vice and crime.

A. T. J.

June 19, 1889

"The Proposed Authority for the National Sunday Law" *The American Sentinel* 4, 21 , pp. 161-163.

AMS authority for Sunday, and as the basis of national Sunday legislation, Dr. Herrick Johnson before the Senate Committee appealed to the fourth commandment. The "American Sabbath Union," whose grand aim is a national Sunday law, likewise declare the basis of their movement to be the fourth commandment. It is proper, therefore, to inquire what authority there is for Sunday laws in the fourth commandment. As it is a question of legislation and of law, it would be proper to examine it from the standpoint of law. Suppose; then, that the Blair bill, or one to the same purpose, were enacted into a law, and the courts in construing it should take judicial cognizance of the fourth commandment as the authority and the basis of the law.

Courts are governed by certain well-established rules in the construction of laws. Let us notice some of these rules and see what would be the result of a judicial construction of such a Sunday law on the basis of the fourth commandment.

1. "What a court is to do is to declare the law as written."

The fourth commandment as written is as follows: "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it."

That commandment as written says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Consequently, at the very first step, the first day of the week, as declared in the bill and as these people demand, would be completely shut out. But if any should innocently inquire, The seventh day of what? the commandment itself is ready with an explicit answer. It is the day upon which the Lord rested from the work of creation. In that work he employed six days, and the seventh day he rested, and that, and that alone, as Doctor Johnson has said, established the weekly division of time. As those seven days formed the first week of time, the seventh day of those seven was the seventh day of the

week. And that is the seventh day fixed in the commandment. This is confirmed by the Scriptures throughout. The New Testament declares that the Sabbath is past before the first day of the week comes. Mark 16:1, 2 says:—

"And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun."

The people mentioned in this scripture came to the sepulcher very early in the morning of the first day of the week; yet the Sabbath was past. This national Sunday bill, and the people who favor it, propose to secure the religious observance of the Sabbath on the first day of the week. But no such thing ever can be done, because, according to the Scripture, the Sabbath is past before the first day of the week comes; and it matters not how early persons may come to the first day of the week and its observance, they will not be early enough to find the Sabbath there, because, by the word of the Lord, it is past before the first day of the week comes.

This is made yet more positive, if need be, by the record in Luke 23:56 and 24:1, which reads as follows:—

"And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them."

Here it is declared that certain people rested on the Sabbath-day, *according to the commandment*, and then on the first day of the week did what they would not do on the Sabbath-day. This proves conclusively that the Sabbath-day according to the commandment which these men cite, and which it is supposed the courts will have to interpret when such a bill becomes a law—is the day before the first day of the week; which plainly demonstrates that the seventh day named in the commandment is nothing else than the seventh day of the week. Therefore, if courts, in the interpretation of this commandment as the basis of a Sunday law, declare the law as written and as defined by the plain word of the Lord, they will have to declare that the seventh day, and not the first day of the week, is the Sabbath.

2. "In the case of all laws it is the intent of the lawgiver that is to be enforced."

What, then, was the intent of the Lawgiver when the fourth commandment was given? Did

162

the Lawgiver declare or show in any way his intentions?—He did. When the Lord gave that law at Sinai he did not leave it to the people to interpret it to suit themselves, nor to interpret it at all. By three special acts every week kept up continuously for nearly forty years, he showed his intent in the law. The people were fed by manna in their forty years' wandering. But on the seventh day of the week no manna ever fell. On the sixth day of the week there was a double portion, and that which was gathered on that day would keep over the seventh, which it could not be made to do over any other day in the week. By this means the Lawgiver signified his intent upon the subject of the observance of the day mentioned in that law; and keeping it up continuously for so long a time made it utterly impossible that his intent should be mistaken.

Therefore, if the courts of the United States shall ever take judicial cognizance of the fourth commandment, which is held forth by these people as the basis and the authority for their movement, according to this rule the seventh day of the week, and not the first day, will have to be declared the Sabbath.

3. "When words are plain in a written law there is an end to all construction; they must be followed."

This rule, in these very words, was declared by the Hon. John Bingham, when, as special judge-advocate appointed by the representatives of the United States, he was conducting the impeachment trial of Andrew Johnson. Are the words of the fourth commandment plain words? Are they words of common use? They are. There is not an obscure nor an ambiguous word in the commandment. Then, according to this rule, if ever that question becomes one of judicial cognizance in the courts of the United States, as the plain words of that commandment must be followed, and as they plainly declare, "The seventh day is the Sabbath," that is all the courts can declare.

Therefore, the conclusion of the whole matter thus far is, if our courts are to remain courts of law, and are to be guided by the established rules for the construction of laws, they never can uphold

any law founded on the fourth commandment for the observance of the Sabbath on the first day of the week.

Just here, however, another element comes into court, and that is the theological. The theologians step in right here and declare that the intent of the fourth commandment has been changed, and that now instead of that commandment's requiring the observance of the seventh day in remembrance of creation, it requires the observance of the first day of the week in remembrance of the resurrection of Christ. To reach this point they first declare that the phrase "the seventh day" in the commandment is indefinite; that it does not enjoin the observance of any particular day, but only of one day in seven. Such a construction is clearly in violation of established rules for the construction of law; it involves an assumption of power on their part that can never be allowed. Admitting for argument's sake that that phrase in the commandment is indefinite, it must be admitted that the Lord when he wrote it intentionally made it indefinite, because the Scripture says that when he had spoken those words he added no more; he had nothing more to say on the subject. What he said then was final. If, then, that statement be indefinite he intended it so, and no other power than the Lord ever can, or ever has the right to, make it definite. But the theologians, just as soon as they have made it indefinite, to escape the obligation it enjoins to observe the seventh day, at once make it definite in order to sustain the supposed obligation to keep the first day of the week. Consequently, when they make it definite, after having declared that the Lord made it indefinite, they assume the power and prerogative to do what the Lord intentionally declined to do; and in that they put themselves above God.

So much for their theological assumptions. Such a course, however, is not only an assumption of almighty power, but on the basis of law it is a violation of the rule which declares that—

4. "No forced or unnatural construction is to be put upon the language of a statute."

To make the phrase "the seventh day" in that commandment indefinite, and to mean one day in seven and no day in particular, is nothing else than to put a forced and most unnatural construction upon the language not only of the commandment itself throughout, but on all the language of the Scriptures upon the subject of the commandment.

Further, to make that commandment support the first day of the week in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ is a direct violation of that other rule of law which declares that—

6. "A constitution [or statute] is not to be made to mean one thing at one time and another at some subsequent time, when the circumstances may have so changed as perhaps to make a different rule in the case seem desirable. . . . The meaning of the Constitution [or statute] is fixed when it is adopted, and it is not different at any subsequent time when a court has occasion to pass upon it."

The meaning of the fourth commandment when given was, as has been clearly proved, that the seventh day of the week should be observed, and for the reason that God rested that day from the work of creation and blessed the day and hallowed it. The Sabbath-day was established for that reason, before men had sinned, and before there was any need of the resurrection of Christ. If man had never sinned, the day would have been observed for the reasons given, in commemoration of the rest of the Creator from his work of creation. That being the meaning of the commandment when the commandment was given, that must be the meaning of the commandment so long as the commandment remains, and according to the rules of law it never can be made to mean anything else, although the theologians should wish to have it so, and circumstances concerning the resurrection may seem to them to make it desirable.

The question here very properly arises, Shall the courts of the United States, in violation of these rules, adopt the wishes of the theologians and make that statute to mean that which it was never intended to mean? In contemplation of such an issue, the words of Judge Cooley—"Constitutional Limitations," page 57—are worthy of consideration by Congress as well as by the judges of the United States courts. He says:—

"A court or legislature which should allow a change in public sentiment to influence it in giving to a written constitution a construction not warranted by the intention of its founders, would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty."

The theologians have given to the fourth commandment a construction which is not in any sense warranted by the intention of the Author of the commandment. They go to the National Legislature and ask it to allow itself to be influenced by theological sentiment in giving it a written Constitution of the Government of God's

construction which is not warranted by the intention of the Founder of that Constitution. As Judge Cooley says, "Such a thing done to . . . constitution, an earthly statute, would be . . . disregard of official oath and public duty." But if this be true in the case of things strictly human and earthly, what should be thought of such an action with reference to the divine Constitution and heavenly law?

Will the National Legislature allow this theological sentiment to influence it to consult . . . with reference to the Constitution and law of the living God, which, if committed with reference to the laws of man, would be reckless disregard of official oath and public duty? Not only do we ask, Is the National Legislature ready to do this, but is it ready also, by doing it, to form the United States courts into the sanctioning of it in direct violation of the plainest principles of every rule for the construction of law? Is the National Legislature ready to take the step which would turn all our courts of law into courts of theology? For such would be the only effect of the enactment of such a law as is here demanded by the theologians, because when the law comes to be interpreted by the courts upon the basis upon which the law is enacted, the first day of the week as the Sabbath can never be sustained by rule of law nor by the principles of interpretation established in law. The only way that it can ever be sustained is by principles established by the theologians, and by theological distinctions, in total disregard of the rules of law; and the effect of it can be nothing else than to turn our courts of law into courts of theology.

The Scriptures also plainly and logically show the seventh day to be the Lord's day. Yet this law proposes to enforce the observance of the first day of the week as the Lord's day. As it is not a universally accepted view that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, the question will certainly come before the courts for decision. When the courts come to construe the law, it will be proper, if not indeed necessary, that they shall consult the word of the Lord in regard to the question of what day is the Lord's day, and as to what its proper observance is. When the courts, or any other persons, inquire of the word of the Lord upon the subject of the Lord's day, they find the expression and but once in the Bible, and that in Rev. 1:16, saying, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." But this does not say what day of the week is the Lord's day, nor does the book in which this text is found say anything further upon the subject.

Other texts, however, in the Bible, speak on the subject in such a way as logically to show what day is there meant by the expression "the Lord's day." The Lord himself said, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:28. The Lord also said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Here are two plain scriptural statements which may form the major and the minor of a syllogism; thus:—

Major—The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath.

Minor—The seventh day is the Sabbath.

The only conclusion that can ever be drawn from these two premises is that,

163

Therefore, the Son of Man is Lord of the seventh day.

That conclusion is just as sound as these two statements of Scripture are, and the two statements of Scripture are as plain and positive on that subject as any two statements ever can be made. Therefore the Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

Taking this conclusion as the major in a second syllogism, we have this:—

The Son of man is Lord of the seventh day.

That day of which he is Lord is the Lord's day.

Therefore, the seventh day is the Lord's day.

This logic is unquestionable; this conclusion is as true as the Scripture itself. Therefore, just as surely as courts undertake the interpretation of any statute enforcing the observance of the Lord's day, and enter upon an inquiry as to what day is the Lord's day, they will, if logical, be brought face to face with the fact as demonstrated by the word of the Lord itself, that the seventh day, and not the first, is the Lord's day.

But it will probably be said that the courts are not to enter on the interpretation of Scripture; they are to interpret the law as it is enacted and as it is written, and that the law as it is enacted says that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, and that that is as far as the court can go. Suppose this be granted, then it puts the United States Government into a position where it establishes and enforces the observance of an institution as the Lord's which is not the Lord's, and which is directly contrary to the word of the Lord on the subject of the institution and its observance.

One or the other of these alternatives, therefore, the United States Government will be forced to adopt as surely as this bill, or any one like it, shall ever become a law. The Government will either have to be become the authoritative interpreter of the Scripture for all citizens

of the Government, or else it will have to put itself in the place of God and authoritatively declare that observances established by the State, and which the State chooses to call the Lord's, are the Lord's indeed, although the word of the Lord itself declares the contrary. Is the United States Government ready to take either of these positions? Is the Congress of the United States ready to force the Government of the United States into a position where it will be compelled to take one or the other of these positions? The taking of either position by the Government of the United States would be nothing else than for this enlightened Nation, in this period of the nineteenth century, to assume the place, the power, and the prerogatives of the Governments of the Middle Ages in enforcing the dogmas and the definitions of the theologians, and executing the arbitrary and despotic will of the church.

Thus, from whatever point this subject of Sunday laws may be viewed, it clearly appears that the only effect that it can ever have will be only evil, and that continually. Let Congress now and forever decidedly refuse to have anything to do with it in any way whatever. And let all the people, instead of sanctioning a movement to bring the national legislation down to the degraded level of that of the States on this subject, put forth every effort to bring the legislation of the States up to that place where it shall be limited, as the power of Congress is limited, by the declaration of the National Constitution, that they "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

A. T. J.

"Sunday-Law Theology" *The American Sentinel* 4, 21 , pp. 169, 170.

THE president of the National Sunday-law Association, Col. Elliott F. Shepard, made a great speech May 18, in Brooklyn, N. Y., to the Kings County Sunday Association. Of course his speech was on Sunday laws, and he still insists, in spite of the denials of the two secretaries of the association of which he is president, that "the only authority for the Sabbath-day is to be found in the statutes and laws and commandments of the Lord God Almighty." Dr. Crafts says that "Mr. Shepard don't know very much about this." Nevertheless, Mr. Shepard goes on as though he knew a good deal about it. Mr. Shepard seems to be quite a theologian in his way, and the professional theologians seem to think so too, because he is invited

to their conventions, general assemblies, etc., to instruct them in regard to the limits and obligations of the ten commandments; they indorse his expositions of Scripture, by frequent manifestations of applause; and, from the assurance with which he sets out his views of Scripture and moral obligation, it evidently appears that he actually considers himself a theologian of no mean order.

We cite an instance or two illustrating the depth of his theological-lore. He says:—

"God rested upon the accomplishment of his work at creation, and his seventh day was man's first day."

Now the Bible says that on the sixth day God made man and gave him dominion over the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that moveth upon the earth. Then every beast of the field and every fowl of the air was brought unto Adam to see what he would call them, and he gave names to all cattle, and to the fowls of the air, and to every beast of the field. This was all on the sixth day, and for all that to be accomplished in the same day that he was created would seem to show that he must have been there on that day. Yet Mr. Shepard insists that he was not there until the next day. We have a sort of lurking suspicion that Mr. Shepard is wrong.

More than this, for all that to be accomplished on the sixth day would show that it mast have been not very late in the forenoon, at least, when man was created; and it would seem that if man should be able to accomplish all that is written in the Bible of that man in the same day that he was created, that that must have been his first day. We have always understood that a man's birthday—the day of his entrance into the world—counted as his first day; but Mr. Shepard's theology will have it that his first day is the next day after his birth.

Yet more than this. When Adam had named all the creatures upon the earth, it was found that there was not any fit to be a companion for him. Then that same day the Lord made the woman and brought her unto the roan, and married them—all this on the sixth day; yet Mr. Shepard's theology will have it that even his wedding-day didn't count, and that his first day, his birthday, in fact, did not come till the next day after he was married. We can't shake off the suspicion that there is something wrong with CoL Elliott F. Shepard's theology.

Another instance. Mr. Shepard says:—

"The Sabbath was his [man's] first day, and he was prepared by this first day of rest for six days of labor."

The Sabbath was his first day, and yet the first thing he had to do was to rest! Well, well! we have indeed heard it suggested that certain individuals were bore tired, but never before did we know that when the Lord created man, he made him tired.

Further, Mr. Elliott F. Shepard says that by resting on the first day of his existence man was prepared for six days of labor. This is another thing new under the sun. We have always understood that men rest after labor, and the whole world has understood it so, and has acted according to this understanding of the matter; but it must be that this is all wrong, because ,but Shepard says so. He says that the rest comes first, in order that we may be prepared to labor.

Is it any wonder that after such a magnificent display of theological oratory as this, the divines and other members of the Kings County Association should greet the speaker with "applause"?

Just one more instance and we are done. Mr. Shepard says:—

"Mark, it was not the seventh day which he blessed, but the rest-day."

Reader, please turn to Genesis, second chapter and third verse, and "mark" these words: "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." Then decide if you can that the Sunday theology of the president of the National Sunday-law Association is anything else than a downright fraud.

Theologically, Mr. Shepard's statements are unworthy of anything but contempt; but yet there is a serious side to this thing which forbids its being passed by with the contempt which it deserves. Mr. Shepard and all those who are working for a national Sunday law propose to compel everybody in this Nation to accept that theology, and to act in conformity with it. They propose to have the National Legislature frame this stuff into a law; and then to have the courts of the United States adopt the same theology, and by their decisions uphold the law; and then

170

to have the executive department of the Government compel all people to receive it as the oracles of God. The stupendous impudence of such a proposition can be accounted for only upon the theory that again the "mystery of iniquity doth already work."

A. T. J.

July 3, 1889

"Sunday a Day of Devilry" *The American Sentinel* 4, 23 , p. 178.

SUNDAY evening, May 19, the Kings County Sunday Association held its seventh anniversary in Hanson Place M. E. Church, Brooklyn, New York. There were several addresses made, one by Mr. Elliott F. Shepard, president of the National Sunday Union. The annual report of the association, and Mr. Shepard's speech, are given in the *Pearl of Days* column of the *New York Mail and Express*, of May 24, 1889. The speeches furnish some very interesting matter, which we shall have occasion to notice at different times in the columns of the SENTINEL. One of the points is contained in the statement by the secretary of the Kings County Association, that in Queens County "Sunday is a day of devilry." How can Sunday ever be anything else than a day of devilry to those who are not religious, so long as they are compelled to be idle on that day? Satan finds something for idle hands to do, and when men are forced to be idle, they are going to fill up the time some way; and as they have not that regard for religion which will lead them to fill up the time with worship and devotional thought or exercises, it is inevitable that the time will be filled with worldly things; and as the law will not allow them to work, nor to play harmless games, even though they be worldly, no result can follow but that the time will be filled with devilry, because by this system they are thrown back upon themselves for resources with which to fill the time, and from himself no ungodly man can ever get anything but ungodliness, and ungodliness is devilry. But this association, and the Sunday-law workers everywhere, propose to cure the devilry by more stringent laws for the enforcement of idleness out of which the devilry comes.

Another statement in the same live was made, that "drunkenness and public disorder are altogether too common on Sunday." This is entirely true, and for the reason, as stated above, that on Sunday people are compelled to be idle. They are not allowed to work, they are not allowed to play, consequently drunkenness and public disorder are the only outcome from those who have not the disposition to worship and make the day one of devotion. Then in the next sentence the association innocently inquires, "If open saloons and the Sunday liquor traffic do not cause them [drunkenness and public disorder] what do?" Well, that open saloons and the Sunday liquor traffic do not cause them is certain, because there are open saloons and liquor traffic in full blast all the other days of the week,

more than on Sunday, if there is any difference; and yet there is more drunkenness and public disorder on Sunday than on any other day of the week. These are facts admitted by Sunday-law workers themselves. Therefore, the increased amount of drunkenness and disorder on Sunday is not because of the open saloons, but because of the idleness. To put it somewhat in the form of a syllogism, it would be about as follows: More saloons are open every other day of the week, when men are allowed to work, than on Sunday. There is more drunkenness on Sunday, when men are compelled to be idle, than on any other day of the week. Therefore, the increased amount of drunkenness and disorder on Sunday is due to the fact that more people are idle on that day than on any other.

The Sunday-law makers can never escape this logical conclusion from their own premises. They propose to escape it by shutting the saloons altogether on Sunday; but that will not help the matter a particle, because those who want to drink will buy their whisky Saturday night and drink it on Sunday. There is another piece of unfairness that comes in right here, illustrated by an actual occurrence. In a certain town where the saloons were shut on Sunday only, a woman whose husband was given to drink stated that her lot was actually worse than when the saloons were open on Sunday; for when the saloon was open on Sunday he would get drunk at the saloon, and the saloon keeper and his other companions had to care for him till he got sober; but when the saloons were closed on Sunday, then he would bring the whisky home on Saturday night, get drunk on Sunday, and she had to take care of him till he got sober. This point is worth considering by the would-be Sunday prohibitionists.

Others again propose to cure the evil by a Saturday half holiday; that is, by enforcing idleness an extra half day. Is this so as to give those who drink ample time to get drunk and sober up in time for their Sunday worship? The whole system of Sunday laws, that is, of enforced idleness, is only one of iniquity.

A. T. J.

"The 'Voice' of Church and State" *The American Sentinel* 4, 23 , p. 179.

NOT long since the AMERICAN SENTINEL said this: "Let everybody be assured that work done for party prohibition is work

done to promote the union of Church and State, and to bind the citizens of the United States in a worse slavery than was ever suffered by the negroes. We cannot any longer in good conscience call the third party the Prohibition party, for temperance is by no means its main issue."

Upon which the *New York Voice*, the leading Prohibitionist paper of this country, said this:—

"There is an air of delightful indefiniteness about this charge. It seems from the context that an unknown 'Prohibition politician' glided into a room where the editor of the AMERICAN SENTINEL and others were, made the statement that Church and State meant Prohibition, and left as mysteriously as he entered, and the conclusion is what we have quoted above.

"Such accusations are childish. The utterances of the party in its platform in any way bearing on this subject are:—

"1. Acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all power in Government; and,

"2. 'Declaring for the preservation and defense of the Sabbath as a civil institution, without oppressing any who religiously observe the same on any other than the first day of the week.'

"The first can be subscribed to by any person who believes that there is a God, and the second by any person who has ordinary common sense. We never heard of a prominent Prohibitionist who favored the union of Church and State."

And in reply we say this: Take the last statement first. The *Voice* says it has "never heard of a prominent Prohibitionist who favored the union of Church and State." Now Mr. Sam Small is a prominent Prohibitionist; one of the most prominent of Prohibitionists, in fact. He was secretary of the National Prohibition Convention of 1888, and he publicly declared this in Kansas City, in January of that year:—

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

If that would not be a union of Church and State will the *Voice* please tell us what would be? If that would not be a union of Church and State then there never has been and never can be such thing as a union of Church and State. Such a thing as that, therefore, being a union of Church and State, and Mr. Sam Small being a prominent Prohibitionist, it is proved that there is at least one prominent Prohibitionist who favors a union of Church and State.

Further we take it that the Prohibition party of the State of California is rather a "prominent Prohibitionist." And when in the State convention of 1887 a speaker showed opposition to a union of Church and State he was yelled and hissed down. This is a second "prominent Prohibitionist" that favors a union of Church and State. And we can honestly inform the *Voice* that there are thousands more of them in the Prohibition party; and that, as a matter of fact, the Prohibition party at present exists for scarcely any other purpose than the inculcation of Church and State principles.

We need not go beyond the above extract from the *Voice* to prove that it itself advocates Church and State principles. It gives two planks of the Prohibition party platform as having a bearing on the subject; and the second of these declares "for the preservation and defense of the Sabbath as a civil institution without oppressing any who religiously observe the same on any other than the first day of the week."

Now if it is with civil institutions, and civil things, only in a civil way, that the Prohibition party has to do, why then does that party by its national declaration demand the *religious* observance of a day. It proposes to refrain from oppressing only those who religiously observe the Sabbath on any other than the first day of the week. That plainly argues that the Prohibition party does not hold itself under obligation to refrain from oppressing those who do not religiously observe the Sabbath on any day. This plainly shows that the Prohibition party declares for the enforcement of religious observances. The enforcing of religious observances by the civil power is nothing else than a union of Church and State. Therefore the National Prohibition party itself, by its own declaration, favors a union of Church and State.

As for us, we forever deny the right of the Prohibition party, or any other, to oppress anybody, whether he religiously observes the Sabbath or not.

A. T. J.

July 10, 1889

"Who Shall Be the Pope" *The American Sentinel* 4, 24 , p. 185.

IN his argument before the Senate Committee in favor of the Blair Amendment to the Constitution, putting the principles of the Christian

religion in the public schools, T. P. Stevenson, of the National Reform Association, argued, of course, in favor of it. In his speech he referred to the demand of the Catholic Church that the public school fund shall be divided, and denied the justice of the claim by arguing that,—

"The Roman Catholic Church . . . teaches . . . that the Roman pontiff . . . and the church of which he is the head, are the only authoritative interpreters of the Scriptures; and that since Nations are moral persons, and the questions they deal with are largely moral questions, the authority of the Pope extends over all Nations and Governments."

With the exception of teaching the authority of that particular pope, this is precisely the teaching of the National Reformers, and of Mr. T. P. Stevenson himself. The fundamental principle of the whole National Reform scheme is that Nations are moral persons, and that they deal with moral questions. Now it is a fact that the Scriptures are the standard of morality. Whatever person or power, therefore, that has to deal with moral questions, has necessarily to do with the interpretation of Scripture; and whatever person or power that undertakes *authoritatively* to deal with moral questions, necessarily has to be the authoritative interpreter of Scripture. The National Reform Association declares that the Nation is a moral person, and proposes by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to declare the right of the Nation authoritatively to deal with moral questions. When the time comes, the Nation by some means will just as certainly have to be the authoritative interpreter of the Scripture. And whether that authority of interpretation be lodged in the Supreme Court, or in a board of ecclesiastics, or in one single ecclesiastic, it is all the same, that authoritative interpreter is, to all intents and purposes, a pope. And that that authority should be seated in the Capitol of the United States, at Washington City, instead of in the Vatican, at the city of Rome, does not relieve the teaching of its essential iniquity, and should not commend it any the more to the American people. A pope is the inevitable logic of the proposition, whether it be taught by the Catholic Church or by the National Reform Association; and it is no use for that Association, or for the Protestants of this country generally, to deny the claims of the Catholic Church so long as they assert the principles upon which alone those claims are based. The only difference between the teaching of the Catholic Church and the National Reform Association on these questions is that the Catholic Church openly asserts, not only the principles, but the logic of the principles; while the National

Reform Association asserts the principles, and pretends to deny the logic of them. In other words, the Roman Catholic Church is consistent, while the National Reform Association is wholly inconsistent.

A. T. J.

"Bad Tactics" *The American Sentinel* 4, 24 , pp. 185, 186.

IN his argument before the Senate Committee in behalf of the amendment establishing religion in the public schools, February 15, 1889, Doctor Morris drew the line between "the evangelical church bodies on one side, and the Roman Catholics on the other." Then he said: "Now the fact that the public sentiment of the United States stands divided along the lines suggested, gives importance to the question as to the relative strength of the two bodies."

Then, in comparing the relative strength of the two bodies, he said: "According to the latest statistics, in the year 1886 the Roman Catholic population was 7,200,000. That estimate included every man, woman, and child of the Catholic faith in the United States of America at that time. . . All their children are baptized into the church, and every person of the Roman Catholic faith is a member of the Roman Catholic Church, and is so enumerated and reported. . . Along that line the Roman Catholics in 1886 were represented to be 7,200,000 citizens, including children. The evangelical population at that time—not the church-membership simply, but the population—numbered 42,646,279."

Senator George—"Those figures, I suppose, are assuring to us politicians that in getting after the Catholics and all that sort of thing, we are not getting in a minority."

Doctor Morris—"Well, sir, you are at liberty to make a very wise inference from the facts which are before you, without comment so far. And now that brings us to a consideration of the peril arising to the country from the method adopted by this minority, this acute, adroit, determined, and united minority, to accomplish their purposes. They seek to secure theta not so much by the American method of intelligent agitation before the great jury of the public, presenting the facts and discussing the principles in the open light of broad day, but by political methods, at the handling of which they are adepts."

186

Senator George—"Let me ask you a question there. Is not this proposed amendment, and are not these proceedings here, rather

an imitation of what is charged against the Catholics, of attaining their ends by political methods?"

Doctor Morris—"It would be very strange, sir, if we would not follow an enemy into any battle-field to which he might resort to accomplish his purposes."

This is a new sort of military tactics. That a general should leave a field in which he has every advantage, and follow an enemy into a field where he confesses that that enemy has every advantage, is certainly a novel method of conducting a campaign. He condemns the Catholics for not seeking to accomplish their purposes by the American method of intelligent agitation before the great jury of the public. He knows, and so do we all, that the Roman Catholic claim on the question of religion in the public schools cannot for a moment stand in the field of public discussion against the principles of the American Constitution. Therefore, the proper thing to do for those who oppose the Roman Catholic scheme is to make the public discussion as wide, as public, and as determined as possible. If Mr. Morris's forty-two million of "evangelicals" will take the true American position and stand upon the position of the American Constitution, they need not fear for one moment any peril that might arise from Roman Catholicism; but instead of doing this, these men abandon that field where they have every advantage, and in their own words follow their enemy into the battle-field to which he resorts to accomplish his purposes and not only that, but in that field they undertake to meet the enemy with the very weapons at the handling of which they confess that the enemy are adepts. It is impossible in such a case that there can be any other result than that the evangelicals will be ingloriously defeated.

This, however, is not the first instance in which the "evangelicals" have done the same thing. They first went into the enemy's field by demanding the teaching of religion in the public schools; they now find that they are getting worsted in the contest, and instead of honorably retreating to firm ground in a field in which they could have every possible advantage, they blindly follow the enemy yet further into the field of his own choosing, there to use weapons in the use of which they know the enemy are adepts. Was there ever another instance of such folly?

