**“‘The Secular Theory of Education’” American Sentinel 4, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

Thursday morning, April 25, Rev. David McAllister, of Pittsburg, delivered an address upon the above subject before the National Reform Convention assembled at that place. In beginning he referred to a paper that had just been read on “The Romish Assault on the Common Schools,” stating that his address came in very appropriately after that topic, for the reason, as he said, that “when this assault is understood by multitudes of our citizens, they can see no way of meeting it except by the secular theory of education.” He then proceeded as follows:— {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 145.1}

“What commands my respect for the Catholics is this, that they maintain that education cannot be complete when that education ignores religion. They are on the right ground there. Man is a religious as well as an intellectual being, and no scheme of education, whether by the family, or the church, or the State, is worthy the name that ignores the higher part of man’s nature. The only mistake with Romanists is this, that the religion which they insist upon it; the religion of Romanists. No other religion will they have. They won’t accept the principles that are common to Romanian with Protestantism, for there are such principles. They won’t allow these to be taught, for they maintain that any system of religion that leaves out what they regard as essential is utterly defective, and heresy is to be condemned, and heretics who embrace it are to be persecuted.” {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 145.2}

There are several points about this paragraph which we wish to notice. We are willing to admit that a man is not perfectly developed whose education does not embrace the moral and the physical as well as the purely intellectual. But that does not prove that it is the duty of the State to educate him in all of these principles. Indeed, it is an open question with leading educators how far the State should go in education on even a secular basis. There are not a few who maintain that the State should teach nothing except the common English branches, leaving all scientific and classical studies to be provided for by the individual himself, or by his guardians. Certainly then the statement that man is a religious as well as an intellectual being,—that no scheme of education is complete that ignores the higher branch of man’s nature,—proves nothing whatever as to how or by whom this higher part should be educated. We hold that it is not the province of the State to furnish religious education of any kind whatever; that for the State to get into the business of teaching religion is directly opposed to our Government, in that it involves class legislation. There are so many conflicting views concerning religion, and the public schools cannot by any possibility teach them all, so that if the State should go into the business of religious education it would be obliged to discriminate between a large class of citizens as worthy as those who are favored. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 145.3}

Again, note Mr. McAllister’s statement that the only mistake with the Romanist idea of education is that the religion upon which they insist is the religion of Romanists. In this they are perfectly consistent, and nobody can justly find any fault with them for it. Protestants who are worthy of the name must take a similar position, and insist that whatever religion is taught their children, whether by the State or otherwise, shall be none but the Protestant religion. But by this token we know that National Reformers are not Protestants, because they are willing to join with Romanists. It is true that Mr. McAllister wishes to compromise, having the State teach such branches as are common to both Protestants and Romanists; but he might as well go right over to the Catholic Church at once; for when he begs the. State to teach the principles of the Christian religion, and says that the principles which he desires to have taught are only those which are common to both Protestants and Romanists, he shows that in his mind there are no distinctive features of Protestantism, as compared with Romanism, that are worthy of being held. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 145.4}

Now let us see where this will lead to. The Romanist will not consent to any such fusion. He thinks that the principles of his religion which differ from Protestantism are vital, and he will not consent that they shall be ignored. In this he is consistent. The only reason why he remains a Romanist is because he regards his religion as superior to Protestantism. But Mr. McAllister, speaking for the National Reform Association, is not so strenuous in regard to his religion. He is willing to drop every feature that is different from Catholicism. The one point upon which Romanists and National Reformers are agreed is that the State shall support religious teaching. Now since the Romanists are decided in their convictions, and refuse to compromise their religion, while the National Reformers are willing to compromise, it is very evident that the stronger and more decided party will carry the day. That is, when National Reformers see that they cannot have religion taught by the State without joining with Catholics, and that the Catholics will not yield, they will compromise, not simply on those principles that are commn to Protestantism and Romanism, but on Romanism pure and simple. That this will be the result is further evident from a statement made in the *Christian Statesman* of August 31, 1881, by the Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, who, speaking of the desire of the National Reformers to secure the co-operation of Roman Catholics, said:— {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 145.5}

“We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches as such; but the time is come to make repeated advances, and gradually to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the necessities of the situation.” {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 145.6}

Now no matter how ardently the Roman Catholic might desire religious education by the State, they would be very foolish to yield a single principle in their religion in order to gain it, when they can see clearly by such statements as this, that by remaining firm they can bring professed Protestants to their position. When the National Reformers say that they are willing to make repeated advances, and to endure repeated rebuffs, and will gladly accept co-operation in any form in which the Roman Church exhibits it, all the Roman Church has to do is to wait. She is well assured that the National Reformers will keep up their wooing, and she is sure of gaining all that she may exact from so ardent a suitor. National Reformers may deny that their scheme, if successful, will make Romanism the ruling power in this country; but their denials amount to nothing in the face of such statements as those of Mr. Scovel and Dr. McAllister. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 146.1}

In saying this we would not have anyone think that we objected to the National Reform scheme just because it will result in Roman supremacy. We would just as soon see the State enforce the Catholic religion as the Protestant religion. Not but what we have decided convictions in matters of religion, but we have no choice as to what religion the State shall enforce, if it is to enforce any. The Protestant religion united with the State would be no better than Mohammedism. It is the union of Church and State that we protest against. It was by such protesting that Protestantism originated. He who does not protest against such a union is not a Protestant; and when so-called Protestantism is enforced by the State, it ceases to be Protestantism. The reason why we make so much of the statements of National Reformers, both direct and indirect, that they are willing to join hands with Romanists, and of the fact that Romanian will thereby be supreme in the State, is that we thus show clearly that their scheme does embrace the union of Church and State; because Romanian is avowedly in favor of a Church and State union, with the Church as senior partner. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 146.2}

This one point is sufficient to condemn Mr. McAllister’s entire speech. We might well leave the article here for the present, but will call attention to one little absurdity. Dr. Mc-Allister said:— {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 146.3}

“I might pursue at considerable length a line of argument that has become very familiar with the National Reformers; but I will only revert to it very briefly. It is this: The great mistake that is made by secularists is in comparing the State itself to any mere business association. Secular education rests upon the social compact theory of government-a theory that has been exploded long ago. The best political papers do not entertain it for a moment. There is something back of the social compact theory. Men come together and snake a covenant, and there is a compact. You cannot have a compact without the Nation, and there must be a Nation behind the compact. It is the Nation itself that makes the compact. The duties of government are laid upon it. Here is the being that is to undertake the work of education.” {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 146.4}

Let us make a parallel. Here is a railroad company. A number of men have come together and made a compact, or agreement. They mutually pledge themselves to work together in this line of business, and thus they form a company. They secure a charter and become a corporation. Now we may say there can be no there before the compact, that there must be a Nation behind the compact. But a Nation is not a mere aggregation of individuals, although there can be no Nation without people. Ten million people thrown together promiscuously within a certain territory, each one independent of everybody else, would not be a Nation. They become a Nation only when they unite their interests, and covenant together for mutual protection, and agree upon certain officers to execute their wishes. But according to the National Reform idea there has been a Nation stalking around this American continent from time immemorial, waiting for centuries for people to settle in order that it might make a compact with them, and have people to carry out its designs. Surely, if the National Reform scheme were not inherently wicked, the absurdities into which intelligent men are obliged to run in order to foster it, should consign it to oblivion. But people love to be humbugged. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 146.5}

