**“Sunday Law and the Law of Nature” American Sentinel 4, 15.**

E. J. Waggoner

A gentleman in Kansas, who has been receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL for some months, by the courtesy of a friend, writes to us that he does not indorse its teachings, and particularizes after the following fashion:— {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.1}

“It would be unwise to enter into detail, but I am amazed that Americans calling themselves intelligent should oppose so-called civil Sunday legislation, and, at the same time, favor legislation touching other propositions contained in the decalogue. ‘Thou shalt not kill,’ ‘Thou shalt not steal,’ ‘Thou shalt not bear false witness,’ etc., might as well be kicked against on religious grounds as, ‘Remember the Sabbath-day,’ etc. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.2}

“I have had personal occasion to know that a mule team can make a one-thousand-mile journey at the rate of six days per week, and come out at the end in less time and in better condition than when worked seven days per week. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.3}

“I once asked a locomotive engineer which would be the best for the locomotive, all other things being equal, forty-two days’ work in six weeks, or forty-two days’ work in seven weeks? He replied, ‘The latter, by all means.’ Mules and locomotives cannot be accused of religious fanaticism. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.4}

“My conclusion is that a rest-day of one in seven is *inwrought into the nature of things*. You and I cannot change it. We may buck, and kick, and wax profane, but the great law of a necessary rest-day will still exist, and the higher the enlightenment the more the law will be recognized.” {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.5}

We quote this much of the letter because it is a fair sample of the understanding, or rather the misunderstanding, which Sunday-law advocates seem to have of our opposition to their work. Our correspondent well says that we are opposed to “so-called civil Sunday legislation.” That is it, exactly. It is so-called civil Sunday legislation, but actually religious or ecclesiastical Sunday legislation. To show that this is so we make a few quotations. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.6}

In an article in the *California Prohibitionist*, of December 6, 1888, the Rev. N. R. Johnston, a prominent National Reformer, said:— {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.7}

“We do ask a law that will be in accordance with the divine law of the fourth commandment.” {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.8}

And again:— {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.9}

“We recommend most strenuous and prayerful efforts in the States and Territories to secure legislation in harmony with the fourth commandment.” {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.10}

In Mr. Crafts’s speech before the general assembly of the Knights of Labor, at Indianapolis, November 16, 1888, he said:— {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.11}

“A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out and you take the rest out.” {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.12}

The Rev. James Brand, D.D., in an article in the *Advance* of March 21, 1889, said:— {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.13}

“If there is no good moral principle behind the Sunday law it cannot stand.” {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.14}

And Colonel Shepard, president of the American Sabbath Association, in his address upon his election, said: “Every man, woman, and child in our country is going to be judged by the fourth commandment,” indicating, as Mr. Johnston said, that Sunday laws are designed to enforce the religious observance of the day. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.15}

Finally, as an admission of what we have always claimed, we quote from a sermon by Rev. Byron Sunderland, D. D., entitled, “The Right to Sunday Laws,” published in the New York Evangelist, March 28, 1889. Speaking of the declaration made by Mr. Wolfe of the secular league, before the Senate Committee, that “he did not object to the civil Sunday, and would help to enforce it,” Mr. Sunderland says:— {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.16}

“No man can make such an admission and not go to the end with those who secure and retain a Christianity which is the rational observance of our American Sabbath in every particular. It is simply impossible to have a civil Sunday, that is, a day of rest from ordinary, occupation, and not exclude from it a voluntary religious observance. The declaration forcibly reminds one of a certain lord bishop who said, ‘Oh, but you know, John, I do not swear as a bishop, only as a man.’ ‘That is true, your grace,’ replied the valet, but I was thinking when the devil comes for the man what will become of the bishop who said, ‘Oh but you know, John, I do not swear as a bishop, only as a man.’ ‘That is true, your grace,’ replied the valet, but I was thinking when the devil comes for the *man* what will become of the *bishop?*’” {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.17}

These statements, from among many that might be quoted, show not only that Sunday legislation is religious legislation, but that it cannot by any possibility be anything else. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.18}

Concerning the sixth, eighth, and ninth commandments, which our correspondent quotes, we have this to say: First, that there is a universally recognized difference between the first four commandments and the last six. The first four relate only to man’s duty to God, but the last six present his duty to his fellow-men. With man’s duty to God no man has any right to interfere, but Governments exist for the sole purpose of preserving the proper relation of citizens to one another. Second, legislation concerning killing and stealing and bearing false witness is not legislation upon the sixth, eighth, and ninth commandments, and does not derive its authority from those commandments. The Government punishes the murderer, not because the commandment says it is wrong to kill, but because the murderer interferes with the right to life and liberty which the Government grants to all citizens. This is shown further by the fact that, when the Government punishes the murderer, it does not execute one particle of the penalty for breaking the sixth commandment. The punishment which civil government metes out to the murderer does not make his guilt any the less, or leave him any the less to answer for before the bar of God. It is simply a pledge on the part of the Government that the people shall be protected in future from his lawlessness. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 113.19}

We might call attention, while passing, to the fact that Sunday legislation has nothing whatever to do with the fourth commandment, even though it were proper and possible for Government to legislate concerning the decalogue. A man will search in vain for any reference to Sunday in the fourth commandment. A law in accordance with the divine law of the fourth commandment, such as Mr. Johnston wants, would enforce the observance of the seventh day, or Saturday; but, although this day is enjoined by the commandment, civil government has no right to enforce its observance. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 114.1}

Our correspondent says that “a mule team can make a thousand miles’ journey at the rate of six days per week, and come out at the end in less time and in better condition than when worked seven days per week.” We do not question that at all, but we claim that it affords no reason for Sunday legislation. Granting that man and beast could do more work if they rest one day in seven, what is there in that to indicate that that day should be Sunday? and what right has the Government to specify on which day they shall take their needed rest? We are not, as he imagines, “kicking against a rest-day.” We not only believe in the right of every man to rest one day in seven if he chooses to, but we also believe that it is the duty of every man to rest one day in seven, even on the day which the fourth commandment enjoins; but we do not recognize the right of Government to say that a man shall do his duty in regard to the fourth commandment, any more than it may compel him to obey the first, and worship God. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 114.2}

