**“Is the Constitution Infidel?” American Sentinel 4, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman*, of August says that the statement that the American government was established on the secular principle, is untrue. It says that to represent the National Reform movement as revolutionary is to forget, or intentionally ignore, the plainest facts of history. It says that the government is Christian, but overturns this in the same short article by saying: “We admit that infidelity stole a march on the American people in the framing of the Constitution of the United States, and we admit that, largely through the unsettling influences of that instrument, the relation of government to religion has become an open question, now in process of settlement, in this country. But the claim that the secular theory is the established American theory is false and unfair, and, like all unfair attempts in controversy, will yet bring confusion to those who make it.” {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 316.3}

To the covert threat in this last clause we have nothing to say. But we would like to ask the *Statesman* what it is that determines the character of the government, if it is not the Constitution. If, as it admits, the Constitution of the United States is a secular document, then the American theory of government must be the secular theory of government. And therefore the unfairness is wholly on its own part, in claiming that the American theory of government is to combine religion with the government, when, according to its own admission, such a claim is a false one. Whatever confusion results, must necessarily come to those who make such false claims. {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 316.4}

But mark, that while we say the American theory of government is the secular theory, we do not at all admit the *Statesman’s* charge that it is an infidel theory. Infidelity did not steal a march on the American people in the framing of the Constitution of the United States, and that document is not an infidel document, it does not teach infidelity. It has no tendency whatever towards infidelity. To show the falsity of the statement that infidelity stole a march on the American people in the framing of the Constitution of the United States, it is only necessary to say that there were religious men in the Constitutional Convention, and serious consideration was given to the matter of recognizing God and religion in the Constitution; and the omission of such recognition was the result of careful, deliberate, conscientious consideration. This is more clearly apparent from the fact that within two years after the Constitution was adopted, ten amendments were added, the first of which is the following: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” If the omission of the name of God, or the recognition of religion, was an oversight, the, first amendment, instead of declaring against an establishment of religion, would have provided for it. Nay; the original Constitution itself declared that no religious test should ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States. {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 316.5}

But the fact that God’s name is not mentioned does not make the Constitution an infidel Constitution, any more than the fact that a murchant’s sign or his advertisement in the newspaper does not contain the name of God proves that he is an infidel. The Postmaster-General, John Wanamaker, is the pride of the National Reform party, although perhaps not a member of that organization. He is pointed to with pride as the Christian merchant. We have no disposition to question his Christianity; but we would simply call attention to the fact that in all his extensive advertisements the name of God does not occur once. Are we to judge from that that he is an infidel? His clerks transact his business and sell goods over the counter without making any mention of the name of God. Does that show that his business is an infidel business? Nobody thinks so. On the contrary, if he should flaunt the name of God in his advertisements, and if he should instruct his clerks to make some mention of God with every yard of cotton or silk that they tore off, the people would justly question the genuiness of his profession. {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 316.6}

In his book, “Church and State in the States,” Dr. Schaff speaks as follows concerning the proposed amendment recognizing God in the Constitution:— {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 316.7}

“Our chief objection to such an amendment, besides its impracticability, is that it rests upon a false assumption, and casts an unjust reflection upon the original document, as if it were hostile to religion. But it is neither hostile nor friendly to any religion; it is simply silent on the subject, as lying beyond the jurisdiction of the general government. The absence of the names of God and Christ, in a purely political and legal document, no more proves denial or irreverence than the absence of those names in a mathematical treatise, or the statutes of a bank or railroad corporation. The title ‘holiness’ does not make the Pope of Rome any holier than he is, and it makes the contradiction only more glaring in such characters as Alexander VI. The book of Esther and the Song of Solomon are undoubtedly productions of devout worshipers of Jehovah; and yet the name of God does not occur once in them.” {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 316.8}

According to the National Reform view, the book of Esther and the Song of Solomon would be called infidel documents. But of all who talk about infidelity, the National Reformers show the least knowledge of what infidelity is; and this for the reason that they have the least knowledge of what constitutes Christianity. {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 316.9}