E. J. W.

**“A True National Reform Government” American Sentinel 4, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Century* of April, 1888, Mr. George Kennan had an article on “Russian Penal Code,” from which in the August SENTINEL we copied what it had to say on the subject of religion. In that it was shown clearly that the Russian Government, with all its tyranny and intolerance, is the very kind of government that the National Reformers are working for. In the April *Century*, this present year, Mr. Kennan gives us a view of the workings of the Russian police department, in which is shown very clearly the working of National Reform principles. The following extract from the article will enable the reader to judge for himself:— {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.1}

“The police, with the Minister of the Interior at their head, control, by means of passports, the movements of all the inhabitants of the empire; they keep thousands of suspects constantly under surveillance; they ascertain and certify to the courts the liabilities of bankrupts; they conduct pawnbrokers’ sales of unredeemed pledges; they give certificates of identity to pensioners and all other persons who need them; they superintend repairs of roads and bridges; they exercise supervision over all theatrical performances, concerts, tableaux, theater programs, posters, and street advertisements; they collect statistics, enforce sanitary regulations, make searches and seizures in private houses, read the correspondence of suspects, take charge of the bodies of persons found dead, ‘admonish’ church-members who neglect too long to partake of the Holy Communion, and enforce obedience to thousands of multifarious orders and regulations intended to promote the welfare of the people or to insure the safety of the State. The legislation relating to the police fills more than five thousand sections in the Svod Zakonof, or collection of Russian laws, and it is hardly an exaggeration to say that in the peasant villages, away from the centers of education and enlightenment, the police are the omnipresent and omnipotent regulators of all human conduct-a sort of incompetent bureaucratic substitute for divine Providence. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.2}

“In order to give the readers of the Century an idea of the nature and infinite variety of the trans-actions regulated in Russia by the Government through the police, I will quote, almost at random, the titles or subjects of a few of the circular letters of instructions sent by the Minister of the Interior to the governors of various Russian provinces between 1880 and 1884. They are as follows:— {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.3}

“1. To regulate religious instruction in secular schools. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.4}

“2. Concerning measures to be taken to prevent horse stealing. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.5}

“3. Concerning a list of dramas that are unconditionally permitted to be put on the state. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.6}

“4. To prohibit the sale of Shimanski’s Pills. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.7}

“5. To prohibit peasants from cutting young birch trees with which to decorate churches and houses on holidays. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.8}

“6. Prescribing the manner in which the censor shall supervise the reports and accounts of private societies. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.9}

“7. Concerning a removal of the restrictions upon the transportation of rendered tallow. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.10}

“8. Concerning personal identification marks in the passports of Jews. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.11}

“9. To regulate the use of mineral waters by sick or wounded officers of the army. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.12}

“10. Concerning an order for the sale of all grain by weight instead of by measure. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.13}

“11. Setting forth the circumstances under which, and the times at which, the police and other employes of the Ministry of the Interior can wear white linen covers on their caps. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.14}

“12. Concerning the question who has the right to collect subscriptions in the empire for the holy places in Palestine. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.15}

“13. To abolish the long chains used for the purpose of chaining together marching criminals in gangs of six. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.16}

“14. To regulate printing on the paper of cigarettes. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.17}

“15. Concerning the prohibition, at meetings of provincial assemblies and town councils, of the expressions of such opinions or judgments as may, from their nature, lie outside the limits of the jurisdiction of such bodies. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.18}

“16. Concerning an order prohibiting the emigration of dissenters to the Trans-Caucasus. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.19}

“17. Concerning regulations for the proper construction of houses in peasant villages. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.20}

“18. To control and regulate the transportation of animal bones. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.21}

“19. To regulate advertisements of medicines. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.22}

“20. Forbidding the use of all school-books-and appliances of instruction not approved by the Minister of the Interior and the ecclesiastical authorities. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.23}

“21. Concerning the proper method of measuring the legs of recruits for the army. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.24}

“22. Concerning meetings of school-teachers. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.25}

“23. Prescribing the manner in which permission shall be obtained for concerts, readings, theatrical performances, and other public entertainments. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.26}

“24. To require printers to send to the Departments of Police copies of all newspapers, magazines, and almanacs printed by them. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.27}

“25. To prevent the sale of quinine that is not of good quality. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.28}

“26. To regulate the censorship of price-lists, printed notes of invitation, and visiting cards. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.29}

“27. Concerning the construction of water-closets according to the removal or barrel system. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.30}

“28. Providing for the censorship of the seals, rubber stamps, and cards of private individuals and business corporations. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.31}

“29. To regulate begging for ecclesiastical institutions and for the holy places in Palestine. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.32}

“30. To regulate the sale by apothecaries of certain ‘cosmetics’—namely, soap, starch, brilliantine, tooth-brushes, and insect powder. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.33}

“These are only a few of the countless thousands of orders, directions, and regulations that come within the jurisdiction of the imperial police. Of course they are not all carried into effect. The enforcement of such a multitude of prohibitions and restrictions, affecting every province of human life, is beyond the power of any one man or any set of men; but whether they are enforced or not, they operate constantly as a bar to individual enterprise, a network to restrain every free impulse, and a clog upon all human activity. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.34}

“It is difficult for Americans to realize that such relations can exist between the people of a country and the Government as those shown by these circulars to exist in Russia. Imagine a governor of New York State issuing an order requiring all the citizens of that State to send in their seals, rubber stamps, and visiting cards for censorial supervision. Or imagine a Postmaster-General writing a circular letter to the governors of all the States prescribing rules for the regulation of the sale of soap, starch, brilliantine, tooth-brushes, and insect powder? Such an extension of the powers of the Government is to us almost inconceivable, both on account of its tyranny and on account of its preposterous absurdity; and yet such regulations are not regarded in Russia as anything extraordinary, and one sometimes finds the police engaged in work that is even more remarkable than the regulation of the sale of tooth-brushes and insect powder. I have in my possession the original report of a Russian police *pristav*, written upon a printed form, in which the officer notifies his superior that, in compliance with instructions of such and such a date, he has called upon such and such persons, who are named, and has ‘admonished’ them that they must partake of the Holy Communion, ‘upon penalty of an administrative calling to account [pod opasenient v’ protivnom sluchae kazennaho vziskania]. This document bears in capital letters at the top of the first page the words, ‘Ukase [oo-kaz] of his Imperial Majesty the Autocrat of all the Russias: In the newspaper *Sibir* (See-beer) for July 10, 1883, it is stated, as a matter of news, that the police authorities of the city of Irkutsk have just received orders to admonish all persons who have been neglectful of religious duty, and to oblige them to partake of the sacrament. The use of the police power as a means of compelling indifferent or backsliding Christians to partake of the Holy Communion-the sending of an armed man in a blue uniform to drag another man to the table of the Prince of Peace, and to compel him to eat and drink the symbols of the broken body and shed blood of Christ-is something that has not often been seen, I think, outside of Russia, since the Dark Ages.” {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 147.35}

A few words only are necessary to show that this very state of things must exist in this country, if the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, succeed in carrying out their (ir)religious designs. All of these associations heartily indorse Mr. Blair’s proposed amendment to the Constitution, which requires that the principles of the Christian religion be taught in the public schools. It has already been shown in these columns that the adoption of that amendment would require that text-books on religion be issued, and that both text-books and teachers should be in harmony with the standard of religion that would be recommended by the ecclesiastical authorities. But when that is done it will be necessary that a strict watch should be kept to see that no other text-book is brought in; and to see that no teacher presumes to inculcate any ideas of his own, that may be different from the established religion. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 148.1}

