**“National Reform Bigotry” American Sentinel 4, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* of August 8, contains a characteristic report from Secretary Gault. He has been circulating through Iowa recently, and in the course of a report of some meetings held at Malvern, we find the following paragraph:— {AMS October 10, 1889, p. 285.1}

“The preceding Sabbath I preached twice at Afton, county seat of Union County, in the evening, on the Sabbath-Rest question, at a union service of the Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Evangelical churches. Here there was but one lady, a Seventh-day Adventist, who opposed the petition when it was put to vote of the congregation. She was landlady in the hotel where I lodged, and all day Sabbath her sewing machine hummed with a vim that was significant and unmistakable.” {AMS October 10, 1889, p. 285.2}

We mean nothing personal when we say that that is the utterance of a narrow-minded bigot. We simply state a fact. A bigot is one who thinks there is no one in the world of any consequence but himself, that the world was made for him, and that the sun shines principally for his benefit. The only possible inference that can be drawn from Mr. Gault’s remark is that that lady committed an unpardonable act in doing her ordinary work on Sunday while he was in the hotel. The bigotry of the thing may be shown if we turn it around. Suppose that lady, or any individual who conscientiously observes the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, should chance to stop at a hotel kept by one who observes Sunday, would Mr. Gault think that person ought to cease his ordinary work on that day? {AMS October 10, 1889, p. 285.3}

If Mr. Gault were a hotel keeper, and by chance a seventh-day observer should stop over the Sabbath with him, would he have everything stopped in his own house? Of course he would not. It is only when he is around that things must stop. It is his presence that must be regarded. If anyone believes differently from him, that individual has no right to exist, at least to carry out or act upon his belief This principle is not peculiar td Mr. Gault, although it seems to be very fully developed in him, from what we have seen of his writings. But it is the principle of National Reform to act as though “we are the people, and the government must shape its action to conform to our opinions and to please us. It does not make any difference if other people are discommoded. What does that matter? They have no business to believe differently from what we do.” This is National Reform in a nutshell. It must, from the very nature of the case, make bigots of those who devote themselves to it, no matter how liberal minded they might be by nature. {AMS October 10, 1889, p. 285.4}

E. J. W.

**“Sunday in California and New York” American Sentinel 4, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

Mr. Crafts has been in California, the only State in the Union which has no Sunday law; and the people may now expect to have it held up in season and out of season as the terrible example of immorality and vice consequent upon having no Sunday law. In his speeches here be declared that the State had retrograded in religion and morals since the repeal of its Sunday laws six years ago. To be sure Mr. Crafts was not in California six years ago, or before, when they bad a Sunday law, and has not been here since that time, with the exception of a few days this year; but that doesn’t make any difference with him. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 296.1}

But he does not find it all clear sailing in his endeavor to make capital for Sunday laws at the expense of California. At a meeting of the Congregational club in San Francisco, at which Mr. Crafts was present, the Rev. Dr. Barrows, of that city, said that what Dr. Crafts had said about the moral and religious declension in California was not true; that he had been here eight years, and that in all that time there had been a steady and constant advance in the moral and religious status, and that Dr. Crafts had been here but a few days and could not judge. He protested strongly against Dr. Crafts carrying such a report back to the East, because it was not true. The report of the meeting continues as follows: “Dr. Williams of Tulare City indorsed Dr. Barrows’ remarks. The Sabbath was as well observed in Tulare as in any city that he had ever lived in. He was certainly in favor of the workingmen having the privilege of Sunday rest, but for the churches to press Sunday observance on the State, upon religious grounds, and endeavor indirectly to compel men to go to church by strict Sunday laws, could do no good, and might do much harm to the cause of religion. Rev. Dr. Cruzan of the Third Congregational Church, San Francisco, agreed with Dr. Williams and Dr. Barrows. During his recent visit to the East he had spent a Sunday at Coney Island. There was nothing like it for immorality and dissipation on the Pacific Coast; yet this was right under the nose of Dr. Crafts when he was at home, in a State that had strict Sunday laws.” {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 296.2}