Senator George probed to the heart the scheme that underlies this whole movement, when he asked Doctor Morris whether these proceedings were not "rather an imitation of what is charged against the Catholics, of obtaining their ends by political methods." That is

precisely what it is, and that is all that it is. And as the Protestants, taken as a whole, are so overwhelmingly in the majority in this country, the probabilities are altogether in favor of their winning in the race, and the result can be nothing else than the establishment of a Protestant religious despotism after the model of the Catholic one of the Middle Ages. Will the American people be wise in time?

A. T. J.

July 17, 1889

"What is Sectarianism?" *The American Sentinel* 4, 25 , p. 195.

SENATOR Blair's proposed amendment to the Constitution is to the effect that no sectarian religion shall be taught in the public schools. Yet the men who went to Washington to plead for the adoption of that amendment, argued before the committee entirely from a Protestant standpoint upon a Protestant basis, and in behalf of Protestantism as directly opposed to Catholicism. The proof is abundant. George K. Morris, D. D., of Philadelphia, said to the committee:—

"I ask your attention to the fact that on this matter of the proposed constitutional amendment the country stands divided along a line indicated by the evangelical church bodies on one side and the Roman Catholic Church on the other."

The argument of James M. King, D. D., who represented the Evangelical Alliance, was aimed directly at "Jesuit attempts to misrepresent and blacken the schools." "Jesuit attempts to drive the Bible from the schools," and "the hostility of Jesuits to American institutions." He attacked the "Ultramontane boasts," and exposed "the low civilization of the Catholic colony in New York." He declared:—

"The testimony of statesmen, political economists, and historians . . . warns us as a people to beware of the Jesuits and Ultramontanes."

In short, there was not a single argument presented by any one of the men who spoke in favor of the amendment, that was not aimed directly at the Roman Catholic Church and its doctrines, nor one that was not intentionally made directly antagonistic to that church and her doctrines. And yet they pretended all the time to be arguing in favor of what they called a "broad tolerant Christianity," and pleaded for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

forbidding any use whatever of any public money in support of instruction in any religion sectarian in its character.

From the facts in the case, as they appear on the face of the record, the manifest conclusion is that these men must hold that Catholicism is sectarian while Protestantism is not. In other words that the religion of the majority is not sectarian. According to their own proceeding, it is apparent that if that resolution were adopted the question that is to be settled by it, instead of being so, would be more unsettled than it has ever yet been in this country; because if that amendment were adopted, as it is the religion of the majority only which is non-sectarian, there would arise an inevitable religio-political contest amongst the religious bodies, to determine which could secure the majority, by which alone it could prove that it was not sectarian. The truth is, that the arguments of those men before the Committee on Education and Labor were wholly disingenuous, if not hypocritical.

Suppose a committee of Roman Catholic bishops and priests had gone before the Senate Committee and argued in favor of that same constitutional amendment by an attack upon Protestantism, giving their opinion of it, and what, according to their opinion, its tendency is, and all this while pleading for an amendment forbidding public support for sectarian religion. Would not the Protestants throughout the country, and these men themselves, have counted that a queer way to secure instruction in the public schools in non-sectarian religion? There is no doubt whatever that they would. But if that would be so when done by Roman Catholics, wherein is it better when done by Protestants?

We are not defending the Roman Catholic Church as such, nor her doctrines. We are only defending her rights. We have no disposition at all to deny any statement that was made by these divines before the Senate Committee against the Catholic Church or her doctrines. We think the statements are all true; but what we are objecting to here is the way in which these professed Protestants undertake to plead for a non-sectarian religion in the public schools, by arguing straight ahead upon a sectarian basis. Catholics have all the rights that Protestants have; Catholics have just as much right to their views of the public school question as Protestants have. Catholic's have a right to ads that a constitutional amendment shall be adopted establishing Catholicism as a non-sectarian religion just as much as

Protestants have to ask for an amendment establishing Protestantism as a non-sectarian religion.

The truth of the whole subject is simply that, with religion, sectarian or non-sectarian, in the public schools or anywhere else, the State can never of right have anything to do.

A. T. J.

August 7, 1889

"Should Civil Law Forbid Blasphemy?" *The American Sentinel* 4, 28 , pp. 217, 218.

ACCORDING to Judge Cooley's definition, blasphemy is an attempt to lessen men's reverence, not only for the Deity, but for "the accepted religion" as well. But any man in this wide world has the right to lessen men's reverence for the accepted religion, if he thinks that religion to be wrong. Consequently, that which would be counted blasphemy in this country, would not be counted blasphemy in China; and that which is in the strictest accordance with the word of God and the faith of Jesus Christ here, is necessarily blasphemy in China, or in Turkey, or in Russia. A man who preaches the gospel of Jesus Christ in China commits blasphemy under this definition. He does make a willful attempt to lessen men's reverence for their accepted religion, and for the deities recognized in their religion. He has to do so, if he is ever to get them to believe in Christ and the religion of Christ. He has to bring them to the place where they will have no reverence for their deities or for their accepted religion, before they ever can accept the religion of Jesus Christ. Wherever the gospel of Jesus Christ is preached in any heathen country, it is blasphemy under this definition, because its sole object is not only to lessen men's reverence for their deities and for their accepted religion, but to turn them wholly from it.

It is so likewise in Russia. Anybody there who speaks against the accepted religion, or against the saints, or their images, is subject to the penalty of blasphemy, which is banishment for life to Siberia.

But if blasphemy be a proper subject of legislation by civil government, if it be right for a government to make itself the "defender of the faith," then it is perfectly proper for the laws of China to prohibit under whatever penalty it pleases, the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ within the Chinese dominions; because its

effect is to lessen men's reverence for the deities recognized by China, and for the accepted religion of the country. And in that case there is no such thing as persecution on account of religion. The only persecutions that have ever been were because of men's speaking against the accepted religion. If this principle be correct, then the Roman empire did perfectly right in prohibiting under penalty of death the preaching of the religion of Jesus Christ. Whenever Paul, or any of his brethren, spoke in the Roman empire, they blasphemed, according to the Roman law. They were held as blasphemers, and were put to death under the very principle of this definition, which is the principle of the American statutes on the subject of blasphemy. The Christians had to tell the Romans that the Roman gods were no gods. And they did it with the express purpose of destroying reverence for them and for the accepted religion. Rome put them to death. And I repeat, if the principle of the American statutes against blasphemy is correct, then Rome did right.

To make this clearer, I quote a passage from the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in defense of this principle, in a decision upon this very subject, which says: "To prohibit the open, public, and explicit denial of the popular religion of a country, is a necessary measure to preserve the tranquillity of a government." That is precisely what the Roman empire did. Christianity did openly, publicly, and explicitly deny the popular religion of the country. It did it with intent to destroy men's reverence for the deities and the religion of that country. Rome prohibited it; and upon the principle of the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, which is the principle of American law on blasphemy, Rome did right, and Christianity was a blaspheming religion. The principle of this decision seems to be that those who represent the popular religion of a country have so little of the real virtue of the religion which they profess, that if anybody speaks against it, it is sure to rouse their combativeness to such a degree as to endanger the public tranquillity. Therefore, in order to keep civil those who represent the popular religion, the State must forbid anybody to deny that religion.

This decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania is one of the grand precedents that have been followed in all the later decisions upon this subject in the younger States; but this decision itself followed one by Chief Justice Kent of the Supreme Court of New York in 1811, in which he embodies the same principles. He defends the right of the State to punish such offenses against what he calls a

Christian people, and not. equally to punish like offenses against the religion of other people in this country, by the following argument:—

"Nor are we bound by any expression in the Constitution, as some have strangely supposed, either not to punish at all, or to punish indiscriminately the like attacks upon the religion of Mohammed, or of the Grand Llama, and for this

218

plain reason: that the case assumes that we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those impostors."

This is only to argue that if the morality of the country were engrafted upon the religion of Mohammed or the Grand Llama, and Christians were to speak against and deny that accepted religion, it would be proper that the State should punish those Christians for so doing. If that principle be correct, then a Mohammedan country has the right to prohibit the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ within its limits.

According to these decisions, Luther and the reformers of his day were blasphemers. The reformers did hold up to ridicule and contempt the popular religion of all Europe. They did right, too; and when the State punished them, it was but carrying out the principles upheld by Chancellor Kent and the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and all the other States that have legislated on the subject of religion. As we have already stated, it was upon this principle precisely that the Roman Empire forbade the preaching of the gospel of Christ. It only forbade an open, public, and explicit denial of the popular religion of the country, yet in forbidding that, it forbade the preaching of the gospel of Christ. But Christ sent forth his disciples to preach the gospel to every creature, and they did it in the face of the Roman law, and in opposition to the whole power of the Roman Empire; and everybody in all the world has an undeniable right to make an open, public, and explicit, denial of the popular religion of this country, or any other, if he thinks that religion to be wrong.

The principle of these decisions and of the civil statutes against blasphemy, is essentially a pagan principle, and not a Christian principle. It is peculiarly appropriate, therefore, that Chief Justice Kent not only cited the precedents of the church-and-state principles of the colonies and of the British Government, but appealed to the pagan governments of antiquity and the Papal institutions of modern Europe, as the basis of his decision. It is true that all these nations

have set themselves up as the special guardians of their deities, and have prohibited the denial of the popular religion; and it is equally true that all these Nations have resisted every step in enlightenment and progress that has ever been made in the march of time. Every step forward in religion and in enlightenment has of necessity been taken in the face of all the opposition which these States and empires could bring to bear. But the principle of American institutions are neither pagan nor Papal. The principles of the American Constitution which forbids legislation on the subject of religion, are Christian principles. And it is strictly in order for Supreme Courts in making decisions in behalf of what they boast of as the Christian religion, to base their decision upon something else than the course of the pagan governments of antiquity, and the Papal institutions of modern Europe. Upon such a subject one would naturally expect them to refer to the teachings of the Author of Christianity, but they have never done so, for the very good reason that the teachings of Jesus Christ are directly against their theory.

His word forbids civil government to have anything to do with what pertains to God. And instead of teaching his disciples to prosecute, to fine, and to punish by civil law those who speak against them or their religion, he says, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." How can men be brought to respect God or Jesus Christ by civil penalties upon their bodies and goods? How can they respect the religion of men who are ready to prosecute and imprison them? Every principle of the thing is contrary both to the spirit and the letter of Christianity. The religion of Jesus Christ properly exemplified in the daily lives of those who profess it; is the best argument and the strongest defense against blasphemy, both as defined by the Scriptures and by the civil statutes.

A. T. J.

August 14, 1889

"The Best Sunday Observance" *The American Sentinel* 4, 29 , p. 225.

TO OBTAIN a world-wide view of Sabbath observance, Dr. Crafts says he has corresponded with more than two hundred persons

residing in nearly every nation of the world. One of the questions which he asked in this correspondence was:—

"Where have you seen the best Sabbath observance?"

A San Francisco pastor answered:—

"Among the Christian people of California."

Now California is the only State that has no Sunday law. Yet this pastor testifies that in this State there is the best Sabbath observance that he has seen. And under the circumstances, it is properly to be presumed that this pastor has seen Sabbath observance in other States than California. But, the other States have Sunday laws, therefore the Sabbath observance that that pastor saw in other States, must have been under Sunday laws. Consequently, it is demonstrated by Dr. Crafts's own evidence that there is better Sunday observance where there is no Sunday law than where there are Sunday laws.

Again. Up to 1883, California had a Sunday law. In 1885, Dr. Crafts published his book. This was nearly two years after California abolished her Sunday law. Yet, in that book, on page 94, Mr. Crafts says:—

"Both laymen and ministers say that even in California the Sabbath is, on the whole, better observed and Christian services better attended, than five years ago."

Five years goes back three years into the time of the Sunday law, consequently it is once more demonstrated by Dr. Crafts's own evidence that Sunday is better observed, and Christian services better attended, where there is no Sunday law than where there are Sunday laws. Therefore, Dr. Crafts and all the people who work for Sunday laws are working against the best Sunday observance.

The reason why there is better Sunday observance and better attendance upon Christian services where there are no Sunday laws than where Sunday laws exist, is plain. Where there are no Sunday laws, the Christian people are thrown upon their own resources for securing the best observance of the day. Thus they work by Christian means, by Christian influences, and by Christian persuasion, to secure the best observance of that which they deem to be a Christian institution. This is right. Such methods will always win. They will always work for good.

But, on the other hand, when the aid of the civil power is sought, and Sabbath observance is sought to be secured by the enforcement of law, Christians are drawn away from dependence upon Christian

methods, men are repelled instead of being won, and Sunday is worse observed, and Christian services more poorly attended.

By these evidences it is clear that every person who respects Christianity, and who wishes to secure the best Sunday observance, and to have Christian services best attended, ought to oppose Sunday laws with all his might. It is entirely out of respect to Christianity that the AMERICAN SENTINEL opposes all Sabbath laws of civil government.

Let religious institutions be sustained by religious means. Let Christian duties be maintained by Christian methods. Let attendance at Christian services be secured by Christian influences and Christian persuasion. This is the position of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and it ought to be the position of every person who lives Jesus Christ.

A. T. J.

"The Authority for Sunday Laws" *The American Sentinel* 4, 29 , pp. 227, 228.

WE believe that every State in the Union, except California, has a Sunday law. And we believe also that in every State in the Union, except California, Sunday laws have always been held to be constitutional. California's first decision on the question, held the Sunday law to be unconstitutional; but a dissenting opinion held it to be constitutional, and this dissenting opinion was afterward adopted by the Supreme Court, and so held until 1883, when the people, by a majority of nearly eighteen thousand, declared they would have no Sunday law.

The story of that first and proper decision, in brief, is this: In 1858, the Constitution of California said, in Section 4: "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference shall forever be allowed in this State." There was a statute passed by the Legislature enforcing the observance of "the Christian Sabbath," on the first day of the week. A Jew in Sacramento kept his store open on Sunday; he was arrested, convicted, and sent to jail. He sued out a writ of *habeas corpus* on the ground of "the illegality of his imprisonment by reason of the unconstitutionality of the law." The majority of the Court sustained the plea by decisions separately written, whose soundness, both upon constitutional principles and upon the abstract principle of justice itself, can never be successfully controverted. Mr. Stephen J. Field,

now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, was then a member of the California Court. He rendered a dissenting opinion, taking the same position as the Supreme Court of Arkansas as to the, omnipotence of the Legislature, and soberly maintaining that the term "Christian Sabbath" in the act was not a discrimination or preference in favor of any religious profession or worship. He declared that "moralists and statesmen," "men of science and distinguished philosophers," have pronounced the rule of "one day's rest in seven" to be "founded upon a law of our race." But he omitted to state what scientist or philosopher or moralist or statesman has ever pronounced upon what law is founded the rule of *two* day's rest in seven for the man who chooses to rest some other day than Sunday!

In his written opinion, Mr. Field said that he had found that in twenty-five States of the Union, Sunday laws had been held to be constitutional. That this is so there can be no doubt. On this subject, the younger State's, both in legislation and judicial decisions, have followed the example of the older States; these have followed the decisions of the oldest, and the oldest followed the example and the precedents of the colonies; and every one of the colonies had Sunday laws *because every one had an established religion*. The colonies not only followed the precedents, but they were a part, of the English system, which is wholly a Church and State system. The Church and State system of England severed itself from the papal rule when Henry VIII. renounced allegiance to the Pope, and "put himself at the head of the Church of England in the place of the Pope. The British system at that time was the papal system; the papal system was established by the mutual craft, flattery, and policy of Constantine and the ambitious bishops of his time, when the first Sunday law was enacted. This, in a word, is the genealogy of the Sunday laws of the United States. They belong with an established religion,—a union of Church and State. And in this country they have been almost universally sustained, either upon the British principle of the omnipotence of Parliament, or upon the Church and State principles of the colonies of the British Government, and of the Papacy.

The law of Pennsylvania, sustained by a Supreme Court decision, is virtually a colonial law, which was a part of the system in which nobody who did "not confess and acknowledge one Almighty God to be the creator, upholder, and ruler of the world," could be a citizen.

The Supreme Court of New York sustains Sunday laws by at once declaring Christianity to be the established religion of that State. This is based upon Chief Justice Kent's decision, of 1811, which cited a law of the colony which declared that "the profanation of the Lord's day was 'the great scandal of the Christian faith.'" That decision of Judge Kent's made Christianity the established religion of the State of New York, by citing the precedents of the papal institutions of modern Europe and the pagan nations of antiquity.

This, again, proves Sunday laws to belong with established religions, with the union of Church and State, finding their basis in papal and pagan institutions.

In every statute book in America, with scarcely an exception, Sunday laws are found under the head of "offenses against religion," or "offenses against God and religion." This springs naturally from the colonial legislation, where each colony deemed itself the special guardian of God and of some particular form of religion.

228

But according to the word of unrest, the civil power has nothing to do with either God or religion, nor with offenses against God or religion. Religion is defined by Webster as "the recognition of God as an object of worship, love, and obedience." Another definition, given by the National Reform Association itself, is "man's personal relation of faith and and obedience to God." Civil government has nothing to do with a man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God. If he has no faith at all, and makes no pretensions to obedience to God, that is nothing to the civil government, so long as the man conducts himself civilly. Neither has civil government anything to do with offenses against God; the Lord himself can attend to that. A man is responsible alone to God for the offenses which he commits against God. Civil government has no business to establish a religion, and then make offenses against it criminal; nor has it any business to put itself in the place of God, and presume to declare that an offense against *the governmental idea of God* is an offense against God. How is the civil government to know whether an act offends God or not? The fact of the matter is, that just as soon as Sunday laws are investigated at all in the light of truth, or justice, or law, it is found that they are inseparable from an established religion,—inseparable from a union of Church and State.

This is further shown by a mere glance at the British system, as set forth by Blackstone in his chapter on "Offenses against God and

Religion." There "profanation of the Lord's day" is classed with such things as "apostasy," "heresy," "reviling the ordinances of the church," "non-conformity to the worship of the Church," "witchcraft," "conjurament," "enchantment," "sorcery," "religious imposture, such as falsely pretending an extraordinary commission from Heaven," adultery as an ecclesiastical offense cognizable by the spiritual court, and such confusion of civil and religious ideas as the punishment of drunkenness as an offense against God and religion. This is the company with which Sunday laws belong. The penalty for apostasy was, first, burning to death; this fell into disuse after a while. Then the penalty was that "for the first offense the offender should be rendered incapable to hold any office or place of trust."

At such legal nonsense as this the United States Constitution struck a death blow in the clause which declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this Government." And by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, this Government utterly separates itself from the whole system of offenses against God and religion so long maintained by the British Government, by the colonies, and, even yet by many of the States, and which is characteristic of all Church and State governments—governments of established religion—by declaring that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This is sound American principle, and accords with the word of Jesus Christ. And the effort ought to be, throughout this whole nation, to lift the Constitutions, the legislation, and the jurisprudence of the States up to the level of that of the National Constitution. But instead of doing that, and so carrying this whole Nation bodily onward in the march of liberty, enlightenment, and progress, these people go about to bring down our national system of Constitution and laws to the level of that of the States, which is the level of that of the colonies, which is the level of that of the British system, which is the level of that of the Papacy, which is the system of paganism under cover of the Christian name.

At the hearing before the Senate Committee last December, on the Sunday bill, Dr. Elliott cited Edgar, Athelstan, and Alfred; and Dr. Crafts cites Alfred, Charlemagne, and Justinian; in support of Sunday laws. To be sure! And with equal force they can cite these and many others of the Dark Ages in support of tithes to the clergy, the supremacy of the monks in civil affairs, the "holy anointing" of kings

by the Pope, and for any and every other thing that belongs with the papal system. They can carry Sunday-law precedents farther back than that: they can go back to the time of Theodosius and Constantine. They can find, and so can anybody else, that as *Pontifex Maximus* of the old pagan system, Constantine "had the plenary power of appointing holy days;" they can find that by virtue of this power, Constantine established the first. Sunday law of all time, in honor of the "venerable day of the sun," whose special devotee he was; and also that as "bishop of externals" of the new pagan system,—the papal,—which office he assumed by virtue of his political conversion to the political Christianity of his time, he played into the hands of the ambitious bishops by giving them in that Sunday law their coveted "use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims" to compel men to accept the decrees, and submit to the dictates, of the church. He, and all others, will find that this is the literal truth of the origin of Sunday laws.

All this is supported by abundance of testimony of undoubted authority. So eminent a divine as Dean Stanley declares plainly that the retention of the old pagan name of "*dies Solis*," or Sunday, for the weekly Christian festival, "is owing to the union of pagan and Christian sentiment with which the first day of the week was recommended by Constantine to his subjects, pagan and Christian alike, as the 'venerable day of the sun.' . . . It was his mode of harmonizing the discordant religions of the empire under one common institution."

This same mode of harmonizing paganism with Christianity was further illustrated by his imperial coins, bearing on one side the name of Christ, and on the other the figure of the sun-god, with the inscription, "the unconquerable sun." This confusion of pagan and Christian ideas and practices is what made the papacy, the union of Church and State, and the confusion of civil and religious things from which, with the exception of the Government of the United States, the nations have not even yet freed themselves. *That* is the authority, and the only authority, for Sunday laws. Sunday has no basis whatever as a civil institution; it never had any. And the only basis it has, or ever had, as a *religious* institution is in that confusion of paganism and Christianity which made the papacy, with all that it is or ever was.

A. T. J

"Who Is on the Constitutions Side?" *The American Sentinel* 4, 29 , pp. 229, 230.

IN the words, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," the United States Constitution guarantees perfect religious liberty to every soul in this Nation. A great many people appear to dread the encroachments of the Roman Catholic power. But, so long as the United States Constitution shall be kept as it is, and legislation in harmony with it, such fears are groundless. Cardinal Gibbons might be elected president, Archbishop Corrigan, vice-president, every seat in the Senate might be filled with bishops, and every seat in the House of Representatives might be filled with priests, yet so long as they should respect the Constitution they could not pass a single law affecting Protestantism in any way, because the Constitution says that, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And under this Constitution, the Roman Catholic, in the exercise of his religion, is just as free from any interference by Protestants as Protestants are from the interference which they profess to fear from Catholics.

Much is said of the hatred of infidels toward Christianity; but with the Constitution as it is, and with legislation and public sentiment in harmony with it, infidels might hate Christianity as heartily as many persons think they do, and yet they could do Christianity no harm. Colonel Ingersoll might be elected president and every seat in Congress filled with infidels as outspoken as he, yet so long as the Constitution should be respected, they could not make a single law affecting Christianity in any way, even if they wanted to, because the Constitution says that, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Under this Constitution religious profession and worship are absolutely free. And so long as public sentiment shall see to it that the Constitution remains as it is, and legislation in harmony with it, every man's religious profession and worship will remain free. Constitutional safeguards are such only so long as there is "an enlightened public opinion based on individual intelligence."

There is, however, an already large, and constantly increasing element demanding that the Constitution shall be so amended as to empower Congress to legislate in behalf of Christianity. And a great many are even calling for religious legislation without any such

amendment. May 21, 1888, Senator Blair, of New Hampshire, introduced a bill to "promote" the observance of the Lord's day "as a day of religious worship," and to secure the "religious observance of the Sabbath day." Four days afterward, May 25, the same Senator introduced a "joint-resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, respecting establishments of religion and free public schools;" providing for instruction in "the principles of the Christian religion" in all public schools of the Nation; and empowering Congress to "enforce this article by legislation when necessary;" which only proposes to empower congress to legislate in regard to the principles of the Christian religion. During the last session of the Fiftieth Congress, there were repeated visits of large and influential delegations to the Senate committee having these items in charge, pleading strongly for the passage of both. The adoption of either would be but the establishment of a national religion, and the establishment of a national religion is but the establishment of a national despotism, even though it be under the name of Christianity. True Christianity never can be made a national religion. To make it national is to pervert it. Christianity is universal. It embraces all the world, having its head in Heaven and not on earth.

Jesus Christ separated forever civil government from his religion when he said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and, "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Cesar's, and unto God the things which are God's." Bancroft, the historian of the United States, says: "No one thought of vindicating religion fire the individual, till a voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity, by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Caesar only that which is Caesar's. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men." "The new Nation when it came to establish a government for the United States refused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by a corporate body, or having a headship in a monarch or 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 ordained of God in Judea." The United States Constitution as it is, upon the subject of religion, is in exact harmony with the principles and the word of Jesus Christ. Therefore, any effort to change that Constitution, respecting religion, even though it be professedly done in behalf of Christianity, is directly opposed to the word of Jesus Christ.

Again the Declaration of Independence declares that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. This is the fundamental principle of American institutions, and it is in harmony with the word of God. Yet, at a convention held in Sedalia, Mo., May 23 and 24, in behalf of the proposed National Sunday law, Mr. W. P. Gray, the secretary of the convention, who was made secretary of the State Sabbath Union, said:—

"I for one, do not believe that as a political maxim, governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. And I believe with Mr. Gault on this, I think. And so the object of this movement is an effort to change that feature in our fundamental law."

This statement is quoted and endorsed by the *Christian Statesman*, which is the official organ of the National Association for securing such an Amendment to the United States Constitution as Senator Blair proposed. Therefore, it stands proved by their own words that, those who favor the resolution and the bill introduced by Senator Blair on the subject of religion, are, through these, aiming at the subversion of the fundamental principles of American institutions, the destruction of the rights and liberties of men; and that their work is directly opposed to the principles and the word of Jesus Christ.

It is true that both these pieces of proposed

230

legislation died when the Fiftieth Congress expired, March 4, 1889. But it is also true that all those who favor them are preparing to do their utmost to have them introduced as soon as the next Congress convenes, and also to do their utmost to secure their adoption.

Do you respect the word of Christ? Do you love liberty, civil and religious? Do you respect the rights of men? Do you appreciate the liberty asserted in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States? If you do any one of these, then you should be willing to let your voice be known in the endorsement and your name in the signing of the following petition:—

"To the Honorable, the Senate of the United States, (duplicate also to the House):—

"We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, hereby respectfully but earnestly petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way give 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."

The lines are being drawn. On which side will you stand? A. T. J.

August 21, 1889

"Where Does the Civil Sabbath Come In?" *The American Sentinel* 4, 30 , pp. 233, 234.

IN the California *Christian Advocate*, July 31, 1889, is a long article by Rev. E. D. McCreary, Ph. D.—Doctor of Philosophy—on "Observance of the Sabbath." It hasn't anything in it particularly new, but now when there is such demand for the enforcement by law of a civil Sabbath, it is important to keep the run of the discussions upon the subject. The Doctor says:—

"The saloon is the worst enemy of the Sabbath, persistently in the face of all laws, human and divine, devoting the hours of that holy day to its nefarious work, it reaps larger returns from its Sunday traffic than any other day in the week."

Is it because the saloon is more open on that holy day than any other day of the week, that it reaps larger returns? How is this? Why is it that the saloons reap larger returns from Sunday traffic than upon any other day of the week, when the saloon is open every other day of the week as well as on Sunday? There is one reason, and only one, that ever can be offered in explanation of this fact. That reason is, that more people are idle that day than any other day of the week. Other days of the week men are allowed to work, and while a man's time is occupied by work, and his mind is upon that, it is easy enough to keep sober and to keep away from the saloon. Allow people to work on Sunday, as they have a right to do, and the returns from liquor traffic on Sunday will be no larger than on any other day. But instead of this, the preachers throughout the whole country demand laws both State and national, to compel men everywhere to be idle on Sunday, and then they make a national complaint that the saloons reap larger returns upon Sunday than any other day; when the reaping of these larger returns is because of the idleness into which the laws have forced the people, to satisfy the preachers.

Again the Doctor says:—

"It is estimated that not less than two millions of workingmen in this country are engaged in Sunday work, while millions more

spend the day in frivolity and amusement, turning its holy hours into seasons of recreation and dissipation."

Well, now, Doctor, are not those two millions who are engaged in their honest occupation on Sunday a good deal better off than those other millions who spend the day in frivolity and dissipation? And, indeed, are they not better off than the great mass of those who spend that day in amusements and recreation? Because, you know that much of the amusement, and of the recreation, too, indulged in on that day, is not by any means as innocent, nor as harmless, either morally nor physically, as is the work in which the two millions are engaged on that day.

Has it come to this that honest labor must be counted worse than frivolity or dissipation? worse than questionable recreation; and more than questionable amusement? Shall it be admitted that the man who follows his honest occupation on Sunday as on other days; is more wicked than those who spend the day in amusement and recreation? or that he is as bad as those who spend the day in frivolity and dissipation? If these Sunday-law ministers have such a tender regard for the laboring man, and such high respect for the dignity of labor, as they profess, they ought to have respect enough not to class honest occupations with frivolity and dissipation, nor to put the workingman on a level with the frivolous and dissipated. As for us, we never will admit that the man who follows his honest occupation on Sunday is as bad as those who spend that day in frivolity and dissipation. Nor will we ever admit that work is worse for men than are frivolity and dissipation.

Again, says the Doctor:—

"California, of all the States in this great commonwealth, enjoys the unenviable reputation of having swept from its statute books every legal safeguard of the Sabbath, both as a civil and religious institution."