The individuals who will have this matter in charge may not be called police, but their duties will be exactly such as are defined in the articles above numbered one, twenty, and twenty-two. They will have to regulate religious instruction in secular schools. They will have to note if any books and plans of instruction are used that are not approved by the ecclesiastical authorities, and they will have to oversee the meetings of school-teachers to guard against the introduction of anything in their discussions that shall differ in any way from the standard of religion set by those ecclesiastical authorities. In short, they will have to see that religion is not discussed at all; for it must be obvious to any thinking person that when the State, having taken counsel of the elders, prescribes the religion for its citizens, religious discussion is at an end. School-teachers will have no business to question the text-books, and they will not dare presume to make any aIteration. If anything different is to be taught, it will have to be decided upon by the ecclesiastical authorities of the Nation, just as in the days of old in Europe, no new thing can be even mentioned in the school unless a new council has passed upon it. When the council shall have decided upon what shall be taught the people, the school-teachers and ministers of low degree will have simply the duty of handing to the people that which has been given to them by their superiors. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 148.2}

Again, the enactment of a strict national Sunday law will require that the powers of the police be very greatly magnified. Indeed, the Sunday law is often called “a police regulation,” showing that the enforcement of the law will rest largely in the hands of the police. Of course the number of police will have to be greatly increased in order that they may keep an oversight over all the people, to see that no one violates the law. It will be their duty, also, as in Russia, to “admonish” people who do not attend divine service at stated intervals. The leaders in the Sunday-law movement openly avow that their desire for a Sunday law is that people may go to church. But as we have before shown, if the mere enactment of a Sunday law does not accomplish their designs, they will necessarily have to amend it so as to require attendance at church. Moreover, Mrs. Bateham has said that what they want is the “ideal Sabbath of the Puritans;” the guarantee to rest and to worship. Now we have before us some of the laws by which that ideal Sabbath was secured, and we will quote them. In Robert Wodrow’s “Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen,” we find the following:— {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 148.3}

“It is thought expedient that ane baillie with tua of the session passed throw the towne everie Sabbath-day, and nott sic as they find absent fra the sermons ather afoir or efter none, and for that effect that they pass and seiche sic hours as they think maist meit.” {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 148.4}

In his collections he says that the session allows the searchers to go into the houses and apprehend absentees from the Kirk. In the records of the governor and company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England we find that in 1629 the first Sunday law in the colony read thus:— {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 148.5}

“And to the end the Saboth may bee celebrated in a religious manner we appoint, that all that inhabite the plantacon, both for the gen’all and pticuler imploymts, may surcease their labor every Satterday throughout the yeare at 3 of the clock in the afternoon, and that they spend the rest of that day in catichising and pparacon for the Saboth, as the ministers shall direct.” {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 148.6}

This is very similar to the law now required by the American Sabbath Union. But that law was found insufficient to meet the desires of the ecclesiastics, and so in 1634 they supplemented it by the following:— {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 148.7}

“Whereas complaints hath bene made to this Court that dyvers psons within this jurisdiccon doe vsually absent themselves from church meetings vpon the Lord’s day, power is therefore given to any two Assistants to heare and sensure, either by ffyne or imprisonmt (aft their discrecon), all misdemeanrs of that kind committed by any inhabitant within this jurisdiccon, provided they exceed not the ffyne of vs for one offense.” {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 148.8}

It worked then just as we have said it will work now. First was the strict Sunday law. Then was the law requiring everybody to go to church, and allowing officers to search the town to discover absentees. In 1782 an act was passed enjoining the worship of almighty God, as an essential part of the due observance of the Lord’s day, and imposing a fine of ten shillings upon any said person who shall absent himself for a month from the public worship of God on the Lord’s day. This statute provided for wardens to enforce the law, and gave them power to enforce it by stopping travelers, and by entering all places where they may find Sabbath-breakers. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 148.9}

That is the “ideal Sabbath of Puritans.” That is the condition of things that Mrs. Bateham wishes to see in this country. When it shall be brought about we shall have a despotism fully as bad as that of Russia. Mr. Kennan says that Russian police are “a sort of incompetent, bureaucratic substitute for divine Providence.” If the American Sabbath Union and the Christian Temperance Union shall secure their desired ends, we shall have a police who will not only be a substitute for divine Providence, but a substitute for men’s consciences. Is there an American who has any love for freedom? If there is let him protest vigorously against any such usurpation. E. J. W. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 148.10}

**“That Petition Again” American Sentinel 4, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

Since the AMERICAN SENTINEL has shown up so fully the crooked methods by which the Woman’s Christian Temperance and American Sabbath Unions have added signatures to their Sunday petitions, the leaders of these organizations have found it necessary to do something to divert public attention from their course, and, not being able to offer any excuse for the dishonest methods, they have had no alternative but to try to snake it appear that the signatures to the protest were not obtained in a legitimate manner. Of course this does not help their cause any, for even if all the signatures to the protest were fraudulent, that would not make their duplicity any the less; but the charge which they bring serves in a measure to divert attention from themselves. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 149.1}

Their charge is: First, that the petition was signed only by Adventists. Second, that those who signed it who were not Adventists did so because they did not understand what they were doing. Third, that all besides Adventists who signed it were saloon keepers, who naturally disliked the idea of a Sunday law. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 149.2}

It needs nothing more than this statement of the charges which they make, to show to what straits they are driven to make it appear that they alone are not guilty of fraud; for one part of their charge contradicts every other part. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 149.3}

That the petition was not signed by Adventists exclusively is shown by the fact that, according to the Seventh-day Adventist Year Book, there are only 26,000 members of that denomination in the United States; whereas, there were 230,000 signatures to the petition that was presented in the Senate last winter, and as many more have been obtained since. These are not “representative” signatures either. Anyone who wishes to do so can verify the fact that there are 230,000 distinct signatures in the petition that was presented to Congress. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 149.4}

We have, however, just received a letter from a gentleman in Woodbury, N. J., a stranger to us, which covers every point of the charge which the Sunday-law people bring against those who circulated the protest. It is so concise a statement that we present it in full. It was entirely unsolicited by us, and was called out by the statements of the Western Christian Union, which were quoted in the article, “Is This the Breath of the Puritan?” in the SENTINEL of April 10. Referring to the statement that the canvassers for signatures to the protest had adopted the practice of “button-holing unsuspecting citizens in railroad waiting-rooms and street corners, not a few of whom were unfamiliar with the question,” the writer says:— {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 149.5}

“Gentlemen, I am not an Adventist; neither am I ignorant of this great question now claiming the attention of so many people of this Union. I was one of several who signed this petition against the Blair bill. I was not asked to sign this until the gentleman who circulated it was fully satisfied that I knew just what I was signing. This paper was headed by the pastor of the M. E. Church of this city; next came that of my own pastor, of the Baptist Church, followed by the signatures of several of the prominent men of our city, whose signatures I recognized. I have in my possession a petition upon which I expect to receive a number of names of Christians. All of them will know why they sign it. I do not wish to weary you, but I want to say to you that I am sorry to see those of my own faith persecuting those Christians against whom they can bring no greater charge than that they insist upon having the liberty which God has given every man, and which our National Constitution guarantees. God speed you in this work. I remain, etc.” {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 149.6}

This simple statement meets every point of the charge which they bring against us; and coupled with the fact that every point of their charge contradicts every other point, it certainly ought to put a stop to their attempt at misrepresentation; but it will not. Having started on a career of misrepresentation, and being determined to have a Sunday law, which cannot be secured by fair means, they must necessarily pursue their course to the end. Our desire is to save as many as possible from coming to that end, which will not be simply the securing of a national Sunday law. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 149.7}

E. J. W.

**“Exemption Clauses in Sunday Laws” American Sentinel 4, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Oracle* of April 25 contains an article from a fair-minded correspondent, upon “License and Sunday Laws.” In it he makes the following reference to one who had previously written to the same paper:— {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 149.8}