Then again there is a difference of opinion among men as to what day is enjoined by the fourth commandment; and Government has no more right to decide the question between them than it has to interfere with men’s honest difference concerning the age of the earth or the mode of baptism. Every man has reason, and one man cannot think for another, neither can the Government take it upon itself to do the thinking for all its citizens. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 114.3}

In line with the statement that “mules will do more work if allowed to rest one day in seven,” is the statement that “a rest-day of one in seven is inwrought in the nature of things;” but that does not prove that the Government should compel men to comply with that law, neither does it indicate upon what day that periodical rest should be taken. If we are to fall back upon the law of nature, then we must let nature execute her own laws, or else we must legislate upon everything which the laws of nature demand. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 114.4}

We will take a parallel and see how it works. The necessity for bodily rest is inwrought in the very nature of man, and not only so, but nature has indicated when that rest should be taken, by making a regularly recurring period of darkness, in which sleep is natural, and work is most difficult. Now, if the State may legislate concerning a weekly rest, surely there is more reason why it should legislate concerning a daily rest, because the daily rest is more necessary to one’s physical well-being than is the weekly rest, and nature indicates when the daily rest should be taken, but indicates nothing concerning the time of the weekly rest. If the State may say that all men must rest upon Sunday because it is good to rest one day in seven, then it may likewise say that all men must take eight hours’ sleep every night. And just as the State makes no difference even though a man may have rested one day in the week and is not tired when Sunday comes, so it must make no difference even though a man is not tired when the regularly appointed hour for retiring comes. Sunday-law makers say that those who observe another day than Sunday are a very small minority, and that they must submit even though they are inconvenienced and obliged to lose more time than others. They say that the liberty of rest for one depends upon the law of rest for all. Now we will apply that argument in another case. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 114.5}

The State, as we have seen, is under greater obligation to compel people to rest every day than to rest once a week, but when it comes to enforcing this law, it finds some men who are employed upon a morning newspaper, and who are obliged to work in the night and to take their needed rest in the day-time. These would naturally protest against a law compelling everybody to go to bed at nine o’clock and stay there till five in the morning; but the advocates of the law may claim that the liberty of rest for each depends upon the law of rest for all, and that no discrimination can be made. The number of those who work upon morning newspapers is only a small proportion of the number of inhabitants of the country, and the convenience of the majority must be considered. We think, that anyone can see the injustice of this, and we know that the only reason why they cannot see the gross injustice of the same argument concerning Sunday is because of prejudice and religious bigotry. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 114.6}

Later on in his letter, our friend tells about people who have been “downed” in trying to reverse the nature of things; but, as we have shown, we are not trying to reverse the nature of things. We are not protesting against a weekly rest-day. All that we protest against is the assumption that, because some men want to take their rest on Sunday, everybody else must be compelled to do likewise. This is not in the nature of things only as it is man’s nature to be selfish; and against such unreasonable selfishness as that everybody ought to protest. It is neither civil nor religious. {AMS May 1, 1889, p. 114.7}

E. J. W.

**“Fitly Designated” American Sentinel 4, 16.**

E. J. Waggoner

The leading article in *Our Day* for April is an address by Rev. W. F. Crafts, at Mr. Cook’s Monday lecture, March 25, and is entitled, “A Strategic Year in Sabbath Reform.” This is a most appropriate heading for a summary of the work of the American Sabbath Union during the year 1888. It shows that Mr. Crafts appreciates the situation. A strategem is defined by Webster as “a trick by which some advantage is to be obtained. An artifice.” Strategic means, “pertaining to strategy, effected by artifice. Therefore, since, according to Mr. Crafts, the year 1888 has been a strategic year in the Sunday work, it has been a year of trickery and fraud. {AMS May 15, 1889, p. 123.1}

That this is indeed so must be evident to anyone who has read the SENTINEL’S exposure of the methods of Mr. Crafts and his associate Sunday reformers. They started out with deceit, and with exhortation to deceive, when they requested all public conventions to indorse the Sunday petition by vote, and then to duplicate the strength of the petition as far as possible by securing the individual signatures of the assembly. Then, by securing a few representative indorsements, they counted in whole denominations, thousands of members of which had never heard of the petition. A letter from Cardinal Gibbons stating simply that he personally favored the movement, was forthwith counted as the signatures of 7,200,000 Catholics. Not content with counting in the entire membership of the various religious organizations as well being twenty-one years of age or more, they went to Sunday-schools, and secured the names of the children to their petition, which stated that each signer is twenty-one years of age or more. Then, in order to swell their list of petitioners, they counted some of the religious denominations twice, then counted the Woman’s Christian Temmperance Unions as local organizations as State organizations, and again twice as a national organization, besides already having counted them in with the religious bodies. The same way with the Knights of Labor. They secured the votes of local assemblies, then by a vote of the general assembly they counted in the entire organization, and then securing a favorable vote from the Counsel of Federated Trades they succeeded in counting the workingmen in again, although thousands of them are opposed to the Blair bills. {AMS May 15, 1889, p. 123.2}

Mr. Crafts went in person to the Assemblies of the Knights of Labor and pleaded with them to indorse his petition. Yet he claims that the petition was started to satisfy the clamor of the workingmen! Not content with these methods of making it appear that the great majority of the people of the country are calling for Sunday laws, they now garble the statements of those who are opposing the movement with all their might, and give it out that their opposition is really not opposition, but a plea for the law. {AMS May 15, 1889, p. 123.3}

Then again the Rev. Herrick Johnson, in his address on Sunday newspapers at the Washington Conference, in December, said, as quoted in the February number of *Our Day:*— {AMS May 15, 1889, p. 123.4}

