THE NATIONAL REFORMED CONSTITUTION AND THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY

WE propose to give the American people a view of our Constitution as it will appear when amended to conform to the views of the National Reformers. This is a matter that concerns everyone, and will do so more and more as the National Reform party grows in influence and power. {NRCAH 3.1}

In this matter of reforming the Constitution, and thereby the nation, the National Reformers begin with the Preamble. At the first National Convention ever held by the National Reform Association—Alleghany City, Pa., January 27, 28, 1864—a memorial to Congress was adopted, asking the United States Senate and House of Representatives to adopt measures for amending the Constitution of the United States, so as to read in sub-stance as follows, the Amendment in brackets:— {NRCAH 3.2}

*THE PREAMBLE*

“We, the people of the United States [humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler among the nations, his revealed will as the supreme law of the land, in order to constitute a Christian Government], and in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, Insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.” {NRCAH 3.3}

It will be seen at a glance that this work of “reforming” the Constitution, cannot stop with the Preamble. For as the amended Preamble demands “a Christian Government,” it follows that the whole Constitution will have to be made to conform to this idea. This is exactly the aim of the Reformers. In that same memorial to Congress, immediately following the reformed Preamble as above quoted, is the following:— {NRCAH 4.1}

“And further: that such changes with respect to the oath of office, slavery, and *all other* matters, should be introduced *into the body of the Constitution* as may be necessary to give effect to these Amendments in the Preamble.” {NRCAH 4.2}

As the purpose of this reformed Preamble is declared to be “to constitute a Christian Government,” it necessarily follows that all who are to have any part or lot as citizens under the Government must be Christians. Therefore Section I of Article XIV of Amendments to the Constitution will have to be reformed so as to read thus:— {NRCAH 4.3}

All *Christian* persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside, etc. {NRCAH 4.4}

This is proved by “District Secretary” Coleman’s words that:— {NRCAH 5.1}

“The existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel.”—*Christian Statesman, November, 1883*. {NRCAH 5.2}

And Rev. J. C. K.—John Calvin Knox—Milligan says:— {NRCAH 5.3}

“When the Amendment is adopted, how will it act upon the civil and political rights of infidels, Jews, etc.? This depends largely upon themselves. The worst result will be to disfranchise them.”—*Christian Statesman, February 21, 1888*. {NRCAH 5.4}

This then being a “Christian Government,” all officials in the Government will have to be Christians. Therefore Section 2 of Article I of the Constitution will have to be reformed so as to read as follows:— {NRCAH 5.5}

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be a Christian, and an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen. {NRCAH 5.6}

Section 3 of the same Article will have to read the same way in regard to Senators, thus:— {NRCAH 5.7}

No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be a Christian, and an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen. {NRCAH 5.8}

In relation to the President, Section I, Article II, will have to read about as follows:— {NRCAH 6.1}

No person except a Christian, and natural-born citizen of the United States, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty-five years, and been fourteen years resident within the United States. {NRCAH 6.2}

In the matter of the oath this same section will have to be reformed so as to read something like this:— {NRCAH 6.3}

Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath of office: I do solemnly swear “*in the presence of the eternal God, that during the whole term of my office I will serve the same eternal God to the utmost of my power, according as he hath required in his most holy word, contained in the Old and New Testaments; and according to the same word, will maintain the true religion of Christ Jesus;* AND SHALL ABOLISH ALL FALSE RELIGION CONTRARY TO THE SAME; *and shall rule the people committed to my charge according to the will and command of God revealed in his word; and shall procure to the utmost of my power to the church of God, and the whole Christian people, true and perfect peace*;” and that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. {NRCAH 6.4}

This is a genuine National Reform oath, and is strictly according to the doctrines which that Association preaches. To accord with this, Article VI will have to be reformed about as follows:— {NRCAH 6.5}

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by *the aforesaid oath, substituting in each case the title of his own office for the words “President of the United States;”* AND THE TEST OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION SHALL be required as a qualification to every office or public trust under the United States. {NRCAH 6.6}

This will necessitate the reform of Article I of Amendments to the Constitution, so that its first clause shall read thus:— {NRCAH 7.1}

Congress shall make laws respecting the establishment of the Christian religion; prohibiting the free exercise of all other religion and of all irreligion; and abridging the freedom of speech and of the press in religious matters. {NRCAH 7.2}

This is confirmed by the words of “District Secretary” Rev. M. A. Gault, who says:— {NRCAH 7.3}

“Our remedy for all these malefic influences is to have the Government simply set up the moral law, and recognize *God’s authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it*.”—*Christian Statesman, January 13, 1887*. {NRCAH 7.4}