“He says that if the Blair bill should pass, and a strict Sunday law be passed, Adventists could obey the law without any violation of their religious principles. True; but if you forbid them doing any manual labor on that day you rob them of one-sixth of their power to earn a living for their families-or at $2.00 per day it would amount to $104 annually. Without their consent, is that American liberty? Suppose you rest on Sunday, and we pass a law to prohibit you from working Mondays; how would that suit you? Brethren, we don’t want a Sunday law unless it has a proviso that those who conscientious keep the Sabbath shall not be prohibited from performing their usual occupation on Sunday. The Constitution is good enough as it is.” {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 149.9}

The writer of the above evidently believes in equal and exact justice to all; but he has not given the Sunday question sufficient thought, or he would know that there can never be any justice in connection with a Sunday law. In the first place, a seventh-day Christian could not obey a Sunday law without violating his conscience. It is not necessary, however, to dwell upon this, since the writer would not have such compelled to rest on Sunday, because, as he rightly says, such compulsion would be robbery. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 149.10}

But those who have given much thought to the subject, whether friends or foes of Sunday legislation, know that no law can long be enforced with exceptions. We say that it is utterly impossible to enforce a Sunday law that makes an exemption in favor of those who observe the seventh day. Such a thing never has been done, and never will be done. True, there are Sunday laws which exempt observers of the seventh day; but those laws are never enforced. They remain upon the statute books as dead letters. When the time comes that enough people get in earnest to have them enforced, they secure the repeal of the exemption clause. Then they can enforce the law, and not before. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 150.1}

Take the case of Arkansas as an example. It had for a long time a Sunday law which made an exemption in favor of seventh-day people. But that law was not enforced. No attempt was made to enforce it. Finally some unto quid people concluded that the law ought to be enforced. But they could not enforce it as it was. Why?—Because there was really nothing to enforce. The exemption in favor of seventh-day observers deprived the law of all its force. So they pleaded for the repeal of that exemption section, so that no non-religious person could evade the law by professing to be an observer of the seventh day. There is no evidence that any person had ever done so; but the Sunday-law people saw plainly that that could easily be done, and that to attempt to enforce a Sunday law with an exemption section, would be like trying to trap a fox with two holes to his den. So they stopped up all chance of escape, by securing the repeal of that obnoxious section. Then the law was enforced for the first time in its existence. And right vigorously was it enforced too. Then the saloon keepers had to suffer, didn’t they? Not much. They sold whisky as openly as ever, and were not even indicted therefor. It was enforced against those who had rested on Saturday, and against no others. The National Reformers of Arkansas seemed to feel a special interest in the physical welfare of the Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh-day Baptists, for they sought to compel them to rest after they had already rested, while others were left free not to rest at all. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 150.2}

This prosecution went on until public indignation demanded that simple toleration, if not justice, should be granted to those observers of the seventh day, all of whom were good citizens. So a bill was introduced and passed, which granted to conscientious observers of the seventh day immunity from the pains and penalties of the Sunday law. The result was that the prosecution ceased. No attempt has been made since to enforce the law. Surely this is far more than merely suggestive. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 150.3}

Now a National Sunday law is desired. Its advocates make a great show of liberality, and say that they are going to see that it exempts those who observe the seventh day. The Blair bill, however, made no such exemption. Nevertheless, fair-minded persons are caught by the pretension to liberality on the part of the National Reformers and the American Sabbath Union. But let it not be forgotten that the object of this proposed National Sunday law is to make efficient existing State Sunday laws. But it cannot give efficiency to them unless it is itself “efficient;” and it may be accepted as a fact that it will be no exception to previous laws, and cannot be enforced so long as it makes any exemption of those who observe another day. So the exemption will be allowed to remain only till the law is secured, and when the time comes to enforce it, the exemption will be repealed. That is the way it is done. Exemption clauses in Sunday laws are frauds. They are designed only to delude fair-minded persons into favoring the enactment of the law, and they never serve any other purpose. Let all lovers of justice pay no heed to the voice of the National Reform charmer, charm he never so wisely. {AMS June 5, 1889, p. 150.4}

E. J. W.

**“A Misleading Petition—Which One Is It?” American Sentinel 4, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the February number of *Our Day*, the magazine edited by Joseph Cook, in an editorial notice of the presentation of the Sunday-law petition to Congress, we find the following:— {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 153.1}

“The Seventh-day Adventists, whose chief aim in life seems to be to break down the American Sabbath, are circulating a misleading counter-petition, which gives the impression that it is the religious observance of the Sabbath which the great petition asks Congress to promote, whereas nothing is asked beyond protection of Sunday rest and public worship in the domain of the National Government, as has been afforded in nearly all the States from the beginning to citizens in the domain of State governments.” {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 153.2}

About the same time Mr. Crafts published a circular letter in which he said:— {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 153.3}

“Prompt action on the petition is the more important from the fact that the enemies of the Sunday-Rest law, a curious combination of Saturdarians, saloonists, and a few papers, are becoming very active in the circulation of misrepresentations and misleading counter-petitions, the latter so worded as to give the false impression that we are asking for a law to promote the religious observance of the Sabbath, whereas our petition seeks only protection for Sunday rest and worship.” {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 153.4}

Since so much is said about this counter-petition, it may be well to publish it, that all the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL may know what it does ask for. The petition reads as follows:— {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 153.5}

“*To the Honorable, the Senate of the United States*— {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 153.6}

“We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord’s day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way tend, either directly or indirectly, to give preference to the principles of any religion or of any religious body above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion; but that the total separation between religion and State, assured by the National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it.” {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 153.7}

Now we can compare the statements with the petition. Mr. Cook and Mr. Crafts say that this counter-petition is misleading, in that it gives the false impression that the Sunday-law people are asking for the promotion or protection of the religious observance of Sunday. But the most careful reader of the counter-petition will fail to find in it any reference whatever to the American Sunday Union, or to a petition for a Sunday law, or to the Blair bill, or to anything whatever that has been done. It simply asks that Congress shall not pass a bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or in regard to any other religious institution; nor to favor any amendment that would tend to give preference to any religion, or to any religious body, above another, but to keep Church and State entirely separate, as they were designed to be by the fathers of our country. In short, the sum of the petition is that Congress will not interfere in religious controversies, and in matters purely religious. Our Sunday-law friends claim that this is just what they want; they claim that they do not want religious legislation; they claim that they want Church and State kept entirely separate. Now if they are sincere in their protestations, why do they object so strongly to this counter-petition? Indeed, if they mean what they say when they deny the charge that they are laboring for a union of Church and State, and are so bitterly op-osed to civil interference in matters purely religious, they ought to sign the petition. Indeed, they should be intensely anxious to sign it. If their protestations are of any value, then this so-called counter-petition is not a counter-petition at all, but is exactly in harmony with their petition and their line of work, and they ought to adopt it. But they do not indorse it; they most bitterly denounce it. Then what shall we conclude? We can form no other conclusion than that they are not sincere when they say that they do not desire a union of Church and State; when they say that what their petition calls for is not religious legislation. It is the wounded bird that flutters. The hatred which they manifest to this petition, and their evident chagrin at the large number of signatures of the best people that have been secured for it, show that the petition strikes directly against their work. They show that the counter-petition asks Congress not to do the very thing that their petition desires it to do. And what is that? It asks them not to legislate upon the subject of religion, and not to do anything that tends to Church and State union. By opposing the petition which asks that this be not done they show that they want it done. In no other way could they so clearly show the real object of the Sunday-law petition, and the spirit of the Sunday-law movement, than by the bitter opposition which they make to this counter-petition. Their action in the matter stamps their movement as a movement to secure a union of Church and State, and nothing else. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 153.8}

