**“Front Page” American Sentinel 3, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

Thousands of people are signing petitions for the National Sunday law, without a thought of harm to themselves or anybody else. Yet only harm to thousands of people can ever come from the enactment of such a law. Many of those who are signing the petitions would not do so if they knew the danger that there is in the enactment of the law. The Sentinel clearly points out the danger. Therefore the Sentinel should be placed in the hands of every person in the land. Are you doing your part to see that this shall be done? {AMS October 1888, p. 73.1}

Not long since a Prohibition Convention was held in Visalia, Cal. The preachers were very active and enthusiastic in it; and they succeeded in arousing a good deal of enthusiasm in the body of the convention. After the convention had dispersed the following question was put to two of the preachers: “I suppose the object of this is, in the long run, to work it into a Sunday law?” And the answer was this:- {AMS October 1888, p. 73.2}

“That is what it is; but we are not saying anything about that now, till we get the thing in running order-then we will bring that in.” That is precisely the scheme which the preachers are working through the third-party-Prohibition movement, and that is just the way that they are working it. Under cover of Prohibition and temperance legislation they are working for the establishment of a religious despotism. {AMS October 1888, p. 73.3}

Recently a preacher in Selma, Cal., delivered a sermon in which he said:- {AMS October 1888, p. 73.4}

“We have laws to punish the man who steals our property; but we have no law to prevent people from working on Sunday. It is right that the thief be punished; but I have more sympathy for that man than I have for him that works on that day.” {AMS October 1888, p. 73.5}

This is directly in the line of things promised by the Prohibition party. Whenever any party sets itself up as the protector of the Lord, and legislates upon things pertaining to God, then offenses, or supposed offenses, against God take precedence of all things else. Heresy becomes the highest crime. Then the thief will be let run, and receive sympathy, while the man who quietly works at his lawful and honest calling is prosecuted, fined, and imprisoned. And Senator Blair’s proposed amendment and Sunday law open the way for such men as this to carry their views into effect, by the civil power. {AMS October 1888, p. 73.6}

**“The National Sunday Bill” American Sentinel 3, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

The National Sunday Bill, introduced into the United States Senate by Senator Blair, is a queer piece of legislation for this enlightened age and country, in more senses than one. We have referred to it in our columns before; but as the legislation itself is the first step taken in an endless controversy, this is ample excuse for referring to it again. But besides this there is sufficient material in the bill itself to justify a long discussion, and even continuous repetition, until the people shall see the danger there is threatening their cherished liberties and dearest rights. {AMS October 1888, p. 73.7}

We propose to notice it section by section, and call attention, briefly, to some of the moral and civil delinquencies that show themselves in the bill. {AMS October 1888, p. 73.8}

The first section embodies legislation in regard to “the Lord’s day,” and is as follows:- {AMS October 1888, p. 73.9}

“*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That no person, or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord’s day, or during any part thereof, in any Territory,. district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.” {AMS October 1888, p. 73.10}

This is contrary to the word of Christ. Christ said: “Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.” By these words it is clear that that which is the Lord’s is not to be rendered to Cæsar, but to the Lord. Cæsar is civil government; therefore, we are not to render to civil government that which is the Lord’s; with what is the Lord’s Cæsar has nothing to do. Senator Blair’s bill, in legislating upon that which pertains to the Lord, plainly sets itself against the word of Christ, and is, therefore, antichristian. {AMS October 1888, p. 73.11}

Again, this section declares that no person shall do any work, “nor engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord’s day, or during any part thereof.” This leaves it entirely with the other man, or with judge or jury, to say whether that which has been done was a disturbance; and that is only to make every man’s action on Sunday subject to the whim or caprice of his neighbor. But “any condition of the law which allows the test of criminality to depend on the whim or caprice of judge or juror, savors of tyranny.” The doctrine embodied in this section of the Blair bill is subversive of liberty. It attacks; not only the inherent rights, but the constitutional rights, of every American citizen. For a sound judicial decision upon this principle of this section see the article entitled, “The Savor of Tyranny,” in another column of this paper. {AMS October 1888, p. 73.12}

Section two is as follows:- {AMS October 1888, p. 73.13}

“Sec. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal-route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: *Provided*, That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the postmaster-general shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter, and shall make regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: *And provided further*, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week.” {AMS October 1888, p. 73.14}

The object of this section is to stop the carrying of the mails on Sunday; but yet any letter that relates to a work of necessity or mercy, or the health, life, or death of any person, which has the fact plainly stated upon the face of the envelope, shall be delivered on the first day of the week. {AMS October 1888, p. 73.15}

Section 3 is as follows:- {AMS October 1888, p. 73.16}

“Sec. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation who shall willfully violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.” {AMS October 1888, p. 73.17}

This section embodies the same principle as the first in regard to the disturbance of others, and sets a heavy penalty upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality. Upon what principle except that of religious intolerance can it ever be made to appear that an act which is not only perfectly innocent but entirely laudable when performed on any other day of the week, becomes so intensely criminal when performed on the first day of the week as to deserve a penalty of a thousand dollars fine? {AMS October 1888, p. 73.18}

Section 4 reads:- {AMS October 1888, p. 74.1}

“Sec. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord’s day.” {AMS October 1888, p. 74.2}

So far as anything in this section is in itself concerned there is nothing particularly to be noticed except that it is directly in the line of Constantine’s Sunday legislation. He, however, went a step further and caused his soldiers to parade expressly for worship, and wrote out a prayer which he had them all repeat at a given signal. Something like this may fairly be expected to follow should this bill become a law; because, as religious observance and religious worship are the objects of the bill, why should not the soldiers be required to pray on Sunday as well as to religiously observe the day? It may be said that the *religious* observance of the day is not required; but when we come to section six, it will be seen that it is. {AMS October 1888, p. 74.3}

Section 5 reads thus:- {AMS October 1888, p. 74.4}

“Sec. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered or for labor performed or for the transportation of persons or property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.” {AMS October 1888, p. 74.5}

This section provides that if any person works for any other person on Sunday, and receives payment for it at any time, then any person in the wide world, except the parties concerned, can enter suit, and recover the money so paid. If you work for me on Sunday, and I ever pay you for it, then the first man that finds it out can sue you and get the money. That is what the bill says. The bill says that when wages are paid for Sunday work, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same. “Whoever,” is a universal term. Therefore, this bill deliberately proposes that when any man who is subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, receives payment for work done on Sunday, except of necessity or mercy, he may be sued for that money by whoever first learns that he has received it, and that person shall get the money. {AMS October 1888, p. 74.6}

To think that any such legislation as is embodied in this section should ever be thought of by any sane person, is sufficiently astonishing; but that it should not only have been thought of, but should have been thought of and embodied in a bill, and introduced into the United States Senate by a United States Senator, and that it should have passed two readings in that body without a dissenting voice, is simply astounding. It almost surpasses belief. But here are the facts which demonstrate that such things have been done in this land of liberty, in the National Legislature, in this year of the nineteenth century. When United States Senators will employ their time in such legislation as that, then whose liberties are safe? Senator Blair is a Prohibitionist of National reputation. He may justly be considered a representative Prohibitionist, and the legislation proposed in this bill, and in this section of the bill, may justly be considered a representative piece of Prohibitionist legislation. {AMS October 1888, p. 74.7}