But nobody but the Sunday-law workers have counted California's reputation in this as unenviable. They are the only ones that are complaining of it. But, admitting that she has this "unenviable reputation," it is only proper that she should enjoy it, because by the plain evidence of the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, who is just now the chiefest Sunday-law worker of the Nation, it is shown that California has the enviable reputation of having "the best Sunday observance" and the "best attendance at church services" of any State in the Union. This being so, California has a right to enjoy this "unenviable" reputation, because by it she enjoys the entirely

enviable reputation of having the best Sunday observance and best church attendance of any State in the Union. And if in sustaining this enviable reputation she is made subject to the unenviable reputation, it is proper that she should enjoy it, because it certainly is enjoyable.

The Doctor quotes Blackstone to the effect that "a corruption of morals usually follows the profanation of the Sabbath," when the truth is that corruption of morals precedes the profanation of the Sabbath. Man's morals has got to be corrupt before he will profane the Sabbath. This statement of Blackstone's is of the same piece with all religious legislation and Church and State schemes. The whole thing is wrong end foremost, and it is only by that means their demand for legislation on the subject can ever be justified even in appearance. For instance, they start with Blackstone's statement that corruption of morals usually follows the profanation of the Sabbath. Then they argue that that being so, if they can only get a law prohibiting under pains and penalties the profanation of the Sabbath, they can prevent corruption of morals and

234

save the Nation. But the whole thing is a fraud from beginning to end, just as is every other attempt to justify religious legislation. Corruption of morals precedes the profanation of the Sabbath just as it does the profanation of the name of God. Man's morals has got to be corrupt before he will profane either the name or the day of God.

Therefore, the first thing to do is to purify the morals, and that in itself will prevent the profanation of the day. But this can be done only by the inculcation of the principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and that can be done only by the power of the Spirit of God, and never by legislation. If the Lord could have stopped the corruption of morals in this world by law, he never would have needed to send the gospel.

Then, having started in the wrong way, it is inevitable that the farther they go the farther they will be from the right. It is not at all surprising therefore to find him presently making this statement:—

"Bishop Vincent, during the Christian Workers' council recently held in this city, expressed a great truth when he said, 'Better have the old Puritan Sabbath with all its somberness and rigidity, than the present laxity of Sabbath observance with its corresponding laxity and lowness of morals.'"

Yes; no doubt the Sunday-law preachers would count that ever so much better than the present condition of things, because then the preachers ruled everything. Then the Sunday laws compelled everybody to go to church on Sunday, and if there was no church in

the country of their own profession, they were compelled to go to the church of another profession and listen to the preaching there. Absence from the ministry of the word was punishable by a fine; and then, when people were thus compelled, under penalty, to go to church and listen to the preaching, it was such preaching as, said one of the victims, "was meat to be digested, but only by the heart or stomach of an ostrich." Yes, we have no doubt that the Sunday-law preachers would be glad to see those good old times again. That is just what they are trying to bring about by their National Sunday law which is to make the State laws effective. And some of these State laws do actually at this hour of the nineteenth century command attendance at church on Sunday.

The reader will perhaps wonder where, in all the Doctor's discussion, the civil Sabbath and its observance come in. In fact it doesn't come in at all. He says "we are commanded to keep it *holy*, and its *sacred* hours are to be employed in *religious* meditation and *worship*, and in deeds of charity and mercy." He speaks of "the silent, but insidious and steady, encroachment of traffic and trade upon the *sacredness of our holy day*." He speaks of railroads being "flagrant violators of the *sanctity of the Sabbath*." He says "the *Christian Sabbath* is in great peril." He says that Mr. Crafts "should receive the hearty co-operation of all persons who desire the perpetuity of our *Christian Sabbath* and the cessation of its *desecration*." He says "the Sabbath is one of the chief safeguards of morality," and quotes Justice McLean as saying that where there is *no Christian Sabbath* there is no *Christian* morality. He says the Sabbath is "essential to *morality*" "and much more" to the "preservation of *religion*," and that "Sabbath desecration of all kinds imperils the very existence of our *holy Christianity*." He says they must "labor unitedly and earnestly to secure the enforcement of Sunday laws where such exist, and to secure the enactment of better laws for the protection of this *holy day*;" and that the *Christian church* is natural custodian of the Sabbath.

Now if anybody can find anywhere in that, any hint of the *civil Sabbath* we should like to have it pointed out. If it is the civil Sabbath, why didn't he say we are commanded to keep it civilly? and that its civil hours are to be employed about civil things? Why didn't he talk about the insidious and steady encroachment of traffic and trade upon the civility of our civil day? Why didn't he arraign the railroads as being flagrant violators of the civility of the Sabbath? Why didn't he

say the civil Sabbath is in great peril? Why didn't he say that the Sabbath is one of the chief safeguards of civility? Why didn't he say that the Sabbath is essential to the preservation of civility? If it is the civil Sabbath they want, and which they want laws to preserve, why didn't he say that the *civil government* rather than the Christian church is the natural custodian of it? The mere asking of these questions fully answers every one of them, and exposes the sophistry of all their plea for civil Sabbath. There is no such thing. There never was and there never can be any such thing as a civil Sabbath. A. T. J.

"The Evils of Enforced Idleness" *The American Sentinel* 4, 30 , p. 237.

NEW YORK State last year had a law forbidding the use of motive power machinery in its State prisons; forbidding contract labor of State prisoners; and forbidding the selling or giving the product of any convict labor. It seems that that law was passed in the month of August, 1888. And what the law had accomplished from that time up to the month of April, 1889, the New York *Independent* tells in its issue of April 18. It says:—

"The prison is crowded. Discipline is becoming impaired. The men are deteriorating. They are begging for work, sending by hundreds to the head keeper with the same old petition. The best evidence of the evil of the Yates law is that they are going crazy under it. About a dozen have been sent to the asylum from Sing Sing, and three dozen in all during the last six months, or more than twice the number during the same time in the previous year. These are of the first fruits; and as to what may be counted on hereafter, let the prison officers tell us officially:—

"Warden Dunston, of Auburn:—

"The enforced idleness of the convicted criminal demoralizes his mental, and wrecks his physical, system.'

"Warden Fuller, of Clinton:—

"To avoid the debilitating effects, mental, moral, and physical, that are the sequel to the confinement of prisoners in their cells without occupation, and in answer to the personal appeals of men for work, I have made for them such employment as I could.'

"Warden Brush, of Sing Sing:—

"Idleness in a prison is horrible to contemplate, especially to prison officials, who understand fully the consequences. The prisoners soon become restless, unhappy, and miserable. Time with them passes slowly their bodies soon become unhealthy, and the mind must become diseased. In fact, nothing but disease, insanity, and death can be expected from this condition.'

"Physician Barber, of Sing Sing:—

"Confinement in their cells five-sixths of the time in almost solitary idleness appears to be forcing them back upon themselves,—a prey to the baneful influences of impure thoughts, corrupt conversation, disgusting personal habits, physical and mental prostration and moral degradation.'

"General Superintendent Lathrop:—

"Idleness is the bane of a prison, whose malign influence no prison administration, however humane, ingenious, and energetic, has ever been able to overcome."

That is the effect of enforced idleness in a prison where its effect can be definitely determined. Enforced idleness can never do anything else than to force men back upon themselves with the result stated by Physician Barber. Yet in the face of all this evidence of the corrupting influence of enforced idleness, the National Sunday-law workers still go ahead in their efforts to secure a national law by which everybody shall be compelled to be idle one-seventh of the time perpetually. Then, when they get their Sunday law, if a man will not be idle every Sunday he shall be imprisoned; and then, if they should extend the New York system to other States, when they once get them into prison they can compel them to be idle anyhow.

But in view of the facts set forth by these prison officials upon the destructive effects of idleness, every man who has any care for his mental, moral, or physical well-being, ought to oppose, with all his might, the making of any such law, and then, ought to refuse to obey any such law when it is made. In view of these evidences, we do not wonder that Dr. Crafts pronounces idleness to be Sabbath-breaking. It is one of the very worst sort of wickedness. The idle man is thrown back upon himself, and nothing good can ever come from it, even though it be done voluntarily. But when men are compelled by law, under pains and penalties, to be idle, they are *forced* back upon themselves, with the fearful results recorded above. And those who are responsible for making the law which forces men into such a condition as that, cannot be guiltless. The more that Sunday laws are tested, the more hideous they appear in their essential wickedness.

A. T. J.

"What They Want It For" *The American Sentinel* 4, 30 , p. 237.

Mrs. J. C. BATEHAM, superintendent of Sabbath Observance, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, is one of the leading

workers for the National Sunday law. There is no disputing this. What she says therefore on this subject must be authoritative. What she shall say it is for which they want a National Sunday law, that must be the thing for which they want it. This cannot be questioned. She issued, last spring, a leaflet inquiring, How a weekly day of rest and quiet can be best secured by law? and in this leaflet she tells what they want the Sunday rest for. Here are her words:—

"We want it for the purposes for which God designed it when he bid us keep it holy; not for frivolity and amusement, not for sleep and idleness, not for the Sunday newspaper with its demoralizing literature, but for reading which is elevating and improving, including the Word of God, and for attendance upon church services."

Then, a little further along, in the same leaflet she says:—

"Senator Blair's Sunday-Rest bill prepared at the request of the W. C. T. U. and in response to the first two millions of petitions, is in the main entirely satisfactory to us."

Now let us analyze this. What they want a day of rest and quiet for, is, the reading of the Word of God and for attendance upon church services. The inquiry is, "How these can best be secured by law?" Then the statement is, "That the Sunday-Rest bill prepared at their request, is in the main, entirely satisfactory." It therefore follows that the object of the Blair Sunday-Rest bill is to establish a day of rest and quiet for the reading of the Word of God and attendance upon church services. This is the inevitable logic of the statements of one of the very chiefest of the Sunday-law workers. If this be not so, then there is no truth in axioms, there is no force in logic, and Roger Bacon was a fraud.

And yet, they blame us for saying that the object of the Sunday law is religious, and that it is the religious observance of the day that they are trying to secure by national law. But why should they blame us? We say no more than they say themselves. We simply draw the conclusions from their own premises. We cannot forsake our senses. We cannot renounce our own power of reasoning, neither can we be so uncharitable nor so ungallant as to hold that Christian women do not mean what they say. She says they want the day "for reading the Word of God and for attendance upon church services." She wants to know how such a day can best be secured by law, and she says Senator Blair's Sunday-Rest bill, is in the main entirely satisfactory. Then the direct and intentional object of the Blair Sunday-Rest bill is the religious observance of Sunday, and the religious observance,

too, even to the extent of reading the Word of God and attendance upon church service.

Therefore, in the interests of the Word of God and of church services, and of Christianity as a whole, we are everlastingly opposed to the Blair Sunday-Rest bill or any bill like it in any degree. The *Union Signal* says that the strongest opponents of the Sunday law spent twenty thousand dollars last year in defending their opposing doctrines. That may be true, we have not kept exact account, but we are inclined to think it is rather less than more than the sum; but whether it be less or more, we can inform the *Union Signal* and the Sunday-law workers all together, that we intend to spend every cent we have in opposition to the Sunday law, so that when they get it, they cannot take anything from us in the way of fines for breaking it. It is evil and only evil, and that continually, and in obedience to the scriptural injunction we do, as far as in us lies, "Abhor that which is evil." A. T. J.

August 28, 1889

"Some 'Constitutional' Arguments for a National Sunday Law" *The American Sentinel* 4, 31 , pp. 241, 242.

WHATEVER the Sunday-law movement is advocated it is met with the valid objection that a national Sunday law would be unconstitutional. The field secretary of the American Sabbath Union has had to meet this more in the last few months than has anybody else in this country, because his work has been more widely carried on, and he attempts to answer the argument. He attempts to prove, and to his own satisfaction proves, that Sunday laws are strictly constitutional. The first step in his argument is that "the supreme courts of twenty-five States have declared them to be constitutional." And he seems to be astonished almost out of countenance to think that anybody in this Nation should deny the unconstitutionality of a national Sunday law in the face of such an overwhelming argument as that the supreme courts of most of the States should say that they are constitutional.

We have heard the field secretary several times on this point, and for sometime we were considerably at a loss to decide in our own minds whether the argument was a piece of deliberate sophistry or whether the gentleman supposed it actually to be the truth. The field

secretary of the American Sabbath Union needs to become informed upon this subject to the extent that he shall know that decisions of supreme courts of States have no bearing whatever upon questions of national law. A thing might be constitutional and declared so to be by the supreme courts in all the States of the Union and yet it might be wholly unconstitutional if framed into a national law. In many things the States can do what the Nation cannot do. Article X. of the United States Constitution says, "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." There are powers that are not delegated to the United States; there are powers that are not prohibited by it to the States. These still remain with the States or with the people, therefore the States may exert such powers under their own constitutions, while it would be wholly unconstitutional for Congress to attempt to exercise such powers. The enactment and the enforcement of Sunday laws is one of these powers. We know full well that, the States have declared Sunday laws to be constitutional because in these things the States can do what they please unless forbidden by their own constitutions. All this is true, and it is equally true that a national Sunday law would be unconstitutional. State constitutions and decisions have no bearing whatever upon that question.

When the field secretary next speaks upon this subject, we ask him for his own sake not to presume upon the ignorance of his hearers by passing off the supreme court decisions of the States as though they were the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The next step in his argument is that it would be constitutional because the Constitution already contains a Sunday law in itself in the phrase, "Sundays excepted" in the clause which allows the President ten days to consider a bill. But this argument is also sheer fallacy, because that clause does not undertake in any sense to control the action of the President on that day. It does not even say nor imply that he shall not sign a bill on Sunday. The phrase is simply the recognition of the fact that the President of the United States may be a person who deems Sunday to be a holy day, and the Constitution in harmony with itself throughout, in this simply recognizes the right of every man to the free enjoyment of his religious profession if he makes any.

Suppose the President of the United States should be a man who regards Saturday as the holy day and observes it religiously, and he should except the Saturdays and count the Sundays in those ten days. The Constitution would sanction that action as fully as it would the action of the President who deems Sunday a holy day.

Suppose further, that the President were a man who makes no religious profession at all; suppose in fact he were an infidel, cared nothing whatever for Sunday as such, and should actually sign a bill on that day; that bill would thus become a law as certainly as those that were signed on Monday, or any other day of the week. That phrase does not in any sense conflict with the first amendment, nor does it sanction in any way the demand that is being made upon Congress to pass a law establishing the religious observance of Sunday or declaring what people shall or shall not do on that day.

The fallacy further appears in this that whereas the Constitution through thus excepting Sunday, does not in any way propose to say what the President shall or shall not do on Sunday, nor to touch upon his actions in any way upon that day, the Sunday-law workers demand that this as "the acorn" shall be expanded into such a mighty oak as shall cover every action of every soul in this Nation on Sunday, and under which shall be declared what things only can be done on that day not only by all the people but by the President himself. This certainly is to force in-finite possibilities from infinitesimal proportions. But there is nothing too extravagant to be beyond the demands of this would-be hierarchy.

The next argument is that Sunday work and the carrying of Sunday mails "is an infringement of the first amendment to the Constitution" which prohibits Congress from making any law prohib-

242

ing the free exercise of religion "because no man who keeps Sunday can keep his place in the government service, and therefore such are excluded as really from the public service as though a direct religious test were applied," only that that in this case it is declared to be "an irreligious test."

Well, let us examine this. Suppose we admit that in the carrying of the mails and in other work on Sunday, the man who regards Sunday as a holy day, and who treats it as such, is thereby virtually excluded and the government does him injustice and that therefore a national law must be enacted forbidding all such work on the Sunday to protect these in their rights of conscience, and to give them their

share of the offices. Then, there are thousands of people who regard Saturday as a holy day and who keep it as such. These are citizens equally with the others, and have equal rights as citizens with the others; but, the government runs the mails, and does all manner of work on Saturday, and so long as that is so, no man who regards Saturday as a holy day can have a place in the public service. Therefore the next thing for Congress to do would be to pass a national law absolutely prohibiting all such work on Saturday so as to give equal justice to these with the rest.

But no, none who demand Sunday laws would for a moment allow that any such thing as this ought ever to be done. But if it shall be done in behalf of one class of religionists, why not of another? If religious profession is to be the basis of legislation why should the government discriminate, why should it expressly open the way for one class of religionists and exclude another class? Every fair-minded man must admit that this would not be equal and exact justice. Those who demand the Sunday law will not allow for a moment that the government should do such a thing, therefore, it is clearly proved that they want governmental discrimination in their favor, and that solely upon the basis of religious profession.

But under civil government no man can ever of right make his religious profession the basis of any claim for governmental favor. Civil government is for all alike. It takes cognizance of men's actions and deals with men *solely as men*, without regard to any question whatever of religious or non-religious profession or worship. Government rests solely upon this basis, it is composed of men as men, and its affairs are all conducted solely upon this basis.

"Oh!" it is exclaimed, "in a Christian land this would exclude all Christians from office, and thus deprive them of rewards and emoluments that men enjoy who are not Christians, and would thus be a discrimination against the Christian religion." To those who offer it this appears very forcible; but it is easily answered. The Christian who is indeed a Christian, enjoys privileges and rewards as far above the rewards and emoluments of governmental office as heaven is higher than the earth; so that the government when treating all men as men, and treating them all alike, does not discriminate against the Christian. The Christian's profession is the free choice of a heavenly gift which is worth more than all earth's treasures and all its honors. In the precious presence of Jesus Christ no such question ever comes into his mind as to whether he can have a twelve-dollar or a

twelve-thousand-dollar post-office or not. This complaint of the Sunday-law workers, that Christians are excluded from a share in the governmental plunder in its analysis, simply argues that the blessedness of the religion of Jesus Christ, and the riches of the heavenly gift in him, are upon a level with the offices and emoluments of governmental service; and so entirely so at that, that they cannot afford to do without legislation in their special favor. A people who put no more value than that upon the unsearchable riches of Christ haven't enough of the Christian religion about them to do either themselves or the government any good, and the more any government allows itself to favor any such pleas the lower it will be brought.

Oh that those who name the name of Christ would name him for what he is! that they would see in his religion something more than temporal expediency! that they would see in the riches of his grace something more valuable than to fear the competition of the emoluments of governmental service! that they would see that there is a power in the manifestation: of his glorious character greater than that of all the legislative enactments that have been or can be written upon the statute books of all ages and all nations.

A. T. J.

"The Constitutionality of Sunday Laws" *The American Sentinel* 4, 31 , pp. 244, 245.

THE Supreme court decisions of the different States of the Union on the subject of Sunday laws, are worth the study of any person who will take the time, not particularly for any real worth that there is in them, but just to see what queer freaks the judicial mind is capable of. The most recent, as well as one of the most remarkable, is the decision of the supreme court of Arkansas. Considerable mention has been made in the SENTINEL of the prosecutions of seventh-day observers in that State, in 1885 to 1887, for working on Sunday. The first case prosecuted was appealed to the supreme court. The court rendered a decision in which it cited particularly a Massachusetts decision, confirmed the judgment of the lower court, and closed with the following words:—

"The appellant's argument, then, is reduced to this: That because he conscientiously believes he is permitted by the law of God to labor on Sunday, he may violate with impunity the statute declaring it illegal to do so; but a man's religious belief cannot be

accepted as a justification for his committing an overt act made criminal by the law of the land. If the law operates harshly, as laws sometimes do, the remedy is in the hands of the Legislature. It is not the province of the judiciary to pass upon the wisdom or policy of legislation. That is for the members of the legislative department; and the only appeal from their determination is to the constituency."

This decision gives to the Legislature all the omnipotence of the British Parliament, and in that does away with all necessity for a written constitution. The decision, on this principle alone, is un-American. No legislative body in this country is framed upon the model of the British Parliament in respect to power. In this country, the powers of every Legislature are defined and limited by constitutions. It is the prerogative of supreme courts to define the meaning of the constitution and to decide whether an act of the Legislature is constitutional or not. If the act is constitutional, then it must stand, whatever the results may be. And the supreme court is the body by which the constitutionality or the unconstitutionality of any statute is to be discovered. But if, as this decision declares, the Legislature is omnipotent, and that which it does must stand as law; if it be true that "the only appeal" from a legislative enactment is "to the constituency," then there is no earthly use for a constitution. "One of the objects for which the judiciary department is established, is the protection of the constitutional rights of the citizen;" but if the only appeal of the citizen is to the constituency [*sic.*], then he has no constitutional rights in any true sense of the word. Such a decision is contrary to every principle of constitutional law.

So long as there is a constitution above the Legislature, which defines and limits its powers, and protects and guards the rights of the citizens, so long it is the province of the supreme court to pronounce upon the acts of the Legislature. The supreme court of Arkansas, therefore, in this case, clearly abdicated one of the very functions for which it was created, or else subverted the constitution of Arkansas; and in either case, bestowed upon the Legislature the omnipotence of the British Parliament, which is contrary to every principle of American institutions. Nor is the State of Arkansas an exception in this case, for this is the usual procedure of supreme courts in sustaining Sunday laws. They cannot be sustained upon any American principle; resort has to be made for every instance, and has been with scarcely no exception, either to the Church and State principles of the British government, or to the British principle of the omnipotence of the legislative power. But American principles are far

above and far in advance of the principles of the British Government, in that they recognize constitutional limitations upon the legislative power, and countenance no union of Church and State; consequently Sunday laws never have been, and never can be, sustained upon American principles.

That this stricture upon the supreme court of Arkansas is not unjust, we have the clearest proof. The three judges who then composed the supreme court were all members of the Bar Association of the State. In less than three months after this decision was rendered, the Bar Association *unanimously* made a report to the State on "law and law reform," an official copy of which we have in our possession. In that report, under the heading "Sunday Laws," is the following:—

"Our statute, as it stands in Mansfield's Digest, provides that 'persons who are members of any religious society who observe as Sabbath any other day of the week than the Christian Sabbath, or Sunday, shall not be subject to the penalties of this act [the Sunday Law], so that they observe one day in seven agreeably to the faith and practice of their church or society.'—*Mans. Dig., sec. 1886.*

"This statute had been in force from the time of the organization of the State government; but it was unfortunately repealed by the act of March 3, 1895."—*Acts 1885, p. 37.*

245

"While the Jews adhere, of course, to the letter of the original command to remember the seventh day of the week, there is also in the State a small but respectable body of Christians who consistently believe that the seventh day is the proper day to be kept sacred; and in the case of *Scoles vs. State*, our supreme court was compelled to affirm a judgment against a member of one of these churches, *for worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience*, supported, as he supposed, by good theological arguments. It is very evident that the system now in force, savoring as it does very much of religious persecution, is a relic of the Middle Ages, when it was thought that men could be made orthodox by an act of Parliament. Even in Massachusetts, where Sabbatarian laws have always been enforced with unusual rigor, exceptions are made in favor of persons who religiously observe any other day in the place of Sunday. We think that the law as it stood in Mansfield's Digest should be restored, with such an amendment as would prevent the sale of spirits on Sunday, as that was probably the object of repealing the above section."

Now the Arkansas constitution says:—

"All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences;

no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent. No human authority can, in any case or manner whatsoever, control or interfere with the right of conscience; and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment, denomination, or mode of worship, above any other."

This report of the Bar Association says: "In the case of *Scoles vs. State*, our supreme court was compelled to affirm a judgment against a member of one of these churches, for worshiping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

Thus the Bar Association of that State declare that the supreme court of that State confirmed a judgment against a man for doing that which the constitution of that State explicitly declares that "all men have a natural and indefeasible right to do."

And the members of the supreme court all being members of the Bar Association, in that unanimous report of the association they confessed that they confirmed a judgment against a man for doing that which the constitution, which they were sworn to uphold, explicitly declares that "all men have a natural and indefeasible right to do."

And *that* is how Sunday laws were made "constitutional" in Arkansas.

A. T. J.

"A Very Interesting Question,' Indeed" *The American Sentinel* 4, 31 , p. 245.

IN the "hearing" before the Senate Committee last winter, in behalf of the proposed amendment establishing a Christian religion, the following colloquy took place:—

"*Rev. George K. Morris, D. D.*—The Roman Catholics in 1886 were represented to be 7,200,000 citizens including children. The evangelical population at that time—not the church membership only, but population—numbered 42,646,279."

"*The Chairman*—You count men, women, and children?"

"*Dr. Morris*—In all cases.

"*The Chairman*—And entirely regardless now of what is called experiencing religion?"

"*Dr. Morris*—Yes sir, in each case, Catholic and evangelical, we give the population, those who entertain the doctrines of the church.

"*The Chairman*—In that, do you count all who are Catholics on one side and all who are not Catholics on the other?"

"*Dr. Morris*—No, sir. We count all who are Catholics on one side and all who are of the evangelical faiths on the other side.

"*The Chairman*—How large a residuum or fraction is remaining that makes up the entire people?

"*Dr. Morris*—Unfortunately, I have not prepared myself upon that.

"*The Chairman*—How many did you estimate that the evangelicals numbered in 1886?

"*Dr. Morris*—Forty-two millions six hundred and forty-six thousand two hundred and seventy-nine.

"*The Chairman*—And the Catholics?

"*Dr. Morris*—The Catholic population 7,200,000.

"*The Chairman*—The total being 50,000,000 in 1880, the gain between 50,000,000 and the true population in 1886, would represent all the other classes who belong to no church whatever?

"*Dr. Morris*—The atheists, those who entirely reject the Christian faith.

"*The Chairman*—You substantially include everybody in the evangelical estimate except the Catholics.

"*Dr. Morris*—I have not looked closely into that question.

"*The Chairman*—There were 50,000,000 people in 1880 and in 1886 there may have been 58,000,000 perhaps.

"*Dr. Morris*—Yes, I understand that this estimate allows for the population which is supposed to be purely atheistic, rejecting all Christian faiths. They are comparatively a small number.

"*Senator George*—Exclusive of the Mormons too?

"*Dr. Morris*—No, not the Mormons. They would be evangelical in one sense.

"*Senator Palmer*—You assume all who are not atheists and all who are not Catholics, to be evangelical?

"*Dr. Morris*—Yes, sir. Pretty nearly so.

"*The Chairman*—You include all who are known as agnostics perhaps as evangelical then?"

"*Dr. Morris*—The agnostics, properly speaking, are so small in number that they have scarcely entered into the computation.

"*The Chairman*—But the fact seems to be that there is a great body of people who are not communicants of churches, who have no special active affirmative faith in the evangelical creeds or in Roman Catholicism, which, I suppose, is nearly one-third of our people; I think it is.

"*Senator Palmer*—The agnostics are a religious people, more so than many of our people.

"*The Chairman*—Mr. Ingersoll is an agnostic. He leads a type of agnosticism in the country.

"*Senator Palmer*—He is atheistic.

"*The Chairman*—He is an agnostic.

"Senator George—That raises a very interesting question as to what is the Christian religion."

That is a fact. In that sentence Senator George hit the nail on the head, with a mighty stroke. The discussions of those who favor that proposed amendment show in miniature and in a very mild way, indeed, the contentions than would inevitably arise over the question as to what is the Christian religion, should that amendment ever be adopted. If the author of that resolution is wise, he will have learned wisdom by all this and will drop that thing forever.

A. T. J.

September 5, 1889

"Mr. Crafts and His Oath" *The American Sentinel* 4, 32 , pp. 263.

JUNE 19, there was issued a second edition of the AMERICAN SENTINEL of that date on the last page of which there was an article in reference to the failure of Mr. W. F. Crafts to comply with his challenge ha one of the editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to debate the Sunday law petition. In that article: it was stated that, "In the challenge of Mr. Crafts, there was no intimation that he was under the control of the Chicago ministers and that his challenge was accepted by Mr. Jones in perfect good faith, and with the understanding that Mr. Crafts was responsible for his own actions;" that "the challenge and propositions as originally made by Mr. Crafts, were not subject in any sense to the consent of others;" and that the making of the debate to depend upon the concurrence by consent of others was "an after consideration." This edition was largely circulated in the path of Mr. Crafts' appointments as he crossed from the Missouri River to the Pacific Coast. He found it so in Colorado, and to get even on this and much other matter in the same number, he published a sworn affidavit filling three whole columns of the *Colorado Springs Republic* of June 28, charging both the editors of the SENTINEL with willful and malicious slander and falsehood by the "square foot." In that affidavit he made reference to the above statements, in the following words:—

"(1) On page 168 it is said, 'The challenge and propositions originally made by Mr. Crafts were not subject in any sense to the consent of others. 2) In same article, it is said, 'In the challenge of Mr. Crafts there was no intimation that he was under the control of the Chicago ministers.' (3) In same, the dependence of the debate

in Chicago upon the consent of others is called 'an after-consideration.'

"The above statements I declare, on oath, are will-fill and malicious, slanders. In such case Prof. Jones is bound to prove his statements by the original letters. They will show that my first challenge for a debate at Kalamazoo was *subject to the approval of the ministers of that city*. This is stated in my original challenge to Prof. Jones, and also in my letter to Rev. W. A. Waterman of Kalamazoo, who would testify by letter to this effect, if requested. Before the ministers of Kalamazoo replied, Prof. Jones wished the place changed to Chicago, to which I consented *subject to the approval of the Illinois Sabbath Association*, as is shown by several of my letters to Prof. Jones, and by others, to Rev. C. E. Mandeville, D. D., of Chicago, who would so testify if requested. The Illinois Sabbath Association declined to approve and arrange the debate on the ground that Prof. Jones had shown himself a trickster at the Washington hearing and that his obscure sect were not worthy of so much attention."