“If we base the Sabbath on mere human expediency, we base it on sand, just as we would found honesty, if we adopted it simply as a policy. This is no basis for the Sabbath, to put it on the ground of mere expediency. I do not question the propriety of using this argument as a means of influencing a certain class of men. Many will join in this Sunday movement and work heartily in the defense of Sunday as a rest-day, in the interests of health and morals, and good citizenship, who will not come to the higher ground. But we can never permanently keep our Sabbath on the basis of expediency.” {AMS May 15, 1889, p. 123.5}

Here we find this man, a zealous advocate of Sunday laws, deliberately counseling the use of argument in which he does not believe, in order to catch some who will not accept the argument in which he does believe. Much more to the same intent might be quoted, but this is sufficient to show the aptness of the title which Mr. Crafts gives to his summary of Sunday work,—a year of artifice and fraud. The same course was pursued in the history of the early church, as is shown by the following quotation from Mosheim:— {AMS May 15, 1889, p. 123.6}

“By some of the weaker brethren, in their anxiety to assist God with all their might (in the propagation of the Christian faith), such dishonest artifices were occasionally resorted to as could not, under any circumstances, admit of excuse, and were utterly unworthy of that sacred cause which they were unquestionably intended to support.”—*Commentaries, cent. 2, sec. 7*. {AMS May 15, 1889, p. 123.7}

It was just such work as that which resulted in the establishment of the man of sin-the Papacy. It is just such work in these days that will result in the formation of a living image to that man of sin-an American Papacy. {AMS May 15, 1889, p. 123.8}

E. J. W.

**“Protection to Religious Worship, and the Bible in the Schools” American Sentinel 4, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago we received from a friend in the East some questions concerning Sunday legislation, and religious teaching in the schools, which had been put to him, and which he could not answer. As they are questions that might be asked to anyone, we print them herewith and give our reply, for the benefit of all:— {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.1}

“Your position is no civil Sabbath laws. Such a position, carried out with our present influx of foreign element, will soon reduce our present Christian Sabbath to the level of the Continental Sabbath-a, day of excursions, picnics, beer gardens, revelries, and, if desired, make a day of din or confusion right when the majority desire to engage in worship. You cry out against coercion on one side but lose sight of protection on the other. Here are what you would regard as two evils, and one or the other of them must be chosen; hence, would it not be better to have a Sunday law? Is not a village or neighborhood with a Sunday law where things are kept quiet better than one where everything runs riot on Sunday?” {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.2}

“2. The position of the SENTINEL is no Bible in the schools if objected to by Catholics. Many of our text-books have the name of God in referring to him as Creator, etc. Suppose some atheist objects, shall his objection be sustained? Some ‘fogy’ objects to grammar being taught because he don’t believe in it; shall his objection be sustained? {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.3}

“Does not the matter of finances, building school-houses, and *selection of text-books lie with the majority?*—It certainly does. Then if they choose to select the best of all books for a school reader have they not power to do so, even if it does not suit the majority? {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.4}

The first question has been answered many times, but we will answer it again more in detail. The answer is very simple. The whole point is protection to religious worship on Sunday. This is the great plea that made in favor of Sunday laws. People must be protected in their right to worship. We say so too; but there is no necessity for Sunday laws in order to secure this undisturbed worship. To show that this is so, we will make some extracts from the penal codes of a few of the States. Section 302 of the penal code of California reads as follows:— {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.5}

“Every person who willfully disturbs or disquiets any assembly of people met for religious worship, by noise, profane discourse, rude or indecent behavior, or by any unnecessary noise, either within the place where such worship is held, or so near as to disturb the order and solemnity of the meeting, is guilty of misdemeanor.” {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.6}

Such misdemeanor is punishable by “imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding six months, or by fine not exceeding $500, or both.” {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.7}

The Pennsylvania law reads thus:— {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.8}

“If any person shall willfully or maliciously disturb, or interrupt, any meeting, society, assembly, or congregation convened for the purpose of religious worship, or for any moral, social, literary, scientific, agricultural, horticultural, or floral object, ceremony, examination, exhibition, or lecture, such persons shall on conviction be sentenced to pay a fine not exceeding $50, and suffer an imprisonment not exceeding three months, or both, or either, at the discretion of the court.” {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.9}

Following is the reading of the penal code of New York on this subject:— {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.10}

“SECTION 274. *Disturbing religious meetings*. A person who willfully disturbs, interrupts, or disquiets any assemblage of people met for religious worship, by any of the acts enumerated in the next section, is guilty of a misdemeanor. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.11}

SEC. 275. *Definition of the offense*. The following acts, or any of them, constitute disturbance of a religious meeting:— {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.12}

“1. Uttering any profane discourse, committing any rude or indecent act, or making any unnecessary noise, either within the place where such meeting is held, or so near it as to disturb the order and solemnity of the meeting. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.13}

“2. Engaging in, or promoting, within two miles of the place where a religious meeting is held, any racing of animals or gaming of any description. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.14}

“3. Obstructing in any manner, without authority of law, within the like disturbance, free passage along a highway to the place of such meeting.” {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.15}

From the criminal code of Illinois we quote the following:— {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.16}

“Whoever, by menace, profane swearing, vulgar language, or any unusual conduct, interrupts or disturbs any assemblage of people met for the worship of God, shall be fined not exceeding $100. Whosoever, during the time of holding camp or field meetings for religious purposes, within one mile of the place of holding such meeting, hawks or peddles goods, wares, or merchandise, or, without the permission of the authorities having charge of such a meeting, establishes any tent, booth, or other place for provisions or refreshments, or sells or gives away, or offers to sell or give away, any spirits, liquor, wine, cider, or beer, or engage in gaming, or horse-racing, or exhibits, or fairs, shall be fined not exceeding $100 in each offense.”—*Illinois Statute, chap. 35, paragraphs 53, 54*. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 129.17}