But if that be so, then the fewer Prohibitionists who ever, as such, secure legislative power, the better will it be for the people. And when such legislation as is here proposed can be introduced, and read twice in the United States Senate, without a dissenting voice, then it is high time that the American people were awaking to that eternal vigilance which only is the price of liberty. {AMS October 1888, p. 74.8}

The last section of the bill is as follows:- {AMS October 1888, p. 74.9}

“Sec. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in con-sequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and ex-posed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory into another State, district, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day.” {AMS October 1888, p. 74.10}

This section is simply provisory, and requires no comment, except the last few lines, which show the object of the entire bill; and that is, “to secure to the whole people rest, ...and the religious observance of the Sabbath day.” No one, therefore, need attempt to evade the force of objections against this bill by saying that it is not the religious, but the *civil*, observance of the day that is required; because here it is plainly declared in the bill itself, that it is not only to secure rest to all the people, but that it is also to secure the *religious* observance of the Sabbath day. There is not a single reference in the bill to any such thing as the civil observance of the day. The word “civil” is not used in the bill. It is a religious bill wholly. The first section defines the Lord’s day; the second section refers to the day as one of worship and rest; section three refers to it as a day of religious worship; section four refers to its observance as that of religious worship; and section six plainly declares what is apparent throughout, that the object of the whole bill is “to secure to the whole people rest *and religious* observance of the Sabbath day,” on the first day of the week. {AMS October 1888, p. 74.11}

It is religious legislation, and that only; but as the present Constitution forbids religious legislation, it was necessary to follow the presentation of this bill by a proposed amendment to the Constitution establishing the Christian religion. Thus the two go hand in hand. They belong together; either necessitates the other. Let either be adopted, and in the language of the United States Senate in 1829, it will “involve a legislative decision on a religious controversy, and on a point in which good citizens may honestly differ in opinion, without disturbing the peace of society, or endangering its liberties. If this principle is once introduced it will be impossible to define its bounds... If admitted it may be justly apprehended that the future measures of the Government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence. All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it, and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequences... If the principle is once established that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts we must pursue it to its *ultimatum*... Let the National Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid, for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World.” {AMS October 1888, p. 74.12}

The Blair Sunday Bill and its accompanying constitutional amendment bear in them, or in either of them, this desolating scourge, and if adopted will spread that scourge over all this fair land. Therefore we are eternally opposed to this bill or anything like it. We oppose it as human beings who have respect for human rights; we oppose it as American citizens who believe in the rights and liberties asserted for mankind by the Declaration of Independence, and maintained for all by the American Constitution as it is, and which inhere in the genius of American institutions. We oppose it as men who fear God, and respect the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, or, so far as civil government is concerned, not to worship him at all if he chooses; we oppose it as Christians who love Christ and endeavor sincerely to do his will, and who, at the same time, maintain that, under civil government, every other man is entitled to all the rights to which the Christian is entitled; and we would have every soul in the United States inspired with the spirit, and, we hope, with the deathless endurance, with which our own opposition is inspired. {AMS October 1888, p. 74.13}

**“The National Establishment of the Christian Religion” American Sentinel 3, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

A JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, RESPECTING ESTABLISHMENTS OF RELIGION AND FREE SCHOOLS. {AMS October 1888, p. 74.14}

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:- {AMS October 1888, p. 74.15}

**ARTICLE**

Section 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. {AMS October 1888, p. 74.16}

Sec. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools. {AMS October 1888, p. 74.17}

Sec. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve government republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided. {AMS October 1888, p. 74.18}

Sec. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary. {AMS October 1888, p. 75.1}

This amendment to the National Constitution has been offered by Senator Blair, and is now pending in Congress. It is a singular sort of a document, though hardly any more so than was to be expected in the promotion of the scheme which underlies it, *i.e.*, the establishment of a National religion. The proposed amendment is just about as flatly self-contradictory as any proposition could be. Section 1 reads as follows:- {AMS October 1888, p. 75.2}

“No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” {AMS October 1888, p. 75.3}

The first sentence of section 2 reads as follows:- {AMS October 1888, p. 75.4}

“Each State in this Union *shall establish and maintain* a system of free public schools adequate to the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and *the principles of Christian religion*.” {AMS October 1888, p. 75.5}

That is to say, No State shall ever make or maintain a law respecting an establishment of religion; but every State in this Union shall make and maintain laws establishing the principles of the Christian religion. And to make assurance doubly sure, section 3 declares that {AMS October 1888, p. 75.6}

“The United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.” {AMS October 1888, p. 75.7}

And that is to say that the United States Government pledges itself that every State shall establish and maintain the principles of the Christian religion. This proposed amendment therefore, at one stroke, establishes Christianity as the National religion, *because* it declares that every State shall maintain the principles of the Christian religion in the public schools, and the Nation is pledged to see that this is done. Therefore there must be a National decision of some kind declaring just what are the principles of the Christian religion. Then when that decision shall have been made, every State will have to receive from the Nation just those principles of religion which the Nation shall have declared to be the principles of the Christian religion, and which the Nation will have pledged itself shall be taught in the public schools of every State. In other words, the people of the United States will then have to receive their religion from the Government of the United States. Therefore, if Senator Blair’s proposed amendment to the National Constitution does not provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National religion, then no religion was ever established or maintained in this world. {AMS October 1888, p. 75.8}

But how shall this National decision be made as to what are the principles of the Christian religion? It would seem that the second sentence of section 2 makes provision for this. It declares that no “instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.” {AMS October 1888, p. 75.9}

As therefore no religious tenets, doctrines, or beliefs can be taught in the schools, except such as are common to all denominations of the Christian religion, it will follow inevitably that there shall be officially called a National council of the churches to decide what are the principles common to all, and to establish a National creed, which shall be enforced and inculcated by National power in all the public schools in the United States. And that will be but the establishment of a National religion. And that is exactly what Senator Blair’s constitutional amendment assures, so surely as it or anything similar to it shall ever be adopted. And that is what the National Reformers intend shall be. {AMS October 1888, p. 75.10}

It was in this way precisely that the thing was worked in the fourth century. Constantine made Christianity the recognized religion of the Roman Empire. Then it became at once necessary that there should be an imperial decision as to what form of Christianity should be the imperial religion. To effect this an imperial council was necessary to formulate that phase of Christianity which was common to all. The Council of Nice was convened by imperial command, and an imperial creed was established, which was enforced by imperial power. That establishment of an imperial religion ended only in the imperious despotism of the Papacy. {AMS October 1888, p. 75.11}