“Let this be repeated everywhere Mr. Crafts goes. It comes from men who are earnest in their endeavor to get Sunday laws, but who are more interested in truth than in victory. It shows, what the *Alta California* claimed in a recent editorial, that Sunday laws are not necessary for the preservation of morality, and that California without any Sunday law is equal with, and even in advance, morally, of some States that have a stringent Sunday law. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 296.3}

But the point in the above quotation to which we wish to call especial attention is the charge by Dr. Williams, that Sunday laws, such as Mr. Crafts is laboring to secure, are an attempt to compel men to go to church. Mr. Crafts has complained bitterly because we have charged the same thing upon his movement. But here we have a statement to the same effect made by a minister who is engaged with him in an effort to secure a Sunday law, but who does not believe in going to the same length. This is another demonstration that the SENTINEL has not misrepresented the Sunday-law movement. E. J. W. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 296.4}

**“Mr. Small on Church and State” American Sentinel 4, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

Under the heading, “No Steps Backward,” the *Voice*, in its issue of August 8, had the following:— {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.1}

In a recent issue of *The Voice*, we called attention to some very foolish things uttered by the AMERICAN SENTINEL, a paper published at Oakland, Cal., which devotes itself to getting up religious bugaboos. It made the childish statement that “work done for party Prohibition is work done to promote the union of Church and State, and to bind the citizens of the United States in a worse slavery than was ever suffered by the negroes;” and then, in reply to our article showing just where the Prohibition party stood, it said:— {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.2}

“*The Voice* says it has ‘never heard of a prominent Prohibitionist who favored the union of Church and State.’ Now Mr. Sam. Small is a prominent Prohibitionist-one of the most prominent of Prohibitionists in fact. He was secretary of the National Prohibition Convention of 1888, and he publicly declared this in Kansas City in January of that year:— {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.3}

“‘I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, national, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it and enact it into laws.’ {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.4}

“If that would not be a union of Church and State, will *The Voice* please tell us what would be? If that would not be a union of Church and State, then there never has been and never can be any such thing as a union of Church and State. Such a thing as that, therefore, being a union of Church and State, and Mr. Sam. Small being a prominent Prohibitionist, it is proved that there is at least one prominent Prohibitionist who favors a union of Church and State.” {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.5}

Thinking Mr. Small the most competent person to speak for Mr. Small, we inclosed the article to him and asked him to state his opinions on the union of Church and State, which he does as follows:— {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.6}

“*To The Voice*—The representation of the AMERICAN SENTINEL that I favor a union of Church and State is wholly an invention of the enemy. The extract he quotes from a partial report of a sermon I preached in Kansas City in January, 1888, is sufficiently correct to mislead; not exact enough, however, to convey the thought which I clearly expressed and which, at the time, secured the approval of an audience of thousands, the large majority of which was not made up of ‘third party’ prohibitionists. If the AMERICAN SENTINEL desires to do me and the Prohibition party justice, I can repeat my thoughts as clearly now as I did on the occasion in question. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.7}

“The quotation from my sermon should read as follows:— {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.8}

“‘I want to see the day come in the history of our country when the voice of the church of Christ will be heard and respected upon all vital, moral issues. I shall ever hope for and patiently expect the day when legislation, State, national, and municipal, will be projected in harmony with the eternal principle of justice and righteousness, revealed by Christ and proclaimed by his church. Happy will be the day when “righteousness exalts the nation,” when sin is no longer the reproach of our people; when the harmonious judgment of the people of God in America upon the issues of temperance, purity, and uprightness shall be received with respect and enacted into laws; when this people, who owe so much to divine favor, will have no more fellowship with “throne of iniquity,” “which frameth mischief by a law,” and that continually!’ {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.9}

“I hold that the above expressions are in perfect harmony with the principles of the National Prohibition party, as expressed in its preamble and platform. There is in them no warrant for any sane man to pronounce me an advocate of the ‘union of Church and State.’ The charge is a device of desperation to compass an argument against the Prohibition party. At the same time it is a fraud upon the readers of AMERICAN SENTINEL, or a queer confession of the idiocy of its constituency. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.10}

“Yours truly, SAM. W. SMALL.”