The italics in the above are exactly as they appear in the affidavit.

He calls on us to prove our statements by the original letters. This we can, do; if we could not those statements would not have been made in the SENTINEL. He says: "They will show that my first challenge for debate at Kalamazoo was *subject to the approval of the ministers of that city*. This is stated in my original challenge to Prof. Jones." This is not only what he says; but he has made positive oath that it is true. He does not make even the usual qualification of an oath—that it is true to the best of his knowledge and belief. He plainly swears without qualification that his statement is true.

Here is a *fac simile* of the original letter to me in which the original challenge was made. (See printed copy opposite):—

PROF. A. T. JONES: I expect to be in Michigan to speak somewhere—the place is under advisement—on evening of June 3rd. I would be glad to have a kindly debate, not in the interest of personal victory for either of us, but of truth, at Kalamazoo or some other large town quite near to your headquarters, that your people as well as mine may be well represented in the audience; or better still, let it be at the Capital, to which people may more readily come from all parts of the state. If you agree, I think I could get Lansing pastors to secure a hall and advertise the meeting or convention. The subject of the debate to be the enclosed Sunday Rest Petition, which is the form in which most of the petitioners have put their case. That is, the debate is substantially the same as that at Washington, only "before the committee of the whole."

Yours for the truth, WILBUR F. CRAFTS.

There stands the original challenge of Mr. Crafts. It shows that no such statement or condition was made, as that the debate was subject to the approval of anybody; and as for the ministers of Kalamazoo, they are not even mentioned. The only ministers that are referred to are "the Lansing pastors," and the only mention of them is that if I should agree to debate he thought he could get the Lansing pastors "to secure a hall and advertise the meeting or convention." That is all. There is no such statement as that the debate was subject to the approval of the Lansing pastors; and I repeat, as for the Kalamazoo ministers, they are not even mentioned in the letter. Mr. Crafts may say that he meant it so, or that he intended to say so; but that is not the question. He said that we "might properly be called to answer either in civil or church courts," and we are ready to do so. But he must bear in mind that when he comes into either a civil or a church court, the question will not turn upon what he meant, or what he intended to say, but upon what he said. The above letter shows what he *said*. He swears that that challenge will show that a debate at Kalamazoo was "subject to the approval of the ministers of that city." The challenge shows nothing of the kind. Mr. Crafts has sworn that the challenge says what it does not say.

Further: Even though the challenge had actually said that the debate was subject to the approval of the Lansing pastors, still it would be a false oath, because he swears that it was subject to the approval of the ministers of Kalamazoo. But the challenge does not even say of the Lansing pastors what Mr. Crafts swears it says of the ministers of Kalamazoo. Therefore it is demonstrated that on this point his oath is not true in any sense. If he must wear he ought to swear to the truth.

He may plead that he made this condition in a letter written to Rev.

250

W. A. Waterman of Kalamazoo. But how was I to know that? And even though it were true, what matters it to me, what he wrote to Mr. Waterman? That is not the question. The question is upon what he wrote to me. He swears that he wrote to me what he did not write to me. That is all there is to that point.

To this challenge I replied by a letter in which I said: "I gladly accept your proffer to debate. Your choice of Kalamazoo as the place is perfectly satisfactory."

Before I received from Mr. Crafts any answer to my acceptance of his challenge, I was called to Chicago, and wrote from there, asking

that the place of debate be changed from Kalamazoo to Chicago, because to have it there would be much more in keeping with his idea of having it before the "Committee of the whole."

Of this Mr. Crafts states in his affidavit:—

"Before the ministers of Kalamazoo replied Professor Jones wished the place changed to Chicago, to which I consented, *subject to the approval of the Illinois Sabbath Association*, as is shown by several of my letters to Professor Jones." The italics are his own:—

4-6-'89.

PROF. JONES:

Dear Sir: I will transfer debate to Chicago for Friday evening, June 7th, as the reasons you give are good ones. Please see Rev. Dr. Mandeville, Pres. of Illinois Sabbath Association, and see if that organization will join you in arranging for the meeting. Music Hall is the proper place. To make sure of expenses let ten cents be taken at the door, announced as "a collection of no less than 10 cents each at the door to pay expenses." The advertising should be thoroughly and impartially done, announcing the subject and the debaters, giving the whole petition, which I will sustain and you oppose. You can quote your petition [*sic.*] if you choose, not in advertising, of course, but as a part of your negative argument; but I have only one night unengaged—the one named—until later in the season. I hope we may have the debate over again at some other point with two rights or more for it. For the 7th let us begin at 8 sharp, and speak 45 minutes each, with 15 each for rejoinders.

I appoint Dr. Mandeville to represent me in the arrangements, as far as debate is concerned. The expenses I leave for you and the Society to arrange and divide surplus, if any beyond my usual \$10 for traveling expenses. W. F. CRAFTS.

In that letter there is no such statement as that either the debate or the change was subject to the approval of the Illinois Sabbath Association. The letter says: "I will transfer debate to Chicago." He does not say he would transfer the debate subject to the approval of the Illinois Association, nor anything of the kind; but that he would transfer debate to Chicago; and that "as the reasons you gave are good ones." The words are plain, and without qualification.

Then, of the Illinois Association he says: "Please see Rev. Dr. Mandeville, president of the Illinois Sabbath Association, and see if that organization "will join you *in arranging for the meeting.*" I was not to ask Dr. Mandeville if that organization would approve of the debate. I was not to ask whether that organization would consent to have such a meeting; but to see if that organization would join me "in

arranging for the meeting." And the only thing I ever gathered from Mr. Crafts' letters on this point was that if that organization would not join in making arrangements he would name another party.

Again, Mr. Crafts may say that he meant that the debate was subject to the approval of the Illinois Sabbath Association; and again I say, The question is not what he meant, but what he said. He makes oath that this letter shows that the change of the debate to Chicago was subject to the approval of the Illinois Sabbath Association. The letter does not show it. He has sworn that the letter will show what it does not show. He says he said so to Dr. Mandeville, and again I say, How was I to know that? and what has that to do with this case? The question is upon what he wrote to me. He swears that the letter to me shows what it does not show.

This further proves true our original statement that the concurrence of any others was an after consideration, and in that proves *false* his oath that this is a "willful and malicious falsehood." There being no such condition in the original challenge, nor in the letter changing debate to Chicago, the only way in which any such condition could ever possibly come in would be in the way of an after consideration. Thus in this third point also, it is clearly proved that his oath is contrary to fact.

Having now positively proved by his own letters, that in these points he has made a false oath, and having thus clearly impeached his testimony, the SENTINEL might here drop the whole subject; and, upon every principle of law and justice, count itself clear; being fully justified by the legal maxim, "*falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*—false in one point, false in all." But we are willing to waive all this, to be more than strictly just, and to go further and do all we can to make the question plain.

As he appointed for only one night —June 7—and expressed the hope, that we might have it over again at some point, with two nights or more, I did not go to see Dr. Mandeville, but immediately wrote again to Mr. Crafts, asking him to take more nights at first, because there could not

251

be a better place than Chicago. He replied in the following letter (we have not space for *fac similes*):—

PROF. JONES:—I happen to have open June 12, 13, 14, all I can spare at any time. I can come to Chicago then for the debate, on several conditions 1. My expenses from Minneapolis and return and locals in Chicago. 2. Both of us to agree not to linger after 14th,

to speak on Sabbath, lest the attendance be weakened, or speeches be made with no chance to reply. 3. The debate to be under joint control of your committee and Illinois Sabbath Association, Rev. Dr. Mandeville, President, Chicago. 4. The debate to be *one* continuous debate for the three nights. Myself, as affirmative, to speak half an hour the first night, and you to follow with half an hour of your reply, "to be continued in our next." You to have first hour second night and myself closing half hour. The third night each to speak twice—opening addresses 30 minutes each to be followed by rejoinders of 15 minutes each—the order to be determined by lot, that is, who shall open, &c.

Your petition I should not consent to debate "separately, as it relates to National Reform, with which I am not connected, and to Blair amendment, which as Field Sec., I have no right to work upon. I shall however refer to that petition, and you can, of course, use it in your argument as far as you consider it pertinent. Yours, W. F. CRAFTS.

Please see Dr. Mandeville and show him this letter and see what he says about it. As to money above expenses of hall and advertising, if any, I should be willing to have it given to your denomination and Illinois Sabbath Association equally, or more appropriately, devoted half and half to your literature and ours, or better yet, to the printing of stenographic reports of the debate. I should insist on a competent stenographer taking down every word, to prevent misreporting from going uncorrected.

These dates have already been refused to the S. S. Assembly, that would have paid \$50 for two or three addresses, and may be wanted any how. Please hasten a final decision. W. F. C.

This is the last letter I received from Mr. Crafts before he declared the debate off. And as with the others, so with this; there is no such statement as that the debate was subject to the approval of the Illinois Sabbath Association or any other party. The third condition is: "The debate to be under the joint control of your committee and Illinois Sabbath Association." Not that these committees were to decide, or either of them, whether there was to be any debate or not, nor whether the debate depended upon their approval, or the approval of either of them; and it is certain that neither I nor my representatives ever supposed for a moment that these committees were to decide whether the debate should take place or not.

This letter I received in Chicago, April 19, and as I was to leave there that same evening for Minneapolis, I appointed Elders R. M. Kilgore, and George B. Starr, of Chicago, to act with the Illinois Sabbath Association in making arrangements. They visited Dr. Mandeville, and with the following result:—

894 W. ADAMS ST., CHICAGO, ILL.,

April 20, 1889.

GEO. B. STARR, ESQ., *26 College Place, Chicago, Ill.*—

Dear Sir: The executive committee of our association met yesterday and took under advisement the matter of the proposed public debate. After carefully considering the question in all its bearing, we came to the conclusion indicated in the enclosed resolution.

Very sincerely yours, C. E. MANDEVILLE.

WHEREAS, The proposition to hold a public debate between Rev. W. F. Crafts and Prof. Jones, on the petition for a Sabbath Rest bill been referred to the Illinois Sabbath Association; therefore,

Resolved, That as the time of this association is fully occupied with its own work, they do not deem it advisable to spend either time or money in any discussion which in their judgment will in no way conduce to the better observance of the Sabbath. (Fac simile opposite.)

Here we are brought to another point in Dr. Crafts' list of sworn charges. He says that—

"The Illinois Sabbath Association declined to approve and arrange the debate, on the ground that Professor Jones had shown himself a trickster at the Washington hearing, and that his obscure sect were not worthy of so much attention."

Mr. Crafts has positively sworn, and without qualification; that this is true. But the above resolution of that association, declared by Dr. Mandeville over his own signature to be the conclusion to which that association came, gives as the sole reason, that in their judgment a debate would "in no way conduce to the better observance of the Sabbath."

It may be that the Illinois Association gave to Mr. Crafts the statements which he has sworn are true. If they did, then the foregoing resolution, and signature of Dr. Mandeville, show such statement to be clearly a prevarication, and Mr. Craft's oath that it is the truth does not help the matter a particle.

[Inset.]

N. Y. 4-22-'89.

Illinois Sabbath Association do not consent to debate, and so there will, of course, be no debate at Chicago on dates named, and it is too late to arrange for any other place at present. A new call for addresses has made it necessary for me to use those dates in the line of my original plan of tour, and so the whole matter will have to rest for the present as I leave home to-morrow and shall in few

days leave on a winding way for the west.
W. F. CRAFTS.

252

I have hit upon another plan for having the debate in Chicago in the autumn on same general plan as I wrote—of which I will write you when it is arranged, if others concur in it. Probably it will be a month or more before I can arrange it when in vicinity of Chicago in person,
W. F. CRAFTS.

En route 4-25-89. Address always, 74 E. 90, N. Y.

To these I replied in a letter, which Mr. Crafts has sworn "is an abusive private letter." Here is a verbatim copy of this "abusive letter":—

OTTAWA, Kansas, May 3, 1889.

Dr. W. F. Crafts, New York City—

DEAR SIR: Your card of April 25th received at this place yesterday. I was about to answer your other card anyhow.

Your plan of having the debate in Chicago in the autumn is satisfactory if it shall be made definite and carried out.

You speak in your card of writing to me about it "when it is arranged, *if others concur in it.*" I fail to see what the concurrence or non-concurrence of others can have to do with it. I was not challenged by any others than yourself to debate; I had no others in view to debate with when I accepted your challenge. The challenge has come from yourself; the proposition, the division of time, and all other suggestions in regard to the debate, have come from you, and have been accepted by me. And the announcement has been made by you in the East that it was to be. The *Christian Statesman* and the *Herald of Reform* have announced it; and I count it wholly an inadequate reason for your declaring the debate off, as already arranged for Chicago, June 12, 13, 14, that the Illinois Sunday Association decline to have any part in it.

The obtaining of the hall, advertising, and other local arrangements for the discussion, were not wholly dependent upon Dr. Mandeville, and the executive committee of which he is chairman; there are other people in Chicago besides these, who certainly could attend to that just as well as they. And, I repeat, their declining is no valid excuse at all for your setting aside your own challenge, your own propositions, and your own appointment of dates, which I had accepted without qualification.

Yet all this I am willing to pass by if you will within a reasonable time appoint a date to which you will certainly stand.

I care nothing for the concurrence or non-concurrence of others; but unless some date is definitely settled, as above suggested, I

shall hold you to the date already fixed, and hold you alone responsible for the failure of the debate to come off upon the date specified, June 12, 13, 14.

It certainly is an unusual thing for a challenger to declare a meeting off simply because certain third parties decline to have anything to do with making arrangements. Such proceeding is too much like trifling, to much like child's play, for me to look upon it with much favor.

I hope you may soon be able to fix a definite time, whenever it may be; but I cannot promise now to accept whatever date you might name, because certain important arrangements have been made for my work in the fall, which would, in a certain measure, have to be conformed to; but this will not be much of an interference, because we can surely fix upon a date without much difficulty.

Hoping to hear a favorable report from you soon, I remain,

Very respectfully yours, etc.,

ALONZO T. JONES.

Now I am willing to submit to any civil or church court to decide whether this is an abusive letter or not.

In answer to that letter I received from Dr. Crafts, by postal card, the following:—

ADDRESS 74 E. 90TH ST., N. Y. 5-8-89.

I do not like the tone or wording of your letter. I have never accepted challenge except on condition; in the first case, that Kalamazoo pastors would arrange in my behalf, and when you wished a change, that Illinois Association, in whose field you wished to have it, would see that my interests were fairly at-tended to By referring to my letters you will see that I have kept to my agreement. I cannot allow you to arrange the debate, nor are there others in Chicago to whom it would be proper for me to turn. W. F. CRAFTS.

Field Secretary American Union.

I am doing all I can to arrange for the debate.

There is a point here worthy of particular notice. In the second sentence he says, "I have never accepted challenge except on condition," etc. In this he deftly turns the whole case around, makes him-self the challenged party, and, of course, in that event makes me the challenging party. This opened the way for him to decline the challenge, as I found announced by Dr. Nelson when I reached Oakland. But it is just about as unusual a thing for a man to decline his own challenge, as it is for the challenging party to declare a

meeting off because certain third parties will not help make arrangements.

It is true that on that card he said he was doing all that he could to arrange for the debate; but as I had told him plainly in my last letter, that unless some date to which he would stand was soon definitely settled, I would hold him to the date already fixed; and would hold him alone responsible for the failure of the debate to come off at the time specified; as there was then more than a month before that time should come, and as I have received no communication from him since, I, yet hold him alone responsible for the failure of the debate to come off at the time appointed by himself—June 12, 13, 14. I further hold that the failure was without valid excuse on his part; and that the record fully sustains me in so holding. And yet after all this he had the face to stand up in open convention in San Francisco, August 16, and tell the audience that "Professor Jones has been wanting to debate with me;" intentionally conveying the impression that I had been the aggressive party, and that he was the noble one who had the virtue to decline. Yes, he did decline to debate, that is a fact; but it was his own challenge that he declined. And we freely allow him all the credit, and grant him all the honor, that attaches to such action in the minds of honorable men.

Mr. Crafts further says that as late as June 9, at Milwaukee, he told Rev. Mr. Corliss, of Battle Creek, that he was "hoping to have the debate in California, or at Battle Creek." He says also that, "two days before" he said the same thing to somebody else whom he "met in Chicago." But what was all that to me? He did not say anything of that kind to me, neither at that time, nor up to this time. Mr. Corliss was not acting for me. Whether I could debate or not did not depend upon the concurrence of somebody else. My acceptance of Mr. Crafts's challenge was not subject to the approval of Mr. Corliss or some unnamed, and perhaps unknown person, whom Mr. Crafts happened to meet in Chicago. I was conducting my part of the controversy myself, and supposed Mr. Crafts was capable of doing the same thing for himself. In that supposition it seems I made a mistake, for which I humbly beg his pardon.

It is thus clearly demonstrated by every count that Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, Field Secretary of the American Sabbath Union, has positively sworn to things which are not in any emote true. Yet even though all this he has done, I do not accuse him of "willful and malicious" false swearing. I only say that Mr. Crafts, failing to keep copies of his

letters, forgot what he had written, and then swore to what he had not written. He ought to be more careful of his letters, and much more careful of his oath.

Yet if such is the case with Mr. Crafts' unqualified oath, with what confidence can the people receive his unsupported word? And if he is so reckless of a solemn, deliberate oath, how careful is he apt to be of common running statements?

It is well known by all who have heard Mr. Crafts speak on the Sunday-rest subject, that he takes great delight in displaying, as an emblem of the Sunday-law movement, an Oriental saw that works only on the back stroke. In view of the evidence which we have presented in this case, we think it may be unanimously agreed that that backwards saw is a most fitting emblem for Mr. Crafts to display. We would suggest that he have enough of the same pattern made so that he and the members of the Executive Committee of the Illinois Sabbath Association, can each have at least one to wear constantly.

Having now fully proved that the SENTINEL stated the facts, it is but just to the editors of the SENTINEL to say that neither of them wrote the article in question. Both the editors of the SENTINEL were in the State of New York when that SENTINEL was issued, and did not know that the article had been written until after Mr. Crafts had published his sworn statement, when each of the editors, received a copy of Mr. Crafts's affidavit and a copy of that number of the SENTINEL in the same mail. There are words used in the article that neither of the editors would have used. There is a tone to the comments upon the fact which neither of the editors of the SENTINEL would have put into an article. For these things,

253

we are sorry on our own part, and offer to Mr. Crafts our apology; but for the article's statement of the facts, we have no apology to make. In connection with that, the only thing we are sorry for is on Mr. Craft's part. We are sorry that he should be so careless as not to keep copies of such important letters; and that upon that he should be so forgetful of what he had written; and that then above all he should be so reckless of a solemn oath as to swear that he wrote to me what he did not write to me.

A. T. J.

"That Gracious Change" *The American Sentinel* 4, 32 , p. 253.

THE American Sabbath Union makes great objections because the SENTINEL, whenever we have occasion to refer to the object of the Blair Sunday bill quotes it as it is written, to promote its observance as a day of religious worship, and to secure the religious observance of the day. The Union says:—

"It was stated in the hearing of the chief prosecutor of the counter-petition at the time of the Washington convention and hearing, that the word "promote" in this connection would be changed to "protect," so that public worship, so far as this bill is concerned, would simply have that protection which any legitimate institution of the American people is entitled to on that day."

We know that the statement was made at the convention that this change *should* be made. We who know that no such statement was made by anybody having authority to make it as that this *change would* be made. The following quotation from the official copy of the hearing will give the facts on that point:—

"Mrs. Bateham—I wish to say also, that one of the requests of our National Woman's Christian Temperance Union was that the word 'promote' should be changed to 'protect' in the title of the bill, so that it should have no appearance of what all Americans object to, any union of Church and State. That amendment was proposed and accept by the American Sabbath Union, the organized body which has just been in session in this city.

"The Chairman—Do you not think that the word 'protect' implies power to command and compel? An army protects.

"Mrs. Bateham—All our laws protect us, *do* they not?

"The Chairman—You would make this a law?

"Mrs. Bateham—I suggest that the bill be made a law and that it be a law that shall protect the civil Sabbath, not to promote religious worship but to protect the day as a day of rest and of religious worship.

"The Chairman—It seems to me that 'protect' is a stronger and more interfering word than '*promote*.' However all of these suggestions are important."

That is all that was said about it at the hearing by anybody who had any authority to speak on the subject. And the only point in that is, that the word *protect* is a stronger and more interfering word than *promote*.

Not only is this so but it was intended to be so, when the change was recommended, and by those who recommended it. In answer to questions at the minister's meeting in San Francisco, August 5, the American Sabbath Union said that they themselves particularly objected to the word *promote* in the original bill, and asked that it be

changed to *protect*. And then he gave the reason, which was that "the effect of the word *promote* would be only to make an open day which the religious people could keep religiously while those who were not religious could do as they chose." From this, it is perfectly plain that the direct object in substituting *protect* for *promote* is to make the bill stronger than it would be as Mr. Blair framed it.

From this it is also clear that the Sunday-law managers do not intend that people who are not religious shall spend that day as they choose even when they do not work. And to see what they do intend, let us put those statements together again. The word *promote* would allow the religious people to keep the day religiously and those who are not religious to keep it as they choose. That is not satisfactory, therefore they want *promote* changed to *protect*. The only logic of that is that the effort of the word *protect* would be to require those who are not religious to keep the day religiously instead of as they should choose. This conclusion is fully sustained by the title of the bill as proposed in the substitution. It reads:—

"A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the Lord's day, commonly known as Sunday, as a day of rest and to protect its observance as a day of religious worship."

The only thing that is proposed to be protected, is the observance of Sunday as a day of religious worship. It is not to protect the people who worship, nor protect them in their right to worship as they choose, but to protect that day itself, and to protect it only as a day of religious worship. It is not to be protected as a day of rest or a day of recreation, nor its observance as people choose, but specifically its observance as a day of religious worship. That is indeed a stronger and more interfering word than is the word *promote*. Senator Blair was right. And all this clearly demonstrates that the plea that is made by the American Sabbath Union that the word should be changed to *protect* as though that were to modify the force of the proposed Act, is nothing but a piece of unmitigated sophistry.

A. T. J.

"Teach Them to Be Men" *The American Sentinel* 4, 32 , pp. 253, 254.

SUNDAY and Monday, August 4, and 5, were field days in Oakland and San Francisco for the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union. He spoke at 11 o'clock Sunday in the Howard Street Methodist Church, San Francisco. The pastor, Rev. Dr. Harcourt,

introduced him as having been a prominent minister of the Methodist Church, and now an honored minister of the Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Crafts began by saying that the American Sabbath Union was formed in the last General Conference of the M. E. Church, and that "Bishop Newman gave it its happy name of American Sabbath Union instead of a National Sabbath Union," and that it is intended under the name American to maintain the golden mean between the Puritan Sunday on one hand and the Continental Sunday on the other. He declared the American Sabbath to be "more important than the American Constitution," because its observance "gives opportunity for moral culture and so saves the country from drifting into despotism," and that therefore it is "the very tap-root" of the Constitution. He endeavored to distinguish between the religious and the civil Sabbath by saying that these two elements in the Sabbath are just as distinct as his two arms. "The right arm promotes the religious Sabbath, and the left arm preserves the civil Sabbath." "The church forbids Sunday work because it is irreligious, while the State forbids it because it is unhealthy." "The church forbids it as a sin against God; the State forbids it as a crime against man."

But it never can be shown that anybody's working on Sunday is a crime against man. How would it be possible to make it appear that the man who works at any proper calling, at any time, commits a crime against anybody in so doing?

He attempted to make crime appear in it by saying that employes are compelled to work on Sunday "which is unhealthy, not only to the body, but to the mind and morals;" that they are kept in a perpetual treadmill of toil; that employes have no power to choose, but are compelled against their wills to work; and consequently Sunday work is a crime against man, and therefore the State must forbid it as such.

Admitting all this there is a fallacy in the demand for a Sunday law that utterly destroys all of the virtue that they try to put into it. It is those that compel others to work, who, according to this argument, commit the crime. It is not those who voluntarily choose to work at their own calling, those who are free, and not subject to anybody in the way of employment. But instead of asking for a law that would prohibit any employer from compelling any employe to work on Sunday, they demand that a law shall be enacted prohibiting everybody from doing any work whatever except works of religion, necessity, mercy, etc. This shows that it is the observance of the day

itself that is aimed at by those who demand the Sunday law and not protection for those who they say are opposed.

The Doctor admitted that the employe is at liberty to obey the dictates of his conscience and refuse to work if he considered each to be wrong on Sunday; but at the same time he declaimed against it that it was only a "liberty to go out amongst the great army of the unemployed and take his chances there," and that without a Sunday law the Nation was thus "debauching the consciences of the two million employes who were compelled to work." But all this argument is utterly sophisticated, as is proved by his own words in his speech in the evening of that same day. He said he did "not defend any man for working against his conscience," that a man "ought to be willing to be a martyr for his conscientious conviction, yet there was no great fear of martyrdom in this," because he had searched the world over and had "never found one person who had lost anything financially by refusing to work on Sunday." He said that in the States and Territories of this land he had "found hundreds of instances where men had been promoted instead of discharged for refusing to work on Sunday." To illustrate this, and more forcibly to impress his point, he related a story of Stephen Girard, who discharged a man for not working on Sunday, then recommended him for the position of cashier in a new bank that was just being organized because, he said, "that man had too much conscience to work on Sunday, and that's the kind of a man whom it is safe to trust to handle other people's money." This argument is also made in Mr. Crafts's book, "Sabbath for Man," page 428, from which we quote a passage. He says:—

"Among other printed questions to which I have collected numerous answers was this one: Do you know of any instance when a Christian's refusal to do work on Sunday trading has resulted in his financial ruin? Of the two hundred answers from persons representing all trades and professions *not one is affirmative*. A western editor thinks that a Christian whose refusal to do Sunday work had resulted in his financial ruin would be as great a curiosity as 'the missing link.' There are instances in which men have lost places by refusing to do Sunday work, but they usually found other places as good or better. With some

254

there has been 'temporary self-sacrifice, but ultimate betterment.' Some avocations have been deserted by Christian men, but they have found others not less representative. . . . I never knew a case nor can I find one in any quarter of the globe where even beggary,

much less starvation, has resulted from courageous and conscientious fidelity to the Sabbath. Even in India, where most of the business community is heathen, missionaries testify that loyalty to the Sabbath in the end brings no worldly loss. On the other hand, incidents have come to me by the score, of those who have gained even in their worldly prosperity by daring to do right in the matter of Sunday work."

He has filled more than six pages of his book with evidence to the same effect. All of which we are ready to admit is true, because men always respect conscientious conviction; men respect the man who has principle, and who, from principle refuses to compromise for any temporal gain. But instead of cultivating principle in men; instead of training them in the integrity of conscientious conviction, so that as men of principle, they will stand by their convictions and refuse to work, Mr. Crafts and his fellow-workers for Sunday laws go about to have the law take the place of conscience, and rob men, not only of the respect of their employers, but of their own self-respect. Instead of cultivating in all, the manliness of men, the Sunday-law workers go about to establish a system in which all must be nursed and coddled as though they were a mass of simpletons who must be cared for by the State.

The more this system that is represented in the Sunday-law movement is examined in the light of righteousness and reason, the more plainly it appears that it is the wickedest thing that ever struck the earth since the day when the Mystery of Iniquity first appeared, and nothing better than the arguments of those who advocate the measure is ever needed to demonstrate that this is true.

A. T. J.

September 12, 1889

"Political Preaching" *The American Sentinel* 4, 33 , p. 262.

THE New York *Examiner*, a short time ago, recommended that the pulpits of the country should take up as a part of their work, the discussion of civil service reform, "on the ground that its application depends on the principles of righteousness which are based on religion." Civil service reform is that reform which proposes to have all the civil offices of the country, except the very highest, held by the same persons during life unless by committing crime they forfeit them. This is to avoid the changes that would otherwise follow upon

the change of administration. The movers in this reform have been at work a good many years, and some United States laws have actually been secured on the subject. But, success in a political contest is so desirable, that it has been found expedient, and not altogether difficult, to evade the law, or even openly to violate it.

If civil service reform were actually established, and carried into effect, a system would be established by which, for instance, when Mr. Cleveland became President there would have been no changes amongst the postmasters of the country, but all who were postmasters when he became President, would have remained clear through his administration if they had lived and behaved themselves. But, President Cleveland made a good many changes; because, the argument is, that if the people of the country choose a Democratic administration, then it is proper that the administration of public affairs should be carried on by Democrats. Therefore, it was proper for him to make the changes. Then, upon the same consideration, when President Harrison was elected, the people chose a Republican administration and, it is considered but proper and right that the public affairs should be administered by Republican officials, consequently another series of changes was in order. Civil service reform proposes to stop all this, and make public office a public trust and not a reward for political service. It will be seen that this is wholly a political question. This reform is what the *Examiner* recommended that the pulpits should discuss as a part of their work. The *Examiner* is a religious paper. Other religious papers endorse it, and the pulpits apparently being in want of something to talk about seem a good deal inclined to adopt the recommendation, and to enter upon the discussion, "on the ground that its application depends upon the principles of righteousness which are based on religion."