E. J. W.

**“The Christian Statesman in Favor of Church and State Union” American Sentinel 4, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Christian Statesman* of August 29 the AMERICAN SENTINEL 18 described as chronically unfair, in that it charges the National Reform Association with working for a union of Church and State. There are two noticeable things in connection with this controversy. The first is that the *Statesman* has never yet attempted to prove that it is not in favor of Church and State; it simply denies the charges. This would be all that is required, if our charges consisted simply of assertions; but when we cite facts, and make arguments, and draw conclusions, to show that it is in favor of Church and State union, they have never yet attempted to show the fallacy of one of the arguments, or to disprove one of the conclusions. And the other noticeable thing is that the Statesman scarcely ever makes a denial of its desire for Church and State union without in that same denial furnishing proof that it is desirous of such a union. In this very article it says:— {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 323.1}

“We hold as strenuously as do our opponents to the absolute separation and independence of Church and State, but we also hold, with Professor Leiber, that the theory of American institutions requires the total separation of the State from the Church-not from religion.” {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 323.2}

As Dr. Edwards said in the New York convention, they believe in a union of religion and State, but not in Church and State. Now if that were true, it would seem to be proof that they do not believe in religion in the church; and surely that admission must be worse than the other; for a church without religion is a deplorable thing. We are, however, convinced that the National Reformers do not believe in religion in the church, from the very fact that they believe in religion and the State, that is, in making the State the Church; for when this is done there will be no religion in it-only an empty shell. {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 323.3}

But on the first page of the same paper, the *Statesman* shows in an editorial that it is the champion of the union of Church and State. It notes the call for the annual congress of the American Secular Union for 1889, and publishes a statement of the object of that union, which object is to secure the total separation of Church and State. After quoting this declaration of principles, the *Statesman* says:— {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 323.4}

“We cheerfully and zealously assist in giving publicity to this call. Nothing could give the American people a clearer view of the pending situation than these frank, logical, and comprehensive demands of the American Secular Union.” {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 323.5}

The *Statesman* recognizes itself as the direct antagonist of the object of the American Secular Union; we do not say the antagonist of the infidel views of its members, but the antagonist of the work of the association. Therefore, it declares itself to be the champion of a union of Church and State. {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 323.6}

This is still further shown by the fact that the Statesman is one of the most virulent opposers of the petition which has been circulated asking Congress to pass no laws which would look toward a union of Church and State. It is no use for the Statesman to try to conceal its motives. It would be much more honorable for it to boldly avow its advocacy of Church and State union. As it says, nothing can be gained by persistent misrepresentation. It might as well declare the real object of the National Reform Association; for it cannot make a denial of that object without in that very denial revealing it. E. J. W. {AMS November 6, 1889, p. 324.1}

**“Their Object” American Sentinel 4, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following paragraph is from a paper on “The American Sabbath,” read at the Ocean Grove Convention, August 9, by Dr. Robert S. Doherty, formerly assistant editor of the New York *Christian Advocate.* He said:— {AMS November 13, 1889, p. 330.1}

“The Sunday newspaper, as published in our chief cities, is a peculiarly American institution. It could not be supported by its foreign patronage, nor, for that matter, without Christian patronage. It is directly hostile to the Sabbath. Now the most serious aspect of this Sunday paper business is not so much the fact that a few journeymen printers are engaged after midnight on Saturday, or that the fast train carries the edition with great speed, and with more or less disturbance, out into the remote parts of the country. The chief mischief is done in the reading of the paper. For this there is no excuse. For the harm which comes from it, the reader is himself responsible.” {AMS November 13, 1889, p. 330.2}

In this short paragraph we have again revealed to us the real object of Sunday laws,—they are not so much for the purpose of prohibiting all labor on the first day of the week, as for the purpose of inducing men to go to church by cutting off all other means of spending the day. From this and similar utterances, we are warranted in the conclusion that if all the people would faithfully attend church every Sunday there would not be so much objection raised to the work which is done outside of church hours. {AMS November 13, 1889, p. 330.3}