Just here, and as a fitting comment upon these words of Mr. Gault, we may very properly insert a remark of Mr. Waddington: “When the authority of Heaven is pleaded for the infliction of punishment, it creates an implacable and remorseless spirit, since it supersedes, by a stern necessity, all ordinary motives, and stifles the natural pleadings of humanity. The crusaders exclaimed, ‘It is the will of God!’ and in that fancied behest, the fiercest brutalities which the world had ever beheld, sought—not palliation, but—honor and the crown of eternal reward.”—*Church History, chap. 21, sec. 4, “Effects of the Crusades*.” Let the National Reformers once get what they fancy is “God’s authority,” behind their power to move the arm of the State, and it will be a heavy hand indeed that will be laid upon all non-conforming religion. But to return to the question before us. In the Pittsburg National Reform National Convention, 1874, Prof. C. A. Blanchard argued as follows:— {NRCAH 7.5}

“Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and of course Congress establishes a standard for money, weights, and measures. *So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion*.” {NRCAH 8.1}

Therefore clauses 5, 6, and 10 of Section VIII of Article I of the Constitution, will have to be reformed so as to read thus:— {NRCAH 8.2}

The Congress shall have power— {NRCAH 8.3}

5. To coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin, and to fix the standard of weights, measures, *and religion*. {NRCAH 8.4}

6. To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin, *and the religion* of the United States. {NRCAH 8.5}

.10. To define and punish *irreligion*, piracies, and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations. {NRCAH 8.6}

It is certain that all these changes in the body of the Constitution will not be made without universal and almost endless controversy. To say nothing of the open and confirmed opposition that there will be, it is evident that among those who would favor the changes, there will be great differences of opinion upon the exact shape and wording in which the changed Articles shall be couched. Nor will the controversy be confined simply to the called-for changes in the Constitution. As the reformed Preamble declares the “revealed will” of Christ to be the “supreme law,” the changes in the Constitution will be but the culmination of a grand national discussion as to what is the revealed will of Christ, and just how it is to be made applicable in national affairs. This is only what the National Reformers expect. Rev. J. C. K. Milligan writes on this subject, as follows:— {NRCAH 8.7}

“The changes will come gradually, and probably only after *the whole frame-work of Bible legislation* has been thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State Legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens; an outpouring of the Spirit might soon secure it.”—*Christian Statesman*. {NRCAH 9.1}

But that the National Reformers expect such a condition of affairs as this, is not all. They arc doing, and will do, their very best to create it; not out of love for the Bible, nor for Christianity, but for their own self-aggrandizement. This is clearly revealed by Mr. Milligan in words immediately following the passage just quoted. He continues:— {NRCAH 9.2}

“The churches and the pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and *with interpretations of Scripture* on moral *and civil*, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points; and it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of our citizens about these, the chief discussions and the *final decision* of most points will be developed there. ‘Many nations shall come and say: Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion.’” {NRCAH 9.3}

Exactly! the churches are “Zion,” and “the law shall go forth of Zion.” Therefore in the national canvass of “the whole framework of Bible legislation,” when it comes to the changes in the body of the Constitution, and thus the culmination of the discussion, in the form of law, then Congress, the State Legislatures, and the Supreme Courts will have to receive that law from the churches and pulpits, and the law in its final form will have to be according to the mould or the indorsement of the “leaders and teachers” in the churches, for “*the law shall go forth of Zion*,” and the “*final decision will be developed there*.” And then, after this august deliverance, the Rev. Mr. Milligan straightens himself up and admiringly pats himself, and all his fellows, upon the back, after this style:— {NRCAH 10.1}

“There certainly is no class of citizens more intelligent, patriotic, and trustworthy than the leaders and teachers in our churches.” {NRCAH 10.2}

In connection with these words there are certain scriptures which we would commend to Mr. Milligan’s consideration: “Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips.” Proverbs 27:2. “For men to search their own glory is not glory.” Proverbs 25:27. “Not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth.” 2 Corinthians 10:18. {NRCAH 10.3}