As surely as the complete establishment of the Papacy followed, and grew out of, that imperial recognition of Christianity in the fourth century, just so surely will the complete establishment of a religious despotism after the living likeness of the Papacy, follow, and grow out of, this National recognition of Christianity provided for in the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator Blair, and which is now pending in Congress. {AMS October 1888, p. 75.12}

**The Savor of Tyranny**

Senator Blair’s National Sunday Bill declares that no person shall “engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, *to the disturbance of others* on the first day of the week, commonly called the Lord’s day, or during any part thereof.” Some of the States already have the same sort of Sunday laws as this. California has no Sunday law, much less one of this kind. But not long ago the city of San Francisco had, on another subject, an ordinance of the same nature as this passage in the National Sunday Bill. San Francisco has no such ordinance now, however; the merit of the ordinance came up before the Supreme Court, and the whole thing was treated with the contempt which all such statutes only deserve. {AMS October 1888, p. 75.13}

The ordinance read as follows:- {AMS October 1888, p. 75.14}

“No person shall in any place indulge in conduct having a tendency to annoy persons passing or being upon the public highway or upon adjacent premises.” {AMS October 1888, p. 75.15}

A man by the name of Ferdinand Pape was distributing some circulars on the street, which had “a tendency to annoy” somebody; he was arrested. He applied to the Superior Court for a writ of *habeas corpus*, claiming that the offense charged against him did not constitute a crime, and that the ordinance making such action an offense was invalid and void, because it was unreasonable and uncertain. The report of the case says:- {AMS October 1888, p. 75.16}

“The writ was made returnable before Judge Sullivan, and argued by Henry Hutton in behalf of the imprisoned offender. Disposing of the question, the Judge gave quite a lengthy written opinion, in which he passed a somewhat severe criticism upon the absurdity of the contested ordinance, and discharged Pape from custody. Said the Judge:- {AMS October 1888, p. 75.17}

“‘If the order be law, enforceable by fine and imprisonment, it is a crime to indulge in any conduct, however innocent and harmless in it-self, and however unconsciously done, which has a tendency to annoy other persons. The rival tradesman who passes one’s store with an observant eye as to the volume of business is guilty of a crime, because the very thought of rivalry and reduction of business has a tendency to annoy. The passing of the most lenient creditor has a tendency to annoy, because it is a reminder of obligations unfulfilled. The passing of a well-clad, industrious citizen, bearing about him the evidence of thrift, has a tendency to annoy the vagabond, whose laziness reduces him to a condition of poverty and discontent. The importunities of the newsboy who endeavors with such persistent energy to dispose of his stock, has a tendency to annoy the prominent citizen who has already read the papers, or who expects to find them at his door as he reaches home. He who has been foiled in an attempted wrong upon the person or property of another, finds a tendency to annoy in the very passing presence of the person whose honesty or ingenuity has circumvented him. And so instances might be multiplied indefinitely in which the most harmless and inoffensive conduct has a tendency to annoy others. If the language of the ordinance defines a criminal offense, it sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality. {AMS October 1888, p. 75.18}

“‘But it may be said that courts and juries will not use the instrumentality of this language to set the seal of condemnation on unoffending citizens, and to unjustly deprive them of their liberty and brand them as criminals. The law countenances no such dangerous doctrine, countenances no principle so subversive of liberty as that the life or liberty of a subject should be made to depend upon the whim or caprice of judge or jury, by exercising a discretion in determining that certain conduct does or does not come within the inhibition of a criminal action. The law should be engraved so plainly and distinctly on the legislative tables that it can be discerned alike by all subjects of the commonwealth, whether judge upon the bench, juror in the box, or prisoner at the bar. Any condition of the law which allows the test of criminality to depend on the whim or caprice of judge or juror savors of tyranny. The language employed is broad enough to cover conduct which is clearly within the constitutional rights of the citizen. It designates no border-line which divides the criminal from the non-criminal conduct. Its terms are too vague and uncertain to lay down a rule of conduct. In my judgment the portion of the ordinance here involved is uncertain and unreasonable.’” {AMS October 1888, p. 75.19}

This decision applies with full force to Senator-Blair’s proposed National Sunday law. Under that law all that would be necessary to subject any person to a criminal prosecution, would be for him to engage in any sort of play, or game, or amusement, or recreation, on Sunday, because there are many of those rigid National Reformers who would be very much “disturbed” by any such amusement or recreation, however innocent it might be in itself. And it is left entirely to the whim or the caprice of the “disturbed” one, or of the judge or jury, to say whether the action has really disturbed him or not. {AMS October 1888, p. 76.1}

The California decision is, that such a statute “sets a very severe penalty of liberty and property upon conduct lacking in the essential element of criminality.” California courts “countenance no such dangerous doctrine, countenance no principle so subversive of liberty,” or which so “savors of tyranny.” It is very likely that should Senator Blair’s bill be enacted into a law, the United States courts would decide in the same way as did the Superior Court of California. But it is an exceedingly ominous sign, and one most startling in the danger which it displays, when a bill which so “savors of tyranny,” and which embodies a “principle so subversive of liberty,” can be introduced into the National Legislature, can be received and reported favorably, can pass two readings, can be spread broadcast throughout the land, and only one single voice-that of the American Sentinel-be raised against it. {AMS October 1888, p. 76.2}

The American people have so long enjoyed the liberty which has been justly their boast, that they seem, from appearances, to think that now they can lie down safely and hibernate undisturbed for all time to come. We wonder what can ever awaken them. “Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty;” but “corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.” {AMS October 1888, p. 76.3}

**“The National Reform Association” American Sentinel 3, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

The National Reform Association is an organization composed of representative men of all “evangelical” denominations, and its object is to secure an amendment to the National Constitution, making Christianity the National religion. Among its vice-presidents are: Joseph Cook, President Seelye, Bishop Huntington of New York, George W. Bain of Kentucky, Miss Frances E. Willard, Mrs. Josephine Bateham, Mrs. Mary A. Woodbridge, Mrs. Hoffman, Mrs. Lathrop, and others of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, besides such a number of Reverends, D. Ds., LL. Ds., that we cannot take the time to name them, but which number in all about one hundred and twenty. All these are simply the vice-presidents of the Association. This Association, we have said, was organized to secure an amendment to the National Constitution, recognizing the Christian religion as the religion of this country, and enforcing its precepts upon all who live under the Government. The proposed constitutional amendment introduced by Senator Blair, which we print in another column, is just the kind of an amendment which they seek to have adopted, and with this amendment they are intensely pleased. The *Christian Statesman* is the organ of that Association, and in its issue of July 18, 1888, it indorses this amendment as furnishing an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people, and as embodying principles which have been advocated by the Association for a quarter of a century. In the same paper, of September 6, Mr. John Alexander, father of the Association, urges without delay the circulation of petitions favoring the amendment in such numbers, and signed by so many people, that it will require a procession of wheel-barrows to trundle the mighty mass into the presence of the representatives of the Nation, in the Houses of Congress. Other such commendations might be given, but these are sufficient to show how entirely the Blair amendment meets the mind of the managers of the National Reform Association. {AMS October 1888, p. 76.4}