This is not an isolated utterance. Everyone who fights the Sunday newspaper makes the same statement. When told that more work is done on Sunday in preparing the Monday paper than in preparing the Sunday horning edition, they say that the Sunday work that is done by the newspaper employes is not the evil against which they strike; but that what they are concerned about is the fact that the newspapers keep people away from the church and destroy the effect of the sermon on those who do go. Thus they show that they are working not so much in the interest of Sunday rest as in the interest of the pulpit. We wish to emphasize this point until our readers see that this Sunday movement is nothing more nor less than an effort on the part of the churches to have the State legislate in their behalf. {AMS November 13, 1889, p. 330.4}

But this is not all that is shown; the paragraph just quoted shows the seemingly utter inability of the advocates of Sunday laws to comprehend the fact that the State does not possess the same power that the Spirit of God does. They want the State to pass laws to suppress a thing the evil of which, they themselves confess, rests solely with the individual. It is not a public nuisance-not something which, like the saloon, tends only to destroy the well-being of society; for whatever mischief is done, the individual reader is himself alone responsible. Yet they expect that the State is going to remedy this evil; they expect that the State, by taking away the news-paper, will make the individual who now reads it spiritually-minded. They do not seem to understand that the lack of spirituality is what leads professed Christians to read these papers when they should be engaged in worship; and that if the newspapers were taken away, their carnal minds would find some other worldly means of gratification. If they would think of the matter seriously, they could but confess that the suppression of the Sunday newspaper would not in the slightest degree increase the spirituality of the people; and that admission would at the same time be a confession that they are more interested in having people possess *a form* of godliness than in laboring through the divinely-appointed agencies to really convert them; in other words, that they have lost sight of the gospel. And so it is no doubt true that while National Reformers have so much to say about atheism on the part of those who oppose Sunday laws, they themselves are most zealously working to undermine true Christianity. {AMS November 13, 1889, p. 330.5}

E. J. W.

**“The Principles of Constitutional Recognition of God” American Sentinel 4, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Christian Statesman* of September 5, R. C. Wylie gives quite a lengthy report of the discussion of the proposal to acknowledge God in the constitution of the new State of Washington, which is quite interesting. There were some things said which show that some of the members had the right idea as to the relation of Church and State. When the convention went into committee of the whole to consider the preamble and bill of rights, the following preamble was read:— {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 337.1}

“We, the people of the State of Washington, to preserve our rights, do ordain this constitution.” {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 337.2}

Immediately one of the members moved to substitute the following:— {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 337.3}

“We, the people of the State of Washington, grateful to almighty God for our freedom, to secure and transmit the same unimpaired to succeeding generations, do ordain this constitution.” {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 337.4}

The mover of this substitute afterward with-drew it in favor of the following, after it had been read:— {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 337.5}

“We, the people of Washington, in order to form more independent and perfect government, ... profoundly grateful to almighty God, for this inestimable right, and invoking his favor and guidance, do ordain and establish the following constitution and form of government for the State of Washington.” {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 337.6}

The discussion was on the adoption of this, instead of the simple preamble first read. Mr. Comegys, of Whitman, made a strong speech upon this, the force of which Mr. Wylie attempts to break down by a slur upon the personal appearance of the speaker, who said:— {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 337.7}

I am opposed to the substitute. The gentleman is in favor of it, because he thinks we ought to be grateful to almighty God. I would like to ask him if he thinks this provision would add anything to our gratitude by being in that preamble. He admitted the necessity for brevity, and has made it as brief, he says, as he could and include that point. Now, as I understand it, Mr. President, this has nothing to do with gratitude, or reverence, or irreverence. A man may be very reverent or very grateful, without lifting up his voice on the street corners, or he may lift up his voice and claim to be very grateful and yet not be grateful. The question is, Shall we advertise it in this way? Has it anything to do, here? The framers of the Constitution of the United States had this matter under advisement, and after mature deliberation (and many framers of the Constitution were devout Christians), they deemed it not wise to have any reference to the Deity, because they had agreed that Church and State and matters of religion should forever be separate from civil government. Now, what object is to be attained? Will we be more grateful by reason of putting it there? or will we be less ungrateful, notwithstanding we put it there?” {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 337.8}