But whether they will heed these scriptures or not there is one thing certain: that is, by the evidences here presented, it is perfectly clear that the direct aim of the leaders in the National Reform movement is the exaltation of themselves into a hierarchy as absolute as is that of Mormonism, or as was that of the Papacy in the supremest hours of the Dark Ages. They deliberately propose to make themselves the arbiters of every controversy, and the interpreters of Scripture on all points, moral, civil, theological, and ecclesiastical. And mark, their decision, it is plainly declared, will be “final.” There can be no appeal, for there is none higher than they. There can be no appeal to God, for is not the Lord King in Zion? and don’t they represent Zion? and isn’t the law to go forth of. Zion? Thus they would make themselves the vicegerents of the Lord, and the fountain of all law. And just now, and in view of these propositions of the National Reformers, the American people would do well to remember the truth stated by Dean Milman in relation to what is simply a matter of fact in all history: “In proportion as the ecclesiastics became co-legislators, heresies became civil crimes, and liable to civil punishments.” {NRCAH 11.1}

Upon the surface, some of the changes in the Constitution, which we have marked, appear very innocent. It is only when we go below the surface that the real iniquity of the thing appears. When the real purpose of the movement is discovered, it is found that the Christianity that is to become national, is just what this hierarchy shall declare to be Christianity; that the “revealed will,” which is to be the supreme law of the land, is what the hierarchy shall declare to be the revealed will; it is seen that in submitting to the proposed test of the Christian religion, it is not such a view of that religion as a man’s own conscience approves, but such a view as the hierarchy approves; that in submitting to this proposed revealed will as the supreme law, it is not to that revealed will as a man may read it in the Scripture and interpret it by the best light of his own conscience, but to what the hierarchy shall declare to be the revealed will, as interpreted by their own will. Then there is no more the liberty of every man worshiping God ac-cording to the dictates of his own conscience, but all must worship(?) according to the dictates of the hierarchy. {NRCAH 11.2}

Then when these exceedingly “intelligent, patriotic, and trustworthy leaders in our churches” shall have succeeded in thus placing themselves in the position of supreme arbiter of all controversies, and supreme interpreter in all points of the revealed will of Christ, it will be necessary to reform Section 7 of Article I of the Constitution, so that it shall read about as follows:— {NRCAH 12.1}

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, *and the President*, shall, before it become a law, be presented to “*the leaders and teachers in our churches*,” *whose “decision” shall be “final*.” {NRCAH 12.2}

Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President, *and to “the churches and pulpits*” of the United States, *and the “decision” of “the leaders and teachers in our churches” shall be “final*.” {NRCAH 13.1}

There, fellow-citizens, are some of the features that our Constitution will present, when it shall have been “reformed” according to the doctrines of the National Reform party. If there are any of our readers who do not yet see that the success of the National Reform movement will he the establishment of an absolute hierarchy in this nation, we ask their indulgence a little further, while we present such evidence both of fact and of law, as shall leave no room for any reasonable doubt. {NRCAH 13.2}

Let it be observed that the immediate effect of the Religious Amendment to the Constitution, will be to make the ten commandments the supreme law of the land. This is what the National Reformers propose, and here is the proof. Rev. J. C K. Milligan, in the article before referred to, asked the question, “How is the Amendment to be carried out practically?” And in the answer to this question he made this statement:— {NRCAH 13.3}

“In brief, its adoption will at once make the morality of the ten commandments to be the supreme law of the land, and anything in the State constitutions and laws that is contrary to them will become unconstitutional.” {NRCAH 13.4}

The ten commandments are the law of God. The ten commandments are, for the universe, the supreme standard of morals. They are the moral law. Every duty enjoined in the Bible, that is to say, every duty of man, finds its spring in some one of the ten commandments. This law takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. To violate that law, even in thought, is sin. For said Christ: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.” And again: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.” Matthew 5:21, 22, 27, 28. And “whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.” 1 John 3:15. {NRCAH 14.1}

This is sufficient to show that the ten commandments deal with the thoughts, with the heart, with the conscience. By this law is the knowledge of sin (Romans 3:20); in fact, God’s own definition of sin is that “sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John 3:4. And as already shown, the law may be transgressed by thinking harshly or impurely of another; it is immoral to do so. {NRCAH 14.2}

Let it also be observed that the National Reformers not only propose to make the moral law the supreme law of the Government of the United States, but they propose to make themselves the supreme interpreters of that law. Again we quote Mr. J. C. K. Milligan’s words:— {NRCAH 15.1}

“The *churches* and the *pulpits* have much to do with *shaping* and *forming* opinions on *all moral* questions, and with interpretations of Scripture on *moral* and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points.” {NRCAH 15.2}

Now there is absolutely nothing that a man can do, or say, or think, that does not involve a moral question. The National Reformers propose to bring about in this Government, a condition of things by which they shall have “much to do” with “all moral questions,” and “with interpretations of Scripture on moral points;” which is only to say that they propose to have “much to do” with what every person does, and says, and thinks. Therefore it is proven to a demonstration that the direct aim of the National Reformers is to establish in this nation a hierarchy perfectly patterned after the infamous model of the Papacy. {NRCAH 15.3}