If any person’s superstitious fears have been wrought upon by stories of the spooks of the Dark Ages, he may rest assured that the Prohibition party isn’t going to revive any of them. The wheels civilization don’t turn backward. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.11}

The extract referred to was published in thee SENTINEL a long time ago. It was taken from a religious paper, one that could have no interest in misquoting Mr. Small, therefore we were warranted in supposing that it was correct. The SENTINEL has never knowingly misrepresented a single person. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.12}

But in this case we are happy to learn from Mr. Small’s own version that the SENTINEL did not do him any injustice. While he did not use the exact words that were attributed to him in the report which the SENTINEL quoted, he did use language which conveys all that we drew from what we supposed were the exact words. Said he, “I want to see the day come in the history of our country when the voice of the church of Christ will be heard and respected upon all vital moral issues.” Mr. Small will not deny that his idea was that the voice of the church should be heard and respected not simply by men as individuals, but by men as grouped together in political parties, and by men as statesmen, judges, etc. Now we say that when that time does come, we shall have a union of Church and State as surely as such a thing ever existed. It will simply be the church dictating, and we say the church has no right to be heard and respected by political parties as such. In the darkest of the Dark Ages, when Church and State union was at its height, the case was simply that the voice of the church was heard and respected by the State. The church dictated the policy of the State. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 298.13}

Bishop Vincent says most emphatically that the church makes a great mistake when it seeks to secure worldly position and to influence temporal power. Said he, “All the church wants is spiritual power, and the only influence it has any right to have is the influence it may have with individuals as individuals.” Mr. Small is doubtless perfectly sincere and honest in his disavowal of any union of Church and State. It would seem that he simply wants the church to assume its rightful prerogative. That is all that Cardinal Woolsey or Pope Hildebrand ever desired. The great trouble with them was that they were mistaken in regard to the church’s rightful position. That is the trouble with Mr. Small. We see no reason, after a careful reading of Mr. Small’s own statement of his position in his sermon, to withdraw our statement that he is really in favor of a union of Church and State. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 299.1}

And this charge is no device of desperation to compass an argument against the Prohibition party. The SENTINEL has no fight with the Prohibition party upon its prohibition principles. We have to do simply with those Prohibitionists who, like Mr. Small, would use the Prohibition party as a religious machine. We are thankful to know that there are many in the party who have no sympathy with any such movement. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 299.2}

As to Mr. Small’s insinuation against the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, we have only to say that they number many thousands in every part of the United States, consisting chiefly of professional men, doctors, lawyers, judges, members of State Legislatures, ministers of the gospel, as well as laboring men; and Mr. Small will not enhance his own popularity by wholesale charges of idiocy against our country’s best citizens. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 299.3}

As to the statement of the *Voice*, that the AMERICAN SENTINEL spends its time in getting up religious bugaboos, we will only say that there is no need for us to work in that line so long as the *Voice*, while professedly working for prohibition, actually makes that secondary to religious legislation. The SENTINEL lays no claim to being an inventor; it simply exposes the inventions of others. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 299.4}

E. J. W.

**“Sunday Closing Not a Temperance Measure” American Sentinel 4, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

In our opposition to Sunday laws we have frequently been charged with working in the interests of the liquor traffic. Many claim, and we do not doubt but a great majority of them think, that the enactment of a rigid Sunday law would be in the interest of temperance. We have always denied this, and we think have demonstrated it many times. It was only recently that we published a short article on this point in the SENTINEL, in answer to the criticism of a sub-scriber. We are glad now to be able to present a definite statement on this point from a temperance worker who is also an ardent advocate of the Sunday law. The *New York Voice* of August 22 contains the experience of a pastor residing in Crete, New York. From some statements in his letter we think he is a Congregationalist. In the course of his article, which is a strong prohibition utterance, he says:— {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 299.5}