Now we will have a little direct testimony concerning the matter of the religious observance of Sunday, which both Mr. Cook and Mr. Crafts say they do not desire. We will quote once more a few statements which will show clearly just what they do want. We have given them many times, but we shall doubtless be compelled to repeat them many more times, for the Sunday people persist in telling the people generally another thing from what they talk among themselves. First, we repeat the statement made by Mrs. Bateham in her speech at the Washington Convention last summer. Referring to the petitions that hung around the assembly room, she said:— {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 154.1}

“As I look about this church to-night, I cannot help thinking of the fourteen million people that this meeting represents, all of whom are praying to have the holy day observed. They are praying that the Government will pass a law that will compel the people to observe the first day of the week; and people in every State of the Union are distributing circulars to secure signatures to that effect.” {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 154.2}

This statement is taken from the report in the *Lutheran Observer* of December 21, 1888, whose editor, Dr. Conrad, was one of the speakers at the convention, and is one of the officers of the American Sunday Union. Nothing that we could say could more directly contradict the statement made by Mr. Cook and Mr. Crafts than does this statement by Mrs. Bateham. They say that their petition does not ask for the religious observance of the day, but she says that the petitioners pray to have the holy day observed. Of course, we know that there were not fourteen million petitioners, and that the day is not holy; but her statement intimates that those who signed the petition intelligently did so with the understanding that it was a request to have the day observed as though it were holy. It is true that the petition itself does not say anything about religious observance; but Mrs. Bateham says that those who sign the petition thereby pray that the Government will pass a law to compel the people to observe the first day of the week. And the fact that she calls it a holy day shows that they sign the petition with the understanding that it is to secure the compulsory observance of Sunday as a holy day. Therefore, if Mr. Cook and Mr. Crafts are so righteously indignant because their petition has been, as they say, misrepresented and made to appear as though it called f’or the religious observance of Sunday, they should turn their guns upon Mrs. Bateham. Not an enemy to the Sunday-law petition or the Sunday-law movement has said a single thing beyond what Mrs. Bateham herself has said. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 154.3}

Again, in the report above referred to in the *Lutheran, Observer*, we find the following statement made by Dr. Crafts. He said, “The bill which has been introduced makes Sunday the ideal Sabbath of the Puritan, which day shall only be occupied by worship.” That bill was introduced by Senator Blair in response to the petition which has been referred to, which was gotten up by the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. Yet Mr. Crafts says that they do not want anything like religious legislation, and that they don’t petition to have Sunday observed religiously. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 154.4}

Again, Mr. Crafts said in his address before the general assembly of the Knights of Labor, reported in the *Journal of United Labor*, November 29, 1888, that “the weekly day of rest has never been secured in any land, except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out and you take the rest out.” {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 154.5}

Col. Elliott F. Shepard is president of the American Sunday Union. The New York Mail and Express of January 25, 1889, gives in full his address before the convention upon his election as president of the Union. In that address, he spoke of the petition as follows:— {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 154.6}

“We have already been told that there are upon this petition for a National Sunday-Rest law some six millions of Protestants, and some seven millions of Romanists. The Romanists are supposed to be represented by that one signature-of Cardinal Gibbons-which was obtained with much less trouble than the greater part of the Protestants in our country. We have some six millions already on the petition, so that we have a basis to work upon; but there are still fifty-two millions of Protestants whom we must interest in this movement. We must go on; we must bring them to sign the petition for the Sabbath. We are very glad to welcome as a coadjutor the Roman Catholic Church in any branch of Christianity, or in any form of benevolent work in which it will consent to join us; but we must not forget the greater number of the population outside of that church, and we are bound to prosecute this work until we lay its binding truths of divine authority before the whole people, and bring them all into the valley of decision. Choose this day whom ye will serve; if the Lord be God, serve him; and if the world be God, serve that. You have to say yes or no-whether you will stand by the decalogue, whether you will stand by the Lord God Almighty, or whether you will turn your back upon him. The work, therefore, of this society has just begun. We do not put this work on mere human reasoning-for all that can be overthrown by human reason. We rest it directly and only on the divine commandment.” {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 154.7}

Now this shows that their petition is the one that is misleading. It shows that they expect to gain a great deal more than appears on the face of their petition; it shows that they have worded their petition just so as to secure the greatest number of signatures to it. They are multiplying signatures by every means, both fair and foul-principally foul-counting in its favor thousands of people who never heard of it, as well as other thousands who have heard of it, but who know really nothing as to its real design; and then they intend to wheel these petitioners into line, as favoring their construction of the petition, and demanding a law to compel people to observe Sunday as a holy day. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 154.8}

We might give other quotations from the leaders in the Sunday movement, but these are sufficient. We are not dealing in conjectures, but we give the statements as they appear in black and white, upon the authority of the leaders of the Sunday-law workers themselves. If anything in our language seems to be harsh, we leave it to the candid reader to decide if it is not just. We make no scruple in charging bad faith upon the leaders in this Sunday-law movement, because we condemn them only out of their own mouths; but in so doing we wish to make no reflections upon these men as individuals. We have no doubt that personally they are very pleasant men, and that under almost any other circumstance they would reason logically and act fairly. We attribute their course, not to any inherent wickedness in themselves but to the force of circumstances. They have committed themselves to the securing of an iniquitous law, and such a law can be secured only by iniquitous methods. Religious legislation by civil Governments has always been marked by fraud and a disregard for the rights of dissenters; and when these men give themselves to such unrighteous work they can do no other than what they are doing. We pity them, and hope that some of them, at least, may see the error of their way and turn from it. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 154.9}

E. J. W.

**“Mr. Crafts against Facts” American Sentinel 4, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have before us a copy of the Vineland (N. J.) *Evening Journal*, of April 19, which contains a report of an address on the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, delivered in that place by Doctor Crafts. From that report we make the following brief quotations, that we may compare them with the facts:— {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 155.1}

The Blair bill, said he, is not what its enemies would have it. Blair drew this bill for the Sabbath men the same as any lawyer would draw bills for any client. Blair has drawn bills for another sect who are opposed in some degree to the American Sabbath, or a day of rest. The two bills are put together by enemies of the Rest bill, and thus misrepresentations are made. When Blair drew the original bill he used his own language, and the bill read ‘promote’ Sabbath observance instead of ‘protect.’ Enemies took the word ‘promote’ as an effort to get God in the Constitution and establish State religions-that is, religions supported and maintained by the State. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 155.2}

“The friends of the bill never had any desire to ‘promote’ Sabbath observance, and therefore that word was stricken out and ‘protect’ inserted, and this was done immediately, but the enemy still delights in informing the people that ‘promote’ is the word. Dr. Crafts gave a history of how the movement for Sabbath observance first started, and denied, as has been charged, that the W. C. T. U. was at the head of the move. The movement was started, not as a religious measure at all, but because some people saw that it was necessary to have a day of rest for the health of the multitudes, and that in these days of soulless corporations and combinations, it was necessary that law should stand between the ‘spoiler’ and the employes. When P. M. Arthur, the head of the Locomotive Engineers, and T. V. Powderly, the head of the Knights of Labor, each representing thousands of signatures, signed the petition for this Sunday-Rest bill, it was plain that they saw a need of a day of rest for the workingmen. Now labor organizations are taking the matter up and will carry reform out. Understand that ‘religious observance’ nor the ‘word of God’ are not mentioned in the bill, and are no part of it. The ‘Rest bill’ is for the benefit of the masses and the health of the people. The bill does not deny the right to work to any citizen in the United States, on any day of the week, provided that citizen does not engage in trade where there is competition, so that his neighbor is compelled to keep open his shop.” {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 155.3}