The New York *Sun* laughed at the clergy for being "caught with chaff." The *Christian Union* takes up the defense of the clergy, heartily endorses the recommendation of the *Examiner*, and says:—

"The clergy are right in seeing in this a moral issue, and if the clergy shall follow the suggestion which has been made, and generally preach on this subject on next Thanksgiving day, we may expect to see an impulse given to public honesty, that is, to civil service reform, which will make the campaign of resistance still more difficult for the place-hunters and their advocates."

If this question is to be discussed by the pulpit because it depends on the principles of righteousness which are based on religion, thus virtually making it a religious question, instead of political, then, why

not every other political question also be discussed by the preachers for the same reason? Then, how long will it be before religion becomes a direct element in politics, the pulpit only a place for political scheming and the preachers become partisans. A union of religion and the State is becoming more and more popular. The evil spirit seems to be in the very air and can be discerned in almost every wind that blows.

If the pulpits would engage constantly and faithfully in the preaching of the gospel of Christ, and inculcating upon the hearts of men the principles of righteousness as therein revealed, implanting in the heart the love of righteousness for righteousness' sake rather than as a political factor, then there would be vastly more of the principles of genuine reform pervading all classes and conditions of society, and there would not be such a special demand for the discussion of particular phases of politics.

A. T. J.

"The Model Nation" *The American Sentinel* 4, 33 , p. 262.

A CORRESPONDENT in the *Christian Statesman* of July 4, 1889, arguing for the religious amendment to the Constitution, making this a religious instead of a civil government, and providing for religious tests and qualifications for office, says "it would exert a salutary influence on other nations" because,—

"They are looking to America as an example of free popular government. Some of them are struggling toward public liberty and are taking this Nation as a model and guide. They are trying to ascertain the secret of our national greatness and prosperity. For this, they look at our written Constitution. Hence, it should clearly indicate that we are a Christian Nation. They should be made to understand that our holy religion is the source of our national exaltation.

Yes, they are looking to America as an example of free popular government, and they see it, too, and have seen it so far; and they do right, in their struggle toward republican liberty, to take this Nation as a model and guide. It is the model of all of earthly governments, and should be the guide of all, as it is the first one of the kind that the earth has seen. And in their efforts to ascertain the secret of our national greatness and prosperity, they do well to look at our written Constitution. It is because that Constitution is as it is, utterly separated from religious, that we have attained to such national

greatness and prosperity. No other nation ever had such an opportunity, because no other nation ever had such a Constitution, consequently no other nation ever attained to such greatness and prosperity.

And we are willing to admit that our holy religion is, in its place, the source of our national exaltation. But that religion has been kept as holy as it is by the very fact that it has been utterly separated from the unholy State. If there had been here, as in other nations, a union of religion and the State, nobody would have ever seen such an example of national greatness and prosperity as has appeared in this Nation. And just as soon as religion becomes an element of legislation here in national affairs, then, this Nation may bid an everlasting farewell to all her greatness. Then other nations will cease forever to look to America as an example of free popular government. By the example of this Nation, other nations have been carried forward almost in spite of themselves, and entirely in spite of the Papacy, in the march of liberty and enlightenment. By it even Spain, the home of the Inquisition, has been brought to the "toleration" of other professions of religion than the Catholic. But just as soon as this order shall be reversed and religion be made an element in national legislation; just as soon as oppression and persecution for religious profession shall be established; our national progress thus checked;—just then the reaction upon other nations will be such as to lift the Papacy to the highest point that it has ever stood in the world, even to that where, as it is written, "all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. 13:3. Yes, this is the model nation. Let it remain so.

A. T. J.

September 18, 1889

"The Explanation Does Not Explain" *The American Sentinel* 4, 34 , p. 266.

SINCE our publication of Cardinal Gibbons' letter to Mr. Lindsay of Baltimore, stating that in indorsing the Sunday movement last winter, he spoke only for himself and that he had neither the authority nor the intention of binding the archbishops, bishops, or the Catholic laymen of the United States, Mr. Crafts finds himself in hot water, about

everywhere he goes. In the *Chicago News* of May 21, Mr. Edward Cadman published a communication upon which Mr. Crafts replied in the *News* of July 13, in which he flounders considerably. He says:—

"The American Sabbath Union, not the 'American Sunday Union,' when Cardinal Gibbons' letter was first presented at the National Sabbath Convention, distinctly said through my lips, as the letter was directed to me, that the letter (which was read in full, that each hearer might judge for himself what is meant) was not equivalent to the signature of the whole Catholic Church, although it was hoped it would be equivalent to a negative indorsement by that church in that the approval of the Cardinal, it was thought, would prevent opposition to the Sunday-rest petition by any loyal Catholic."

Yes, Mr. Crafts, on that point, said:—

"The letter is not equal in value to the individual signatures of the millions he represents, but no Catholic priest or pastor or person will oppose what has thus been indorsed."

But in that very statement he speaks of the millions whom the Cardinal represents when the Cardinal distinctly asserts that his action in that thing was not representative. More than this; Mr. Crafts makes the Cardinal's action a test of loyalty to every Catholic priest, paper, and person, when the Cardinal distinctly affirms that he had not the authority to make his action in that a test of the loyalty of Catholics, and that "as he had not the authority, so he had not the intention" of doing it. And still, Mr. Crafts insists that it is a test of Catholic loyalty. The fact is, his explanation is more wicked and far less excusable than his original statement.

Nor is this all. When Mrs. Bateham stood on the platform of the Foundry Methodist Church of Washington City, on the night of December 11, 1888, and spoke of the petitions with which that church was festooned, and told who were in favor of it, she distinctly said:—

"Cardinal Gibbons has indorsed for all his people."

I myself was there, within thirty feet of her, and was paying the strictest attention when she made the statement, and I wrote down the words as they fell from her lips. Mr. Crafts speaks of the explanation (which doesn't explain), which was given through his lips, but these are the words which came through her lips.

Yet more than this. In document No. 1, of the American Sabbath Union, issued December, 1888, after the convention was over, there is this sentence:—

"Cardinal Gibbons also sent him (Dr. Crafts) an official letter indorsing the petition on behalf of the plenary council of the Roman Catholic Church."

And also this one, which editors are asked to publish:—

"The Catholic Church has indorsed the petition through a letter of its Cardinal."

This shows that the American Sabbath Union did intentionally, and without authority, count all the Roman Catholics of the country in Cardinal Gibbons' name. It shows also that they intentionally made the Cardinal's indorsement binding even to the test of loyalty upon all the Catholics of the country, thus transcending both the authority and the intention of the Cardinal himself.

These are facts which the American Sabbath Union and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union cannot escape. Nor can they escape the just condemnation which goes with the facts. No explanation that has been, or that can be presented, will clear them. Every effort to defend their action, and every effort by explanation to shield themselves from just condemnation, only makes the matter worse. There is only one way out, and that is by open confession. Let them confess that they committed a fraud. Or, if they think that that would be too much for them, we are inclined to be charitable, let them confess that in the matter of the Roman Catholic petitions they have wholly misrepresented; then let them stop circulating the documents which contain the misrepresentation. This will clear them from any further guilt in the matter, then we will count all that in the past, and hold them no longer responsible for it, and will say no more about it. But so long as they defend their action in this matter, just so long will we see to it that the facts shall be set before the people and that the authors of the wickedness are held up to the just condemnation that belongs with the facts.

In the above extract Mr. Crafts says that at the National Sabbath Convention at Washington, the Cardinal's letter was read in full that such hearer might judge for himself what it . . . Upon this, it must be said, to put it in the mildest possible way, that Mr. Crafts has forgotten the facts. I say again, that I was there, and was within thirty feet of Mr. Crafts when he referred to the letter; and listened carefully, hoping that the whole of the letter might be read, and was disappointed that the whole of it was not read. We therefore say upon the evidence of distinct remembrance that the letter was not read in full, because Mr. Crafts stated that it was "for the Senate, Committee."

Mr. Crafts further says:—

"Another misrepresentation in the letter of Mr. Cadman is the statement that 'the admission of a single Catholic to the Union was strenuously posed.' The fact is dishonestly withheld that it was more strenuously favored, and that a Catholic was elected as a member of the Executive Committee."

It is not in any sense a misrepresentation to say that the admission of a single Catholic to the Union was strenuously opposed. That is a positive fact. It was opposed, and that by Mr. Crafts himself. Even to the extent of trying repeatedly to adjourn the meeting, and it was only owing to the fact that it was more strenuously favored that even one Catholic was elected as a member of the Executive Committee. Although there isn't a great deal of credit attaching to the Union on that account, because the Catholics, according to the count, were the majority of all—7,200,000 to 5,977,693—and yet they were allowed only one member upon an Executive Committee more than a dozen.

The American Sabbath Union had better start new, and do its work fairly.

A. T. J.

"Religion and the Public Schools" *The American Sentinel* 4, 34 , pp. 267, 268.

FEBRUARY 15, 1889, there was held a hearing before the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor upon the Blair resolution, to teach the principles of the Christian religion in all the public schools of the Nation. At that time there appeared before the committee, Rev. T. P. Stevenson, of Philadelphia, corresponding secretary of the National Reform Association; Rev. James M: King, D. D., of New York, representing the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance; Rev. George K. Morris, D. D., of Philadelphia; Rev. W. M. Glasgow, of Baltimore; Rev. J. M. McCurdy, of Philadelphia; C. R. Blackall; and W. M. Morris, M. D., of Philadelphia—all these in favor of the resolution.

Again, on February 22, there was a hearing before the committee on the same resolution. At that time there appeared Rev. Dr. Philip Moxom, Rev. Dr. James B. Dunn, Rev. Dr. James M. Gray—these three being a sub-committee from the Boston Committee of one hundred; Rev. Dr. J. H. Beard, Rev. T. P. Stevenson, and others, all in favor of the resolution. Against it there were Rev. J. O. Corliss and Alonzo T. Jones, editor of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. The following is Mr. Jones' argument:—

Mr. Chairman, there is a point or two not yet touched upon which I wish to notice in the little time that I shall have. I gather from the letter from the author of this resolution to the secretary of the National Reform Association that the intention of this proposed amendment is primarily for the benefit of the State; that the object of the teaching of religion in the public schools is not to be given with the view of fitting the children for heaven, nor of making them Christians; but that it is rather and more particularly to fit them for this world and to make them good citizens; that it is not, religion which needs the support of the State so much as it is the State which needs the support of religion. This is the view held, I know, by some of the principal members of the National Reform Association, as, for instance, President Julius H. Seelye and Judge M. B. Hagans. These have expressed it that it is only as a political factor, and its worth only according to its "political value," that the State proposes to secure and enforce the teaching of religion in the public schools; that the object of the instruction is not "the spiritual welfare of the children," but "for the benefit of the State."

This argument appears very plausible, but it is utterly fallacious. The supreme difficulty with such a view is that it wholly robs religion of its divine sanctions and replaces them only with civil sanctions. It robs religion of its eternal purposes and makes it only a temporal expedient. From being a plan devised by divine wisdom to secure the eternal salvation of the soul, Christianity is, by this scheme, made a mere human device to effect a political purpose. And for the State to give legal and enforced sanction to the idea that the Christian religion and the belief and practice of its principles are only for temporal advantage, is for the State to put an immense premium upon hypocrisy. But there is entirely too much of this already. There is already entirely too much of the profession of religion for only what can be gained in this world by it politically, financially, and socially. Done voluntarily, as it now is, there is vastly too much of it; but for the State to sanction the evil principle, and promote the practice by adopting it as a system and inculcating it upon the minds of the very children as they grow up, would bring upon the country such a flood of corruption as it would be impossible for civil society to bear.

Let me not be misunderstood here: I do not mean to deny for an instant, but rather to assert forever, that the principles of the Christian religion received into the heart and carried out in the life will make good citizens always. But it is only because it derives its sanction

from the divine source—because it is rooted in the very soul and nourished by the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit. This, however, the State of itself can never secure. This at once carries us into the realm of conscience, upon the plane of the spiritual, and it can be secured only by spiritual forces, none of which have ever been committed to the State, but *to the church only*.

But right here there comes in an argument presented to me by a United States Senator in this Capitol, one who is in favor of this proposed amendment, too. He was speaking in favor of the amendment. I had said that religious instruction belongs wholly to the parents and to the church—that the State cannot give it because it has not the credentials for it. He replied in these words:—

"But when the family fails and the church fails, the State has to do something.

"The answer to this is easy:—

(1) To the family and to the church and to these alone the Author of the Christian religion has committed the work of teaching that religion, and if these fail, the failure is complete.

(2) The statement of the Senator implies that the State is some sort of an entity so entirely distinct from the people who compose it that the State can do for the people what they cannot do for themselves. But the State is made up only of the people who compose the State. The church likewise is made up of such of these as voluntarily choose to enter her fold. To the church is committed the Spirit of God and the ministrations of the word of God, by which only the inculcation of the Christian religion can be secured. Then, the people composing the State, and the families composing the people, and the propagation of religion and the credentials for it being committed only to the family and the church, by this it is again demonstrated that

268

when the family and the church fail to teach the Christian religion the failure is complete.

The only thing that the State can do under such circumstances is by an exertion of power, the only means at its command, to check the tide of evil for a time, but it is only checked. It is like trying to dam up any other torrent—it may be checked for a moment, only to break its bounds and become more destructive than before. The only real remedy is to begin at the fountain and purify the heart, which can be done only by the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ; for it is only faith in him that can purify the heart and cause the fountain to send

forth the sweet waters of everlasting righteousness instead of the bitter stream of evil. This work, however, is committed to the church and not to the State; to the church is given the credentials and the power for its accomplishment.

But the complaint which comes from the gentleman referred to, and which seems to be embodied in the proposed amendment, is that the church has failed to do the work which belongs only to her to do. No more stinging rebuke could be given to the professed church of Jesus Christ in the United States than is given in this despairing plea of the statesman, and no more humiliating confession ever could be made by the church than is unintentionally made by these clerical gentlemen from Boston and other places in their mission to this Capitol today to ask the State to undertake the task of teaching religion. Their mission here to-day, sir, is a confession that the professed church of Christ has failed to do that which God has appointed the church to do. It is a confession that the professed church has lost the power of God, the power of the Holy Ghost. It is a confession that she has proved unfaithful to her trust, and that now she wants to ease herself of the responsibility and pass it over to the State. But when they shall have gotten the State to take upon it-self the work of the church, what then do they intend that the church shall do? That is the next question that arises; it is an important one, too, for the State to consider, but it is easily answered. When they once get the State to carry on and support the work of the church, the next step will be to get the State to support the church, and that in idleness, as every State has ever had to do, and will ever have to do, which takes upon itself the task of teaching religion. And this is precisely the thing that the National Reform Association, whose chief secretary stands the second time to-day in this room to plead for the adoption of this resolution, proposes that the State shall do. Rev. J. M. Foster, who has been for years a "district secretary" in active service in the work of that association, declares that among the duties which the reigning Mediator requires of nations, there is this:—

"An acknowledgment and performance of the Nation's duty to guard and protect the church—by suppressing all public violations of the moral law; by maintaining a system of public schools, indoctrinating their youth in morality and virtue; by exempting church property from taxation;" and "by providing her funds out of the public treasury for carrying on her aggressive work at home, and in the *foreign* field."—*Christian Statesman, February 21, 1884.*

That is the very point to which the State will be brought as surely as it ever takes it upon itself to teach religion. Therefore, if the government of the United States wants to keep forever clear of the galling burden of a lazy, good-for-nothing church, let it keep forever clear of any attempt to teach religion.

But the statement upon which I am arguing was to the effect that if the church fails and the family fails, something must be done. Yes, it is true, something must be done; but it must be done by the church and not by the State. The church must return to her Lord. She must be endowed afresh with power from on high. Then she can take up with vigor and with prospect of assured success her long-neglected work. Let the preachers come down from their tenthousand-dollar pulpits, lay aside their gold rings, and preach the gospel of Jesus Christ in the spirit of love of the Divine Master. Let them go to the common people, to the poor, to the outcast, the neglected, and the forsaken. If to these they go in the spirit and with the mission of the Saviour, they will be heard gladly, as was he. There is no need to complain of the wickedness of the people. This Nation is not as wicked yet as was the Roman world in the day when Christ sent forth his little band of disciples. Yet as wicked as the world then was, these few men went forth armed only with the word of God and the power of his Holy Spirit, to contend against all the wickedness of the wide world; and by their abiding faith, their unabating earnestness, and their deathless zeal, they spread abroad the honors of that name to the remotest bounds of the then known world, and brought to the knowledge of the salvation of Christ multitudes of perishing men. If that little company then could do so much and so well for the then known world, what could not this great host now do for the United States, if they would but work in the same way and by the same means. Yes, gentlemen, something must be done; but it must be done by the church; for it never can be done by the State.

Gentlemen, it is perfectly safe to say that no more important question has ever come before your committee than is this one which is before you to-day. It is a question that is approaching a crisis in more than one of the States; and it is exceedingly important that the National Constitution and laws and government be kept on the side of right, and the constitutions, laws, and governments of the States shall be lifted to the level of the Nation.

A. T. J.

[To be Continued.]

**"Should Civil Laws Forbid Blasphemy?" *The American Sentinel* 4, 34 ,
pp. 269, 270.**

OUR National Reform friend, Mr. N. R. Johnston, takes us to task for printing the article in the SENTINEL No. 28, under the above heading. He says:—

"Your editorial under this head is wrong because it is all based upon a wrong definition of blasphemy. You follow the writings of civilians who know no more than you should know—and not so much. Watson says, 'There can be no blasphemy where there is not an impious purpose to derogate from the divine Majesty and to alienate the minds of others from the love of God. The blasphemer is no other than the calumniator of almighty God.' Such an act is a most heinous sin against God, and against man, against government and against its divine author, and therefore should not be tolerated but punished."

We knew at the time that the full definition of blasphemy was not given. The object of the article was to expose the evil of that part of the definition which makes blasphemy consist of speaking against the accepted religion. For that reason we did not quote the definition in full, reserving that part of it for another article which Mr. Johnston's communication demands, but which would have appeared soon even though he had not written. We quote it from the same authority from which we quoted the other; that is, "Cooley's Constitution of Limitations," He says:—

"Blasphemy has been defined as consisting in speaking evil of the Deity with an impious purpose to derogate from the divine majesty and to alienate the minds of others from the love of God."

It is seen that this definition is in substance the same as that quoted by Mr. Johnston from Watson, and therefore the distinction which he would make between the writings of civilians and those of theologians on this point, is not valid. The later part of the definition involves the speaking against the accepted religion, because when a government forbids anybody from speaking so as to alienate the minds of others from the love and reverence of God, it has to set up some form of governmental idea of God. Such governmental idea can be only that which is held by the majority in the government. And for anybody to speak in such a way as to alienate the minds of those people from that governmental idea of God is necessarily held by such government to be blasphemy. The Russian system is a case in point in which this principle appeals in its perfect baldness. As it

prohibits the speaking in any such way as to turn anybody's mind from the accepted religion, whoever does so is guilty of blasphemy and incurs the penalty of forfeiture of all civil rights and banishment to the most re-mote parts of Siberia. Any such system as that is as wicked as blasphemy itself.

Our object in this article, however, is not to defend the previous article, but to examine the merits of the other part of the definition of blasphemy not noticed in that, and that is, of its consisting in speaking with an impious purpose to derogate from the divine Majesty. We should like for our correspondent or anybody else to explain how any man's speaking against God can derogate from the divine Majesty. The majesty of Jehovah does not consist in what men give to him. He is the eternal God, and is eternal and infinite in majesty as well as in every other attribute. Then what men may or may not do cannot effect his majesty to the slightest possible degree. If all men on the earth were, to-day, to break out in the most hideous possible reviling of the Lord, that couldn't effect his majesty in the least. It would cause the further degradation of the men themselves and lessen their own dignity; but it *couldn't* effect the dignity of God nor degrade him. Before there ever was a man or intelligent creature God had all the majesty that he has now and all that he ever will have, and he would have had that majesty had man never been created.

The creation of all intelligent creatures was not with the proud, selfish purpose of building himself up, or of increasing his dignity; but it was out of love to them, that they might have the joy of eternal joy in his presence. And all these intelligences ever can do is either in gratitude to him to enjoy eternally the blessedness of that joy, or by sin to rob themselves of it. If any choose to rob themselves of it, as many have, that does not in the least derogate from the divine majesty. If any choose to enjoy it, as untold myriads have chosen, that does not add any to his majesty. He is the self-existing One. Complete in himself, in every perfection, and nothing ever can derogate from his divine majesty. Therefore such a definition of blasphemy expressing such an idea of the Deity as that he can be robbed of his divine majesty is in itself blasphemy.

The truth is, that the idea expressed in these definitions of blasphemy is wholly pagan. It is becoming only to man-made gods, as all but Jehovah have ever been. The gods of the heathen have always been only such as the heathen themselves made. When men

make a god it is evident on the face of it that all the majesty which that god can ever have is such as those men can give to him. Therefore the more worshipers that god has the more majesty he has; the fewer worshipers, the less majesty; consequently, when anybody should speak against those gods in a way to lessen men's reverence for them, this was to derogate from their majesty.

If, for instance, one of these gods had fifty thousand worshipers, he had, comparatively, a good deal of majesty; but if twenty-five thousand of these worshipers should turn against him, he would only have half as much majesty as he had before; and if *all* his worshipers should desert him he would have no majesty at all. This legal definition of blasphemy, and those who defend it, do therefore put Jehovah, the self-existent One, the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ, they do put him upon a level with all the heathen gods as one who derives his majesty from men, and one from whose majesty the words and actions of men can derogate. And as real blasphemy is to attribute to God that which is contrary to his nature, and does not belong to him, or to deny what does; and as the legal definition of blasphemy does both of these; it is demonstrated that the legal definition of blasphemy is in itself blasphemous.

But it is asked, Did not Jehovah himself for-bid blasphemy and punish it? Yes, he did and he does yet. But he never did forbid it because he is afraid he will lose some of his majesty. Not at all. He forbids it because it is sin; because it is wickedness; because it is rebellion against divine authority. And this is why it is that when civil governments undertake to punish it, they usurp the authority of God. In all the statute books on this subject it is treated as an offense against God, which only argues that the Lord is not capable of dealing with offenses against himself; that therefore the government must take it upon itself to help him. This is only again to come down to the pagan idea and put him upon a level with all the man-made gods who are incapable of dealing with offenders.

There is an old lesson upon this subject which we would sincerely commend to the careful study of judges, jurists, lawyers, and National Reformers. It is recorded in the sixth chapter of Judges. Israel had fallen into idolatry and were overrun by the Midianites. Gideon was called of the Lord to save Israel from the hand of the Midianites. The great majority of the people of his own city, and even his father, were worshipers of Baal. Gideon was directed to throw down the altar of Baal and cut down the Asherah that was by it, and build an altar unto

the Lord, and take a young bullock and offer it for a burnt offering and to burn it with the wood of the Baalim which he had dethroned. And because there were so many of the idol worshipers there, he did not dare to do it in the day time and did it at night. When the people arose the next morning, and went out to worship, they found their gods were destroyed. Somebody had derogated immensely from the majesty of Baal. Such a thing as that could not be suffered. They set on foot a diligent investigation to discover the one who had so wickedly blasphemed. "And when they inquired and asked, they said, Gideon the son of Joash hath done this thing. Then the men of the city said unto Joash, bring out thy son, that he may die; because he hath cast down the altar of Baal, and because he hath cut down the grove that was by it. And Joash said unto all that stood against him, will ye plead for Baal? Will ye save him? . . . *If he be a god let him plead for himself*, because one hath cast down his altar." Joash was wise. That decision is sound. It would be well if the legislators and the judges of the different States in the United States were up to the same level and would allow that, when offenses are committed against the Lord, he is capable of dealing with those offenses himself. Let them leave such questions entirely to the Lord, and thus show that they really believe him to be what they profess to believe he is.

Civil laws against blasphemy are becoming only to pagan and papal systems; the one, hav-

270

ing only such gods as they make themselves, whose gods only derive their majesty from men and have only such as men give them; the other, recognizing a living and self-existence God yet usurps his authority and his prerogative. The government of the United States, with which that of all the States should be put in harmony, is distinct from both these and by its Constitution absolutely forbidding religious tests, and religious legislation, stands in harmony with the word of Jehovah, the living and true God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of sinners, whose majesty is his own, eternal and infinite, and never can be derogated from; and who can deal with offenders without any of the jury-meddling mediumship of earthly governments.

A. T. J.

"The Puritan Theocracy" *The American Sentinel* 4, 34 , p. 270.

MR. JOHN FISK has lately published a book on the "Beginnings of New England, or the Puritan Theocracy in its Religious and Civil Liberty." He well and abundantly shows what it would seem no one in these days should be disposed to deny, that is, that "the faults of the Puritan theocracy, which found its most complete development in Massachusetts, are so glaring that it is idle to seek to palliate or explain them away," and that the aim of the Puritans "in coming to Massachusetts was the construction of a theocratic State which should be to Christians under the New Testament dispensation all that the theocracy of Moses and Joshua and Samuel had been to the Jews in Old Testament days." Pp. vi. and 146. Such truths, however, are not acceptable to some Calvinists even at this day. The *Interior* objects to this and criticises the theory. It cites the dedication of the national monument a short time ago at Plymouth, and says that in that, "no such ideas found expression or even an indorsement by implication," and that "further and more definitely the orator at the dedication took issue with the historian by declaring that these devout emigrants did not believe in a theocratic State any more than a secularized church."

The orator referred to was the Hon. W. C. P. Breckinridge, member of Congress from Kentucky and a member of the Presbyterian Church.

The *Interior* quotes from the orator the following words:—

"No historian has given to those who first suffered for the sublime truth, that human freedom was impossible except by the separation of Church and State, that place of eminence which is by right theirs. This is the truth to which the pilgrim fathers testified. This truth they first brought to America; this is their true honor; this their fadeless crown. The company 'which came over in the *Mayflower*' was of the Calvinistic Protestant Church. Its peculiarity was that it was a separatist church. It was purely English. It differed alike from the Catholic and English Church, including the Puritans in the English Church, and the difference was wide, fundamental and irreconcilable. It involved nothing less than the whole question of enforced or free religion, the difference which separated and still separates the State churches from the free. What is involved in this belief? That the Church is a voluntary, spiritual association, to be governed only by the laws of Christ, and entirely free, as church, from the domination of the State. The honor due to the Plymouth fathers is that they first brought that truth as a practical, vital principle of governmental life to

this continent. It was an immense stride when this separation was won."

This may be admitted to be true as it is stated, but the difficulty with it is that even though true, as far as it goes, it tells but half of the truth. It is true that they held that the Church is a voluntary spiritual association to be governed only by the laws of Christ and entirely free as a Church from the domination of the State. But it is *not* true that they believed or held in any way that the State should be free from the domination of the Church, and that is just what makes the half truth.

In stating a people's belief in the separation of Church and State, it is not enough to say that they do not believe in the churches being free from the domination of the State. To state the whole truth in such a case, it must be said that they do not believe in the domination of the State by the Church. There is a union of Church and State when the Church dominates the State as certainly as there is when the State dominates the Church. And in talking of a theocracy it is not at all a correct expression of a separation of Church and State to say that the Church is free from the domination of the State.

Properly speaking, the domination of the Church by the State is not a theocracy. A theocracy is only where the religious element dominates the civil. And when speaking of a theocracy the only correct statement of a belief in the separation of Church and State is to say that it is a belief in the total separation of religious and civil things; that the religious shall not interfere with, nor control, nor use the civil power for its own purposes in anything.

In the line of its own criticism and of the above thought of the orator, the *Interior* says:—

"The interference of a temporal ruler with spiritual matters or the holding of a church service under State authority and patronage becomes intolerable to those who have conceived the thought of worshiping God according to the dictates of their own consciences."

That is all true. And in addition to this it is also true that the interference of a spiritual ruler with civil matters, or the holding of State service under Church authority and direction, is intolerable to those who have conceived the thought of worshiping God according to the dictates of their own consciences, as well as to those who have conceived the thought of not worshiping God at all.

The truth of this whole subject is expressed in these three sentences: The State dominating religion and using religion for State purposes is the pagan idea. Religion denominating the State and

using the civil power for religious purposes is the papal idea. The total clear-cut and distinct separation of religion and the State, as the United States Constitution has it, is *the Christian idea*. A. T. J.

September 25, 1889

"It Is Indeed a Union" *The American Sentinel* 4, 35 , p. 273.