“The saloon keepers of this place have not sold openly on the Sabbath to any great extent. That the Sunday restriction has its merits as a Sabbath-observance measure is true, and as such it should secure a strict enforcement. As a temperance measure it has little merit. It is just as practicable to get the Sunday supply of whisky or beer as of steak or roast. When the Omaha mayor a few weeks ago began shutting up the Sunday saloon in that city, men had a dry and dreadful time for the first Sunday under that policy. They had not dreamed it to be a serious purpose of the mayor. They were not caught a second Sunday, however; they got an abundant supply the Saturday before. The entire traffic can be carried on in six *days,* the only objection being that it is a little Iess convenient to get and keep over the Sunday supply.” {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 299.6}

We hope the *Voice* will not be accused of working in the interest of the saloon, because it published this statement. We believe in prohibition, but we are strongly opposed to prohibition, so called, only one day in the week. But we are in favor of it three hundred and sixty-five days in the year. We say that the Sunday-closing movement not only has no value whatever as a temperance measure, but that it is a strong prop to the liquor traffic, in that it tends to make it respectable. This it does by placing it on a level with all other lines of business and making it legitimate. Let us illustrate:— {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 299.7}

A good, conscientious woman who on Sunday morning sees her little boy playing ball, says, “Johnny, you should not play ball on Sunday. You must not do that.’ What idea would Johnny get from his mother’s words? Would he say, “Mother says it is not right to play ball”?—No. He would say, “Mother says it is not right to play ball on Sunday, but it is right to play ball on other days.” Suppose she sees her boy smoking a cigar on Sunday, and, of course, does not want him to smoke, would she say, “Johnny, don’t you know that you ought not to smoke cigars on Sunday?” Would not the boy get the idea from that that it was not wrong for him to smoke cigars, but that it was simply wrong to smoke on Sunday? He could get no other idea. But, no; it is wrong, and it hurts her boy, no matter on what day it is done, and she does not want him to smoke at all, Sunday or any other day. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 299.8}

The special point that we would leave with our readers is this, that any of them who are inclined to oppose Sunday laws, yet who have been hesitating because they were temperance men, need hesitate no longer. The Sunday-closing movement and the temperance movement have nothing in common. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 299.9}

E. J. W.

**“The Petition and the Inquisition” American Sentinel 4, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

The supplement to the March monthly document of the American Sabbath Union was devoted to a statement of how the friends of the Sunday might co-operate with the union. Following an extract from the constitution, which states that the object of the union is “to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship,” there was an earnest appeal to every individual to push the petitions for a Sunday law, making not the least abatement because Congress had adjourned. The following form of petition, was suggested:— {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 305.1}

“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 mail and military service and in inter-state commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, except 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 October 16, 1889, p. 305.2}

We claim that this petition alone furnishes ample proof that the American Sabbath Union contemplates a union of Church and State in the fullest sense, and is providing-unconsciously it may be, but none the less surely-for the establishment of the Inquisition. Strange as it may seem to some, we find the strongest proof of this in the proposed exemption of those that observe another day. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 305.3}

The workers for a Sunday law lay a great deal of stress on the fact that they make such an excerption. In his speech before the Senate Committee, Mr. Crafts spoke of the exception that is made to the Seventh-day Baptists by the laws of Rhode Island, allowing them to carry on public industries on the first day of the week, and said that “the tendency of Legislatures and executive officers towards those who claim to keep a Saturday Sabbath is to over-leniency rather than, over-strictness.” {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 305.4}

In the same hearing Mrs. Bateham spoke of the exemption that was asked for in the petition, stating that they would like to exempt Seventh-day keepers from the penalties of the law for which they asked, providing it could be done, but that if such an exemption would work, against the general enforcement of the law then they did not wish it. These statements show that they simply regard themselves as making a great concession when they do not persecute people who rest upon Saturday. Dr. Bothwell, of Oakland, Cal., stated their reeling very well when he said: {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 305.5}

“Most of the States make provision for the exercise of the peculiar tenets of belief which are entertained by the Adventists. They can worship on Saturday, and call it the Sabbath, if they choose; but there let their privileges end. Instead of thankfully making use of concessions granted them, and then going off quietly and attending to their own business, as they ought, they start out making unholy alliances that they may defeat the purposes of their benefactors.” {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 305.6}