Section 189 of the criminal code of Colorado reads thus:— {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 130.1}

“Whoever shall be guilty of any noise, rout, or amusement on the first day of the week, called Sunday, whereby the peace of any private family may be disturbed, or who shall by a disorderly, immoral conduct interrupt or disturb the meeting, procession, or ceremony of any religious denomination, on either a week-day or Sunday, such person so offending shall be guilty of misdemeanor, and upon conviction therefor shall be fined any sum not exceeding $50.” {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 130.2}

Section 4,853 of the criminal code of Tennessee says:— {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 130.3}

“If any person willfully disturb or disquiet any assemblage of persons met for religious worship, by noise, profane discourse, rude or indecent behavior, or any other act at or near the place of worship, he shall be fined not less than twenty nor more than two hundred dollars, and may also be imprisoned not exceeding six months in the county jail.” {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 130.4}

We do not know of any State that does not have similar provisions. It is very evident, therefore, that Sunday laws are not needed in order to protect people in their right to rest and worship undisturbed on Sunday. And since, notwithstanding the existence of these statutes, it is claimed that Sunday laws are needed in order to protect the Christian Sabbath, or, as the Blair Sunday-Rest bill says, “to protect the religious observance of the day,” it is evident that the de-sire is not to protect those who do keep Sunday, since they have protection already, but to compel others to observe the Sunday religiously against their will. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 130.5}

A case in point occurred in this city not long since. At a public meeting, the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, and others, complained very bitterly that a service had been disturbed on the previous Sunday, by the beating of drums in a circus tent, which had been pitched adjoining his church. He stated that at times it had been almost impossible for the congregation to hear the sermon, because of the outside din. An impassioned plea was made for a Sunday law in California, so that congregations might be protected in their worship. The case was put very strongly, so as to excite sympathy, and no doubt many persons were moved by it to resolve to do all in their power to secure a Sunday law. Yet the readers of this article will see from the section quoted from the penal code of California, that ample provision already exists for the stopping of all such disturbances. The church where this thing happened is not more than two minutes’ walk from police headquarters, and it is safe to say to say that in five minutes from the first beat of the drum, the offenders might have been lodged in a cell at the police station. Yet those people endured all the disquiet, rather than avail themselves of the provisions already made. Why was this?—The only reason that can be given is that if they had demonstrated that religious service can be conducted quietly, and that any disturbance to it can be promptly checked, they would deprive themselves of their strongest arguments for the enactment of the Sunday law. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 130.6}

We trust that our friends will save these quotations that we have made, and secure others if they can, and use them whenever it is claimed that Sunday laws are a necessity in order that worship may be conducted undisturbed. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 130.7}

The second question concerning the Bible in the schools might be answered briefly, as follows:— {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 130.8}

1. The position of the SENTINEL is not simply “no Bible in the schools if objected to by the Catholics.” We are utterly opposed to the teaching of the Bible in public schools, no matter whether desired by Catholics or Protestants, or both. The reason is that the schools established by the State were not established for the purpose of teaching religion, and are not competent to do that work. What will be taught will be simply the empty shell, destitute of all power, for it is claimed that it is not desired to have the Bible in the schools for the purpose of teaching religion, but simply as a reading book. We reply that the Bible is essentially a religious book, and it is nothing less. The history and biography which it contains were written for the sole purpose of showing God’s dealings with men. They are practical object lessons in real piety, or else in the results of a failure properly to acknowledge God; and when the Bible is read or studied with any other object than to arrive at a knowledge of the religion which it inculcates, it is read and studied to no profit. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 130.9}

There is no point in the argument that if the Bible is kept out of the schools, all books in which the name of God occurs should likewise be kept out, else some atheist will be disturbed. It is a matter of fact there is no such thing as a real atheist. This was well shown in a convention of so-called atheists in Paris a few years ago, in which one of the leaders said, in an impassioned address, “I am an atheist, thank God.” {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 130.10}

2. No one ever heard of a conscientious objection to the teaching of grammar. There is no parallel whatever between the teaching of grammar and the teaching of the Bible. There is no difference of opinion concerning grammar, arithmetic, and geography. Those principles are well known and agreed to by all men of all nations and all classes. If the same thing were true in regard to the Bible, there could be no objection to having it taught in the schools. We say that if there were no disagreement as to the doctrines which the Bible teaches,—if all men who know anything about it were perfectly agreed upon it, as are all educated persons upon the principles of mathematics and language, and if there were no more possibility for a disagreement than there is upon the principles of these studies, there could be no objection to its being taught, because there would be nobody to object in that case. If a person did not want to study the Bible, be could refrain from studying it, just as he can now refrain from the study of the common branches of knowledge, if he wishes to remain ignorant. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 130.11}

This covers the whole ground. The trouble with those who plead for the Bible in the public schools, is that they do not discriminate between it and the common text-books. As we have before charged, they bring the Bible down to a level of grammar and geography; thus they convict themselves of the very things they charge us with, namely, of working against true religion and a real knowledge of the Bible. We think anyone can see the justness of our opposition. We are opposed to the teaching of the Bible in the public schools, because we love the Bible, and we do not want to have people steeled against what influence it has in the world, by having it taught as a thing of no more importance than grammar. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 130.12}

E. J. W.

**“The Blair Bill” American Sentinel 4, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is the heading of the communication which follows, to which we herewith reply. While it is true that the Blair bill is dead, by the adjournment of Congress, yet the movement which resulted in the presentation of the Blair bill, is not dead, and we are assured that, as soon as the next Congress assembles, another bill will be presented, which will be even stronger than the one introduced by Senator Blair; therefore, it is not out of place to consider that bill even now. Following is the communication:— {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 131.1}

“EDITORS OF THE AMERICAN SENTINEL: I wholly misapprehend the meaning of the Blair bill, if it mean anything more than that some one of the days in each week shall be observed as a day of rest. To this construction of the bill, I give my unqualified assent; to any other meaning of the proposed law, I am uncompromisingly opposed. I never will support any law that takes from the citizen the right to observe his own Sabbath, according to his own convictions of right. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 131.2}