We know nothing of a bill that Mr. Blair has drawn for a sect that is opposed to the American Sabbath or to a day of rest. Indeed, we do not know of any sect in the United States that is opposed to a day of rest; but whatever other bills Mr. Blair may have drawn up, the enemies of the Sunday-Rest bill have not put together nor confounded it with any other. All our strictures have been made upon the Sunday-Rest bill, without any regard to any other bill. Further, Mr. Blair did not draw up the Sunday-Rest bill just as a lawyer would draw up any bill, but has shown himself intensely partisan in pushing the bill. In the notice which the April number of *Our Day* gives to the hearing on the Rest bill, we find this sentence: “We subjoin from its pages some of the dialogues between Senator Blair (who showed himself matchless in cross-questioning) and the opponents of the bill.” This states the case exactly, as the reader of that hearing will see. Mr. Blair did act the part of a paid attorney, cross-questioning and arguing with the opponents of the bill, but assisting those that were praying for its passage. This may be set down as one instance where Mr. Crafts unfortunately differs with facts. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 155.4}

Again, concerning the relative importance of the words “promote” and “protect.” It is not true, as Mr. Crafts states, that “the enemy still delights in informing the people that ‘promote’ is the word.” It is a matter of fact that the bill was not amended, now was any substitute introduced during the session of Congress. All there is to it is this: The American Sabbath Union, at its meeting in Washington last December, saw that the statement that the bill was designed to promote the observance of Sunday as a day of religious worship, showed too plainly upon its face that it was an act to establish a State religion. Accordingly they appointed a committee to formulate changes they desired in the bill. This committee reported; and among other things was the substitution of the word “protect” for “promote” in the preamble and last clause of the bill. These changes we immediately noted, publishing the original bill side by side with the bill as the Union desired it to read; we have printed it more than once, and have repeatedly referred to the change from “promote” to “protect;” although, as it has been said before, the bill which was introduced into Congress read, “to promote its (the first day) observance as a day of religious worship,” until the bill died a natural death by the adjournment of Congress. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 155.5}

What Mr. Crafts objects to, however, is the fact that we have showed that the word “protect” does not conceal the object of the bill any more than did the word “promote.” We have shown again and again that so far as the people who observe Sunday are concerned, they do not need any more protection than they already have. There is abundant provision in the laws of every State for the protection of religious worship. And the bill which Mr. Blair introduced does not say that it is desired that the people shall be protected, but that the religious observance of the day shall be protected; and that can mean nothing else but that all the people shall be prohibited from using the day in any other way than as a day of religious worship. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 156.1}

And this is just what Mr. Crafts himself has said that they desire to secure by the passage of the bill. In the Washington Convention he declared that “the bill which has been introduced makes Sunday the ideal Sabbath of the Puritans, which day shall be occupied only by worship.” So here we have No. 2 of Mr. Crafts’s unfortunate collisions with facts. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 156.2}

Again, the report says that “Dr. Crafts gave a history of how the movement for Sabbath observance first started, and denied, as has been charged, that the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union was at the head of the movement.” Unfortunately for Mr. Crafts, we have something upon this point also. In the Union Signal of May 3, 1888, there appeared a report of a hearing which the Senate Committee on Education and Labor gave on the 6th of the preceding month to the friends of a Sunday law. Mrs. J. C. Bateham, the superintendent of the Sabbath Observance Department of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, presented the opening paper, and was followed by several ministers. The Union Signal, to which we just referred, said: “Senator Blair will now draft and present a bill for us.” This shows that the bill was introduced at the request of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 156.3}

Again, in the hearing before the committee on Education and Labor, on Thursday, December 13, 1888, Mrs. Bateham, in replying to a question by Mr. Blair, said: “This petition work has been done chiefly by our Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. The ministry, I may say, have had almost nothing to do with it. It was started in behalf of the elevation of the masses to protect the morality of the people.” This is sufficient on that point. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 156.4}

Mr. Crafts says that the movement was started, not as a religious measure at all, but because some people saw that it was necessary to have a day of rest for the health of the multitude. Again he says: “Understand that ‘religious observance’ nor the ‘word of God’ are not mentioned in the bill and are no part of it. The Rest bill is for the benefit of the masses, and the health of the people.” Mr. Crafts may presume upon the ignorance of the people to whom he lectures, but he ought to take some precaution to keep his lectures from getting into print, where they can be seen by those who are familiar with the Blair bill. With his statement that religious observance is not mentioned in the bill, and is no part of it, compare the preamble of the bill. We quote it with the changes desired by the American Sabbath Union, so that Mr. Crafts can find no fault with it. It reads as follows:— {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 156.5}

“A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the Lord’s day, commonly known as Sunday, as a day of rest, and to protect its observance as a day of religious worship.” {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 156.6}

Now it is technically true that the term “religious observance” does not occur in this preamble; that is, the words do not occur in just that relation; but nevertheless it is plainly declared that the bill is to protect the religious observance of the day. But this is not all; the bill itself closes with the statement that “the act shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during Sunday, their mental and moral culture, and *the protection of the religious observance of the day*.” Yet in the face of this Mr. Crafts wishes us to understand that “religious observance” is not mentioned in the bill and is no part of it! The reader cats draw his own conclusions as to the design of Mr. Crafts in making that statement. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 156.7}

Again he says that “when P. M. Arthur, the head of the Locomotive Engineers, and T. V. Powderly, the head of the Knights of Labor, each representing thousands of signatures, signed the petition for this Sunday-Rest bill, it was plain that they saw the need of a day of rest for the workingmen.” Mr. Crafts is here trying to substantiate his assertions that this Sunday movement was originated solely by the workingmen and not by the churches. But it is about as nefarious a statement as the other; for, as a matter of fact, Mr. Powderly and Mr. Arthur did not indorse the petition in behalf of the thousands who had never seen it, until Mr. Crafts had labored with them for several hours, overcoming their objections. And further than this, the Union Signal, referring to the vote passed by the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor after Mr. Crafts had argued and pleaded with them, said that it was a wonderful victory achieved by Mr. Crafts. It could not have been very much of a victory to secure the signatures of those workingmen, if the workingmen had instituted the movement. There seems to be a little discrepancy here which we will leave to Mr. Crafts to explain. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 156.8}

Once more, Mr. Crafts says that the bill does not deny the right to work to any citizen in the United States, on any day of the week, provided that citizen does not engage in trade, where there is competition, so that his neighbor is compelled to keep open his shop. If we had the space we would reprint the bill in full; but those who have files of the AMERICAN SENTINEL can find it, and can verify our statement that the bill specifies nothing of the kind. We will quote enough to show that it does deny the right of any person subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States to work on Sunday, even if he is not engaged in trade, and if there is no competition. Section 1 of the bill (and let it be understood that we are quoting from the bill as amended by the American Sabbath Union) reads as follows:— {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 156.9}

*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, games 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, is 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 June 12, 1889, p. 156.10}

We advise Mr. Crafts to study the Sunday bill a little more thoroughly before he lectures again. We might dwell at length upon the last statement quoted by Mr. Crafts in regard to competition, but if we merely call attention to it it will be sufficient in this place to let the reader see that if his statement were true it would show that the Sunday movement was simply a part of a gigantic monopoly, that if carried out would eclipse anything that has ever been known. All that we designed to do in this article was to call attention to the almost constant collisions between the statements of the leaders in the Sunday-law movement and the truth. It can truly be said of them that they are not afraid of the truth, for they meet it in conflict nearly every day. {AMS June 12, 1889, p. 156.11}