IN the Missouri Sunday-law convention Rev. Mr. Tallow said:—

"Neither the civil power as God's ordinance, nor the civil ruler as God's minister, within its special province, has any authority as such, to make void any of the ten commandments, whether by neglect in enforcing them or by indifference to their authority and claims. At this point, the party of civil policy protests and cries out that this is uniting Church and State. The Christian replies, it is indeed a union, but only so far as two separate jurisdictions—the one spiritual and primary, and the other secular and secondary—exercise each one its own appropriate authority, within its own individual province, to secure a two-fold good to the twofold life of man. This union, therefore, is like the union of the spiritual in man acting conjointly with the body of man, the body being brought under and kept in subjection to the spiritual."

That is precisely such a union of Church and State as the Papacy advocates. The statement is almost word for word, as is the statement of the papal claims on the same point. The papal claim is, that the two powers in the world are the spiritual and the secular. That the spiritual is the church, and the temporal is the State. That the spiritual is superior to the temporal, and, as in the body man's temporal concern must be subject to the spiritual, so in the world the temporal power must be subject to the spiritual. The State must be subject to the church; and the temporal power, the State, must be brought under and kept in subjection to the spiritual, the church. And therefore, the Pope as head of the spiritual power is superior to kings who are the heads of the temporal. Consequently, all civil rulers must be subject to the Pope.

There is not a shadow of difference between the papal theory and this so distinctly set forth by Mr. Tatlow. It is indeed a union. A union of the most vital sort, a union as close as is the union of the spiritual and the physical in man. And this is the deliberate view set forth in a written essay by a representative speaker in the Missouri State convention which was called to organize, and which did organize, a State Sabbath Union auxiliary to the American Sabbath Union, and at

which the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union was present. Mr. Tatlow's view of this relationship, however, is not at all distinct in principle from that stated by the American Sabbath Union himself. He puts it up under the illustration of the two arms of the body, the religious being the right arm and the civil being the left arm. Mr. Tallow only more clearly expresses how closely and intimately the two arms are expected to act together. And how the left arm is to be guided by the right arm, and kept in subordination to it. And then in the face of these plain statements of their own they will still put on an air of innocence injured almost to holy martyrdom, when we say to the people that the Sunday-law movement bears in itself a union of Church and State, with all that history shows that that term implies.

We have known all the time that it is indeed a union in which the spiritual is intended to be primary and the secular secondary. We have known all the time that it is indeed a union in which the secular authority is to be brought under and kept in subjection to the spiritual. This is what the SENTINEL has been telling the people for these four years. And now it comes forth plainly in their own words. And yet we doubt not that when we thus print it, and send it forth, that they will again deny that they intend to bring about a union of Church and State, or that their movement has any tendency whatever in that direction.

A. T. J.

"An Inadmissible Admission" *The American Sentinel* 4, 35 , p. 274.

The Cumberland Presbyterian Church, at its General Assembly in Kansas City, last May, amongst its resolutions passed the following on the subject of the liquor traffic:—

Resolved, That, admitting that it is a crime, it cannot be legalized without sin. It cannot be licensed without legalizing it. Therefore to vote for license is sin.

This is a fair sample of the predicament into which men get when they undertake to create sins. It is probable that to their own satisfaction, that General Assembly has decided that to vote for license is sin. And, probably, that General Assembly is prepared to deal with the man who votes for a license as with a sinner, and to consign him to the place where all sinners are to go, except they repent.

But, have they proved that to vote for license is sin? The conclusion in a syllogism is always as good as the premises, but it is

never any better, and it can't be any better. What then, is the premise in this one? Major: Admitting that it is a crime, it cannot be legalized without sin. Minor: It cannot be licensed without legalizing it. Therefore to vote for license is sin. The whole thing depends upon the major, "admitting that it is a crime." But suppose that is not admitted, then what? Then neither the minor nor the conclusion follows. So that all that syllogism amounts to, and all that the resolution amounts to in fact is, that if it be admitted that to vote for license is sin, then it is sin. But even that doesn't follow, because it may be admitted that a certain thing, because it may be admitted that a certain thing is sin when there may be no sin about it.

More than this. A thing may be admitted to be a crime and yet it be not sin at all. It is a crime in nearly every State in this Union to work on Sunday, and a good many people are doing their best to make it a crime anywhere in all the Nation. But to work on Sunday is not sin. An act may be a crime and yet not in any way a sin. To be a Christian in the days of Paul, in the Roman Empire, was to be guilty of the highest crime—*crimen majestatis*. But there were multitudes of people who committed that crime and yet were sinless in it.

Crime is a violation of human law—a law of the State. And human laws—laws of the State—may forbid that which is right, as the Roman Empire did when it prohibited the worship of any gods but such as were recognized by the Roman law; and as the different States of this Union do when they prohibit work on Sunday. For the Christians to worship God in the Roman Empire in the first two centuries was a crime, but it was not sin. For people to work on Sunday in nearly all the States is a crime, but it is not sin. Consequently, admitting a thing to be a crime does not at all admit it to be sin. It may be sin. But whether it is does not at all depend upon men's admitting that it is, but upon whether God says it is. If God says a thing is sin, it is sin, whether it be admitted or not, and whether it be a crime or not. And what God does not say is sin is not sin, even though it be admitted to be a crime.

We freely admit that the liquor traffic is sin, whether it is a crime or not depends upon what the State laws say. The liquor traffic is a crime in this country only in Iowa, Kansas, and Maine. In none of the other States is it a crime, because the State does not prohibit it.

Again: This resolution says, "Admitting that it is a crime, it can't be legalized without sin." But whether it is a crime or not, depends upon whether it is legal or not. If it is legalized, it is not crime. If it is

forbidden, it is crime. Consequently, the admission is not admissible unless the law declares the fact, and if the law declares it, then it is a crime whether it be admitted or not.

This resolution illustrates the absurdities into which men run when they confound crime and sin, and religious with civil things, as the third party prohibition element does. It also shows what the SENTINEL has constantly affirmed, that, if prohibition were secured upon the basis upon which it is demanded by the third party prohibition element, the condition of affairs would actually be worse than they are now. Prohibition, on a civil basis, is right. But prohibition upon a religious basis,—the liquor traffic prohibited because it is irreligious or because it is immoral, or because it is a sin,—would introduce into the body politic such a confusion of elements as would, in a little while, prove the remedy to be ten thousand times worse than the disease.

A. T. J.

October 2, 1889

"That Washington Preamble" *The American Sentinel* 4, 36 , pp. 281, 282.

WE print in this number of the SENTINEL a report of the debate in the Constitutional Convention of Washington on the preamble to the pro-posed constitution of that State. This debate is of special interest to more people of this country than simply the people of the State of Washington. In view of the demand that is being made for a religious amendment to the National Constitution, the arguments used and the result in the Washington convention are worthy of careful study. It is evident that the opponents of the religious idea had by long odds the best of the argument. Not only so, but these stood solely upon principle, while those who favored it openly confessed that it was a mere matter of sentiment, while some of them went so far as to make it a matter of temporal gain and even of political party influence. Those members of the convention who had most respect for religion and for God as a matter of principle, were opposed to the religious preamble while those who had least respect for religion, whether in principle or in practice, were the ones who favored it most.

For instance, Mr. Warner, the chairman of the committee on preamble, is a member of the church and is a gentleman in whose

life, religion and respect for God are matters of abiding principle; and because this is so he consistently opposed any sentimental or conjuring use of the holy name. On the other hand, Mr. J. Z. Moore, who had so little respect for God, or religion, or the convention, or himself, as to have a keg of whisky sent all the way from Kentucky for use during the convention, and openly advertised it in the convention on a question of privilege, and made use of it there,—he, consistently enough, *favored* the substitute in order to prevent "a bad example to the youth of the growing State!" These two cases form as good an illustration of the respective merits of the two sides of this question as can ever be found.

The arguments proposed in favor of the religious substitute are worthy of brief notice. Thus Mr. Cosgrove wanted the name of God in the preamble as an immigration scheme, and to sustain this idea, he presented the plea that "the people of the East believed that Washington Territory was a heathen land," and are "only now commencing to learn that the people of Washington Territory are civilized and enlightened." We would simply remark, that if Mr. Cosgrove expects by constitutional provisions to instruct the people of the East in regard to the State of Washington he has got a bigger task on his hands than he will ever get through with.

In his second speech, Mr. Cosgrove made it a political party matter and a bid for votes by arguing that "The party which organized this convention, from president to page, would be held responsible for all that was left out as well as all that was put into this constitution; and might find itself needing votes for this document from the very people who would withhold them from it unless a simple recognition of the Supreme Being was in."

Mr. Turner, the other one of the three chief advocates of the substitute, first stated that "it was a matter of sentiment, he admitted," but afterward declared that "it was from the highest motives of duty" that he offered the substitute. Yet neither his religious sentiment nor his motives of duty prevented him from getting roiled at Mr. Sullivan's incisive speech. If it had been a matter of religious principle rather than of sentiment with Mr. Turner, he would have been enabled to keep his temper; yet if it had been a platter of religious principle and real respect for the Lord, he would neither have offered nor supported the substitute that he both: offered and supported.

This is further shown by the fact that those who favored the substitute started out with a professed respect for Almighty God and

proposed to be grateful to him, but yet they had not gone far before they admitted that it mattered not whether it was He who was recognized or not, just so it was somebody. Mr. Dyer, who presented one of the substitutes that caused all the debate, in arguing for it said he "believed in beginning this great constitution by recognizing the Supreme Being, whether as God, Allah, or Jehovah, and express gratitude to him. Mr. Cosgrove argued in the same line, to the effect that "the man who is not accountable to a Diety pf some kind is unsafe in any community." And all the rest who were so strongly sentimental in their favor to Almighty God were willing to compromise, as Dyer and Cosgrove were, upon "God, Allah, or Jehovah," or "a Diety of some kind;" all of which conclusively shows that none of those who so strongly favored the substitute had any definite idea of whom Almighty God is, nor who it was to whom they proposed to be grateful. And so far was their action from being a tribute of respect or gratitude to Almighty God, indeed, that the whole thing was precisely what Mr. E. H. Sullivan called it, just "stuff and nonsense; and was not far removed from blasphemy. Blasphemy is not only "denying that which is due

282

and belonging to God," but is "attributing to him that which is not agreeable to his nature." And to attribute to God such a sentiment or character as to imply that he would receive as a token of gratitude to him, and thus make himself a party to, an act done merely as an immigration scheme or for political party effect, is nothing else than to make him as they themselves were, mere politicians; and was certainly to attribute to him that which is not in any sense agreeable to his nature.

We have said that this is important to the people outside of the State of Washington, in view of the fast growing demand for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States embodying the same ideas, or proposing to recognize religion in some way in that instrument. In view of the result in the Washington convention, it is not by any means a groundless fear that when such a proposition comes before Congress, it will be passed, and for the same reasons, supported by the same arguments, and by the same kind of men. Nor is it by any means an extravagant conjecture that when Congress shall pass such a measure, it will be adopted by the people.

It may be said by others as it was by its advocates in the convention, that being a mere matter of sentiment, it will not amount

to anything either way. But before many years there will be questions before the Supreme Court of Washington that will demonstrate that that thing is much more than a mere sentiment and will amount to a good deal. Mr. Turner, who so strongly advocated the sentiment, is spoken of as a candidate for the Supreme Court, and if, upon a question of religion before the Supreme Court, his influence should prevail, the first effect of this supposed sentiment would be the establishment of a religion and the enforcement of its observance. It is not a harmless thing. It has proved to be a very harmful thing in New York, and other States. That part of the preamble to their constitution ought to be decisively rejected by the people of Washington.

A. T. J.

September 25, 1889

"Back Page" *The American Sentinel* 4, 36 , p. 288.

THE *Christian Nation* of June 26, 1889, has an editorial entitled, "The Preachers and the Politicians," in which it says:—

"The late contest in Pennsylvania over the Prohibition amendment, was emphatically a trial of strength as to who should control the people of that State, the preachers or the politicians. . . . It was preacher against politician, and the politician won by a tremendous majority. . . The lines are being drawn between the followers of the preachers and of the politicians and every moment that hastens such division is beneficial."

This is not a correct statement as to the real fact of the Pennsylvania campaign. But admitting the *Nation's* statement of the case, we say that that is precisely what the SENTINEL has been showing in regard to the Prohibition party all along. We have been saying all the time that the third party prohibition movement was only a stepping-stone to help the preachers to power over the people. Whenever preachers undertake to influence or control people by any other means than the meekness and gentleness of Christ, they are dangerous. And in any contest for political power by which to control people, they are more dangerous than those who are politicians only. The control of the people by earthly governments is political. It is properly the work of politicians. It is not the work of the preacher, and the preacher has no right to enter into any contest with the politician to gain that control. To the twelve original preachers and to all other's

who should ever come after them Christ said: "Ye know that they which think good to rule over the Gentiles exercise, lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them, but so *shall it NOT be among you.*" This is the word of Jesus Christ. Everybody who respects Christ should respect that word. And by that word it is proven that whenever a preacher enters into any contest with politicians, as to who shall control the people, he is out of his place.
A. T. J.

October 9, 1889

"Some News" *The American Sentinel* 4, 37 , p. 290, 291.

THE *Denver News* says the AMERICAN SENTINEL "is doing great injury to the cause of the masses of America by discouraging the right to a day each week for worship, rest, or innocent recreation." This will be news indeed to the readers of the SENTINEL, as every intelligent reader of the SENTINEL well knows that its work is and always has been to *assert* the right of every man to these very things. What the SENTINEL denies is the right of the State or any other earthly power to compel any man to rest who does not *want* to rest, or to compel him to rest *when he* does not want to, or to compel him to rest or worship or recreate to suit the majority. The SENTINEL has never denied nor discouraged the right of any man to rest or worship or take innocent recreation when he pleases, as he pleases, and as much as he pleases; but it forever denies the right of the State to compel those who do not want to do any of these things to do them in order to please those who do want to do them. The SENTINEL denies the right of the State to rob any man of his right to follow his honest occupation at all times. It denies the wisdom of Acts which make crimes of honest occupations, and it denies the justice of any system of law that punishes the honest, industrious citizen equally with the thief and the vagabond.

Another statement of the *News* that will be equally newsy to the readers of the SENTINEL is that this paper "is doing efficient work for he enemies of all religion." Why! the SENTINEL itself is a religious paper. We know it is doing efficient work; but as for doing efficient work for the enemies of *all* religion, this is a mistake. For the true religion, the religion of Jesus Christ, the SENTINEL'S sole endeavor is to do the most efficient work that it possibly can. And against every

effort to support religion by the State or to enforce its sanctions or observances by civil law, the SENTINEL endeavors to do as efficient work as it possibly can. Any government which sets itself to aid, support or enforce the sanctions or observances of religion, is itself an enemy of all true religion; and he is the best friend to true religion who is most opposed to any such system. Any religious rite or institution whose observance cannot be secured without resort to the civil power, ought not to be observed at all. Any religion that cannot sustain itself or its observances in the world without the aid of civil government is unworthy of the consideration of mankind.

As those who are working most strenuously for Sunday legislation, are doing it professedly in the Christian name; and as the movement can only do the more harm to the Christian name as it becomes the more popular and powerful; so those who most love Christ will oppose the movement most. That is what the SENTINEL opposes and this is why we oppose it. And those who know the most about true Christianity will easily understand our opposition the best. Opposition to false religion is not opposition to all religion. Opposition to false forms of the true religion is not opposition to all religion. Opposition to false methods of securing conformity to false forms of the true religion is not opposition to all religion. Opposition to false methods of securing conformity to even the true forms of the true religion, is not at all opposition to all religion. Will the *News* please note; for this is the opposition which the SENTINEL conducts. A. T. J.

October 16, 1889

"Another 'Boycott'" *The American Sentinel* 4, 38 , pp. 297, 298.

THE Pacific Press Publishing House is an institution established in Oakland, Cal., and is the largest one on the Pacific Coast. The *Morning Times* is a leading daily of the city of Oakland. The *Popular Railroad Guide* is a monthly publication. The owners of the *Guide* get their printing done on contract by the Pacific Press. The daily *Morning Times* advertises in the *Guide*. The labor unions made several attempts to get the Pacific Press Publishing House to join some of their organizations. The Pacific Press wouldn't do it. Then the unions tried by a boycott to force it to do so, but the Press was as independent of their boycott as it was of their unions in the first place. Then they undertook to boycott those who did business with the

Press. A certain Pope, not Leo XIII. but one John L., took it upon himself to command the owner of the *Guide* to take away from the Press the work of publishing the *Guide*. The owner of the *Guide* replied that the publishing of the *Guide* was offered to the principal union job office in Oakland and declined on the ground that it was unprovided with the necessary plant; then the Pacific Press was invited to bid upon the work. It did so and the bid was accepted, but the bid of the Pacific Press was not as low as the bids of other and union offices. This Pope was informed, however, that the owners of the *Guide* had received a bid lately from a union job office which was willing to establish the necessary plant, and that they would make the change provided the Typographical Union would bear one-half of the expense of making the change, which would be \$200, the total expense being \$400. This offer was promptly declined, yet flip change was insisted upon under penalty of a boycott. But the owners of the *Guide* would not break their contract, especially when they had no place else to get the work done. Then, as the boycott upon the Press was declared to be such as to reach all who patronize the house either directly or indirectly, and as the *Morning Times* advertised in the *Guide*, the boycotters next demanded that the *Times* should stop advertising in the *Guide*, and this under penalty of a boycott. The *Times* replied in the following forcible article, which we fully indorse in its every sentiment:—

"The tyranny of labor is the most oppressive that has ever been exercised by human ingenuity, when unscrupulous or ill-advised men hold the reins of power.

"The 'boycott' is the weapon by which the more reckless and ruthless of the labor demagogues seek to achieve objects which they know could not be attained by fair arbitration or honest argument before the jury of the people.

"Acting upon a principle derogatory to the best interests of organized labor, the Alameda County Federation of Trades has issued a circular, 'boycotting' not only the publication known as the *Popular Railroad Guide*, but against the *Times* and others who advertise in the pamphlet. The reason for this 'boycott' is because the *Guide* is printed at the Pacific Press, an institution which the circular says 'is notorious for its opposition to, and oppression of labor, humiliating and degrading its hired help by every means in its power, and under the garb of religion enforcing the violation of the Sabbath

and acquiring large properties from the profits they are enabled to make through the oppression and ill-pay of its employes.'

"Here is arrogance, bigotry, and demagoguery ex-pressed within the space of a few lines. By what right does the Alameda Federation of Trades, or any other organization, whether *of* labor or otherwise, assume to dictate the Sabbath of this nation? Whence do they derive the privilege *of* ordering the religious observance of any sect, in defiance of a plain provision of the Constitution of the United States, guaranteeing to every citizen the right to worship his God in any manner he may see fit. The fact that the Federation of Trades proposes to boycott the *Times* and other advertisers in the *Popular Railroad Guide*, a publication printed at a 'boycotted' concern known as the Pacific Press, is only secondary in impudence to this wanton attack upon a religious community, composed of citizens as privileged as the high and mighty Federation of Trades itself.

"That the *Times* and other advertisers are under contract with the publisher of the *Guide*, seems to bear no weight with the tyrants of organized labor. They 'appeal' that we 'withdraw' our advertisement. This 'appeal,' in the presence of the previously expressed threat to 'enforce a boycott against all who deal with or patronize the place, *whether* directly *or* indirectly,' is in fact a demand that we shall injure our business by lessening our opportunities of informing the public that we are printing the best newspaper, with the largest circulation, in Alameda County. The demand is absurd, and we refuse to accede to it. We claim the right as American citizens to advertise where, when, and how we see fit, even to the extent of resisting an arrogant and tyrannical 'boycott.' We refuse to bow down to the presence *of* this 'boycott,' because we have never yet yielded to threats or intimidation. We refuse to 'withdraw' our advertisement from the *Popular Railroad Guide*, because the 'boycott' is cowardly and un-American. We refuse to accede to the miscalled 'appeal' of the Federation of Trades, because they openly avow their opposition to the religious privileges of a sect who see

298

fit to differ from the members of the Federation in regard to the observance of a day for the worship of their God. As well might the Federation of Trades 'boycott' our Jewish citizens for refusing to observe this same so-called 'Sabbath' for religious purposes.

"The Seventh-day Adventists, against whom this 'boycott' is mainly directed, are peaceable, law-abiding, honest, industrious citizens, earning a livelihood in their own way, fully within the pale of the constitution of this State and country, and they are thus fortified against organized conspiracy by men who, in thus threatening their

fellow-citizens with the cowardly and tyrannical 'boycott,' remove their cause entirely outside the sympathy and beyond the support of any decent community where 'patriotism and a sense of justice' prevail. Now let the 'boycott' proceed."

The boycott is a relic of the Inquisition, when that wicked despotism chose to curse everybody who didn't yield to the dictation of *the* pope, and then to curse everybody who wouldn't curse these. It is a proper thing that a Pope should be at the head of this thing in Oakland, because the very principle of the thing is popish. The real true popery of this act is clearly exposed in the fact that this Pope plainly stated in his letter to the owners of the *Guide* that he was 'not officially instructed to write' to them on the matter, thus showing that his action was wholly an arbitrary assumption of power. This popery is also revealed in his insisting that the owners of the *Guide* should take their work away from the Pacific Press, when there was no other place to take it. In other words, insisting that they should abolish their publication, stop their business; and all to conform to the arbitrary wish of these unions as expressed by this Pope. If the unions have any respect for themselves they would do well to canonize this Pope and "fire" him, and with him all the popish ways and principles that have hitherto too closely attached to trades unionism.

A. T. J.

"He Withdrew Himself" *The American Sentinel* 4, 38 , p. 298.

THE State Convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Minnesota was held at Duluth, September 11 and 12. The following extract from the speech of the president, Mrs. H. A. Hobart, sets forth the aims of the W. C. T. U. It can be depended on, for it was copied from her manuscript:—

"If the interest and welfare of the people and their advancement in social, civil, and religious power, with their growth, manufactories, commerce, agriculture, arts and sciences, have any place in the policy of this government, and our life nationally is not to be a farce and travesty, a sort of political comedy played for the benefit of the few hundred millionaires and monopolists, then the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is right in standing as it does 'with malice toward none and charity for all,' using every item of influence which it possesses for the upbuilding of righteousness in the prohibition of the legalized liquor traffic by whatever political party has the courage and manhood to do it.

"But what political party shall thus lead for 'God and home and humanity'? Has it been born? Has it a name? With what radiant entablature shall it come forth ramifying all parties, and uniting not only the memories of the blue and the gray in our 'sweet dream of peace,' but moulding all the manhood and womanhood of the North and South in marshaled force and power against the common foe of each? Whatever name such a party shall bear, or wherever it shall appear, one or two facts in reference to its advent are self-evident. This coming party, the advocate of truth and righteousness, of the equality of the sexes before the law with one code of morals for men and women, will be the child of the Prohibition party and Woman's Christian; and its most royal, inflexible, and foremost principles of platform will be the recognition of God in the government, and the constitutional prohibition of the liquor traffic, and everything that degrades humanity.

"While we wait for the coming of such a party, what are the W.C.T.U. doing. Will they who by prayer and faith and well-directed effort made the coming of such a party a moral certainty, rest on the record of past achievement? Oh no! A thousand times no. They are praying more earnestly and instantly. They are studying God's word more carefully. They are instructing the children in scientific temperance more diligently. They are bearing to the prisoners and to the victims of strong drink words of help and hope. They are securing these brands from the burning more tenderly, as with mother love they lead them to the crucified One. They are mastering the mysteries of State statute laws and unraveling the labyrinths of man-made penal codes. . . . But when the influence of the blessed gospel shall have permeated lands and climes and lives, and like the leaven which you know a woman took and hid in three measures of meal until the whole was leavened,—then when Christ shall be king of this world's customs and commerce, king of its revenues and its resources, king of its farms and its factories, king of its mints and mines, king of its press and its politics, king of its courts, its judges, its juries, and its laws, then shall we, in our sun-bright home in the glory land, begin to have some idea of the greatness of this foundation work, this Woman's Christian Temperance Union work to which God has called us. Then too shall we have some appreciation of the value of that unflinching determination of some men of to-day who, rising above all selfish considerations, labor, and pray, and vote for a pure political party. So by God's grace we are doing the very work that none could do, and which angels might well desire to do."

This repeats and enlarges somewhat in the matter of particulars, Miss Willard's declaration a few years ago that "Christ shall be this world's king." They seem determined, just like those worldly-minded

and politically-ambitious people of old, to take him by force and make him king.

These women should draw lessons *now* from the fact that *then* he withdrew himself from them (John 6:15); and the more clamorous are their efforts to make him king the further he will withdraw himself. And, too, Mrs. Hobart thinks that in this they are doing a work which angels might desire to do. It may be so but if it is so it must be "the angels which kept not their first estate."

A. T. J.

"Queer 'Americanship'" *The American Sentinel* 4, 38 , p. 299.

IN the *California Prohibitionist* of September 11, 1889, somebody who signs himself "Christian Citizen," and says that he is not a Roman Catholic, indorses the assertion of the Roman Catholic Church that "our public schools are godless," and protests, "in the name of Protestant, Christian Americanship, against the continuance of such an outrage against the home, the State, and God;" and loudly exclaims, also in the line of Roman Catholicism, "Let there be a division of the school fund." This person, however, asks that there shall be a division of the fund into but two parts. He says:—

"Let one portion of it be used for the support of such schools as at present exist, where infidels, and scoffers, and patriots of the Harcourt stripe—may send their children if they like; and let the other portion be devoted to the support of schools in which the principles of morality and Christianity, as laid down in the Bible, shall be taught without sectarian bias."

That is to say that the school fund should be divided into two parts, one part to be given to those who do not believe as he does, and the other part to him and those who *do* believe as he does. Oh yes, true patriotism never appears more glorious than when *I* am the patriot and *I* the one to be delivered from oppression! Unselfishness never appears more truly sublime than when I can unselfishly demand that half the public school fund shall be appropriated, applied, and used to support my views of religion and what religious instruction ought to be!

What this "Christian citizen" means by "patriots of the Harcourt stripe" is explained by the fact that Rev. Dr. Harcourt, of San Francisco, has been delivering a series of Sunday evening discourses, in opposition to the Roman Catholic demands for religion in the public schools or else a division of the school fund. Dr. Harcourt

consistently and patriotically holds that the public school is for the public. That as the public school funds are drawn by taxation from all classes, without discrimination or preference, so they shall be applied.

It would be a real good thing if those who profess religion could recognize the fact that no man gains any additional civil right or privilege by virtue of his religious profession. If there is not virtue enough in his religion to pay him for professing it, without demanding that the civil power should pay him, then there certainly is not enough virtue in it to *pay* for forcing it on somebody else.

A. T. J.

"Sectarian Control" *The American Sentinel* 4, 38 , p. 300.

WE here present the section of the proposed constitution of the State of Washington which relates to religion in the public schools, with the discussion had upon it at its adoption by the constitutional convention:—

Section 4. All schools maintained or supported, wholly or in part, by the public funds shall be forever free from sectarian control or influence.

Comegys moved to amend by adding these words: "And no religious exercise or instruction shall be permitted therein;" and argued in favor of that proposition. "Sectarian" had been decided by the courts as not prohibiting the reading of the Bible, or prayers. That was not toleration to Jews, Catholics, agnostics, Mohammedans, and several other creeds and sects, who were entitled to it as much as Protestants, and he would not believe there could be any serious objection to his amendment.

Blalock thought the section was broad enough.

Comegys asked if Blalock thought that the section would exclude the reading of the Bible, and prayers.

Blalock thought it would.

Comegys said that if the gentlemen would give him a little time he would bring him decisions from several States holding directly opposite opinions.

Dyer thought this might exclude religious meetings in school-houses in several districts, but Comegys said "public schools" did not mean "public school-houses."

Stiles suggested "religious" for "sectarian," and Comegys agreed.

Cosgrove thought this might exclude any teacher from employment who had any decided religious views of his own. He had a running fire of questions from Comegys until T. M. Reed raised a point of order against the colloquy, and then Cosgrove proceeded and finished his remarks.

Sturdevant didn't think this would trouble any teacher unless he wanted to teach his views. If there was doubt as to this language, and the chairman of the committee (Blalock) admitted that his committee intended to exclude the Bible and prayers in schools, why not so amend that no doubt could exist as to the meaning of the language used.

Godman didn't see how anything could exclude religious "influence." Christianity and religion were not necessarily identical. A brainy man would have influence over his pupils anyhow. "Control" was all that the constitution could prohibit.

Comegys only wanted to prohibit religious exercises in public schools, but was called to order for speaking two or three times on the question.

Turner put on the brakes by moving the previous question, and it was ordered.

Stiles offered to withdraw his amendment, but Power objected, and Stiles' motion failed on a vote of 20 to 33. Absent and not voting 22.

Moore moved to strike out the last two words, "or influence," and roll-call was ordered on that, resulting in failure by ayes 11, nays 39.

The section was agreed to.