“It is in man’s physical nature to need one day of rest in the week; all toiling creatures, whose muscular energy is strung to its highest pitch to drive life’s varied pursuits, or to promote man’s pleasure, need a time to recuperate these worn and often over-taxed powers. For them, as well as for man, I plead for one day of rest at least. With the same zeal I would plead for religious freedom; I would compel no man to observe for rest, and for religious exercise, a sabbath that he believes is not the day appointed by the divine Being. When we give away one item of that faith, so well expressed by our institutions, we take one step toward that despotism that has over-run the hopes of religious freedom in the world, one step from the principles upon which our institutions were founded. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 131.3}

“Am I mistaken in the meaning of the Blair bill? or are you not wrong in opposing a measure, a specification, that is comprehended in the great principle upon which your faith is founded? {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 131.4}

“J. W. HERVEY, A.M., M.D.  
“*Indianapolis, Ind., Feb. 4, 1889.*”

The fact is, as our correspondent suggests, that he wholly misapprehends the meaning of the Blair bill. He certainly did not read it very closely or he could have seen that it did mean a great deal more than that some day in each week should be observed, but that any individual was at liberty to select his own day of rest. It was entitled a “bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord’s day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship.” In the new bill the word “protect” is to be substituted for “promote.” Now this contemplates nothing less than the enforcement of the observance of the first day of the week, and that upon every individual within the jurisdiction of the proposed law. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 131.5}

That this is true, is shown by the first section, which says that “no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, amusement, or recreation to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord’s day, or during any part thereof, in any territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.” In the new bill this is to be made stronger. Instead of prohibiting work, amusements, or such like, “to the disturbance of others,” they propose to prohibit any work or amusement that is done “in public,” whether it disturbs anybody else or not. It needs no comment to show that our statement is true, that the purpose of the Blair bill is to compel everybody to keep Sunday. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 131.6}

This is further shown by the introduction. It states that the object of the bill is to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, and to promote, or protect, its observance as a day of religious worship. Now as we have before shown in the SENTINEL, there are ample laws in every State to protect the people in their rest upon Sunday, and also to protect them in their religious worship. There is no necessity for a Sunday law in order that people may be protected in the enjoyment of Sunday rest and worship. But note that it is not the people that are to be protected, but the day. The bill is “to protect the observance of Sunday as a day of religious worship.” That is a different thing from protecting the people. We protect a flower garden by building a fence around it, and putting up a sign warning people to keep off. So Sunday is to be protected as a day of religious worship by putting the fence of the law around it, and warning everybody not to trespass upon it. There is a vast difference between protecting people in their worship on Sunday, and protecting Sunday as a day of religious worship. The former, the State is in duty bound to do, just as it is in duty bound to protect all citizens, at all times, who conduct themselves peaceably. The latter it has no business whatever to do. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 131.7}

Our friend says that he would give his unqualified sanction to a bill providing that some one of the days in each week shall be observed as a day of rest, and gives as his reason that man’s physical nature needs one day of rest in a week. We hardly think he has considered this matter carefully, or he would not make so sweeping an assertion. We agree that it would be all right for the Government to enact a law that every man may rest one day in each week, or, in other words, that no one shall be compelled to labor seven days in a week. But that would be the same as saying that no peaceable, law-abiding citizen shall be interfered with in his right to conduct his own affairs as he pleases, and our laws already provide that. It is a most pernicious idea that the State must compel a man by force to do everything that is for his physical or moral welfare. Let that principle be admitted, and then every man’s privilege of judgment is taken away. He is left no chance to decide what is good and what is bad. The State decides for him, and he becomes simply a machine to be manipulated by the Government. Moreover, such a principle as that invests the law-makers with infallibility, in that it assumes that they are fully qualified to decide what is best for every man, when, as a matter of fact, they may be far less qualified than many men in private life. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 131.8}

It is altogether a false assumption by National Reformers and their allies, that the Sabbath is for the purpose of securing to the people physical rest. The only Sabbath law that we know of is the fourth commandment, and that says nothing about man’s nature requiring a weekly rest. The Sabbath was ordained for the purpose of worship, and for that alone. Of course, if it is observed, there is a benefit physically, but that is only a secondary matter in connection with the Sabbath observance; and when professed Christians appeal for Sunday laws on the basis of man’s physical necessity, they virtually deny the morality of the Sabbath. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 132.1}

Our correspondent says he never will support any law that takes from the citizen the right to observe his own Sabbath according to his own convictions of right. That is good, and we hope that after a little further consideration he will say with us, that he never will support any law that takes from the citizen the right to take his rest whenever he feels like it. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 132.2}

National Reformers make the very specious plea that seventh-day people will be at full liberty to observe their Sabbath, even though a strict Sunday law be enforced. Now here is a query. Seventh-day people form a very small minority of the population of this country. Now if the Sunday-law advocates are sincere in their statements that they will lose their rest-day if they do not have a civil law to protect them, and to compel others to rest on that day; if they are sincere in their statement that “the liberty of rest for each depends upon a law of rest for all,” how can they say that seventh-day people will have perfect liberty to keep their Sabbath even though a strict Sunday law be enacted? If the great majority of people, who profess to regard Sunday as a sacred day, cannot keep it without a law enforcing its observance, how can the very small minority of people who regard the seventh day holy keep that day with no civil law favoring it, but with a law which tends to compel them to use it for labor, by depriving them of one of their regular working days? We apprehend that no one will attempt to harmonize this. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 132.3}

As a matter of fact, seventh-day people can and do observe Saturday strictly with no law to favor them, and even with laws discriminating against them; therefore, it is a self-evident fact that Sunday people may, if they will, observe the first day of the week without any Sunday law. Therefore, it is evident, still further, that the only reason why they desire a Sunday law is that they may compel others, against their will, to keep the day. Sunday laws are always and everywhere oppressive, immoral, and antichristian. {AMS May 22, 1889, p. 132.4}