Now we propose to give a few items showing what the National Reformers wish to do when they get that which the Blair Amendment embodies. {AMS October 1888, p. 76.5}

The *Christian Statesman*, of October 2, 1884, said:- {AMS October 1888, p. 76.6}

“Give all men to understand that this is a Christian Nation, and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain, by all right means, our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution... Enforce upon all who come among us the laws of Christian morality.” {AMS October 1888, p. 76.7}

“Enforce,” according to Webster, is “to force, to constrain, to compel, to execute with vigor.” Therefore the proposition of the National Reformers is to force, to compel, all to keep the laws of Christian morality; to execute with vigor upon all the laws of Christian morality. {AMS October 1888, p. 76.8}

It will be seen at once that this will be but to invade the rights of conscience, and this, one of the vice-presidents of the Association declares, civil power has a right to do. Rev. David Gregg, D.D., now pastor of Park Street Church, Boston, a vice-president of the National Reform Association, plainly declared, in the *Christian Statesman*, of June 5, 1884, that the civil power “has the right to command the consciences of men.” {AMS October 1888, p. 76.9}

Rev. M.A. Gault, a district secretary, and a leading worker, of the Association says:- {AMS October 1888, p. 76.10}

“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 hands on any religion that does not conform to it.” {AMS October 1888, p. 76.11}

Rev. E. B. Graham, also a vice-president of the Association, in an address delivered at York, Nebraska, reported in the *Christian Statesman* of May 21, 1885, said:- {AMS October 1888, p. 76.12}

“We might add in all justice, if the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a Government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas, and then if they can stand it stay there till they die.” {AMS October 1888, p. 76.13}

In a speech in a National Reform Convention held in New York City, in February, 1873, Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D.D., named atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Christians, and summed them all up under the head of atheists, and said:- {AMS October 1888, p. 76.14}

“These all are... as far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together... The first-named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry. It is his class... The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him. They must be treated, as for this question, one party.” {AMS October 1888, p. 76.15}

Then he tells how they propose to deal with these people when they get what the Blair amendment supplies. He says:- {AMS October 1888, p. 76.16}

“What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would a poor lunatic, for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man... Tolerate atheism, sir! There is nothing out of hell I would not tolerate as soon... Atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They can-not dwell together on the same continent.” {AMS October 1888, p. 76.17}

As though this were not enough, and as though their tolerant intentions were not sincere enough, they propose in addition to all this to join hands with the Catholic Church and enlist her efforts in their work. The *Christian Statesman* of December 11, 1884, said:- {AMS October 1888, p. 76.18}

“Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them.” {AMS October 1888, p. 76.19}

These are the men, and this is the Association, which rejoices and is glad at the prospect opened before us by Senator Blair’s proposed amendment to the National Constitution. This is how they propose to use the power that will be bestowed upon them if that amendment is adopted. This is the Association that is filling the country with petitions to be signed by the people asking that that amendment be adopted. With this Association both the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and the Prohibition party are allied. {AMS October 1888, p. 76.20}

Fellow-citizens, these petitions you will be asked to sign. By these presents you know who it is that is asking you to sign them. You know what they propose to do under the amendment if they succeed in securing it. What are you going to do? Will you sign the petitions and thus lend your influence to establish such a religious despotism as is here shadowed forth? or will you refuse to sign, and tell your neighbor about the wicked scheme, that he may refuse to sign? The danger is upon us, will you awake to the occasion? Do not delay your answer, but act promptly and energetically we beg of you. {AMS October 1888, p. 76.21}

**“The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union” American Sentinel 3, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Sentinel has had occasion frequently to criticise some of the workings of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. Upon the part of those who favor the establishment of a religious instead of a *civil* government here, this fact has been made the means of an attempt to create prejudice at the expense of the Sentinel. They try to make it appear that the American Sentinel is opposed to temperance. We propose to make plain our attitude toward temperance in general and toward the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union in particular. {AMS October 1888, p. 76.22}

The American Sentinel is thoroughly and consistently devoted to the genuine principles of temperance. And what the Sentinel considers to be the genuine principles of temperance can be stated in this single sentence, viz.: *Total abstinence from all stimulants and narcotics of whatever kind or nature or degree*. More than this, it is out of allegiance to Christian principle that the Sentinel is devoted to this principle of temperance. It is thorough-going Christian temperance in which the Sentinel thoroughly believes. It is because allegiance to Christ demands that we shall be temperate in all things, that we advocate the principle of temperance. Both of the editors of the Sentinel are doing their very best to act strictly in accordance with this principle of temperance. It must therefore be manifest to every soul that the American Sentinel is decidedly in favor of temperance, and *Christian* temperance at that. And in this it must likewise be manifest to everybody that whatever criticisms we have ever made, or shall ever make, upon the workings of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, are not in any sense in opposition to the purest principles of Christian temperance. {AMS October 1888, p. 76.23}

Although we are decidedly in favor of Christian temperance, and endeavor personally to practice it, and to persuade others to practice it, we are not in favor of using the civil power to compel anybody either to favor or to practice it. And when the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union attempts, as it does, to use the civil power to compel people to conform to the principles of Christian temperance, it goes beyond its legitimate province, it acts contrary both to civil polity and Christian principle, and therefore we oppose it. Christian principle knows no such thing as outward force; it never seeks either the support or the control of the civil power. Christian principle knows only the force of conscientious conviction, aroused to action by persuasive reason, under the blessed influence of the Spirit of God. Christian principle knows no power but the power of God as manifested in the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Believing this with all our heart, although we are decidedly in favor of *temperance*, of *Christian* temperance, of woman’s Christian temperance, and even of woman’s Christian temperance *union*, we are just as decidedly opposed to the political aspirations of *the* Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. {AMS October 1888, p. 76.24}

The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish a theocracy in this country, and to that end demands that the ballot shall be put into the hands of women. Proof:- {AMS October 1888, p. 77.1}

“A true theocracy is yet to come;...hence I pray devoutly, as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women, and rejoice that the National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union has so long championed this cause.”-*W.C.T.U. Monthly Reading for September, 1886*. {AMS October 1888, p. 77.2}

Now the establishment of a man-made, or a woman-made, theocracy will be but a repetition of the establishment and working of the hideous principles of the Papacy, if not the establishment of the Papacy itself, in this country. The Papacy is a theocracy. Its workings throughout history have been but the practice of the principles of a man-made theocracy-such a theocracy as the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union proposes to establish here by the ballot. The rule of such a theocracy is the wickedest rule that the world has known or can know. {AMS October 1888, p. 77.3}

It puts man in the place of God, and deifies human passions; and such a *regime* is but one remove from that of Satan himself. Therefore, as such a theocracy is such a wicked thing, as it is such an utter perversion of every principle of government, we are entirely and everlastingly opposed to it. And as the National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union is pledged to the establishment of such a theocracy, and rejoices that it has so long championed such a cause, we are entirely and everlastingly opposed to *that part* of the aims and workings of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. And why should we be blamed for it? {AMS October 1888, p. 77.4}