With these statements compare the following from the first chapter of Dr. Schaff’s work on “The Progress of Religious Freedom, as Shown in the History of Toleration Acts.” Says he:— {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 305.7}

“An edict or act of toleration is a grant of the civil government, which authorizes religious societies dissenting from the State religion to worship according to the dictates of conscience without liability to persecution. Such an edict always presupposes a religion established by law and supported by the State, and the right of the State to control public worship. Toleration may proceed from necessity, or from prudence, or from indifference, or from liberality and an enlarged view of truth and right. It may be extended or withdrawn by the government; but it is usually the entering wedge for religious liberty and legal equality. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 305.8}

“There is a wide difference between toleration and liberty. The one is a concession, the other a right; the one is a matter of expediency, the other a principle; the one is a gift of man, the other a gift of God. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 305.9}

“Toleration implies more or less censure or disapproval. We tolerate or endure what we dislike or cannot prevent. The most despotic governments are tolerant towards subjects who are too numerous or too useful to be killed or exiled. Russia tolerates Romanists, Protestants, Jews, and Mohammedans; Turkey tolerates ‘Christian dogs,’ and likes them to prey upon each other; but woe to him in either country who apostatizes from the State religion, or attempts to induce any member of the same to apostasy. Toleration is first sought and granted as a favor, then demanded and conceded as a right, and at last spurned as an insult. In a free country nobody wants to be tolerated for his religious opinions or sacred convictions. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 305.10}

“Religious liberty is a natural, fundamental, and inalienable right of every man. It is founded on the sacredness of conscience, which is the voice of God in man, and above the reach and control of human authority. There is a law above all human laws. It is written, not on parchment and tables of stone, but on the heart of man by the finger of God. It is that law which commands with the categorical imperative, and which filled the philosopher Kant with ever-growing reverence and awe. ‘We must obey God more than man.’ He and he alone is the Author and Lord of conscience, and no power on earth has a right to interpose itself between them. ‘Every man stands or falls to his own Lord.’ Liberty of con-science requires liberty of worship as its manifestation. To grant the former and to deny the latter is to imprison conscience and to promote hypocrisy or infidelity. Religion is in its nature voluntary, ar4d ceases to be religion in proportion as it is forced. God, wants free worshipers, and no others. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 305.11}

“Toleration is an intermediate state between religious persecution and religious liberty. Persecution results from the union of Church and State; toleration, from a relaxation of that union; full religious liberty and legal equality require a peaceful separation of the spiritual and secular powers.” {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 305.12}

Note particularly what he says of toleration, that it is an intermediate state between religious persecution and religious liberty. He says also that it is usually “the entering wedge for religious liberty and legal equality.” This is true, providing it has been preceded by despotic intolerance. If a government has rigidly persecuted everyone who dissents from the established religion, then an act of toleration would be the entering wedge toward religious liberty-a step toward freedom; but if perfect liberty and equality have been enjoyed by the citizens of a government, then an act of toleration would be a long stride toward the taking away of religious freedom. For an act of toleration, as Dr. Schaff truly says, “Always presupposes a religion established by law and supported by the State, and the right of the State to control public worship.” {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 306.1}

The very fact of exemptions being thought of in a law-the use of the word concession and toleration-shows the existence of a despotic law; so that the more the Sunday-law advocates talk about “concessions, the more they boast of their leniency, the more they press their petition for a Sunday law which shall exempt those who religiously and regularly observe another day, the more they proclaim the fact that they are working for a State religion. Now, whenever a religion, or any form of religion, is established by the State, the Inquisition and persecution must inevitably follow. For in such a case an offense against the established religion is an offense against the State; and of course the State is bound to punish all who violate its laws. But punishment by the State for differences of opinion, or of acts in matters of religion, is persecution. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 306.2}