E. J. W.

**“Dr. Crafts at Pittsburg” American Sentinel 4, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

The event of the evening of the second day of the National Reform Convention at Pittsburg was the speech by Dr. Crafts, entitled, “Liberty and the Sabbath.” With the exception of the speech by Dr. McAllister on the “School Theory of Education,” this was the only one of the speeches, so far as we have received them, containing anything worthy of notice. That which makes this speech noteworthy is not its logic, because it has none, but the perverted ideas of liberty to which the speaker gave expression. In the beginning of his speech, he referred to the Sunday-law petition, copies of which had been placed in the seats, and which he read. It has been changed somewhat, so we will quote it as it now reads:— {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 137.1}

“*To the United States Senate*.—The undersigned organizations and adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, earnestly petition you to pass a bill forbidding in the Government’s mails, military service, and inter-state commerce, and in the District of Columbia, and Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, excepting works of necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who religiously and regularly observe another day of the week, by abstaining from labor and business, as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.” {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 137.2}

Concerning this, Mr. Crafts said: “It may be best to define it as a supplement to the State Sabbath law, by doing through Congress what the States cannot do,—giving protection to thousands beyond the jurisdiction of the State laws.” From this it seems that Mr. Crafts’s idea of liberty and protection is that they shall be guaranteed only to those who think as he does; and that everybody else must be deprived of liberty and protection. Mr. Crafts knows as well as we do that public worship is already protected, and that no Sunday law could afford any better protection to it than it has now. His continually harping on that string shows that he is working for a law from some other motive than that of reason and regard for religion. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 137.3}

While we are talking about protection to religious worship, it may not be amiss to inquire why those who religiously and regularly observe another day, are not entitled to as much protection as those who observe the first day. If Mr. Crafts says it is because those who observe another day are in the wrong, then he contradicts his statement that the Sunday law is not a religious law. To say that Saturday is not the correct day for Christians to observe, and to say that Sunday is the proper day, and ought, therefore, to be enforced by the State, is to say that the State should decide for people on questions of religious duty, or, in other words, that the State should act as Pope. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 137.4}

But the answer which, Mr. Crafts does give is that those who observe another day are so few that they are not worth noticing. In his speech he spoke of the opposition to his movement as composed of “two little Christian sects, professedly Christian,—the Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists, who, with the Jews, make about one per cent. of the population.” Of course he knows that his wished-for law will work great disadvantage to these people, but he philosophically answers that it is better for a few to suffer in order that many may be benefited. This is what the false-hearted high priest Caiaphas said when the council were considering whether or not Jesus should be tolerated. He said that it was expedient that one man should die in order that the whole nation should not perish. So, in order to save the nation, they put the one man to death; nevertheless, the whole nation miserably perished, and for the very reason that they rejected Jesus in order to gave themselves. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 137.5}

Now we will say this, that any law which works injustice to a single individual in a nation, is an unjust law; and the man that talks about securing liberty for the multitude by means of a law which shall deprive a few equally deserving persons of their liberty, shows that he does not understand the first principles of liberty and justice, but is at heart a tyrant. True liberty knows no favoritism. It may seem to some of the Sunday-law workers that liberty for the people can be obtained only by a law which will deprive some people of their liberty; but they will find in the end, that they are grievously mistaken, as did the Jewish people who crucified Christ in order that they might retain their nationality. Their ideas of liberty, and of gaining it, are just such ideas as were held by Napoleon, who, in order to gain his ends, which no doubt he forced himself to believe were for the good of the people, heartlessly sacrificed thousands of men. When people find that in their supposed march to liberty they are obliged to trample upon the rights of a single individual, they should halt, and take that as a sure indication that they are on the wrong road. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 137.6}

Referring to the observers of the seventh day as in the front rank of opposers to the Sunday-law movement, he said that they constituted but one per cent. of the population, and added, “And yet they would have the other ninety-nine per cent. yield their convictions in this matter.” To this we have to say, first, that the observers of the seventh day do not ask anybody to yield their convictions, unless their convictions are that everyone who does not observe Sunday should be deprived of their civil rights. Sunday-law advocates profess to think that the opposers of their movement want to deprive them of their rest-day. Nothing could be more untrue. The opposers of the Sunday law are perfectly willing that everybody who wishes to keep Sunday should be allowed the fullest liberty to do so, and be protected in his worship on that day to the fullest extent. We challenge Mr. Crafts, or any of his co-workers, to quote a single line from any opposer of the Sunday law, whether he be Christian, Jew, or infidel, which could possibly be construed as indicating any desire whatever to deprive any individual of the fullest liberty to rest and to worship on Sunday. The intolerance is all on the other side. It is the Sunday-law advocates who have such overweaning ambition to rule, that they cannot enjoy their Sunday rest so long as any person who differs with them is granted freedom of action. The opposers of the Sunday-law movement simply ask equal and exact justice for all. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 137.7}

Again, by his statement that the seventh-day people, who, as he says, form one per cent. of the population, would have the other ninety-nine per cent. yield their convictions in this matter, he conveys the idea that ninety-nine per cent. of the population of the United States have decided convictions in favor of Sunday. Now if that were true, they would not be asking for a Sunday law. If ninety-nine per cent. of the population of the United States were conscientious observers of the Sunday, the day would be observed so strictly that the labor that would be done by the one per cent. would not make a ripple on the surface of society. But let us look at figures for a moment. The population of the United States is about sixty-five million, but the number of church-members in the United States, both Protestant and Catholic, is not more than thirteen million. That is, only twenty per cent. of the people of the United States are even nominally Christian. This is a good deal less than ninety-nine per cent., but not all of these church-members are desirous of a Sunday law. We have in our possession the statements of prominent religious workers to the effect that the larger part of the present disregard for Sunday is due to members of churches. It is repeatedly stated that if it were not for the patronage of church-members the Sunday newspaper could not exist. Certainly, then, the conviction that Sunday should be observed strictly cannot be overwhelmingly strong, even among the small minority of the people who are nominally Christian. Then there are many thousands of people who conscientiously observe the first day of the week, who are as strongly opposed to a Sunday law as any seventh-day person can possibly be. Mr. Crafts himself only claims ten million petitioners presented to Congress shows that only a few hundred people actually signed the petition; and it is making a very liberal estimate to say that the entire number of people in the United States, who are zealous for a Sunday law, is less than a million. So then we may say that one per cent. of the population desire a Sunday law, and are determined to have it in spite of the opposition, and the passive indifference, of the other ninety-nine per cent. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 138.1}