In order to the establishment of this theocracy here, they “pray devoutly for the ballot in the hands of women.” But whenever the ballot is put into the hands of women, for any such purpose as that, then the ballot will be the worst thing that was ever put into the hands of a woman. {AMS October 1888, p. 77.5}

Again; the Sentinel is first, last, and all the time, opposed to the aims of the National Reform Association. That Association likewise proposes to turn this Government into a theocracy, ruled by the “leaders and teachers in the churches.” It declares that dissenters from National Reform opinions “cannot dwell together on the same continent” with the National Reformed Christianity; and that “there is nothing out of hell” that should not be “tolerated” as soon as these. In Senator Blair’s proposed National Sunday law and constitutional amendment, both of which are now pending in the United States Senate, the National Reformers see taken the first steps towards making effective their “tolerant” intentions. Now the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union is the closest ally, and the most powerful support, that the National Reform Association has in this Nation to-day. Many of the officers of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union are also vice-presidents of the National Reform Association. It was the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union that first started the petitions for this National Sunday law, which pleases the National Reformers so well, and which so fitly plays into their hands; and the Union went before the Senate Committee with the names of one and a half million petitioners, and more to follow, in favor of that law which, in more than one of its provisions, is subversive of liberty, and which savors all over of tyranny. It is perfectly safe to say that from the position which she occupies, the present president of the National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, herself alone, is doing more to spread National Reform ideas and principles than are all the National Reform “District Secretaries” put together. And there are other leaders of the Union who are not much behind her in this bad accomplishment. {AMS October 1888, p. 77.6}

Therefore, as we are totally opposed to the aims of the National Reform Association, and as the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union is the most powerful support of that Association, we are, consequently, totally opposed to that part of the workings of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. And why should we not be? {AMS October 1888, p. 77.7}

Nor is this all. We view with grave apprehensions the encroachments of the Papal power, on its own part, upon the civil institutions of this Government. Everybody knows that the Papacy has never wearied of condemning our public schools because they are not made the medium of religious instruction. The National Reform Association and its allies now echo the Papal condemnation, and seek to remove the cause of it, by the pending amendment to the National Constitution, in which the National power is pledged to see that every State “shall establish and maintain” a system of religious public schools. Now to secure this and the co-operation of the Papacy at the same time, the National Reform Association agrees that the Catholic Bible, and Catholic instruction, shall be established in the public schools wherever “Roman Catholics are in the majority.” And also in securing and enforcing the pending National Sunday law, the National Reformers pledge themselves to “gladly join hands” with the Roman Catholics, and to make repeated advances to secure the co-operation of the Roman Catholics “in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it.” Therefore the two points,-the National Sunday law, and religion in the public schools,-upon which the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union is diligently working to secure National religious legislation, are the very points upon which the National Reform Association stands pledged to unite with the Papacy. {AMS October 1888, p. 77.8}

Now the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union supports the National Reform Association. The National Reform Association is pledged to Rome. Rome stands pledged forever to the subversion of every principle of liberty. Therefore, as we are forever opposed to the encroachments of Rome, so we are forever opposed to that part of the working of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union which supports the National Reform Association, which is pledged to Rome. And why should we not be opposed to it? And why should not everybody else be opposed to it? {AMS October 1888, p. 77.9}

We know that there are many of the women of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union who do not favor the political, nor the theocratical, nor the National Reform, aspirations of the leaders of the Union. We know a number of women who have separated themselves from the workings of the Union because of the very things which we have here pointed out. They joined the Union to work for Christian temperance upon Christian principles, and to secure the practice of Christian temperance by Christian means. But when they saw that by the leadership of the Union, political efforts and means were supplanting the Christian principles, efforts, and means, they left it. They did well to leave it. And so will every other woman do well to leave it, who does not want to be sold into the hands of Rome through the political, theocratical, and National Reform aspirations of the present leadership of the National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. {AMS October 1888, p. 77.10}

We only pray that the whole body of the Union, leadership and all, may awake to the danger of their position before they shall have delivered the civil power, and themselves and us all with it, into the hands of a religious despotism. {AMS October 1888, p. 77.11}

**“The Prohibition Party” American Sentinel 3, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

Not long since one of the editors of the Sentinel made a speech in San Diego, Cal., on religious legislation in general, and Senator Blair’s proposed National Sunday law and religious amendment to the Constitution in particular. We gave a sketch of the theocratical workings of the church, the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, and the Prohibition party, with the National Reform Association, and the aim of the National Reformers to hand over the whole thing to the Papacy as soon as the Papacy is ready. The San Diego *Sun* stated that in this we “assumed what every member of these organizations will promptly deny.” We do not think that the statement of facts can rightly be considered assumption. As to the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, we give our position in regard to that elsewhere in this paper. We wish now to show that when we name the Prohibition party in the same category we *assume* nothing. {AMS October 1888, p. 77.12}

It cannot be denied that the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association are pledged to the establishment of a theocracy in this country. Nor can it be denied that the Prohibition party is inseparably connected with both the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association. The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union demands the ballot in the hands of women, in order to establish a theocracy; the Prohibition party is pledged to secure the ballot in the hands of women; therefore the Prohibition party is pledged to the establishment of this woman-made theocracy. In order to establish a theocracy, the National Reform Association demands a constitutional amendment empowering Congress to legislate in religious things; a leading Prohibitionist-Senator Blair-proposes in Congress just such an amendment, accompanied by a bill legislating upon things pertaining to God; and the *Lever*, in commending the “*moral* element,” in the make-up of the Prohibition party, “the foundation” for which is laid in the recognition of “Almighty God as the source of all power in government,” says:- {AMS October 1888, p. 77.13}

“At this point the Prohibition party stands out in bold contrast with the old parties. It recognizes the authority of God in human government, and proposes that all legislation shall be in harmony with Christian morality.” {AMS October 1888, p. 77.14}

This is precisely what the National Reform Association has in view, therefore the aim of the Prohibition party and the aim of the National Reform Association are identical. And besides this the National Reformers have pledged themselves to join hands with the Catholic Church as soon as *she* is ready. {AMS October 1888, p. 77.15}

More than this, this is only that at which the Papacy itself is aiming in this country. Pope Leo XIII commands that,- {AMS October 1888, p. 77.16}

“All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church.” {AMS October 1888, p. 77.17}

Senator Blair’s constitutional amendment and religious legislation are modeled exactly “on the principles of the true church;” and the Prohibition party is pledged to such legislation; therefore the aim of the Prohibition party and the aim of the Catholic Church, so far as religious legislation is concerned, are identical. *And they are working together to secure it*. At the county Prohibition convention for Tulare County, Cal., held in Tulare City not long ago, a Catholic priest was introduced by a Methodist minister, and made a strong speech and offered the Catholic Church free to the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, at any time, to hold their Prohibition unions in. About the same time a Catholic priest spoke in a Prohibition convention in Los Angeles, in which he made most prominent the necessity for religious legislation, particularly in regard to enforcing the observance of “the Lord’s day,” as Senator Blair’s Sunday Bill provides. These things greatly please the Prohibition party, the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, and the-Catholic Church. {AMS October 1888, p. 78.1}