We say that this is sound. Gratitude is shown rather by acts than by words. The people of Washington might all of them be profoundly grateful to God, and yet make no statement of it in their Constitution; and on the other hand; they might make a profession of gratitude in their Constitution, and have none in their hearts. Now, which would be the better condition?—Manifestly, to be grateful, and not to advertise it in the Constitution; that would be far better than to proclaim it from the capitol, and not possess it. {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 337.9}

But there is another point to consider. If that were stated in the Constitution, would it tell the truth? Are the people of Washington grateful to God for the blessings which they enjoy?—No doubt some of them are; but the most zealous National Reformer will not claim that all of them are. Are even a majority of the people of Washington grateful to God for the blessings which they enjoy? The people of Washington are doubtless as good as the people of any other section of the United States; but it cannot be denied that only a small minority of people in the United States, or in any individual State, have any real gratitude to God. It is not going beyond bounds to say that the majority of the people scarcely ever think of him. The entire church membership of the United States is less than one-fourth the population, that is, less than one-fourth of the people of the United States make any profession of, or belief in, a gratitude to God; and the declarations of leading ministers and religious journals are to the effect that the churches themselves are lamentably deficient in godliness; that thousands of church members are in no respect different from the professed ungodly. This being the admitted fact, it is manifest that for the people of any State, or of the United States, to put in their Constitution a statement that they were grateful to God would be to make their Constitution state a falsehood. If that preamble were adopted which says, “We, the people of Washington, grateful to almighty God,” etc., the constitution would be a lie upon its very face. Certainly no good can be accomplished by falsehood. Truth cannot come from evil. Placing the acknowledgment of God in the constitution would not make a single individual more grateful to God than he now is. Therefore, for people to adopt a constitution with such a statement would be a positive wrong. People who know nothing about God would imagine themselves to be grateful to him, simply because they had subscribed to a constitution which said that they were grateful. So the constitution, instead of making people better, would lave a tendency to confirm them in their ungodliness. {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 337.10}

One of the speakers in favor of the substitution was a Mr. Cosgrove. He started out by saying that the effort to have such a preamble was not an attempt to connect the Church and the State. He said: “It does not in any way associate the Church and State because of this recognition of God. It is not necessarily recognizing the Church in any sense.” And then he went on to disprove this statement, by saying: “We expect to get a large amount of immigration into this country before many years, and I do not care what the committee intended by leaving it out of this preamble, the masses of the United States will take it as an indirect attack upon the church, and as an indirect pandering to infidelity by leaving out this word.” This statement of his shows conclusively that the substitution would in a way connect Church and State, although it is not true that the omitting of the substitution would be an attack upon the church. Anyone can see that to adopt a constitution which says nothing about the Deity or the church, could not be considered an attack upon the church any more than a bank corporation could be said to be making an attack upon the church if it adopted articles of corporation without making any reference to the Deity. {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 338.1}

Mr. Cosgrove said further: “Let me say, gentlemen, that this territory would have been built up long ago had it not been that the people of the East believed that Washington Territory was a heathen land, peopled with heathens, without government.” That statement shows the hollownesss of the whole thing; the recognition of God in the constitution was designed simply as an advertising scheme, to induce immigration. But what nonsense to suppose that people would settle in the Territory any quicker because its constitution contained the name of God. Did the speaker suppose that the people of the East are so ignorant that they could be duped into supposing that the insertion of the name of God in the constitution would make the people any better? Would they imagine that the inhabitants of the State were all pious, simply because of a few words in the constitution? The idea is absurd. {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 338.2}

Mr. Warner, chairman of the Preamble Committee, said that he would yield to no one in reverence for God, but likened the placing of his name in the constitution to the action of the Pharisee in the Scriptures. He did not believe it was needed any more than the Lord’s prayer. This is true, as we have already shown. The adoption of such a preamble would simply be a piece of Phariseeism, and that in reality is all that was expected. Mr. Cosgrove’s argument showed that it was designed simply to advertise to the people of the world that the people of Washington were religious, although the statement would not represent the truth. Mr. Sullivan, of Tacoma, showed the sophistry of Mr. Cosgrove’s statement, that to leave out the recognition of God would check immigration. He pointed to the Constitution of the United States, which contains no recognition of God, and said that there was no trouble about immigration to this country. {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 338.3}