Note particularly the petition which we quoted. It provides for the exemption of those who “religiously and regularly” observe another day of the week. How, in the face of this, it is possible for the framers and advocates of that petition to claim that they are not working for a State religion, it is impossible for us to conceive. That petition lays the foundation for the Inquisition; and if a law should be passed in harmony with it, the Inquisition would have to be established. How can the State tell who do and who do not religiously observe another day? Anyone can see that the petition plans for the State to inquire, not simply into a man’s religious or irreligious acts, but into the motives of his acts. Of course it is well understood that under all circumstances there are people who have a form of religion, people who do certain things professedly in the name of religion, yet from selfish motives. Now if a law is passed in accordance with this petition, the State through its officers would be obliged to inquire into the motives which prompt a man’s rest upon Saturday. No individual will have any guarantee that he will remain unmolested for a week. He may be brought up at any time at the instigation of any bigot or any person who has a fancied grudge towards him, and put under examination as to whether or not he observes another day from religious motives. And the worst of it all will be that in such examination his own testimony will avail nothing. Of course those who do observe the day religiously would say so; and any who are not conscientious in their observance of the day would, in order to escape the penalty, declare that they observed it religiously. And so whether or not a person were cleared would depend upon the testimony of men who might have bitter prejudice toward him. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 306.3}

We believe that every thoughtful, candid individual can see that to work for this petition is to work directly for as wicked a persecution as ever existed on earth. Let those who see this point use all their energy in setting the light clearly before others, in order that they may not be deceived by the specious arguments of those who are working for the Sunday law. To every individual that petition will be presented, and many will be misled by its outward pretention to justice and of caring for the rights of a minority, unaware that in this very concession is the strongest proof of the wicked character of the proposed law. {AMS October 16, 1889, p. 306.4}

E. J. W.

**“The American Sabbath Union and Human Rights” American Sentinel 4, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

In Dr. Herrick Johnson’s address before the American Sabbath Union, on the Sunday newspaper, as published in the March *Monthly Document* of that association, there are four propositions laid down concerning the Sunday newspaper, the last of which we shall give special notice. Quoting from an Illinois Supreme Court Report, he says:— {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.1}

“Every individual has the right to the enjoyment of the Christian Sabbath without liability to annoyance from the ordinary secular pursuits of life, except so far as they may be dictated by necessity or charity.” {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.2}

This proposition is self-evident, and needs no discussion. No one would uphold it more strenuously than would the editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. But there are some questions that we would like to ask, to find out the idea of the Sunday-law advocates upon the subject of human rights. Suppose a man does not wish to exercise his right to rest on the first day of the week; what then? Must he be forced to exercise it? Will he be compelled to rest, whether he wishes to or not? If he is to be, then it is demonstrated that the law does not contemplate the protection of Sunday observance as a man’s right, but the enforcement of it as a duty. Governments are organized for the protection of people’s rights, not for the purpose of compelling them to exercise their rights, for it is considered self-evident, as a law of nature, that no man will need to be compelled to assert his own rights. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.3}

Another point that should not be passed lightly by is this: How extensive an idea of human right have these Sunday-law advocates? Do they mean to imply that every man has a right to the enjoyment of a Sabbath rest whenever he chooses to take it, and on whatever day he chooses to rest? or do they mean to limit that right to a certain day? Do they mean that every man has a right to be protected in the enjoyment of rest only on Sunday? This we should infer from the proposition, which plainly implies that a person has no right to the undisturbed enjoyment of rest on any other day. If they say that a man has a right to the undisturbed enjoyment of rest on the seventh day of the week, then they deprive themselves of all argument for a Sunday law; and if they say that a man has not a right to rest upon Saturday, they thereby confess that their proposed law is a law against the rights of conscience; for it is well known that those people do conscientiously rest upon the seventh day. This is just what they mean. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.4}

That their movement for a National Sunday law is a movement to the effect that no one has any rights except those who keep Sunday, is evident from the following. It has been quoted many times before in the SENTINEL, and it doubtless will be quoted many times again, unless National Reform Sunday-law advocates specifically repudiate it. It is from Dr. Edwards’ speech at the New York National Reform Convention. He says:— {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.5}

“What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would a poor lunatic, for in my view he is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator.” {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.6}

And later he exclaims, “Tolerate atheism, sir? there is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon.” {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.7}