Now we would like for some Prohibitionist to tell just about how much any advocacy of Prohibition by the Catholic Church is worth, while everybody knows that there is not a saloon keeper in all the land who cannot keep a saloon and be a member of the Catholic Church as long as he lives, and (if he pays money enough) go straight through purgatory without even getting scorched, when he dies. We can tell what it is worth, and that is, just what influence and support the Catholic Church can get out of the Prohibitionists in accomplishing the Papal scheme of causing “the constitutions of States, and legislation, to be modeled on the principles of the true church.” {AMS October 1888, p. 78.2}

That is what it is worth, and that is all it is worth. But if the Prohibitionists think that a safe investment, they have vastly more confidence in the wheedling charms of the Papacy than we have. For we never can forget the truth of Macaulay’s words, that- {AMS October 1888, p. 78.3}

“The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved that polity [of Rome] to such perfection that, among the contrivances for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place.”-*Essays Von Ranke*. {AMS October 1888, p. 78.4}

“Rev.” “Sam” Small, the associate revivalist with “Sam” Jones, was secretary of the National Prohibition Convention, held at Indianapolis. And what he wants to see, as stated in his own words at Kansas City last winter, is this:- {AMS October 1888, p. 78.5}

“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.” {AMS October 1888, p. 78.6}

Was ever the Papacy more than that? Did ever the Papacy *ask* more than that? *Could* it ask more? {AMS October 1888, p. 78.7}

From these evidences it is plain that the Prohibition party, as it is, is set for the establishment of a religious despotism of which the Papacy shall be at least a part. And whoever works for, or votes, the Prohibition ticket, works and votes for the establishment of such a despotism. {AMS October 1888, p. 78.8}

The following letter, from a prominent Prohibitionist in an Eastern State, but who does not work for the Prohibition party as at present constituted, is sound and to the point:- {AMS October 1888, p. 78.9}

“The church may adopt any form of government for itself that it chooses, but must keep hands off the civil government. The worst despotism the world ever experienced was under a theocracy. The church party, misnamed Prohibition party, seeks to proselyte and carry on a religious crusade under the guise of a so-called political party. Put that party in power, and the priest and minister would supersede the judge, the jury would disappear, civil courts would give place to ecclesiastical courts, the public court-room to the star chamber, the ordinary jail to the inquisition. {AMS October 1888, p. 78.10}

“My vote, and my voice, shall ever be for a free, civil, enlightened, and progressive Government. {AMS October 1888, p. 78.11}

“I am a dyed-in-the-wool Prohibitionist, and daily practice what I preach, but do not belong to the clerical party.” {AMS October 1888, p. 78.12}

This letter exactly expresses the views of the Sentinel. The American Sentinel is entirely and consistently in favor of Prohibition; but it is not in any sense in favor of religious legislation. What we here say is not against Prohibition, but against the religious legislation element, the Church and State element, in the Prohibition party and in the Prohibition platform. Opposition to Church and State was hissed and yelled down in the California State Prohibition Convention of 1888. And a consistent Prohibitionist told the Prohibition party in that same convention, that if they went into the campaign with the platform as it is, “they would have to pass half the time in convincing the people that it was not a religious movement.” The Prohibition party, both State and National, have gone into the campaign with that very platform, and that party may spend *all* the time in the endeavor, but it can never convince any thinking person that it is not a religious movement. The Prohibition movement as it is now manifested in the Prohibition party, and under its present platform, is nothing else than a religious movement; and that is only what the majority of the preachers, whether Protestant or Catholic, have in view who are making themselves so prominent in behalf of Prohibition-they are only making Prohibition the stepping-stone to religious legislation, and the establishment of their own power by it. And in view of the ecclesiastical engineering of the Prohibition party, Dean Milman’s weighty words are of living importance to every American citizen: “In proportion as ecclesiastics become co-legislators, heresies become civil crimes, and liable to civil punishments.” {AMS October 1888, p. 78.13}

The American Sentinel is in favor of Prohibition everywhere and all the time; but it is not in favor of religious legislation anywhere at any time. We would shut the saloon everywhere and forever, not because it is irreligious nor because it is violative of the law of God, for with such reasons the civil power can have nothing to do, but because it is uncivil. If the saloon were only irreligious, or were only violative of the law of God, the State would have no right to interfere with it to any extent whatever. But as it is essentially uncivil, the State can and ought to abolish it entirely, yet never with any question as to whether or not it is irreligious or violative of the law of God. We would shut the saloon for the same reason that we prohibit the carrying of concealed weapons. {AMS October 1888, p. 78.14}

We know there are many Prohibitionists who, like the correspondent whose words we have quoted, are as much opposed to religious legislation, or priests in politics, or churches in civil affairs, as we are; we know that in the California State Prohibition Convention there were powerful speeches made against the Church and State element in the Prohibition party; but that element carried the day, and that element rules in the so-called Prohibition party; ant whoever would not help forward the union of Church and State, and the establishment of a religious despotism in this Nation, should be a far as the East is from the West from voting thi present Prohibition ticket, or working in any wa for the Prohibition party as it is. {AMS October 1888, p. 78.15}

**“Notes” American Sentinel 3, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Christian Statesman* of September 6 M.A. Gault says:- {AMS October 1888, p. 78.16}

“I had a long talk with Hon. T. C. Richmond leader of the Prohibition party in Wisconsin. He is a popular speaker and a logical reasoner. He is almost constantly in the field addressing large audiences, endeavoring to convince the people that the Prohibition party should drop every other issue but Prohibition.” {AMS October 1888, p. 78.17}

Mr. Richmond’s idea is correct. If Prohibition is what the Prohibitionists want, why are they not willing to work for that alone? If Prohibition is what they want, why are they not willing to secure the help of every element that can b enlisted in favor of Prohibition? The very fact that the so-called Prohibition party will not work for Prohibition alone, is proof that the religio-political managers of that party are only using the Prohibition issue as a stepping-stone to the establishment of their power, and the subordination of the civil to the ecclesiastical power. {AMS October 1888, p. 78.18}

**“Oakland Lawyers on the Blair Bills” American Sentinel 3, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

Public interest has recently been so directed to the two measures proposed by Senator Blair namely, “a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United State respecting establishments of religion and free schools,” and the “bill is secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord’s day, as a day of rest and to promote its observance as a day o religious worship,” that the *Tribune* of this city deemed the matter of sufficient importance to call for the opinions of the Oakland bar upon the proposed legislation. Accordingly a reporter of that paper submitted copies of the Blair bills to number of attorneys and asked for an expression of opinion on them, with the following result:- {AMS October 1888, p. 78.19}