Mr. Crafts says: “It is a very shallow objection, the attempt to charge that this is at the bottom of a Catholic conspiracy to put Catholicism in this country.” We do not know of anybody who makes this charge. We know very well that the Roman Catholics are not at the bottom of this movement. We should not think any the worse of it if they were. We know that there are many Catholics who are opposed to it. All the wickedness in the world does not result from what is called Catholicism, neither is all the goodness bound up in Protestantism. Those who are engineering this Sunday movement call themselves Protestants, but they have not the faintest conception of what Protestantism is. Protestantism derives its name from the protest of the German Princes at the Diet of Spires against religious interference with the Government and the rights of the people. A man is not necessarily a Protestant because he calls himself one. When these professed Protestants labor for the very thing against which the German Princes protested, they show that they are not Protestants, but Papists, at heart. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 138.2}

Mr. Crafts devoted a little time to the consideration of the objection that the Sunday law would be unconstitutional. His answer is as follows: “In cases where it has been carried up to the Supreme Court of the State the decisions have been without reserve that such laws are perfectly constitutional. It seems strange that this cry should still be raised, and the curious thing about it is that in the papers that publish these objections there is not the slightest intimation of the decisions of the courts in this matter.” A fitting answer to this is the following incident related of that eminent lawyer, Henry W. Paine, of Maine. One day Mr. Paine was riding in a horse-car, reading a sheep-skin-bound volume of law reports. An acquaintance hailed him, and said, “See here, Paine, do you have to study law still?” “This is not law,” said Paine. “It is only a collection of decisions of the Massachusetts Supreme Court.” So it may be said of the Supreme Court decisions that Sunday laws are constitutional. They are not law. They are not justice. They cannot make wrong right. Just as Chief Justice Taney’s decision in the Dred Scott case did not make slavery any more constitutional than it was before. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 138.3}

Mr. Crafts claims that the clause of the first amendment of the Constitution, which says that Congress shall not prohibit the free exercise of religion, is infringed in this country. He says: “Certainly it is an infringement of the free exercise of religion, when the public service is so managed that hundreds and thousands of employes in the service of the Government cannot have their rightful privilege accorded them. No deeply conscientious Christian man can take an office in the whole Post-office Department. No man who has a strict conscience can either be a postmaster or a post-office clerk, and I say it is an infringement on the free exercise of religion.” What about the man who has conscience in the observance of the seventh day? He cannot occupy any position in the Post-office Department, because the post-office is regularly open continually on Saturday, when his conscientious convictions compel him to refrain from all labor. Mr. Crafts does not expect that this condition of things will ever be changed. On the contrary, he intends to make it even more uncomfortable for them than it is at present. Therefore, according to Mr. Crafts’s own statement, he and his followers intend to perpetuate that infringement of the Constitution. We have never heard a Sunday-law advocate admit more plainly that the passage of a strict Sunday law would prohibit the free exercise of religion. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 138.4}

But as a matter of fact, the keeping open of post-offices on Sunday does not interfere in the slightest degree with the free exercise of a man’s religion. Any man who has conscience in regard to Sunday will keep it. There is no law compelling him to accept a position under the Government. There are thousands of people who keep Sunday strictly, just as there are other thousands who keep Saturday strictly, who have never dreamed that they were being interfered with,—that their religious freedom was infringed by the mere fact that somebody else worked while they were resting. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 138.5}

One more point in Mr. Crafts’s speech we will notice, and then leave him for the present. He said: “We will now notice the work of the seventh-day Christian people who are doing so much in this country to disturb the objects which we seek. I have been criticised for calling this people Saturdarians. They say that I have viewed that work a little uncharitably; but we claim that they make a fetich of Saturday.” If “Saturdarians” is a proper term to apply to those who observe the seventh day, then “Sundarians” must be a proper term to apply to those who observe the first day of the week. Mr. Crafts would undoubtedly think us uncharitable if we should apply it to him. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 138.6}

Mr. Crafts says that the seventh-day people make a fetich of Saturday. Let us look into this matter. A fetich, according to Webster, is “a material thing, living or dead, which is made the object of brutish and superstitious worship, as among certain. African tribes.” Now Mr. Crafts charges seventh-day people of making a fetich of Saturday, because they observe it strictly. Suppose we look at the other side. Mr. Crafts and his fellow-workers make a great parade of their conscientious regard for Sunday. Now if the simple fact that seventh-day people observe Saturday strictly is evidence that they make a fetich of it, then it must be that Mr. Crafts makes a fetich of Sunday. Indeed, he is a hundred fold more open to the charge of fetichism than seventh-day people are, for whereas seventh-day people are strict observers of Saturday for themselves only, Mr. Crafts not only observes Sunday strictly, but de-sires to compel everybody else to do so. This is one of the characteristics of fetichism; for it is well known that nothing will more quickly exasperate the ignorant devotee than to have people lightly regard his fetich. He not only holds it in superstitious reverence, but he thinks that everybody else ought to do the same; and the less worthy the object of his worship is of adoration, the more intense is his desire to have other people give homage to it, and the more intensely is he excited when it is disregarded. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 138.7}