E. J. W.

**“Christopher Ephraim’s Tottering Morality” American Sentinel 4, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

Someone has favored us with a copy of the *Home Record*, a paper published at Leavenworth, Kansas, which contains an article that shows very clearly the spirit that actuates some of those who are zealous for a Sunday law. The article in question is by Mrs. H. F. Hartough. It purports to be the experience of an old lady with a young lady who was circulating the protest against religious legislation. After a little introductory gossip about her son, Christopher Ephraim, who was a little wild, the old lady describes the visit of the young lady and her introduction of her business, and finally asks what the petition is. The story then proceeds in the old lady’s language, as follows:— {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.1}

“‘It is against establishing a religion in this country,’ says she, ‘that will make a man keep a proscribed Sabbath-day, or believe in things he cannot believe in. It is against recognizing God in the Constitution.’ {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.2}

“That Sabbath business made me think of Christopher E. How he went to base-ball games and races on Sundays in summer-time, and hunting in winter time, an’ it wasn’t doing him any good. So I says, says I, ‘I’m in favor of getting more of God an’ the Sabbath in our Constitution! It won’t hurt our systems one bit. Now, my Christopher Ephraim is lettin’ all the Sabbath get out of his constitution, an’ he’s failin’, morally. His foundation is totterin’, an’ he’ll fall, sure as fate, if there ain’t something done. I want a law passed,’ says I, ‘that’ll compel people to keep the Sabbath-day just as much as to keep ‘em from killin’ folks.’ {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.3}

“‘Whether they believe in it or not, eh?’ says she, sneerin’. {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.4}

“‘Certainly,’ says I. ‘If a man believes in killin’ would you let him murder your family, ma’am?’ {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.5}

“‘That’s quite a different matter,’ says she. {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.6}

“No, ‘tain’t,’ says I, getting warm. ‘One’s just as right as the Pother. It’s no more right for my son to go to base-ball games on Sundays, an’ horse-races, an’ all such, than it is for him to steal or kill. No, ma’am; I want a Sunday law an’ want it enforced, an’ if somebody or other don’t believe in keepin’ the law let ‘em go where there ain’t none. We don’t want ‘em here.’ {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.7}

“She looked at me as if she felt sorry for me. She actually did. But I didn’t mind her looks. I was thinking about Christopher E., and how he was doomed to destruction if these things wa’nt put a stop to, an’ I just went on: ‘This land’s getting too free,’ says I, getting up and resumin’ my dustin’. ‘We’ve put the Bible out of the public school for fear of hurtin’ somebody’s feelings; we’ve let the base-balls run for fear the workingmen wouldn’t get exercise enough, an’ now them freedom-lovin’ folks want us to give up our Sunday. Pretty soon they’ll come sneaking ‘round an’ petition Congress to compel the preachers to hunt texts out of the daily papers or the magazines instead of the Bible, for fear o’ hurtin’ their feelings. They ain’t patriots, they’re heathen infidels, an’ the quicker we send ‘em out o’ this land the freer we’ll be.’” {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.8}

This little story was of course written with an object, and that object was to prejudice people against those who oppose Sunday legislation and Church and State union. We propose to give a brief review of the portion which we have just copied, with the object of showing the real purpose of these Sunday workers. {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.9}

The first point that we notice is the idea that religious legislation will make men good. The old lady gives as a reason why she is in favor of recognizing God in the Constitution, that her Christopher Ephraim is “lettin’ all the Sabbath out of his constitution, an’ he’s failin’, morally. His foundation is a totterin’, an’ he’ll fall, sure as fate, if there ain’t something done.” The idea seems to have obtained a firm foothold that men can be made moral by law; but there is not a law in the universe that can make man moral or religious. The moral law does not make man moral, and will not prop up a “tottering” morality. God’s own righteous law cannot make men righteous. The ten commandments only point out the unrighteousness of men, and drive them to Christ, whose righteousness may be imputed to them, and who, through their faith in him, will enable them to fulfill the righteousness of the law. {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.10}

When people talk about propping up tottering morality by civil enactments, they show their ignorance of what morality is. Does the writer of that story imagine that the enactment of the Sunday law, and the recognition of God in the Constitution, will keep man from falling?—It seems so, and that is a regular National Reform idea; for in the *Christian Nation* of December 5, 1888, the Rev. N. M. Johnston tells of the time when Christ’s “gospel will prevail, and wickedness be suppressed by law.” In a speech in Monmouth, Ill., September 29, 1884, reported in the *Christian Statesman* of November 6, of the same year, M. A. Gault said:— {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.11}

“This movement includes the triumph of every moral reform. Every true reform is simply an effort to get back to some one of the ten commandments. If that law was taken as a standard of religion, and if public sentiment were lifted up to that standard, it would do away with stealing, intemperance, profanity, Sabbath desecration, licentiousness, murder, and every evil that now vexes society. So we do not flatter ourselves when we say that the glorious millennial day will be ushered in by the triumph of this movement.” {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.12}

This shows just how much knowledge these National Reformers have of what sin is. They are going to suppress Sabbath-breaking, murder, licentiousness, etc., by law; but the truth is that very often the most vicious are those of whom the law cannot take any notice, because their viciousness is concealed in their own hearts. When a man commits a murder, the law can punish him, but it cannot prevent him from committing the murder. For instance, here is a man that has received some injury at the hands of another. He broods over the wrong, and cherishes anger and hatred until his revengeful feelings assume entire control of him, and he resolves to murder the object of his hatred. He fixes on the time when he will carry his murderous designs into effect, secretes himself at the place where he expects the man to pass, has his knife all in readiness to give the fatal blow, but his intended victim passes by another way where he cannot reach hire without exposing himself, and so his plan is frustrated. Is he any less a murderer than though he had carried his design into effect? If he should die that moment, would God hold him any less guiltless than though he had killed the man? No; for the Bible declares that whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer. Yet not another soul on earth has known of this man’s murderous intentions. Then how would it be possible to suppress murder by law? {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.13}

Take the case of Sabbath-breaking. It is not simply the abstaining from labor on that day that constitutes Sabbath-keeping. Through the prophet Isaiah, the Lord says that to honor him by keeping his Sabbath, men must not do their own ways nor find their own pleasure, nor speak their own words. Now the minions of the Inquisition cannot keep such persistent watch over men as to know every word they speak, and does anyone suppose that the thoughts can be prevented from running riot even in the house of worship? {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.14}

Take the matter of licentiousness. The law punishes the adulterer and the seducer, but it cannot prevent licentiousness. Here is a man whose very soul is rotten with iniquity. He cherishes lustful desires toward someone of the opposite sex, and his whole thought is how he can accomplish his design. He thinks of it by day, and dreams of it by night. He lives in an atmosphere of impurity, and is wholly corrupt. In imagination he again and again accomplishes his desires; but something happens to prevent the overt act, and nobody but himself knows his evil purpose. Yet, according to the Bible, he is as guilty as though the act had actually been committed. The Saviour said that he who looks upon a woman with lust, has already committed adultery. But law cannot prohibit lust. Even the agents of the Inquisition cannot fathom a man’s thoughts and read his corrupt desires. {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 163.15}

So it is utter folly to speak of suppressing immorality by law. It is not only folly but it is wicked, for it leads to an establishment of a false standard of morality. When men talk of putting down immorality by law, they thereby say that the outward observance of the law, which is all that can be secured, is all that constitutes morality. Therefore they deceive the man who is outwardly correct in deportment but abominably corrupt in heart, into the belief that he is an upright man. {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 164.1}