And what is Dr. Edwards’ idea of an atheist? Following is his own statement, in the save lecture:— {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.8}

“The atheist is a man who denies the being of a God and a future life. To him mind and matter are the same, and time is the be-all and the end-all of consciousness and of character. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.9}

“The deist admits God, but denies that he has any such personal control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he manifests himself and his will in a revelation. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.10}

“The Jew admits God, providence, and revelation, but rejects the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ as sheer imagination, or-worse-sheer imposture. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.11}

“The seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.12}

“These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first-named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry,—the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party.” {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.13}

That is, the man who differs with the majority as to the exact day to be observed, the man who conscientiously observes the seventh day, because the Bible says so, instead of the first, concerning which the Bible says nothing, is classed as an atheist; and it is plainly declared that an atheist is not to be tolerated, except as a lunatic would be tolerated. A lunatic is allowed to run at large so long as he is quiet; but as soon as his mania takes an aggressive form, he is shut up. Dr. Edwards regards the keeping of the seventh day as evidence of an unsound mind. So long as the individual should say nothing about it, he might perhaps be considered a harmless lunatic; but whenever the observer of the seventh day should begin to promulgate his faith, and openly teach others that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and persuade them to accept it, he would be raving, and, therefore, would be shut up and treated as a conspirator. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.14}

In the *Christian Statesman* of July 7, 1887, it is positively denied that atheists, among whom it will be remembered Christians who keep the seventh day are classed, have “any reasonable claim to conscientious convictions, and privileges at all.” Thus it is plainly seen that the success of this National Sunday-law movement means the depriving of a large number of the citizens of the United States of the rights of conscience. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.15}

Let it be understood that whatever right any man has is bestowed upon him by God himself. Human rights are not bestowed by civil government. All that civil governments are instituted for is to protect men in the enjoyment of rights which God has given them. The Declaration of Independence, which has justly been called the charter of American liberties, declares that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This means that every individual is equal, with respect to the rights with which God has endowed him. Now, while we have heard National Reformers and the president of the American Sabbath Union rail against the Constitution, we have never yet heard an American, or any other person, for that matter, find fault with the Declaration of Independence. That document voiced a truth as sure as any statement of holy writ. God has given to every man the same right; if ninety-nine per cent. of the people in any country have a certain right, the other one per cent. have the same right. But the American Sabbath Union is organized for the express purpose of protecting one class in the enjoyment of certain rights, and the depriving of another class of the same rights. In other words, it is organized for the express purpose of overthrowing the work done by the founders of this government. It is distinctively un-American. Nothing is surer than that its work is the exact opposite of the work of the immortal framers of the Declaration of Independence; and therefore since their work was to secure to this land perfect liberty, its work has for its sole object the overthrow of American liberty. It seems as though this demonstration must be clear to every individual. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 313.16}

It will be said that those who are thus discriminated against and deprived of equal rights with others are only a few. Thus Dr. Edwards, in the same speech from which we have quoted, said:— {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 314.1}

“The parties whose conscience we are thus charged with troubling, taken altogether, are but few in number. This determines nothing as to who is right, but the fact remains, and is worthy of note, that, taken altogether, they amount to but a small fraction of our citizenship. They are not even as many as those among us who do not speak the English language.” {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 314.2}

Mr. Crafts, in his speech before the Senate Committee, spoke of “the one or two small sects of Christians who worship on Saturday.” And after speaking of the difficulties that rise in exempting them from the penalties of the Sunday law, contemptuously dismisses them in the following words:— {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 314.3}

“Infinitely less harm is done by the usual policy, the only constitutional or sensible one, to let the insignificantly small minority of less than one in a hundred, whose religious convictions require them to rest on Saturday (unless their work is of a private character such as the law allows them to do on Sunday), suffer the loss of one day’s wages rather than have the other ninety-nine suffer by the wrecking of the Sabbath by public business.” {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 314.4}