H. L. Adams-I gave my opinions through the columns of the Tribune last week, but will repeat sufficiently to say that while I was formerly of the opinion that the first day should be general; enjoined by statute, a careful study of the question has led me to change my views in that regard, and I now believe that any law which compels the observance of one day of the week upon all classes of people without regard to their religious belief constrains them of their liberty and is in violation of the form of thought am religious worship guaranteed by the inventors of this Government in the present Federal Constitution. {AMS October 1888, p. 78.20}

J. R. Glascock-It is an infringement upon the personal liberty of the people. It is a step back ward and not forward. If carried to its legitimate result it would relegate us to the days of Connecticut blue laws. Church and State should be kept as far apart as possible. Let our schools teach knowledge and not religion. {AMS October 1888, p. 78.21}

In this opinion Mr. Glascock recognizes the fact that religious legislation of any description whatever is a virtual union of Church and State whether that legislation be in the interests of one denomination or of many. The next opinion likewise covers both the bill and the amendment:- {AMS October 1888, p. 78.22}

A. L. Frick-I am opposed to teaching the principles of the Christian religion or any other religion in the schools. Religious education should be left to the church and the home. The Sunday bill in my opinion is unjust and unwise. I believe in Sunday regulations only in so far as necessary to protect persons in the uninterrupted observance of worship, and this matter should be left to the several States as distinguished from the Federal Government. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.1}

This opinion might seem to favor State regulation of Sunday observance, but a careful reading of it will reveal the fact that it does nothing of the sort. Every State now has wholesome and just laws protecting from disturbance all religious assemblies, as indeed all lawful assemblies, and so all that is indicated by Mr. Frick as a duty of the State with regard to Sunday is already secured without Sunday laws. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.2}

S. F. Daniels, ex-Police Judge-I am not in favor of this resolution. I think that the teaching of religion should be kept entirely out of our free schools. I do not see how it could be beneficial in any way. I am opposed to Christian religion or any other religion being taught in our schools. With regard to the Sunday law, I am opposed to it. We had a Sunday law in the State at one time, and as Police Judge I had to enforce it, but I did not think it was right, being an injustice to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week. Neither do I believe in prohibiting per-sons from observing any day they choose to. I think that should be left entirely with the conscience. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.3}

J. M. Poston, ex-City Attorney of Oakland-I think the amendment of the Constitution is impracticable, inasmuch as it involves the union of Church and State, to which I am positively opposed. As to the Blair Sunday Bill, I think some parts of that are impracticable, and interfere with the rights of the State, and I think it is the work of a crank anyway. I think that the matter of educational system belongs to the State. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.4}

Here again the idea that the proposed amendment involves a union of Church and State is made prominent. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.5}

J. K. Piersol-I am not in favor of having any law for the establishment of religion in the school. I am in favor of education and the teaching of morality, but not the teaching of any religion. I am in favor of all classes of people refraining from work one day in the week, but that their conscience should be their guide as to which day they observe as a rest day. I think the penalty clause of the Blair bill is useless. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.6}

George M. Shaw-I do not think it would be advisable to amend the Constitution. I think the inventors of the Constitution understood that matter. I think that is going too far with the Sunday law. Any regulation of that question would be a serious disturbance to the country, and I am not in favor of interfering with a person’s religious belief. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.7}

L. N. Church-I think that religion in the schools is all right so far as morality and virtue are concerned; but I could not indorse the sentiment of the bill as it reads, as no one should be restricted in his religious belief. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.8}

Bernard McFadden-I do not think that religion should be taught in the public schools. Thomas H. Smith-I am not in favor of the principles of Christian religion in schools, for this reason, that they have no right to teach one religion to the exclusion of all others. In regard to the Sunday bill, I am in favor of the observance of the first day; but I believe that every man should have the privilege of worshiping Almighty God whenever he wants to do so without the interference of others. I think more can be done by moral suasion than by the State. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.9}

E. C. Robinson-I am opposed to any union of Church and State. I believe there should be no work done on the day set apart for rest; but I think every man should have the privilege of worshiping according to the dictates of his own conscience. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.10}

A. M. Church-Keep Church and State separate forever. Morality is all well enough, but the “principles of Christian religion” should be left out. We had better let the Constitution entirely alone so far as it relates to the rights of a man’s conscience. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.11}

Judge F. B. Ogden-If you strike out that portion that relates to the Christian religion being taught in the schools it would be all right. I think religion should be taught at home and in the churches. Such a law as that would inaugurate a union of Church and State. I do not like the Blair Sunday Bill for this reason-I believe that each State should set apart one day for rest, but I do not believe in prohibiting innocent pleasure. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.12}

Judge Ogden is the only one expressing himself unreservedly in favor of even State Sunday laws, and even he recognizes in the Blair bills an attempt to unite Church and State. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.13}

E. C. Chapman-I believe in the principles of morality, but I do not believe that States should have the right to legislate on these things at all. I do not believe in teaching religion of any kind in the public schools. I am not in favor of any law that would force people to observe any particular day. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.14}

J. W. Harris-I indorse the statement of Mr. Chapman. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.15}

A. C. Lawson-If the principles of virtue and morality be taught, I think that is all that is necessary. With regard to the Sunday bill, I believe that any measure to set apart any particular day as a day for religious worship is in opposition to the Constitution of the United States, and whenever the Government projects to put the religious element under its wing it is wrong. I am a believer in the first day of the week as a day of worship, but I am not in favor of forcing it upon anyone else. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.16}

S. B. McKee-I should not favor the teaching of any particular religion in the schools. In reference to the Blair Sunday Bill, I understand that the foundation of our Government was religious liberty for all classes. The courts have held the observance of Sunday, but I think it is impractical from a business standpoint, and against the policy of the country. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.17}

Robert L. McKee-I am decidedly opposed to any instruction in Christianity in our free public-school system. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.18}

William Lair Hill, of the firm of Davis & Hill-In regard to these matters I am a Baptist, and therefore, of course, I am positively of the opinion that religion should be taught in churches and not in public schools. I see no reason for legislating the Christian religion into the State, which (under the principles of our Government, and the only true principles of any civil Government), would not apply with equal force in favor of legislating. Mohammedanism and Buddhism and Confucianism into those countries where these religions have already the majority of the people. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.19}

Thus it is seen that the *consensus* of opinions among the lawyers of Oakland is that Sunday laws are subversive of religious liberty, that they are religious legislation, and that the success of the Blair bills would unite Church and State in this country. But it is to just such measures as this that the National Reform Association, the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, and the Prohibition party stand pledged. {AMS October 1888, p. 79.20}
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Doctor Crafts reports that between three and four million names have already been secured to the petitions in behalf of the National Sunday law. {AMS October 1888, p. 80.1}

The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and the Prohibition party have become so entirely National Reform organizations that the regular National Reform organizers have ceased to organize local National Reform clubs as such, but work through these to spread the National Reform ideas. So says District Secretary M.A. Gault in the *American*, June 27, 1888. {AMS October 1888, p. 80.2}

The Executive Committee of the National Reform Association held a meeting in Pittsburg September 14; and one of its recommendations is this:- {AMS October 1888, p. 80.3}