One speaker said: “If I remember right, the Bible says ‘there is a time and place for everything.’ It also says, ‘Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.’ The convention therefore should not place the name anywhere, simply to tickle the ear of any individual or set of individuals.” This, again, touches the very heart of the matter. We have already shown that such a recognition as is proposed would be falsehood upon its face; and because of this, it would be a taking of the name of the Deity in vain. God’s name is taken in vain every time it is spoken lightly, every time it is mentioned in any way by those who have not at heart real reverence for God. {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 338.4}

Mr. Warner stated that he was a member of a church which had the most reverent devotion to God; but he did not believe it necessary to advertise that fact in their business transactions. {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 338.5}

Mr. Sturdevant showed the folly of the proposed recognition, by saying:— {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 338.6}

“As well acknowledge the existence of the Supreme Being and an overruling Providence in the making of a, promissory note, as in this constitution; yet who would not say it was ridiculous if you saw a promissory note something like this: ‘For value received, I promise to pay to John Doe, or order, $100.00, recognizing the overruling providence of the Supreme Court, and the credit business and the great privileges which have been conferred upon me by the Supreme Being by reason of this promissory note.’ Then again: What would be said in court of the lawyer commencing his complaint in this way: ‘John Doe vs. Richard Roe; the plaintiff in the above entitled action, recognizing the overruling power and constant care of the Supreme Being, complains of Richard Roe, and alleges,’ etc. Now that is just as sensible, in my opinion, as placing it in the preamble of the constitution. Let us ask God to guide us and teach us common sense in the business which we are trying he transact in this convention.” {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 338.7}

We have devoted this much space to the consideration of the discussion in the Washington convention, because the principles involved are the same as those involved in the attempt to recognize God in the national Constitution. We are anxious in this whole National Reform business to get the people to see that opposition to it does not imply irreverence or infidelity on the part of the opposers, but that the one who has the most intelligent reverence for God, and love for truth and pure Christianity, is the one who will be most zealously opposed to the schemes of the National Reformers. E. J. W. {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 338.8}

**“Why They Are Anxious” American Sentinel 4, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days* which, as is well known, is the organ of the American Sabbath Union, and is devoted exclusively to the work of securing the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws by the State and the national government, presents the following, which was said by an eminent Sunday advocate:— {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 341.1}

“A gentleman living in the country, whose supply of water for household purposes was scant, had a cistern dug near his house for collecting the rain which fell on the roofs of the buildings. For a time the expedient answered perfectly; the supply of water was abundant. Suddenly, however, the pump failed to give forth the contents of the reservoir. The rain would fall copiously, and for a time a few pailfuls would be drawn, but very soon the supply ceased. The pump was carefully examined and found to be in perfect working order, and no flaw could anywhere be discovered. At length it occurred to the perplexed householder to examine the cistern itself; then the mystery was solved. It was found that in one corner the cement had cracked, and there was a gaping leak which allowed the water to escape into a distant pit. It was now plain that however freely the rain might fall the cistern would soon be empty again, as there was this ever-widening leak through which the water disappeared. Such a leak in our church life is the Sabbath profaned or neglected. The rains from above may fall abundantly, the church’s machinery may be diligently plied, but the law of the Sabbath largely forgotten will prove a leak serious enough to undo and render nugatory the happy influences both of the showers of Heaven and the labors of man. It has been well said: ‘The streams of religion run deep or shallow according as the banks of the Sabbath are kept up or neglected.’” {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 341.2}

“This,” says the *Pearl of Days*, “forcibly illustrates the cause of the love of church life.” This may all be true, but to our mind it furnishes no argument for the enactment of a Sunday law. It is strange that people cannot see that the anxiety for Sunday laws is purely from a church standpoint. These people want Sunday laws, for what reason?—Because the church will be the gainer thereby, and because they expect that people will go to church more. Not only do they expect that people who now care nothing for the church will go to church when, other places of amusement are shut up, but they expect that people who are already church members; but who neglect their duties, will take hold of church work, if they are spurred up to it by the State. In other words, they want the State to legislate in behalf of the church, and to enforce church discipline. {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 341.3}