The writer of the article under consideration makes the old lady say: “I want a law passed that will compel people to keep the Sabbath-day just as much as to keep them from killing folks.” Now granting that it is just as wicked to break the Sabbath as it is to murder, it does not follow that there should be a civil law against Sabbath-breaking, just as to punish murder. The two things are entirely dissimilar. A man may break the Sabbath, and do no injury to any person besides himself. He does not interfere with the inalienable right of any individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as he does when he commits murder. He does not by his act compel anybody else to do wrong. His act begins and ends with himself; therefore the Government cannot rightfully take any notice of it. {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 164.2}

But says one, What about the hilarious, boisterous Sunday picnics, in which drunken hoodlums annoy people, disturb worship, and endanger or destroy property?—Why, deal with them just as you would on any other day of the week. The same law that arrests the drunken hoodlum for making a nuisance of himself on Monday will do it on Sunday. The old lady in the story said that her Christopher was doomed to destruction if Sunday labor and amusements were not stopped. This again shows the National Reform theory that the people of the country are to be saved by law. The State is to take the place of the church, and men are to be swept into the kingdom of Heaven by wholesale, whether they will or no. The gospel knows nothing of such methods of salvation. {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 164.3}

Only one point more need take our attention. That is the intolerance of religious legislation. Says the old lady: “I want a Sunday law and want it enforced, and if somebody or other don’t believe in keeping the law; let them go where there ain’t none. We do not want them here.” And again, “The quicker we send them out of this land, the freer we shall be.” These statements stamp this Sunday-law movement as being the very essence of National Reform, for the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL have often read the statement made by Mr. Graham, one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, to the effect that if the enemies of their movement did not like it they could go to some barren land, and in the name of the devil and for the sake of the devil, stay there till they die. Now notice where this false zeal for religion will lead these people to. First, they must Christianize the country by law. Those who do not like the law and do not wish to be Christianized after their methods can leave the country. But some other country to which they might go will be fired with the same kind of zeal, and so will refuse to receive them. Thus we may imagine them wandering from country to country only to find that all are zealous for the same sort of millennium, and that the people are getting so good that they will not tolerate anyone who they think is bad, and that will be the one who does not think as they do. Then what?—Why, then the only thing to do with these persistent heretics, who refuse to be Christianized according to the National Reform idea, will be to put them to death. There will be no room for them on the earth. This was the conclusion that was reached in the days of the Papal supremacy. And if National Reform, which is the image of the Papacy, shall ever be carried to its finality, it will result again. The spirit of so-called National Reform from Sunday legislation to the end of the chapter is the spirit of intolerance and persecution. {AMS June 19, 1889, p. 164.4}

E. J. W.

**“Who Are the Friends of the Bible?” American Sentinel 4, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Congregationalist* of February 7 contained an editorial entitled “Unsectarian Morality,” in which it says:— {AMS June 26, 1889, p. 170.1}

“The *Christian Register* published last week the replies of thirty-five eminent men and women, many of whom are practical educators, to the questions whether morality can be taught in our public schools without sectarianism, and what suggestions they had to offer as to methods and influences. As, naturally, they look at the subject from widely different points of view, their replies vary considerably in detail. It is the more gratifying, therefore, to notice that most of them answer the first question heartily in the affirmative. Of course the five Roman Catholics claim that morality cannot be taught, in any sense satisfactory to them, without including the inculcation of the principles of Roman Catholicism; and there are one or two others who reply negatively.” {AMS June 26, 1889, p. 170.2}

This is in line with the ideas expressed by Senator Blair in his speech in the Senate, December 21, on the occasion of referring his proposed religious amendment to the Committee on Education and Labor. Said he:— {AMS June 26, 1889, p. 170.3}

“In regard to the general principles of the Christian religion, no one but a bigot would think of having introduced into the public schools instruction in favor of any form of sectarianism; but a knowledge of the Christian religion, even if there be no enforcement of those truths upon the conviction and belief of the child, instruction in those principles, a statement or explanation of what they are, exactly as instruction is given in the principles of arithmetic and geography and any of the common branches of science, is exceedingly desirable and important for every citizen of this country to possess, whether he applies the principles in his personal conduct or not.” {AMS June 26, 1889, p. 170.4}

No one can talk that way who has any just idea of the Scriptures-their nature and object. Such talk can come only from those who can see no more in the Bible than they do in an ordinary text-book on science; just as the carrying out of Mr. Blair’s proposed amendment would result in lowering the Bible, in the minds of the people, to the level of text-books on arithmetic and geography. {AMS June 26, 1889, p. 170.5}

In contrast with the statements of those who imagine that the Bible can be studied with profit in the same way that history and geography are studied, let us place the statement of a man who knows what the Bible is, and what it is for. In the *Old Testament Student* of February, 1889, the editor, Prof: William R. Harper, of Yale University, writes as follows:— {AMS June 26, 1889, p. 170.6}

“The Old Testament is not Hebrew literature. This statement may appear startling; but it is true. The Old Testament is not Hebrew literature in the sense that the Iliad and the Greek Drama are Greek literature; or the Book of the Dead, Egyptian; or the Zend Avesta, Persian. If one desires simple Hebrew literature, the product of the Jewish mind, he will find it in the Talmud, Targums, and other rabbinical writings. The writers of the Old Testament were more than mere Hebrews. Moses, David, and Isaiah did not simply reflect national thought and feeling. They were inspired, were men to whom divine thought and feeling were revealed. When we speak of the study of the Old Testament as literature, we mean, then, the study of the national dress and outward adornment of a body of divine truth. Such study is profitable and interesting, and very important. But is it insignificant when compared with the study of the doctrine which this outward national dress contains? Renan has made a special study of the Hebrew Scripture from the point of view that they are a national literature, and with what result? The divine truth has made so little impression upon him that he can write a play, ‘the story of which, of a man’s debauchery the day before the guillotine, is as correct as can well be conceived, and its leading thought is that passions must rum their course even if death stands at the door.’ Such debasing thought and philosophy may thus co-exist with the highest appreciation of the Bible as a literature. Turn now from Renan to those who have studied these sacred writings to find therein the voice of God speaking of sin, ju8tice, and mercy; and haw great the contrast! Here belong such men as Luther, Calvin, Latimer, Knox, Wesley, together with the great rank and file of earnest Christian workers and believers. The Old Testament is not the history of men’s thoughts about God, or desires after God, or affections toward him. It professes to be a history of God’s unveiling of himself to men. If it is not that, it is nothing; it is false from beginning to end. To make it the history of the speculation of a certain tribe about God, we must deny the very root of any speculations which that tribe ever had. For this root is the belief that they could not think of him unless he had first thought of them; that they could not speak of him unless he were speaking of them.” {AMS June 26, 1889, p. 170.7}

“In the modern revival of biblical study there is a danger that the Scripture by some may be studied only after the manner of Renan, or too exclusively as a national literature.” {AMS June 26, 1889, p. 170.8}

Dr. Harper is not ignorant of the literary beauty of the Bible, as anyone who is acquainted with him can testify; but he sees the danger of studying it with that sole object. As a matter of fact, it cannot be taught according to Mr. Blair’s ideas—except by avowed infidels, which of course would never be thought of, and if it were, the result would necessarily be to make infidels. No man who has any regard for the Bible as the word of God, can teach it without conforming his teaching to his own religious views; and if this were done in the public schools, confusion and religious strife would inevitably follow. How can the danger be averted?—Only by keeping the Bible out of State schools, and leaving instruction in it to the family, the church, and the private or denominational school. {AMS June 26, 1889, p. 170.9}

They are not true friends of the Bible who are clamoring for its introduction into the public schools. They may be sincere in their motives, but they would give the sacred Book the worst blow it has ever received. The friends of the Bible are those who wish it studied for just what it is-the revelation of God’s will to man-the guide to holiness and eternal life. {AMS June 26, 1889, p. 170.10}

E. J. W.