Many times have we heard Sunday-law lecturers pass the consideration of the fact that their law would cause seventh-day observers to suffer, with the statement that such people constitute only about seven-tenths of one per cent. of the population, and that therefore they were too insignificant to be noticed. Perhaps they may think so; but such expressions show that they do not understand what they are doing. It is not a question of whether a few people who observe Saturday will be injured or not, but whether the government can afford to adopt the principle that minorities have no rights. If that principle is adopted, it will not be limited in its application to observers of the seventh day. It may seem very fine for the majority on any question of opinion to decide that those who differ with them have no rights; but they should remember that majorities sometimes change. This question of Sunday law will determine whether a man’s life or property is safe in this country. If the government lends itself to a scheme which will be unjust to a single individual, then nobody has any assurance that injustice will not be done him. If the rights of a few people may be trampled upon because they keep the seventh day, the rights of some other people may be trampled upon because they differ with the majority on some other question. If in this country the principle of trampling upon human rights is once adopted, nobody can tell where it will stop. We are not alarmists, but we have no hesitation in saying that if the government follows the course marked out for it by the American Sabbath Union, the scenes of the French Revolution will be re-enacted in this country. It cannot be otherwise. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 314.5}

E. J. W.

**“How is This?” American Sentinel 4, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

On Tuesday evening, October 1, the Prohibitionists of Nashville, Tenn., met in convention to nominate a city ticket, and adopted resolutions, a part of which are as follows:— {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 315.1}

WHEREAS, We, Prohibitionists of the city of Nashville, in convention assembled, have unshaken confidence in the wisdom of that action by which a political party has been organized for the accomplishment of an object more important than any other offered to our consideration as a free people, to wit, the prohibition of the beverage liquor traffic by State and national law, as the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors are the constant and fruitful source of physical, intellectual, and moral unsoundness, producing degradation and crime, robbing women and children, and in ways manifold and extreme perverting the blessings of free institutions, {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 315.2}

*Resolved*, That the prohibition of the liquor traffic should be the dominating and dividing political issue until such prohibition shall have become the recognized and settled policy of the government. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 315.3}

*Resolved*, That the policy of prohibition, because of the scope of its economic and social relations, and the largeness of its connection with civil liberty, should be embodied in the organic law of the States and the United States, as a safeguard of enlarged social life, which is the basis of all stable and prosperous government. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 315.4}

*Resolved*, That the American Sunday, in the interest of public order and morality, should be zealously guarded, and we hereby arraign and condemn the municipal authorities of the city of Nashville for the non-enforcement of law against Sunday tippling. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 315.5}

*Resolved*, That as Prohibitionists we heartily indorse and support the recent protest of citizens of Nashville against Sunday tippling, and proffer cordial co-operation with them in their patriotic and lawful efforts to enforce the law against its violators, and in the enforcement of all other laws. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 315.6}

Our third-party friends who think that if we would demonstrate our temperance principles we should by all means support the Prohibition ticket, seek to allay our fears by saying that the Prohibition party has nothing to do with Sunday laws. We would like to have them explain this resolution, and tell us whether or not the Prohibitionists of Nashville are in harmony with the party at large. {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 316.1}

We cannot understand how the mention of Sunday in the connection that it comes in these resolutions, has anything to do with temperance. The first resolution says that the sale of intoxicating liquors is the “source of physical, intellectual, and moral unsoundness;” that it produces degradation and crime; and therefore they believe in prohibiting it. Very good; but if they do actually believe in prohibiting it, why do they need to specify their protest against Sunday tippling, and their determination to enforce the prohibition of liquor on Sunday? If they are really Prohibitionists, as we have always understood the term, that would include the stopping of the sale of liquor on Sunday as well as on all other days. But if their movement involves something less than the complete suppression of the liquor traffic,—if, as their reference to Sunday implies, they will be at least in a measure content with the suppression of the sale of liquor on Sunday,—how can they harmonize that with the terrible arraignment of the liquor traffic in the first resolution? It seems to us that there is insincerity somewhere, or else a compounding of crime. Will some third-party friend inform us why it is necessary to specify Sunday tippling in resolutions declaiming against any sale whatever of liquor? {AMS October 30, 1889, p. 316.2}

E. J. W.