If the intention is to exclude religious exercises, prayers, the reading of the Bible, etc, from the public schools of the State of Washington, it is certain that this section will not accomplish that object unless the State of Washington shall be blessed with judges who have juster views of things than those have had in the States where the courts have been called upon to pass upon this question. The Supreme Courts of Maine, Massachusetts, and Iowa, and the judge of the Twelfth Circuit of the State of Wisconsin, have all held that the reading of the Bible, and prayers, could be conducted in the public schools under constitutions containing the same or like provisions with this. And the Supreme Court of Massachusetts even went so far as to sustain compulsory bowing of the head at time of prayer.

Mr. Blalock was chairman of the committee that recommended this section, and as his intention clearly was to exclude all these things, it is singular that he should object to framing the section so as to say so. Mr. Comegys and Mr. Stiles were clearly right in proposing the word "religious" instead of "sectarian." However, as "the intention of the lawgiver is the law;" and as the intention of these was that religious exercises should be excluded; if this intention shall have any weight with the courts of the State, then the schools may be kept clear of religious interference. And as section eleven of the Bill of Rights says "that no public money or property shall be appropriated for, or applied to, any religious worship, exercise, or instruction, it would seem that the public schools of the State of Washington may be kept clear of religious interference. Yet there is so much judge-made law in this country that it is not safe to trust any constitutional provision to intention. If a thing is intended it ought to be stated. The makers of the Washington constitution should have made that section to say what they intend shall be done.

A. T. J.

"That Exception" *The American Sentinel* 4, 38 , p. 300.

IN the *Christian Statesman* of August 1, Rev. M. A. Gault, district secretary of the National Reform Association and of the American Sabbath Union, gave a report of work in Kansas in behalf of a National Sunday law. He said he "presented the Sabbath movement at a union service of all the Nortonville churches" June 16, then said:—

"There is a Seventh-day Baptist congregation here which exerts an unfavorable influence upon Sabbath observance."

Now the petition in which Mr. Gault and the Sunday-law workers ask for a National Sunday law, proposes to exempt from its provisions those who religiously and regularly observe another day. But Seventh-day Baptists do religiously and regularly observe another day. They observe it much more religiously than nine-tenths of those who keep Sunday, and yet Mr. Gault complains that they exert an unfavorable influence upon Sabbath observance.

This shows at a glance all the virtue there is in that proposed exception in the petition. It is only a ruse which is employed to attract the attention and allay the opposition of the seventh day people until the law is secured. Then it will be found at once that all observance of another day exerts an unfavorable influence upon Sabbath

observance; and all such unfavorable influences will be speedily checked. For the seventh-day people to consent to any such proposed exceptions as the Sunday-law petition proposes to offer, is to put themselves into the power of the Sunday-law workers and managers. It is to surrender themselves and all their rights, civil and religious, bodily into the hands of these men. The very kind favors which these men pretend so generously to hold forth in order the more easily to obtain the power which they seek, will be considered in a far different light when they once secure the power. In the effort to secure their coveted power it is to their interest to allay as far as possible every element of opposition. There is nothing that they hate more than an open free discussion of the principles which they advocate, but when they shall have secured the power and such opposition is no longer to be feared, then any such compromise will be counted by them as only treason to their cause. We think that the seventh-day people are wide enough awake to see this, and if it should be so that any of them are not, then we pity them and confess ourselves disappointed.

The truth is that the proposed exception in the National Sunday-law petition is one of its very wickedest features, and those to whom it is offered can never afford to accept it.

A. T. J.

"The State and the Church" *The American Sentinel* 4, 38 , pp. 300, 301.

IN the *Christian Statesman* of August 22, 1889, Mr. John A. Dodd got off some National Reform doctrine that is worthy of notice. He says:—

"In due time he (Christ) gave his life a ransom for the *eternal* salvation of the individual, and for the *temporal* salvation of the State and the family, neither of which would have been rescued from the Adamic wreck had it not been that God had intended to make use of both in building up his spiritual kingdom, his church in the world. The life of each depends absolutely on their attitude to his church. If they do their duty, they will last like the sun; if not, they will be destroyed. 'For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee (the church) shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.' The destruction of nations can be accounted for only in this light."

The principal difficulty with this statement is that it is not true. It does not in any sense accord with the facts. The Roman Empire from

Constantine onward was used only for the building up of the church; and in about a hundred and fifty years it was brought to such a condition of immorality and wicked pollution to be blotted out of existence, and that by hordes of utterly savage barbarians; yet savage, were morally less impure than those who composed the Church and State system which they destroyed.

After the ruin of the western empire the Eastern empire remained still as the champion, the support, and the builder up of the church. Justinian was the model builder up of the church of the eastern empire. The one grand object of his life was to glorify the church and to see that everybody in the empire was orthodox. It was so with many others beside him, and yet the Mohammedans blotted out the last vestige of the Eastern Empire.

Charlemagne built up an empire devoted wholly to the service of the church. He "Christianized, or wiped out," people by the thousands in the service of the church. Thus he did his "duty" to the church and constantly expected that his empire would last like the sun, but it didn't worth a cent.

Afterward, the Holy Roman Empire, which was neither Roman nor holy, was built up to serve the church, and it did it as thoroughly as that service was ever done, in its service to the church it set itself against God in the Reformation. It too expected to last like the sun, and the church promised that it should, but it didn't. It was not, however, only in the Reformation that

301

the Holy Roman Empire set itself against God. Every State and every empire sets itself against God when it makes itself the champion of the church, and undertakes to build up the church; and the church sets itself against God whenever it consents to be partaker of any such offices on the part of the State. And when a State and the church thus unitedly set themselves against God, there is produced that which at the first made the mystery of iniquity, and that which ever since has been carrying out, the spirit of the mystery of iniquity. And when the United States falls into this wicked condition, the same wicked spirit will show itself, and the same wicked works will be the result, as in all the cases before it.

A. T. J.

"The Evangelical" *The American Sentinel* 4, 38 , p. 302.

AT the hearing before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor February 15, 1889, in behalf of the Blair resolution, to teach religion in all the schools of the nation, there were prominent men pleading for adoption of the proposed amendment, from Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore. Rev. George K. Morris, D.D., of Philadelphia, drew the line between those who favored the amendment and those who opposed it, by the following statement:—

"I ask your attention to the fact that on this matter of the proposed constitutional amendment, the country stands divided principally along the line indicated by the evangelical church bodies on the one side, and the Roman Catholic Church on the other."

Upon this the chairman asked,—

"In that do you count all who are Catholics on one side and all who are not Catholics on the other?"

Rev. Dr. Morris—"No, sir, we count all who are Catholics on one side and all who are of evangelical faiths on the other side."

Then presently Senator George inquired,—"Exclusive of the Mormons, too?"

Rev. Dr. Morris—"No, not the Mormons. They would be evangelical in one sense."

And so the Mormons have become evangelical! We don't see, then, why the churches should make such a great complaint about the Mormons and their hierarchy so long as they can be classed with the evangelicals. But Dr. Morris says they are evangelicals in one sense. He didn't say in which sense it is, but it is presumable that they are evangelicals because they favor the Bible and the teaching of religion in the public schools.

From Dr. Morris' speech it is evident that those who favor the use of the Bible and the teaching of religion in the public schools, are evangelical, and all who oppose it are not. All who favor it are evangelical, even though it be; the Mormon Bible and the Mormon religion which they favor. Joseph Cook favors the Edmunds amendment rather than the Blair amendment to the Constitution. And the Edmunds amendment proposes to allow the reading of the Bible in the public schools. It would devolve upon the people in each State or Territory or school district to say what Bible should be read, and the majority, having the power to decide, would have the Bible which pleases the majority. Where the Catholics are in the majority it would be the Catholic Bible; where the Protestants are in the majority it would be the Protestant Bible; and where the Mormons are in the majority it would be the Mormon Bible. But, as the Mormons are

evangelical, we suppose it is badly unorthodox to protest against any such system.

We do protest, nevertheless. We deny the right of the Protestant majority to compel the Roman Catholic minority to read, or to listen to the reading of, the Protestant Bible in the public schools. We likewise deny the right of a majority of the Catholics to compel the Protestant minority to read, or listen to the reading of, the Roman Catholic Bible in the public schools. We deny the right of the Mormon majority to compel the gentile minority to read, or listen to the reading of, the Mormon Bible in the public; schools; and we deny the right of the evangelical Protestant and Mormon majority together to compel the unevangelical Catholic and gentile minority to submit to the dictates of their unevangelical religion.

The sum of it all is, that by no right whatever can religion ever be taught, or the Bible read, in the public schools.

A. T. J.

October 23, 1889

"The Edmunds Resolution" *The American Sentinel* 4, 39 , pp. 306, 307.

THE SENTINEL has said considerable during the past year about the proposed amendment to the national Constitution establishing instruction in the principles of the Christian religion in all the public schools in the nation. The last few numbers have contained an argument made by one of the editors of the SENTINEL before the Committee on Education and Labor in opposition to that resolution. When the next Congress shall assemble, there will be a powerful effort made to secure the introduction of a resolution embodying the doctrines proposed in that, but in what shape the matter will be presented, it is of course impossible in advance to tell. The forces are being rallied, the different views are being brought together as much as possible, and the people cannot be too wide-awake nor too diligently engaged in the study of the subject, nor can there be too prompt action in opposing the movement. The Blair resolution is not the only one that is advocated. There is another called the "Edmunds Resolution," so called because it was framed and presented by Senator Edmunds, of Vermont.

The history of the Edmunds resolution is this, to begin at the beginning of the subject: April 19, 1870, Hon. S. S. Burdette, of Missouri, proposed an amendment to the United States Constitution upon this subject, reading as follows:—

"SECTION 1. No State or municipal corporation within any State of the United States shall levy or collect any tax for the support or aid of any sectarian, denominational, or religious school or educational establishment; nor shall the legislature of any State, or the corporate authorities of any municipality within any State, appropriate any money or make any donation from the public fund or property of such State or municipality for the support or aid of any sectarian, religious, or denominational schools or educational establishments.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

It will be seen at a glance that this only prohibits State aid to denominational or religious schools or establishments. It does not prohibit sectarian, religious, or denominational instruction in the public schools. It thus missed the mark so widely that it seems not to have been taken any notice of after its introduction.

It was not long, however, before another step was taken. December 19, 1871, Hon. William M. Stewart, United States senator from Nevada, proposed an amendment to the national Constitution, reading as follows:—

"SECTION. 1. There shall be maintained in each State and Territory a system of free common schools, but neither the United States nor any State, Territory, county, or municipal corporation, shall aid in the support of any schools wherein the peculiar tenets of any denomination are taught.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

This proposition seems to have excited some public discussion. It was strongly disapproved by many on the ground that such a measure was "both unnecessary and misleading"—unnecessary because no danger could arise in any State from such action; and mischievous because it would only tend to provoke a controversy which was uncalled for. Nothing seems to have come of Mr. Stewart's proposition except the discussion referred to.

Nothing more was done for four years. Then, however, December 14, 1875, Hon. James G. Blaine, then a member of the House of Representatives, proposed an amendment, as follows:

ARTICLE XVI

"No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of a religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no money raised by taxation in any State for the support of public schools, or derived from any public fund therefor, shall ever be under the control of any religious sect, nor shall any money so raised or land so devoted be divided between religious sects or denominations."

August 4, 1876, Mr. Blaine's resolution was reported back from the Judiciary Committee with two slight additions, one, of the words "or denomination" following the word "sect" in the second clause, and the other a sentence at the end, saying, "This article shall not vest, enlarge, or diminish legislative power in Congress."

It will be seen that Mr. Blaine's resolution goes a step further than either of the ones which preceded it, in that it embodies in its first clause the substance of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting any State making any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. As for the rest of his resolution, it is in substance the same as the other two, simply saying that no public money raised by taxation or derived from public funds for the support of public schools should ever be under the control of any religious sect or divided amongst religious sects or denominations. It does not prohibit the teaching of religion in the public schools, nor does it prohibit the use of public money for the support of religious teaching in the public schools. Therefore, as for any real value in that resolution, there was none except in its first clause.

Yet, it was adopted by the House of Representatives after brief debate, by vote of 180 yeas to 7 nays, with 98 not voting. The resolution then went to the Senate, and, August 7, was referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, with several substitutes which had been offered for it. Two days later, August 9, Senator Edmunds, of the Judiciary Committee, reported back the joint resolution with an amendment which was in fact a substitute, reading as follows:—

ARTICLE XVI

"No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under any State. No public property, and no public revenue of, nor any loan of credit by or under, the authority of the United States, or

any State, Territory, district, or municipal corporation, shall be appropriated to, or made, or used for, the support of any school, educational or other institution, under the control of any religious, or anti-religious, organization, or wherein the particular creed or tenets of any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination, shall be taught. And so such particular creed or tenet shall be read or taught in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by such revenue or loan of credit; and no such appropriation or loan of credit shall be made to any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination, or promote its interests or tenets. This article shall not be construed to prohibit the reading of the Bible in any school or institution; and it shall not have the effect to impair rights of property already vested.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to provide for the prevention or punishment of violations of this article."

August 11 this substitute was accepted for the House resolution by a vote of 27 to 15. August 14 the substitute was brought to vote upon its adoption. The vote stood 28 yeas to 16 nays. But as it requires a majority of two-thirds to adopt such a resolution, and as the vote fell two short of being two-thirds, the resolution was lost. This is the Edmunds amendment, and this is its history. And that was the last effort to amend the Constitution until May 25, 1888, when Senator Blair introduced his. And, as stated at the beginning, the Edmunds amendment is being advocated for introduction at the next Congress as well as the Blair amendment.

We have not space here to discuss the merit of the Edmunds resolution; we can only say now that it is an excellent illustration of how not to to [*sic.*] say it, and leave the fuller discussion of it until our next.

A. T. J.

"Papal Protestantism" *The American Sentinel* 4, 39 , p. 307.

THE question of the Bible in the public schools has lately caused considerable discussion in Detroit. One preacher of that city, Rev. James M. Henderson, says on the subject:—

"I am in favor of introducing the Bible into the public schools. The Bible, as the standard of Protestant religion, should be retained, and Catholics whose children attend our public schools should accept our Protestant Bible. I do not believe that any Catholic is ever willing to have as the basis of the religious training of his children the Protestant Bible, but the Catholic children usually

attend Catholic schools. Parents of children who do attend our public schools should accept our Protestant Bible without sectarian comment."

This shows the real purpose of the effort being made all over the land, and even in the religious attack made upon the national Constitution. It is simply to have the State establish the Protestant religion and enforce upon everybody the dictates of the Protestant church rulers.

Another preacher, Rev. Joseph W. Blanchard, sets forth the same doctrine in these words:—

"The public school should suit the majority, as this is a country where majorities rule. The majority of the people of this country are Christians, therefore the majority should rule. There ought to be Christian teaching in the public schools. The Bible should be read without note or comment, and the simple fundamental principles of Christianity taught."

It is true that he uses only the terms Christian and Christianity to describe the religious teaching which they propose to force upon others; but he means only *Protestant* Christian teaching and *Protestant* Christianity. But it might not prove so in the end. Protestants might be in the minority in a little while, then it is probable that the Roman Catholics would be in the majority—it is so already in about a dozen of the States—and if the Catholic majority should force the reading of the Catholic Bible and Catholic instruction upon all the rest of the people at the public expense, that would probably put another face upon the matter. If some way could be invented by which these particular individuals could be compelled to take some of their own medicine administered by Roman Catholics, it would be an excellent thing. It might be possible in that way to reach their reason.

Rev. F. Grenell sees the matter in a much better light, and says:—

"Right is not decided by majorities, even though the majority be right."

Yet how fast this wicked principle of majority rule in matters of religion and the conscience, is growing. But this question "is not a question of majorities or minorities, for if the conscience of the majority is to be the standard, then there is no such thing as right of conscience at all. It is against the predominance and power of majorities that the rights of conscience are protected, and have need to be." And those who call themselves Protestants are not the only people in the world who have a conscience.

A. T. J.

"The Commonwealth of Souls!" *The American Sentinel* 4, 39 , p. 308.

THE *Christian Statesman* of July 4, 1889, says that:—

"The moral and religious needs of the army and navy of the United States have been brought before several church courts within a year or two, and action has been taken looking to—

"1. The appointment of chaplains in such numbers as to provide for every post occupied by troops.

"2. A movement to secure the convocation of the chaplains in annual session for conference about their work, and for devising new and improved methods.

"3. The setting apart of the Sabbath on or immediately preceding the Fourth of July as Army and Navy Day, on which one service, at least, will be held in connection with that patriotic occasion, when special prayers shall be offered, and the attention of the congregations called to the duty of the church toward the naval and military forces of the country, which are maintained for the supremacy of authority and defense of our orders, who, by the manner of life required in the service of their country, imperil both soul and body for the common good.

"4. That gambling be prohibited in the army and the navy.

"5. That the use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage be prohibited.

"6. That the rights of Christian officers and men to a conscientious observance of the holy Sabbath be guaranteed against invasion by superiors in requiring any duty not exigent and unavoidable.

"7. That a commission of five, with a corresponding secretary, be appointed to co-operate with like commissions from other churches in obtaining, as soon as possible, the legislation necessary to secure the above-mentioned improvement in the moral and religious condition of our soldiers and marines; and also to act as a board to examine and recommend for appointment to the position of chaplain, such ministers as may apply for such position."

When the legislation necessary to secure all that has been adopted, then, how far will the country be from a union of Church and State? How far from a church domination in civil affairs? But besides all this, whoever before heard of any man's imperiling his soul for the public good? What good can any man do to the public by imperiling his soul ten thousand times? A man cannot do the public, nor himself, nor anyone else, any good by imperiling his soul. He can do only harm to himself, and, perhaps indirectly by his influence, to others. A

man cannot imperil his soul except in the way of sin, and sin never can be for the common good, nor any other kind of good.

Sin is the only thing that can ever imperil anybody's soul. Suppose then that the commonwealth of souls were imperiled, and for the common good of souls the men in the army and navy, one and all, by some masterly stroke of sin, imperil their souls for the common good; what possible benefit could ever that be to any soul? It would only the more certainly imperil the souls of those who did it.

But all this is consistent with the National Reform idea of the oneness of moral and civil things. Civil government is for the common good. If a man can imperil his soul for the common good, it must be that the souls of men are a part of the commonwealth, and when anyone sees the commonwealth of souls in danger he shall imperil his for the common good! Did such wild nonsense ever get into the brain of anybody but a National Reformer?

A. T. J.

October 30, 1889

"The Merits of the Edmunds Resolution" *The American Sentinel* 4, 40 , pp. 314, 315.

LAMST week we gave the history of the Edmunds Resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States in regard to religion in the public schools. We had not space then to discuss it, and propose to do that now, and for the convenience of the reader we print again the resolution:—

ARTICLE XVI

"No State shall makes any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under any State. No public property, and no public revenue of, nor any loan of credit by or under the authority of, the United States, or any State, Territory, district, or municipal corporation, shall be appropriated to, or made or used for the support of, any school, educational or other institution under the control of any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination, or wherein the particular creed or tenets of any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination shall be taught. And no such particular creed or tenets shall be read or taught in any school or

institution supported in whole or in part by such revenue or loan of credit; and no such appropriation or loan of credit shall be made to any religious or anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination, or to promote its interests or tenets. This article shall not be construed to prohibit the reading of the Bible in any school or institution; and it shall not have the effect to impair rights of property already vested.

"SEC. 2—Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to provide for the prevention or punishment of violations of this article."

As we said of this resolution before, it is an excellent illustration of how not to say it. If it be intended to prohibit religious instruction in the public schools, it misses it. If it be intended to prohibit sectarian instruction in the public schools, it misses that. Because—

1. The second clause only prohibits the appropriation of public money for the support of schools which are under the control of any religious or

315

anti-religious sect, organization, or denomination. In other words, this clause prohibits the appropriation of any public money to parochial or denominational schools. But this would allow the teaching of religion in the public schools, and at the public expense. This is further proved by the last sentence of section 1, which distinctly allows the reading of the Bible in any school or institution, and the intention of those who ask that the Bible may be read in the schools is distinctly and solely for the purpose of having religion, that is, "broad, general religion," but not sectarian, taught in the schools.

Secondly, the third sentence proposes that no "particular creed or tenets shall be read or taught in any school or institution supported in whole or part by such revenue or loan of credit," that is, in any public school. Yet the section expressly grants the reading of the Bible in any school or institution. Now every sect or denomination that makes any pretension to Christianity gets its peculiar tenets from the Bible. Then, if a certain sect derives from the Bible its peculiar tenet, and the Bible is read in the public schools, assuredly that does grant the reading of that particular tenet, and the resolution distinctly allows what it pretends to prohibit.

For instance, there are two denominations in this country, which together would probably be called a sect. They are the Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh-day Baptists. It is a distinct and peculiar tenet of these denominations that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord. This tenet is derived from the plain reading of one of the

most familiar portions of the Scriptures, the ten commandments, the fourth of which distinctly says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Now how is the Bible to be read in the schools without allowing that particular tenet to be read? Shall that particular tenet be skipped in the reading of the Bible? If not, to allow the reading of the Bible will assuredly allow the reading of that particular tenet, yet the reading of any particular tenet is forbidden by the article! The article therefore contradicts itself.

Again, the doctrine of predestination, of foreordination, is a peculiar tenet of the Calvinistic creeds. They derive this from the Bible, where it reads, with other texts, that God "hath chosen us in him [Christ] before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will." And again, it speaks of Christ, who "verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you." These scriptures express the peculiar tenet of the Calvinistic creed. If the Bible be allowed to be read in the schools, that will surely allow the reading of that particular tenet, unless such portions shall be skipped to avoid reading the tenet. But to read all the Bible except these and undertake to skip them would only the more definitely direct the attention of the pupil to them, and he would read them anyhow.

Again, it is a peculiar tenet of Christianity as a whole that Jesus Christ is the Messiah, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. How shall the Bible be read without reading that peculiar tenet, the reading of which does violence to the religious convictions of the Jew, who, with the unbeliever, is taxed equally with all others for the support of the schools, and who has equal rights in all things, in school as well as out, with all others under the government. This supreme principle of Christianity is therefore a peculiar tenet, and to allow the reading of the Bible in the public schools, as this resolution expressly does, is to allow the reading, of a peculiar tenet, which the resolution expressly prohibits.

Once more. It is a peculiar tenet of the Roman Catholic faith that the Virgin Mary is so intimately connected with the divine plan of salvation as to be so entirely a part of that plan as properly to be an object of adoration. Accordingly, to the Roman Catholic the Bible reads, in the third chapter of Genesis and fifteenth verse: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed;

she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie wait for her heel." The reading of this passage would be declared by every Protestant in Christendom to be the reading of a particular tenet.

But it will be said at once, by every Protestant especially, that that is not the way the Bible reads. That that is the Catholic Bible, and that it is corrupt. Oh! ah! to be sure. There is more than one kind of a Bible, then! But the Edmunds Resolution does not make any such distinction as that. It simply says: "This article shall not be construed to prohibit the reading of the Bible in any school or institution." It does not say that this article shall not be construed to prohibit the reading of King James' Version of the Bible. It simply says the Bible, and that would leave the question as to what is the Bible, to be decided by the majority in a school district, a county, or a State. If the majority are Roman Catholics, then the article could not be construed to prohibit the reading of the Roman Catholic Bible in the public schools. But to allow the reading of the Roman Catholic Bible in the public schools would be to allow the reading of that particular tenet of the Roman Catholic faith which is forbidden by this same article.

If the Mormons were in the majority, as in Utah, then the Mormon Bible would be the one allowed, but the reading of the Mormon Bible would be almost wholly the reading of particular tenets. If the Protestants were in the majority, then King James' Version of the Bible would be the one to be read, which, as we have shown, would be but to allow the reading of the peculiar tenets of the Sabbatarians, the Presbyterians, and Christianity as a whole, which the article professes to intend to prohibit.

This list of particular tenets might be traced through all the creeds, but what we have here given is sufficient to illustrate the point that we make that the Edmunds Resolution is not only vague and uncertain, but that it is plainly self-contradictory.

It may be said that it would be the office of Congress, or of the Supreme Court of the United States, to decide what is meant in the article by the term, the Bible. Then that would be only to have Congress or the Supreme Court settle by law a religious question, and to fix a standard of religion for the nation which would be inevitably the establishment of a national religion. For "wherever there is a system of religious instruction endowed and patronized by law with a preference given to it by the State over all other systems, and a preference given to its teachers over the teachers of all other forms of belief," *that* is a religious establishment. And that is precisely

and inevitably the result of the State's undertaking to define what the Bible is.

This, again, shows that the Edmunds Resolution, although not strictly self-contradictory in its letter, is so in its spirit, because it prohibits any State from making any law respecting an establishment of religion. And as our national Constitution already prohibits the same to the national Legislature, it is properly to be presumed that the spirit of this resolution is intended to be in harmony with the first amendment. But, as we have seen, although it forbids the State to do such a thing, it inevitably involves the nation in the doing of that very thing.

There is one more point in this: Whether it be left to majorities in the school districts, the counties, or the States, or whether it be decided by Congress or the Supreme Court, what Bible it; shall be which may be used in the schools, another most important question is involved. Suppose it should be decided what the evident intention is in all this work, that King James' Version, or the Protestant Bible, is the one that is meant, and that that shall be used in the schools, then every teacher would be required to read the Protestant version of the Bible as the standard of religion and as the word of God. But no Catholic nor Jew, nor one who does not believe the Bible to be the foundation of true religion, could be a teacher in the public schools. All these would be disqualified, and that would be, to all intents and purposes, the establishment of a religious test as a qualification for the office of school-teacher. But that would not only be contradictory to the sixth article of the Constitution as it is, but it would again make this proposed article self-contradictory, because its second clause says that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under any State."

These are the merits of the Edmunds Resolution, proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution. Are the people ready for it?

Next week we shall tell of some who favor it, and of some of the arguments used in favor of it.

A. T. J.

"Sunday-Law Church Going" *The American Sentinel* 4, 40 , p. 316.

IN the Missouri Sunday-law Convention Dr. Hayes, of Kansas City, made a speech in which he said:—

"It is said, 'Is not this Sunday excursion of the country, this trip to the country, is not that rest?' Now I have seen some of these trips to the country; I used to take them occasionally. I have been around considerably to picnics. I have gone to a good many Congregational picnics. Absolutely, I never went anywhere from which I came home more tired than from a Sunday-school picnic. I took my brother from Allegheny into the Rocky Mountains one summer, and we worked so hard resting that we came home absolutely worn out—both of us were absolutely worn out. If you want to see the nervous effect of a Sunday excursion out of Kansas City into a suburban town, take passage on the return home train. The men had caroused all day, letting their wives carry the baby, and if you ever saw a fagged-out set of women you will see it then. The next day as compositors in the printing office, as apprentices in the workshops, and in their blacksmith shops, and carpenter shops—these men all day were not worth much more than half a hand's wages. That is the fact about it. Why?—Because that Sunday, instead of being a day of rest and invigoration, was a day of exhaustion, of nervous exhaustion, and they came back home fagged-out. You follow that same man's brother; probably he took a good nap Sabbath morning; got up at eight o'clock; had a good, comfortable breakfast with his children; along about nine o'clock the children went to Sabbath-school; and at ten o'clock he and his wife leisurely walked down to the church, took their seat in God's house quietly, and listened to the sermon, and by and by went home and took a good comfortable dinner. Then he took a good rest in the afternoon, went to the church at night, and Monday morning that man went to his shop and took hold of the plane and was ready for work."

This contrast is no doubt correct between the man who carouses and the man who goes to church. But admitting all this to be true, then what is the object of stopping the Sunday excursion trains and streetcars, except it be to have the people go to church instead of on excursions? But will they go to church when the cars are stopped? Will not those who are given to carousing carry it on in the city instead of going to church?

It is not at all true, however, that all of the people who go to the park and on excursions on Sunday are given to carousing.

A further point in this is the arrogant assumption of the Sunday-law clerics of power to compel everybody to conform to their views on Sunday. Because some people choose to ill-use themselves upon opportunity, therefore all opportunity to use themselves either well or ill on that day, except that of going to church, must be taken away from everybody! "It is of the essence of power that it may be

exercised unwisely or abused by those to whom it is intrusted." And because some choose to abuse their rights of recreation and enjoyment, this does not in any sense justify the effort of the Sunday-law advocates to take away from other, or even these, the right to rightly use these powers. When these Sunday-law men shall have succeeded in their effort to regulate the exercise of the powers of others, what assurance have we that they themselves will not abuse the power which they propose to exercise? There is no assurance whatever that they will not, but we have the assurance of all history that they will.

More than this, there is no remedy in law for such evils. All that law can possibly do in such cases is by the exercise of restraint to check the evil for a time, and that time is only until the restraint can be cast off, or the vigilance of those who enforce the law is slacked. Then not only does the evil go on, but it goes on with accelerated force, from the fact that the victims will reimburse themselves for the deprivations which they have been forced to bear. As the Hon. Mr. McDougal told the Sunday-law preachers at Columbus, Ohio, the remedy for all these things of which they complain, lies deeper than can be reached by law, and can be effected by nothing else than the strictly remedial power of the gospel of Jesus Christ. That renews the mind, purifies the heart, and reforms the life, by implanting the abiding principle of absolute right and the love of it. If these men would employ the power of the gospel of Christ in their work, instead of the power of the civil law, they would find the results much more rapid and effective.