We have not the space, nor will it be considered necessary, in confirmation of this, to take up the ten commandments one by one. One of them will be sufficient, and we shall choose the one upon which the National Reformers themselves make their greatest argument for national guilt, that is, {NRCAH 15.4}

*THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT*

Bear in mind that in the National Reformed Government, the fourth commandment will be a part of the Constitution of the United States; in fact, strictly speaking, the ten commandments will be the Constitution, because they are to be the supreme law. Then everybody in the United States will have to keep the fourth commandment, for to refuse to do so will be rebellion. Let no one misunderstand us. Our opposition is not against the ten commandments, nor against any one of them. We believe most decidedly in keeping the ten commandments, in every jot and tittle, according to the word of Christ, and we teach men so. In short, we believe in keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. We strictly practice in accordance with this belief. Therefore what we shall ever say on this subject, let no one misconstrue into an opposition to the ten commandments, nor to Christ, nor to the Bible. Our opposition is solely to the National Reform movement, and to the hierarchy, the establishment of which is the object of that movement. We believe in strictly keeping the moral law, in deed, in word, and in thought; but we decidedly oppose the project of the National Reformers to put civil government into the realm of morals, to make civil rulers moral governors, and to make a set of ambitious clerics the supervisors of men’s thoughts and the conservators of men’s consciences. {NRCAH 16.1}

Suppose that the National Reform movement has proved a success. The ten commandments are the supreme law—the Constitution of the Government—and the National Reformers set about to accomplish one of the “practical results” that is sought by their Amendment, namely, “the perpetuation of the Sabbath.”—*See Resolutions, Pittsburg Convention*. The National Reformers expect a “universal gathering” and “discussion” about the changes that will be made in the Constitution, and this question of the bearing of the ten commandments will, in the nature of the case, be the chief, because the ten commandments are to have the chief place in the “Reformed” Constitution. And as the ten commandments are to have the chief place in the Constitution, and as the fourth commandment of the ten is to have the chief place in the efforts of the National Reformers, it follows that the bearing of the fourth commandment will be the one great national question in the National Reformed Government. What then says the commandment? Let us read:— {NRCAH 17.1}

“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 manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it.” {NRCAH 17.2}

Even now there is no little discussion about the meaning of this commandment. There are the National Reformers who profess to keep the commandment, and they keep the seventh day—Saturday. There are the National Reformers and the evangelical Christians generally who also profess to keep the commandment, and they keep the first day—Sunday. Then between these extremes there lies a third class who are not Jews, neither are they classed as “evangelical” Christians, yet they profess to be Christians, and profess to keep the fourth commandment—we refer to the Seventh-day Baptists and the Seventh-day Adventists. These insist that to obey the commandment, the seventh day must be kept even by Christians. There are yet others who believe that Sunday should be kept with some degree of sacredness, but with no reference whatever to the fourth commandment. {NRCAH 18.1}

It is evident that all these discordant views of the bearing of the fourth commandment, are not going to be reconciled by the adoption of the proposed Amendment to the Constitution. And as that commandment will then be a part of the National Constitution, the question of the meaning of commandment, and of what day is to be observed in obeying the commandment, will have to be decided in the Supreme Court of the United States. And mark, if the Supreme Court be left to itself, if the court be allowed to sit simply as a court of *law*, when this question should come up for decision it would do, so as a question of law and not of theology. {NRCAH 18.2}

Considering it therefore as a question of law, the court would be guided by the acknowledged rules that are laid down for the interpretation of law and statute. Let us try the interpretation of the commandment by some of these rules. Chancellor Kent, in his “Commentaries,” lays down this rule:— {NRCAH 19.1}

“The words of a statute, if of common use, are to be taken in their natural, plain, obvious, and ordinary signification and import.” {NRCAH 19.2}

The first question then is, Are the words of the fourth commandment such as are of common used Look at them and see. The only answer that there can be is, They are. There is not a word in the commandment that is not of common use. Then the judges have no alternative, the words are to be taken in their natural, plain, obvious, and ordinary signification and import. {NRCAH 19.3}

The Hon. John A. Bingham was appointed by the House of Representatives, to conduct the impeachment of President Johnson. In the course of that trial Mr. Bingham stated this rule of law:— {NRCAH 19.4}

“When words are plain in a written law, there is an end to all construction. They must be followed.” {NRCAH 19.5}