It may seem to some that the expression just used concerning places of amusement is very irreverent. We do not mean to cast any reflection on the churches, but the point is this. It cannot be denied that the great desire for Sunday law is that people who now find “amusement on Sunday, may constrained to go to church; and those who are working for such laws confess that picnics, theaters, concerts, Sunday newspapers, etc., are greater attractions than the church; but they expect by prohibiting these attractions to induct the people to come to church. That is, people want to pass the time in some way, and if they cannot do it with their favorite amusement they will then take the next thing that presents itself, and will go to church. In other words, they will go to chinch for a pastime the same as they now attend concerts, etc. They will simply substitute a form of amusement which is allowed in place of one which they would prefer, but which is prohibited. The movement may result in filling the churches, but it will not result in the spiritual and moral advancement of the people. {AMS November 20, 1889, p. 341.4}

E. J. W.

**“National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution” American Sentinel 4, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is most strenuously denied by all National Reformers, just as we should naturally expect; because if they should claim, or even admit, that the success of their movement would involve persecution, they could not proceed a step farther. As a matter of course, we expect that they will deny that persecution will follow the success of their movement. Doubtless a great majority of them are sincere in this denial, because they have never taken the trouble to look to the end of their work; and of all people in the world National Reformers seem to be most oblivious to the teachings of history; but their denials amount to nothing in the face of the declarations that they have made from the beginning, and are still making. We will quote a few statements. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.1}

Before the first annual meeting of the association an address to the public in behalf of the cause was prepared by the Rev. T. P. Stevenson, W. W. Spear, D.D., and Wm. Getty, Esq., in which the following statement was made:— {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.2}

“It must be deplored that in a Constitution so universally and so justly admired and loved and studied by the American people, there is nothing to turn the mind of the nation to God, to inculcate reverence for the authority of his Sons, or respect for his word.” {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.3}

This shows plainly that the design of the National Reformers is to so modify the Constitution that the government will act as a teacher of religion. In the address of Dr. Johnathan Edwards, at the New York convention, in 1873, it was said of the Constitution:— {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.4}

“We want to put the people into it; the people in full, with their deep and noble reverence for God, the greatest and best, and for his-word as the underlying and paramount law.” {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.5}

Again: In the Cincinnati convention, in 1872, Rev. A. D. Mayo, D.D., in an address on religion in public schools, said that “the State should teach the existence, sovereignty, and providence of God, and the duty of all men and nations to obey his laws; the spiritual nature, moral obligation, natural rights, and immortal life of man; the binding obligation of the morality of Jesus Christ as the only universal moral law; the acceptance of the New Testament morality as the moral constitution of every civilized State.” He further said that the State is bound to see that the religious morality essential to good citizen-ship is taught. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.6}

At a convention hold in Monmouth, Ill., September 29, 1884, Rev. M. A. Gault said:— {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.7}

“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 recognized as the standard of legislation, and if public sentiment was educated up to that standard, it would do away with lying, stealing, intemperance, profanity, Sabbath. desecration, licentiousness, murder, and every evil that now vexes society.” {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.8}

These statements show that the reform contemplates simply the adoption of the Bible as the law of the land. This was plainly declared by Dr. Edwards in the New York Convention. He said:— {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.9}

“If there be anything in the law of Moses the coming of Christ and the subsequent of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be (and there cannot be many of them), and we are prepared to accept them, and have them re-enacted.” {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.10}

We say that with such a Constitution as this, persecution would be inevitable; but as facts are better than arguments, we will give an instance illustrative of the working of such a Constitution in the past. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.11}

The New York *Observer* of March 22, 1888, contained the fifth of a series of articles on John Calvin, written by the Rev. James M. Lucile D.D. The articles were, as a matter of course eulogistic of Calvin. The article in the issue referred to was upon the trial of Servetus, and the last days of Calvin. Having mentioned the visit of Servetus to Geneva, and his arrest mid trial, the Doctor says:— {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.12}