“That Secretary Weir be appointed especially to press the cause of National Reform upon the attention of political parties, during the next four years, and to enlist, as far as possible, in this endeavor the influence of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union.” {AMS October 1888, p. 80.4}

The National Reform Association is circulating for signatures petitions to Congress asking that Senator Blair’s proposed religious amendment to the Constitution may be passed by Congress and submitted to the States for their approval. One of these petitions was presented to the Prohibition County Convention of Wood County, Ohio, August 8. It was unanimously indorsed, and a copy of a resolution to that effect was sent to Senator Blair, together with the respects of the convention. {AMS October 1888, p. 80.5}

John Alexander, of Philadelphia, is the father of the National Reform Association, as such, and in the *Christian Statesman* of September 6 he congratulates the Association on the introduction of the Blair religious amendment to the Constitution; declares “the National Reform Association ought to spare no pains and omit no effort which may promise to secure its adoption;” and further says:- {AMS October 1888, p. 80.6}

“Let us begin without delay the circulation of petitions (to be furnished in proper form by the Association), and let an opportunity be given to all parts of the country to make up a roll of petitions so great that it will require a procession of wheelbarrows to trundle the mighty mass into the presence of the representatives of the Nation in the Houses of Congress.” And “let a mass convention of the friends of the cause be held in Washington, when the Blair resolution shall be under discussion, to accompany with its influence the presentation of the petitions, and to take such other action as may be deemed best to arouse the Nation to a genuine enthusiasm in behalf of our National Christianity.” {AMS October 1888, p. 80.7}

Isn’t it about time that somebody was arousing to a genuine sense of the danger to civil and religious liberty that inheres in this scheme? {AMS October 1888, p. 80.8}

The *California* *Christian Advocate* some weeks ago gravely informed its readers that “Congressman Plumb, of Kansas, has offered an amendment to the Sunday Civil Bill providing an appropriation for the building of a public drinking fountain in the Capitol.” Of course the bill to which the Kansas Congressman has offered an amendment is the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill; but in these days of proposed Sunday legislation it is perhaps not strange that the friends of Sunday laws fail to discern what to them seem so small a difference. The time may come, however, when even the Sundry Appropriation Bill may contain clauses relative to Sunday, and then it will indeed be literally the “Sunday Civil Bill.” {AMS October 1888, p. 80.9}

Rev. R.C. Wylie says the National Reformers should advocate Senator Blair’s religious amendment to the Constitution, {AMS October 1888, p. 80.10}

“Because of the aid it will give us in discussing National Reform principles. Some of these are clearly embodied in the amendment. Senator Blair’s amendment marks an epoch in our history... The pulpit and the platform should herald the truths it teaches, from ocean to ocean.” {AMS October 1888, p. 80.11}

Yes, the amendment will not only aid in discussing National Reform principles, it will also, if adopted, most materially aid the National Reformers in carrying those principles into practice by the civil power, and in satisfying their intense longing to tolerate dissenters as lunatics and conspirators are tolerated. {AMS October 1888, p. 80.12}

The *Tribune* of this city thinks that we are needlessly alarmed about the Blair Sunday Bill. The *Tribune* evidently does not understand the situation. The bill in question may fail to become a law, but that does not prove by any means that the serious consideration of such a measure is not a menace to religious liberty in this country. {AMS October 1888, p. 80.13}

The systematic and persistent efforts which are being made by hundreds of thousands of people banded together in various churches, associations, and societies throughout our land to secure religious legislation in this country, should arouse every liberty-loving citizen to a sense of danger, and set him to work to enlighten others in regard to National Reform designs and practices. {AMS October 1888, p. 80.14}

Senator Blair may be, as the *Tribune* intimates, a harmless “crank,” but there are many thousands afflicted with the same religious-legislation mania, and there is a dangerous method in their madness. We cannot afford to settle down in fancied security when such measures are being seriously proposed in the Senate of the United States. {AMS October 1888, p. 80.15}

The latter part of July, “Sam” Jones, the great revivalist, preached in Windsor, Canada, to an audience composed mostly of Americans, who went over there to hear him. One of his devout, elegantly refined, and intensely instructive passages was this:- {AMS October 1888, p. 80.16}

“Now I’ll tell you, I think we are running the last political combat on the lines we have been running them on. It is between the Republicans and Democrats, this contest, and it is the last the Republicans will make in America. The Democrats are going in overwhelmingly. Four years from now the Prohibition element will break the solid South. The issue then will be, God or no God, drunkenness or sobriety, Sabbath or no Sabbath, Heaven or hell. That will be the issue. Then we will wipe up the ground with the Democratic party, and let God rule America from that time on.” {AMS October 1888, p. 80.17}

And this the *Christian Statesman* inserts under the heading, “The National Reform Movement!” It is very appropriately placed. It is a worthy addition to the literature of the National Reform movement. But what consummate mountebanks many of those popular “revivalists” do make of themselves! {AMS October 1888, p. 80.18}

As was to be expected, the National Reformers are delighted with Senator Blair’s religious amendment to the Constitution. It is in substance just what they have been working for all these years. The *Christian Statesman* of July 12 says the amendment “should receive the strenuous support of all American Christians.” In its issue of July 19 the Statesman says:- {AMS October 1888, p. 80.19}

“Senator Blair’s proposed constitutional amendment furnishes an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people.” {AMS October 1888, p. 80.20}

Then, after mentioning “Christianity, the religion of the Nation,” and “the Bible, the text-book of our common Christianity, in all the schools,” it says:- {AMS October 1888, p. 80.21}

“These have been our watch-words in the discussions of a quarter of a century. And now these ideas are actually pending before the Senate of the United States in the form of a joint resolution proposing their adoption as a part of the Constitution of the United States. Here is a great opportunity. Shall we boldly and wisely improve it?” {AMS October 1888, p. 80.22}

We are afraid that the iniquitous scheme will ultimately carry. {AMS October 1888, p. 80.23}

In the *Christian Statesman* of August 9, Rev. R.C. Wylie praises Senator Blair’s proposed constitutional amendment, because it would, if adopted, give the National Reformers many advantages which they have not now. He says:- {AMS October 1888, p. 80.24}

“We would then have a vantage-ground we have not now. The leading objection that has been urged against us will have lost its power. That objection, which has such a tender regard for the infidel conscience, will have spent its force against this amendment, and will be no more fit for use against us.” {AMS October 1888, p. 80.25}

That is to say: The charge of invading the rights of conscience has, so far, lain against the National Reformers; but now, if this amendment is carried, this charge will lie against the amendment, and will spend itself there while the National Reformers escape. This charge is justly made against the National Reformers; for they distinctly affirm that the civil power has the right to compel the consciences of men. And the admission that if the amendment were adopted the charge would then lie against that, is a confession that the proposed amendment, if adopted, will invade the rights of conscience. And that is the truth. It will surely do so. If it would not, it would not be so heartily indorsed by the National Reformers. {AMS October 1888, p. 80.26}