The words of the fourth commandment, being of common use, must be plain. Then the court is allowed no latitude for construction, it must follow the plain words of the statute. {NRCAH 19.6}

What is the purpose of the fourth commandment? It is to secure the keeping of the Sabbath day. For the first sentence is, “Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy.” But what day is the Sabbath-day? The commandment itself tells: “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Remember that we are asking these questions from the standpoint of law, and not of theology. We are examining it as it will have to be examined should the National Reform movement succeed. These are the very questions that the judges of the Supreme Court will have to ask. And if they are to follow the rules of law, and the words of the then Constitution, these arc the very answers that they will have to make. The judges must follow the words of the statute. As jurists they can do nothing else. Therefore if the court be left to itself and to the principles and rules of civil law, as everybody knows that Saturday is the seventh day, it follows inevitably that as surely as the National Reform movement succeeds, every-body in these United States *will have to* {NRCAH 20.1}

*KEEP SATURDAY FOR THE SABBATH*

But is *that* what the National Reformers desire to accomplish? Is *that* what they are aiming at? No, indeed, not they! For the court is not to be left to itself and to the rules of civil law. Such a decision as that, the National Reformers never will allow. And right here is where their hierarchy comes in. Here is where they appear as the “interpreters of Scripture” on “all questions of morals.” Here is the point at which they step in with their “final decisions.” For as soon as such an interpretation as that is proposed, they will assert that that is not the *correct interpretation*. They will say that the rules of *civil* law do not apply in the interpretation of a *religious* statute; that this is a theological question and it must be decided by theological definitions. They will say that the unanimous verdict of the theological world on this question is that the expression “seventh day” in the fourth commandment does not mean the definite seventh day of the week, but “one day in seven,” “one day of rest alter six days of work;” that in the Jewish dispensation the day kept was Saturday, but in the Christian dispensation the first day of the week is the. Christian Sabbath, that it is in fact the distinctive badge of Christianity; that this has been by Constitutional Amendment declared to be a Christian nation, and as this commandment is a part of the Constitution, it must be interpreted by the rules of Christian theology. {NRCAH 20.2}

Can there be any doubt as to which way the question will be decided? Not the least. It will have to be decided in favor of the prevalent Christianity, and the “Christian Sabbath” will thus be declared to be the Sabbath in this Government. But by whom is the question decided? by whom is the final decision made? Not by the judges, but by the theologians. Not by the court, but by “the leaders and teachers in our churches.” And that is nothing else than the rule of a hierarchy. {NRCAH 21.1}

Here, and by this, we are brought face to face with another important consideration—in fact, the culmination of National Reform purposes and aims. It is this: As all these questions are to be decided not as questions of law, but of theology; and as “the leaders and teachers” in the churches are to be the interpreters on moral and theological points; it follows that the success of the National Reform movement will be the destruction of all distinction between law and theology, between civil and religious affairs. All the courts of the land will be—not courts of law but—courts of theology; and every question of government and of life will become a theological question, subject to the supervision and the “final decision” of these “leaders and teachers” in the churches. All of which will be but to turn this Government into a man-made theocracy, with the leaders of National Reform in the seat of God. In short, it will be but a new form of the Papacy under the title of National Reform. {NRCAH 22.1}

Even when this question of the Sabbath is decided, we do not believe that all the Seventh-day Baptists, and all the Seventh-day Adventists, and all the Jews in the country, are going to accept and conform to the decision, without coercion. But coercion will be persecution; while if there is no coercion the Reformed Constitution will be set at defiance, and all the work of the National Reformers will be in vain. But as we are not to suppose for a moment that they are working in vain, it follows that the success of National Reform will certainly bring persecution. But that is only to carry out the spirit of the Papacy. {NRCAH 22.2}

If these people who do not want to keep Sunday should all set themselves to work together to obtain an Amendment to the Constitution, by which they could and would, under pains and penalties, compel all persons in the United States to keep Saturday and submit to their “interpretation” and “final decision” upon all questions of Scripture and morals, the National Reformers would at once pronounce it an invasion of human right and religious liberty—in short they would pronounce it an infamous proceeding. And so should we. Therefore when the National Reformers deliberately propose to do this very thing, only putting Sunday instead of Saturday in the law, and bend every element to its accomplishment, then we do likewise pronounce that an infamous proceeding. And so should everyone who has any regard for human right and liberty of conscience. {NRCAH 23.1}

If there be any such thing as logical deductions from clear statements, we believe that we have fulfilled our promise to show that the success of the National Reform movement will be the establishment of an absolute hierarchy in this nation. {NRCAH 23.2}