A. T. J.

November 6, 1889

"The Real Object of the Edmunds Amendment" *The American Sentinel* 4, 41 , pp. 321, 322.

JOSEPH COOK, of the Boston Monday lectureship, is the leading advocate of the Edmunds amendment to the United States Constitution. The topic of the Boston Monday lectures for 1889 is papal domination in American schools. This discussion is professedly in the interests of the public schools, but it is in fact only in the interests of Protestantism instead of Catholicism in the public schools. It is professedly against a union of Church and State, but it is in fact only against a union of Roman Catholicism and the State,

while it just as certainly favors a union of Protestantism and the State. It is professedly in favor of American institutions, as against the domination of the Catholic Church; but it is in fact *against* American institutions and in favor of Protestant domination in civil affairs. This will more fully appear as we proceed. Of the amendment he says:—

"It covered almost precisely the ground now occupied by Senator Blair's proposed amendment, but as its language was perhaps somewhat more cautious, and as it came so near passing, I quote Senator Edmunds proposal as a summary of the highest educational demand of the hour."

He says it contains four great points:—

1. "It prohibits the establishment of a State church in any State of the Union." This is true, but, as we have shown, it leads inevitably to the establishment of a State religion by the nation.

2. "It forbids the sectarian use of public-school funds by any State or municipality." But it does not forbid *a religious* use of public funds by any State or municipality.

3. "It prevents the formation of sectarian public schools." But it does not prevent the formation of *religious* public schools.

4. "Nevertheless, it guards against the exclusion of the Bible from public schools, and so does not establish instruction on a purely secular basis."

But it does establish instruction upon a purely religious basis. And all this is the very thing that no government has a right to do. The State that undertakes to teach religion in order to inculcate principles of good citizenship, will fail to secure either religion or good citizenship.

Of the prospects of the Edmunds resolution, he says:—

"If the Boston election of last December had occurred a few weeks before this vote in Congress, the necessary two-thirds, as I believe, would have been obtained, and the Edmunds amendment might now have been a part of the law of the land. We must launch this reform when the waves are running high. There are many sandbars, but I believe that to-day in Congress there would be a chance for the passage of the Edmunds proposal. Senator Blair's bill covers substantially the same ground and a little more. I should not be sorry to see it passed, but I think it would be more difficult to pass it than it would have been to pass the Edmunds bill."

If this prospect is correctly outlined, and if it be so nearly a practical scheme, which, as a matter of fact, we believe it is, then it is high time that the people of this nation were awaking to the fact, and, as far as possible, making it an impracticable scheme. It is probable

that the Blair Amendment would be more difficult to pass, because its true intent is more plainly revealed.

Mr. Cook indorses the Edmunds resolution because, he says, "It prevents a sectarian division of the school funds." But we should like to know why it would be any more unjust to divide the school funds amongst the sects than it would be to devote the whole of the school fund bodily to the benefit of those sects which, united, call themselves the majority, and proclaim themselves to be the "evangelicals," even though they include the Mormons in their evangelicalism. For this is just what Mr. Cook's scheme amounts to, and to us it would seem to be just as proper to divide the money amongst the different sects, as it would to devote the whole of it to one. Not that we believe for a moment that it should be so divided, nor that it should be so devoted, because the State must have nothing at all to do with the question of religion, whether in the schools or out of 'the schools, but if public money is to be used for teaching religion, then the only fair way to do is to divide the public money amongst the different denominations according to their respective populations. Mr. Cook calls attention to the dangers that already threaten the public-school system from political influence. He says:—

"Scores of teachers within recent years have been dropped from their position by political school boards because their opinions on temperance were a little too strong to suit the school committees. Not a few who have studied the worst cases of this kind have fallen into a sort of moral nausea over the management of schools in certain cities by corrupt committees, mere ward politicians, many of them monstrosly vile men, patrons of the saloons, and of the gambling dens, and of the brothels. There are cities in this country where little local committees, not fit to manage the investment of ten dollars, have the choice of school-teachers and the power to dismiss teachers al-

322

most without reason, and who do all these things from purely political motives, and appoint their own relatives very often, practicing nepotism in its most glaring aspects. The political abuses of the common-school system are becoming a great public terror in mismanaged cities. What is the remedy for all these mischiefs?"

But how does he propose to remedy the mischiefs? Why, by simply adding a religious element to the already mischievous political strifes in connection with the public-school system. He exclaims:—

"So help me, Heaven, I see no way out of the alarming evils arising from the partisan management of common schools except by the success of the Edmunds amendment." (Applause.)

Does any sober-minded man really believe that the success of the Edmunds amendment, or any other, can stop these mischiefs? If that or the Blair amendment were adopted, then a strife upon the question of what Bible it is that shall be used, or what is sectarian instruction, and many other questions, would be added to the already deplorable political mischiefs, and the evils would be increased a thousand-fold. This result would follow just as certainly as day follows night.

This is further proved by Mr. Cook's own statement that "the chief power of the Roman Catholic Church to do mischief in this country is political." Then how can it be expected to weaken that power, or to lessen the mischief, by making religious questions the essential element in politics? It is surprising to think that any thinking man can think so. Then he exhorts thus:—

"Stand up, then, for Senator Edmunds proposed constitutional amendment while yet you can pass it. Let us invoke the national power. Let us invoke it speedily, for if we do not carry an amendment like Senator Edmunds within the next twenty years, it is possible we shall never be able to carry it. The hour is critical. Remember that this amendment was once within two votes of passing in the Senate. Mr. Blaine's proposed amendment upon the same topic had the overwhelming support of the House. And now Senator Blair is advocating substantially the same proposition. The Edmunds amendment is practicable; it is a vital public necessity; but it must be passed soon or never. Therefore let us make Senator Edmunds' program our own concerning the school question. Let us join ranks. Let Protestants stand up, and all stand up, and stand together."

Then in another place he says:—

"Professor Hodge went so far as to say that our conflict on the school question with the Romanist on the one side and the secularist on the other, is of more importance to this nation than the issues connected with slavery and intemperance."

These extracts show, as plainly as need be, that this proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States upon the subject of religion in the public schools, is nothing else than a scheme to establish by constitutional amendment Protestantism as the State religion. This was shown also in the arguments made last winter before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, in behalf of the Blair amendment. Every argument there made was for Protestantism instead of Catholicism in the public schools.

If the American people want to be kept free from the despotism of a national religion, they need to be awake to the efforts that are being

made to secure these amendments that have been offered and that are now advocated. Let the Constitution of the United States remain as it is upon the subject of religion. Keep religion out of the public schools; let the public schools be for the public. As surely as any such amendment shall ever be adopted as has been proposed, so surely will there be the establishment of a national religion, and the establishment of a national religion is the establishment of a national despotism.

The quotations in this article are taken from Mr. Cook's lectures, as printed in *Our Day* for March, April, and May.

A. T. J.

November 13, 1889

"The New Paganism" *The American Sentinel* 4, 42 , pp. 329, 330.

IN his Boston Monday lectures last winter upon religion in the public schools, Joseph Cook discussed the question, "Shall the common schools teach common morals?" This is a singular question for a man who demands that a religiously-grounded morality shall be taught in the schools, and that the religion upon which it shall be grounded shall be Christianity. It is also a singular question to come from a man who pretends to know anything about the morality demanded by Christianity. Even though it should be conceded, which it is not, that the common schools should teach common morality, that would be as far removed from the teachings of morality which Christianity demands, as earth is from heaven. Common morality is nothing but immorality. Common morality is simply that sort of morality that is common, the sort of morality that is practiced by most of the people; and to teach that in the common schools would be only to teach the pupils to do those things which are practiced by most of the people. In other words, it would simply be teaching the pupils in the common schools to do as most of the people do. But pupils can learn to do that without any special instruction.

Again: Such teaching as that erects the common practice into a standard of morality which all must be taught and to which all must be made to conform. In other words, that which most of the people do it is *right* to do, and that is the correct standard of morality. This, in turn, involves the doctrine that what the majority does, or says shall be done, is the standard of right, and is to be conformed to as such. In a

popular government the majority is the State. What the majority says is what the State says. Therefore, as, according to this theory, what the majority says is right, it follows that the majority being the State, what the State says is right. And this brings us at once face to face with the pagan Roman idea of ethics, that the idea of the State is the highest idea of right, and that the voice of the people is the voice of God. It is demonstrated, therefore, that the ethics of the Boston Monday lectureship of 1889 are pagan.

But the idea of the State is not the highest idea of right. The voice of the people is not the voice of God, and most especially it is not upon the subject of religion or morals. What the State says or does may be right, but it is not right because the State says it, for it may be wrong. There is a higher idea of right than the idea of the State, or than any which the State can inculcate. That is the idea of right which God ex-presses and the standard which he has established, and is as much higher than the idea of the State as God's ideas are higher than those of the Boston Monday paganism, or as God is higher than the inventor of it. And, according to this idea of ethics of morality and right, the voice of *God only* is the voice of God. This voice of God, and this standard of right, is expressed in the Bible and is exemplified in the life of Jesus Christ. It is implanted in the human soul, and woven into the character of men, by the power of the Spirit of God in answer to a personal and abiding faith in Jesus Christ. But such a character as that is not common any more than Jesus Christ is common.

Further: Any such view of morals as this taught by the Boston Monday lecturer, reduces it wholly to the plane of the natural. Common morals is only natural morals, and natural morals is nothing but immorality. Jesus Christ gave a description of the moral condition of humanity in its natural state. In other words, it showed what is the nature of this common or natural morals. He said: "Out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness." Mark 7:21, 22. Then Paul described the same thing, only in other words, saying: "It is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth

is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes." Rom. 3:10-18.

That is natural morals. That is common morals, and such it will ever remain in spite of all the States on earth, until the heart is converted by the power of God, and the evil fountain purified from which the evil flows; and by no power which the State can ever exert, nor any instrumentality which it can ever use, can it be effected. It can be done alone by the power of God through

330

the agency of his Spirit; and this is not a common or natural process, but is wholly above the common, and is supernatural. Genuine morality, therefore, in this world, is only the fruit of the Spirit of God. Properly speaking, therefore, there is no such thing as common or natural morals, and to claim such a thing in the name of Christianity is to reduce Christianity and its Author to the plane of the natural, and to place it on a level with all the natural religions of the world, and thus reduces it to the level of paganism. But any theory which reduces Christianity to the level of paganism is a pagan theory. Therefore, it is again demonstrated that the ethics of the Boston Monday lectureship are pagan ethics only. This is not only the logic of the theory, it is the fact, for Mr. Cook says:—

"Merely natural morals, if taught thoroughly, must include the morals taught in the highest of all historical realities in morals, namely, the character of Christ as a man, and, therefore, the picture of the character of Christ as contained in the New Testament literature is not to be excluded from the public schools."

This puts the character of Christ as he lived in this world upon the plane of the "merely natural," and it makes the picture of the character of Christ, as contained in the New Testament literature, a merely natural thing, and the morality of Christ a merely natural morality. This distinctly places Jesus Christ and his character, and the record of it, all upon the plane of the merely natural, than which nothing can be more, false, nor more abhorrent to the character of Christ, or to the picture of that character as given in the New Testament.

Jesus Christ is not a natural product, and therefore the morals of Christ are not natural morals. The character of Christ whether as pictured in the New Testament or the Old, is not a natural product. That picture is not a natural picture. It is all supernatural. Jesus Christ

is the Lord from heaven. His coming into this world was wholly miraculous, and the miraculous is not the natural. The picture of that character as drawn in the Scriptures is a picture drawn by inspiration of God. The Spirit of Christ itself foretold his coming, the manner of his birth, and of his death. That same Spirit recorded the fact of his coming, of his birth, his manner of life, his death, his resurrection, and his ascension again to heaven. These Scriptures came not "by the will of man, but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." To make that character, or the record of it, a "merely natural" thing, as the Boston Monday lectureship distinctly does, robs Jesus Christ of his divinity, destroys the gospel of salvation, and turns the record of it into a myth. Placing all of this on the level of the merely natural, does distinctly place it on a level with all the natural religions that have ever been, and so makes it essentially pagan.

For the sake of the case, we present another extract in the same line as the above, more fully to show that such is intentionally the ethics of the Boston Monday lectureship, and that such is the deduction that was intentionally reached in the lecture under consideration. The lecture closed with these words:—

"In Christ, the highest ethical reality known to established and incontrovertible history, there is the highest self-revelation of God. That revelation, so far forth as Christ is man, is a part of natural morals. Any system of instruction which shuts its eyes to this fact, shuts its eyes to reality. A book on architecture that should not mention the Parthenon, or one on painting that should say nothing of the Sistine Chapel, would be no more defective than is any book on purely natural morals without a definite account of the highest historical reality in morals—the character of Christ as a man and the ethics of the gospel. Natural morals, if taught thoroughly, teach, of course, the highest attained moral ideas. The character of Christ, as exhibiting the highest ideal of morals actually attained among men, is the supreme illustration, and contains the organizing principles of every scheme of natural morals that can be called thorough or scientific. No adequate picture of that character exists except in the New Testament. Natural morals, therefore, cannot be thoroughly taught when the Bible is excluded from the schools; and hence the State, in the exercise of its right of self-preservation, has authority to require that it shall not be so excluded. (Applause)"

That is but to say that the highest ethical reality known to established and incontrovertible history is a purely natural one. It is to say that the character of Christ, as a man, and the ethics of the gospels, are as purely natural as was the Parthenon, or as are the

paintings in the Sistine Chapel. It says that the highest attained moral ideas are but purely natural ones. Hence the State as the highest natural organization of men must adopt, inculcate, and enforce, a system of purely natural morals as the highest ideal, and this it must do wholly in the exercise of its right of self-preservation. And this is only another form of expressing the highest ideal of paganism—the idea that the State is the highest ideal of ethics. And such is the highest ideal of ethics attained in the Boston Monday lectureship. Therefore, the ethics of the Boston Monday lectureship is essentially pagan.

And that is the idea, and such the ideal, to which it is proposed to pledge the American system of government by constitutional amendment establishing religion in the public schools. Are the American people ready to declare their government pagan, as the Boston Monday lecture-ship has declared itself? Are the American people ready to indorse by their votes the Boston Monday paganism, as did that "immense audience" at Tremont Temple, February 11, 1889, by its repeated and "loud applause"?

A. T. J.

November 20, 1889

"What Is the Matter with the Church?" *The American Sentinel* 4, 43 , pp. 338, 339.

IN answer to the fact that the teaching of religion belongs only to the church and the family, Joseph Cook, in his 204th Boston Monday lecture, says: "The church and the family are efficient but not sufficient to meet the moral wants of the educational system;" because "one-quarter or one-third of the children of the republic of school age never see the inside of a church, and must be taught a religiously grounded morality in the public schools or nowhere."

Then he says: "How is the church to be expected to reach all the children of school age? Has it the financial strength to do so, even if it could be brought to take the time?"

These statements open up an interesting subject on several points. First: "Has the church the financial strength to reach all the children of school age?"—She has. It has been published quite broadly, and apparently upon good authority, that Dr. John Hall alone preaches to 200,000,000 dollars every Sunday.

This is doubtless the wealthiest congregation to which any man preaches in the United States, but it is an exception only in the amount. All the leading ministers of every city in the Unions preach every Sunday to men who own vast amounts of money. Take the churches of all denominations in this country, and it is safe to say that in them is comprised the greater part of "wealth of the country, and it is certain that church has the financial strength to reach a child of school age in the United States. The difficulty is not that the church has not financial strength in that direction. The difficulty with the church members that own the money is not that they have not the money, but instead of using it for that purpose they use it only to make more money. There is entirely too much truth in the statement, as published, that Dr. John Herrick preaches to 200,000,000 *dollars*.

The latter clause in Mr. Cook's question of worthy of consideration. He inquires, Has the church the strength to do so, "even if she could be brought to take the time"? Well, is it so that the church has got into that place where she cannot be brought to engage in the work of teaching religion to the youth of the country? What is she doing? Why cannot she be brought to take the time to engage in the work for which she is set in the world, and to which she herself pro-

339

professes to be devoted? What excuse is there for the church's being in such a condition that it is necessary that she should be brought to take the time? What is she in the world for, but voluntarily and spontaneously to seek for the . . . , and take the time, and fill the time, to the fullest extent. The church has nothing else to do in this world but to fill up all the time there is, in this very work. But instead of this, by this statement from one who is certainly a responsible authority on the question, we are compelled to contemplate the fact that the church is in such a condition that she cannot even be brought to take the time to do that work for which she is set in the world, and now she wishes to saddle off upon the State the work which is hers to do. But, as we have before inquired in these columns, when the church shall have put upon the State to do all the work which she alone is set to do, what then does she propose to do? When she has secured the power of the State to carry on and support the work which properly belongs to the church, then the next step will be to have the State support the church, and that in idleness.

This claim that the State shall instruct the children is based upon Mr. Cook saying that ones quarter or one-third of the children of the

republic of school age never see the inside of a church; and, therefore, the State must turn its school-houses into churches and enter upon the inculcation of religious doctrines. Such a statement is a confession that although the church is the conservator of religion in the world, and is held by herself so to be, yet nobody can be benefited by that religion unless they go inside of the church. And by this there is a condition of affairs revealed, which is the direct reverse of that which Christ established, and which the true church will ever occupy; that is, instead of the church's seeking those who are lost, the lost are compelled to seek the church. Instead of the saved seeking the lost, that they too may be saved, the lost are expected to seek the saved. Instead of the church going out into the highways and hedges, and into the streets and lanes of the city, and bidding all, with the earnest tones of the Saviour, to "come unto the marriage," she sets up an establishment, and those that are in the highways and hedges and streets and lanes of the city are expected to come and, ask to be invited. No, no! Such is not the church of Jesus Christ. Such a system neither represents nor embodies the religion of Jesus Christ. And such a system of religion, even though it were taught in the public schools, would be ten thousand times worse for the schools than the system which now is, even though it were as had as these opponents pronounce it to be.

Another excuse he offers for the church's failure to reach the entire population is, that she has "but the seventh part of time in which to do it." Indeed! why, is it she has not only all the time there is, but all the days and nights of the week, and all the year, and all the time there is, or is to be. Is it true that the church works so hard on this one-seventh part of the time that she is obliged to rest all the balance of the time? Is it because she has grown so lazy that the exertion which she puts forth in this one-seventh of the time justifies her in loafing all the rest of the time? It is not difficult at all for the . . . rving person to decide which of these iniquitous touches the fact of the case. And, therefore, it is a proper inquiry, and we think a profitable one too, to the thinking person. Would it be best that such a religion as that should be taught in the public schools? We repeat, The teaching of such religion in the public school would make it worse than even now its opponents declare it to be. An industrious worldling is better than a lazy Christian. And public schools, therefore, would be vastly better off without the teaching of such religion than with it, because it would only be teaching the children to indulge idleness instead of practicing

industry, and to add hypocrisy to irreligion. Such a system, however, is entirely consistent with the other branch of this religious legislation scheme; that is, the demand for a national Sunday law to compel everybody to be idle on Sunday. The two movements, this one to establish the inculcation of the practice of laziness on six days of the week, and the other to establish compulsory idleness on the remaining day of the week—these are entirely worthy of one another; but they are alike totally unworthy of American principles or of the American people, or of the religion of Jesus Christ.

Let the church members put their money and their energies into the work of teaching religion, after the pattern of the Saviour, and then whether the youth ever see the inside of a church or not, they can learn of the religion of Christ. Then, too, the church will be conscious of a power which now she has not, the lack of which civil power never can supply. The Saviour and his apostles found more than one-seventh of the time to devote to the work of religious instruction. We do not read of any time when any effort had to be put forth to induce them to take all the time there was, day and night, continuously. And those who have the religion that they had will never need to "be brought to take time."

A. T. J.

November 27, 1889

"A Pagan Theory" *The American Sentinel* 4, 44 , p. 347.

AT Bay View, Mich., the past summer, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union held a school of methods, at which Prof. E. E. White, superintendent of public schools of Cincinnati, made a speech on "The Duty of the Hour," in which, according to Miss Willard's report in the *Union Signal*, he made the following statement:—

"You must either concede the right of the State to teach everything or deny the right of the state to teach anything. We must take conscience as the compass and put reason at the helm of the ship of State or we cannot weather the gale. The family, Church and State, should in a holy alliance gather about the cradle."

This is a part of the plea for the establishment and enforcement of religion in public schools. It is not true that the State has the right to teach everything or nothing. The State has *no* right to teach religion. In the first place, it cannot do it without establishing a State religion, and a State religion is not genuine religion at all, but is only a wicked

mixture of worldliness with the forms of religion, and amounts to nothing but religious despotism; and such a despotism is the worst of all. Instead of being an educator and an enlightener, such a government crushes out freedom of thought, and ends only in ignorance and superstition; and ignorance mixed with superstition is worse than ignorance alone; and when the superstition is enforced by governmental power the evil is increased a thousand-fold.

If it be indeed true that the only alternative is to concede that the State must teach everything or nothing, then we will take the latter, and deny the right of the State to teach anything, because it is vastly better for the State to do nothing than for it to attempt to do what it is impossible for it to do, with the inevitable result—the establishment of a religious despotism enforcing superstitious forms by governmental power.

But, although it is not the right, and is not in the power, of the State to teach religion, the State *has* a right to teach something. It has the right to teach the rights and the duties of the citizen as a citizen to his fellow-citizens and to the State. This it can do; this it has the right to do; and there its rights and its powers end. It has no right to undertake authoritatively to declare what are men's duties to God, or whether there is any God. That is for the individual to find out for himself, and to render according to the dictates and the light of his own conscience. When it shall ever come to that place where the State presumes to put itself above the parent in his relation to his child, and shall put itself between the parent and his child, and dictate what religion that child shall be taught, such a State is unworthy to stand for an hour. The right of the parent to the religious care and instruction of his child is paramount and absolute. And to the parent and the child this right is worth more than all the States in Christendom. That some parents neglect to exercise this right and fail to give to their children religious instruction, can never justify the State in usurping the place of the parent and destroying the right, either of those who neglect it or those who exercise it.

The State can never of right have anything to do with forming any alliance in which the church is concerned, whether about the cradle or anywhere else; and any alliance of the State with the family with reference to the cradle must end with its simple pledge of protection to both the family and the cradle. The child belongs to the parent and not to the State. Both the dictum and the theory that the child belongs to the State is pagan and not Christian; and throughout this whole

discussion in behalf of religion in the public schools by the would-be leaders of thought, there is a current that is carrying them, and those who follow them, into downright paganism. It is true they profess to be doing it all in the name of Christianity, but the theory of the State which they maintain is the pagan theory; and when they propose to sanctify it with the form of Christianity as the State religion, then the result is a system exactly conformed to that of the Papacy, and is essentially papal.

A. T. J.

December 18, 1889

"Morality in the Public Schools" *The American Sentinel* 4, 47 , pp. 169, 170.

UPON the question as to whether morality should be taught in the public schools, we should suggest that it would be well for those who demand it, to agree upon what morality really is, what is its basis, and what are its sanctions. If this should not be clearly discerned and taught, even granting that it is the province of the State to teach morality, it is certain that the teaching would be no better than that which is now given in the public schools, and the probabilities are, that it would be much worse. It is also certain that those who favor teaching morality in the public schools cannot agree upon what morality is, nor upon what are the grounds of moral responsibility. This question was studied "thoroughly and practically" for four years by the Evangelical Ministers' Association of Boston, "In 1882 an able committee of that body, composed of representative men of all denominations, was appointed for the purpose of preparing a book of morals for the public schools." Two of that committee were Drs. Joseph T. Duryea and Edward Everett Hale. The result of the four years' study upon the question by this committee was expressed by Dr. Duryea in 1885, in a letter to the chairman of a committee in New York appointed to consider the same subject. The following is the material part of the letter:—

"32 UNION PARK, Boston, Dec. 5, 1885.

"MY DEAR SIR: The committee appointed to consider the matter of a book of morals for the public schools, have been trying faithfully to find out what can be done. Difficulties have been met and not overcome. We are trying to evade them. . . . The desire

was for a graded series. This would involve a book worthy to go into the high schools. This could hardly omit reference to the grounds of moral responsibility. The committee have seriously doubted the wisdom of debating the basis of moral choice and action before youth. To show them that apparently good men differ concerning the very foundation of morality, might be harmful before they are developed and informed sufficiently to understand how there can be differences as to theories, and yet substantial agreement as to practical morality.

"I think, now, the tendency is to admit that it is better to address the moral intuitions, and not to theorize about them; also to treat moral matters as they come up in the life of the pupils, and their associations in the school and on the play-ground.

"But it has been deemed practicable to prepare a book, or a series of books, after the pattern of the 'Book of Golden Deeds,' prepared for youth in England.

"The moral affections and sentiments might be exhibited in expression, and moral principles might be embodied in characters, and concretely presented in deeds. An outline including all the virtues, and incidents under each of them, might be selected. Also deeds might be presented involving all the moral rules drawn out of the root principles of morality!

"This is as far as we have been able to go, with expectation of meeting with general approval, and securing the admission of the book or books.

"YOURS truly, JOSEPH DURYEA."

This is an interesting letter, and, coming as it does as the result of years of special study on the subject by such men, its statements are of more than common importance.

First, difficulties have been met and not overcome, and they are difficulties of such a nature as, from the circumstances of the case, to seem insurmountable, because instead of battling with them with a real endeavor to overcome them the committee tried to evade them. But upon such a question, to evade the difficulty is not to escape it, for it is still there and there it remains. This statement simply reveals in a more forcible way than is usually done, the fact that upon the question of the Bible or religion or morality in the public schools, there are difficulties which cannot be overcome with justice to all. Of course we use the word morality in the genuine sense of the word, as meaning much more than civility.

Second, the committee could not insert into a book for the public school any reference to "the grounds of moral responsibility," because that is an unsettled question even among those who were to

compile the book; and because the wisdom of debating before youth the question of what is the basis of moral choice and action is seriously to be doubted; and, further, because it might be harmful for the youth in school to discover that the very reasons why they should choose, and act, a certain way in a given case, was an unsettled question amongst college graduates and doctors of divinity.

These reasons certainly ought to be sufficient to put a check upon the effort of any such committee. They ought also to be sufficient to put a damper upon the zeal of very many who are now so ardently in favor of forcing this question to an issue in the management of the public school. Because when men of mature and trained minds, graduates of the best colleges and the highest universities, and of theological seminaries, and who, of all men, are most intimately and constantly associated with the consideration of this very question in all its phases,—when these cannot agree upon what is the ground of moral responsibility, or the basis of moral choice and action, it certainly would be perfect folly to demand that school-children should decide the question. The committee did well to say it might be harmful; the committee might have gone farther and said not only that it might be harmful, but that it could not be anything else than harmful. It would be a downright imposition as well.

Yet it was not exactly this phase of the question that the committee referred to when it said it might be harmful. It was the fact that the children would discover "that apparently good men differ concerning the very foundation of morality," and would thus be led to doubt whether there is any real foundation for morality, and consequently

370

would be handed plainly [*sic.*] into skepticism. Of course this the committee might well be afraid, because it would be the inevitable result of every attempt of the State to inculcate morality. The grounds of morality lie beyond the natural. They are wholly in the realm of the spiritual, and can be only spiritually discerned. But no man can become spiritually-minded except by faith in Jesus Christ. Faith in Christ purifies the heart and enlightens the mind. By it the love of God is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit, which writes the law of God—the sum of all morality—upon the heart and in the mind. Thus it at once appears that there is no real morality in this world, except that which is grounded upon, and springs from, faith in Jesus Christ. Therefore, when the State requires that morality shall be taught in the public school, it must either require a religious test as a

qualification for the office of public-school teacher, which carries with it an established religion and a State creed, or else require the teacher to give instruction in regard to that which it is impossible for him clearly to discern. But as in this proposed system it is argued that the State is not to apply a religious test, the other alternative is the only one that remains; but the teacher, not being able clearly to discern the matter himself, cannot convey any clear idea to the pupils, and will almost certainly disagree with his fellow-teachers as to the real grounds of moral responsibility and the basis of choice and action; therefore it is impossible that the children can get any real moral good from it, and may be counted fortunate if they do not get positive moral harm by being led to skepticism on the one hand, or to naturalism in morals on the other hand.

All this only shows what is readily proved from every phase of the subject, namely, that with the teaching of religion or morality the State cannot have anything to do. That is committed by the Lord to the church and the family only. If these fail, the failure is complete, and all that the State can do in any effort to supply the lack, is only to make a bad matter worse. The State can have nothing to do with morality or immorality; it has to do only with civility or incivility. The church is God's means, by persuasive teaching, of inculcating morality; the State is God's means, by the exertion of force, of compelling those to be civil who will not be moral.

A. T. J.