Still further may we turn Mr. Crafts’s charge upon himself. A fetich, as before quoted, is the object of superstitious worship. “Superstition,” as defined by Webster, is “extreme and unnecessary scruples in the observance of religious rites not commanded.” Now there is nowhere in the Bible a command for the observance of Sunday. We defy any individual to produce even a semblance of such a command. Mr. Crafts manifests extreme scruples in the observance of Sunday, and it is certain that he manifests unnecessary scruples, in that he wishes to compel others to do so against their will. Therefore his regard for it is superstition; and since a fetich is the object of superstitious worship, we have proved conclusively that Mr. Crafts makes a fetich of Sunday. The columns of the SENTINEL are open to him to clear himself from this charge if he can. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 138.8}

E. J. W.

**“Sunday Laws Antichristian” American Sentinel 4, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days* (New York *Mail and Express*) of February 8 contained an article entitled, “The Sabbath and the Individual,” by Rev. George S. Mott, D. D., the vice-president of the American Sabbath Union for New Jersey, from which we quote the following reasons why Sunday laws and their penalties must be made universal:— {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 139.1}

“The person who keeps the law must not be put out and disadvantaged thereby, and this would be the case were there no penalties for breaking Sabbath laws. The merchant who closes his store might find that his neighbor who keeps open on Sunday was drawing away a trade which belongs to him. Now we must not permit the Sunday-keeping merchant to be the loser because ale regards the law, and so must it be with all kinds of labor. Let public sentiment in favor of Sunday law die away, and try to popularize in this country the Sunday of France, and the American will not be protected in his day of rest. Thus he would be compelled to work on that day or lose his situation. No public conscience or statutes will be on his side.” {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 139.2}

This is one of the most common arguments for, a Sunday law, and is urged by doctors of divinity who claim to be working in the interests of the gospel and pure morality; but to our mind it is one of the strongest evidences of the antichristian character of all Sunday legislation. A Christian is a follower of Christ, that is, a follower of his example and teaching. Now let us quote a few words from his lips, that we may have his statements concerning what must be done by those who follow him:— {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 139.3}

Matthew 5:10-12: “Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake; for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven. Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for any sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in Heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.” {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 139.4}

Luke 6:22, 26: “Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the son of man’s sake.” “Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets.” {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 139.5}

Matthew 7:13, 14: “Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.” {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 139.6}

Matthew 16:24, 25: “Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it.” {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 139.7}

Luke 14:27: “And whosoever cloth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.” {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 139.8}

John 15:18-20: “If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also.” {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 139.9}

John 16:33: “In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.” {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 139.10}

The American Sabbath Union proposes to change this order of things that Christ prophesied should exist. He said that as it was before his first advent, so it should be till the end of time: the righteous should be evil spoken of by the world, and would have greater difficulty in making a living. He expressly told his followers that they would be cast out even as he had been; that they could not plan for ease in this life, and at the same time secure the life to come. He taught them that, when there was a question of right and wrong, they should not parley, nor take anxious thought as to what they should eat or drink or wherewithal they should be clothed, if they should pursue a right course, but that they should first seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and trust him for their necessary support. He expressly stated that if a man did not take up his cross and deny himself, he could not be his disciple. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 140.1}

Now, suppose the American Sabbath Union succeeds in getting laws upholding the Christian religion, and making it easy for a man to profess Christianity, making it impossible for him to suffer any loss thereby, what would be the result? It would simply show that the Christianity that was thus professed was not Christianity at all, but a false profession thereof. By their claiming that they are going to have the religion of Christ respected, and to secure those who profess it from being put to disadvantage, they are doing their best to prove that Christ was a false prophet. But this cannot be done. Christ spoke truth. He did not say that the majority of men would reject truth because he wanted them to do so, but because he knew just what they would do. National Reformers may say as much as they please that, although their laws will make it easy for men to profess Christianity and to comply with the outward forms of it, they will not hinder them from being real Christians at heart, and true followers of Christ; but before they can make their claim good, they will have to prove that the Bible is untrue. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 140.2}

Jesus said: “Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat;” and that the way to life is narrow, and that few will find it. But the American Sabbath Union proposes to make the way to life so broad that nobody can help finding it; and then if anybody has a desire to follow the Saviour, and to walk in the narrow path, it will pursue him with a goad and compel him to walk in the broad way. But “the Scripture cannot be broken.” The broad way will be till the end of time the way to destruction. And so, when the National Reformers shall have succeeded in getting their system of Christianity so protected by civil law that nobody can suffer any inconvenience in obeying its demands, they will simply have succeeded in changing the truth of God into a lie, and in leading people to destruction while making them believe that they are leading them to everlasting life. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 140.3}

Christ never authorized anybody to offer ease and comfort as an inducement for people to follow him. He had no ease while on earth, and he said that it is enough that the servant be as his Lord. When he sent Ananias to baptize Saul of Tarsus, he said, “I will show him how great things he must suffer for my sake.” The American Sabbath Union says: “We must show men how little they will have to suffer, and how prosperous they may be in business, for the Lord’s sake.” Is it not antichrist? {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 140.4}

When a man came to Christ, saying, “Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest,” he replied: “The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.” He was “a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief,” and he says, “If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?” But the American Sabbath Union proposes to make Christianity very popular; therefore it proposes to lead men away from Christ and pure Christianity. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 140.5}

The apostle Paul says, “If we suffer, we shall also reign with him;” but the American Sabbath Union proposes to make it impossible for anybody to reign with Christ, by making it impossible for anybody to suffer with him. Again he says of the children of God that they are “heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified together.” But the American Sabbath Union says that it must not be possible for anybody to be made to suffer for Christ. Therefore we say that the American Sabbath Union is an antichristian institution, devoted to the suppression of pure Christianity, and the propagation of hypocrisy and dead formalism; and to just that extent, also, is it an enemy of mankind. Let every lover of pure Christianity and of his fellow-men work heart and soul against its iniquitous work. {AMS May 29, 1889, p. 140.6}

E. J. W.