“The specific charge against Servetus was that of teaching contrary to the Bible doctrines; but this was only a specification under the more general charge of attempting to destroy the peace, and, indeed, the existence, of the Genevan State. The Genevans had adopted the Bible as a part of their constitution, and every citizen had sworn to defend it; Servetus was thus the foe to the civil order. It was in no sense an ecclesiastical trial, but one which belonged to the civil court, by which it was conducted. Calvin was an expert witness on the points raised, not a judge. That the animus was not that of religious rancor is evident from the fact that Calvin himself was at the same time in fraternal correspondence with acknowledged heretics, like Socinus. But when the heresy was made a lever for the overthrow of the republic, it became a different matter, and the Genevans would have been unworthy of their political existence if they had not been willing to defend it.” {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.13}

The Genevans had a model National Reform government; and the burning of Servetus was a natural result, just as Dr. Ludlow says. And the fact that a man can be found who will apologize for the burning of Servetus, and who will say that it was not an ecclesiastical trial, still at the same time admitting that it was the result of the Bible being adopted as a part of the constitution, is sufficient evidence that if the National Reformers should succeed in having the Bible adopted as part of the Constitution, doctors of divinity and influential teachers would not be lacking who would defend persecution under it. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.14}

But note that it is denied that the burning of Servetus was persecution, or that his trial was an ecclesiastical trial. It is stated that his heresy was made a lever for the overthrow of the government. But how could a heresy affect the government?—Simply because the Bible had been adopted as a part of the constitution-not necessarily the Bible as it reads, but the Bible as interpreted by those in authority; and, therefore, whoever differed in opinion from the established belief concerning the Bible, was talking treason and violating the civil law. If it be denied that the execution of the law in such cases is persecution, then there never was persecution; for when the early martyrs were put to death it was only because they were violating the laws of Rome. James and Paul were beheaded simply because their conscientious convictions in regard to the Bible compelled them to violate the civil law of Rome. And so with what we have been accustomed to call the Roman Catholic persecution in the Dark Ages. If the trial of Servetus was not an ecclesiastical trial, and his execution was not religious persecution, simply because in differing with Calvin concerning the Scriptures he was going contrary to the law of the State, then the Catholics never persecuted anybody; for Cranmer, and Ridley, and Huss, and Jerome of Prague, and thousands of others who were burned at the stake, were tried and put to death for disobeying civil laws. The laws of the church were the laws of the State. The one who defends the burning of Servetus must likewise defend the massacre of St. Bartholomew’s day, and the destruction of the Huguenots and Albigenses. All these people were put to death simply because the Bible, as interpreted by the priests, was a part of the civil law of those countries. The Catholic Church says that all these persons were punished by the State as law breakers. This is in one sense true; but they neglect to state that the church apprehended them, and priests tried them. The Inquisition found them guilty of violating the ecclesiastico-civil law, and they handed them over to the State for punishment, recommending them always to mercy, but expressly stipulating that they should be burned at the stake; and the civil power, as the servant of the church, was bound to obey. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 345.15}

Let the State become the servant of the church again, according to National Reform ideas, and let anybody’s interpretation of the Bible, we care not whose, become a part of the civil law, and the same thing will take place again. It cannot be otherwise, for the State is bound to enforce whatever laws it enacts. If it enacts laws concerning matters of faith and doctrine, then it is bound to punish the man who differs from the established faith. But such punishment is simply religious persecution. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.1}

The cool way in which Dr: Ludlow disposes of Servetus, finds a parallel in the way that men defend the enforcement of Sunday as at the present time. Says he:— {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.2}

“If there was one place in the world the fugitive should have avoided, it was Geneva. The laws of that place he knew were very strict. Calvin had long before warned him not to come there to disturb the peace. The people of that commonwealth had the right to protect their political existence. They had fought for twenty years to get rid of Catholic tyranny, and were now in a life-and-death struggle with the Libertine element. Yet Servetus turned up in Geneva. His purpose was clear. Here the Romish Inquisition could not follow him, for the Calvinists would defend him against that. But while thus receiving their hospitality, he could get a dagger under the fifth rib of Calvinism by siding with the Libertines.” {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.3}

We say this is simply abominable. The man that could coolly write such a paragraph as that would be a worthy companion of Loyola, and a ready tool of the Inquisition. He says that Calvin had warned Servetus and to come to Geneva to disturb the peace, and that the people had a right to protect their political existence. But what was their politics?—It was Calvinism. Servetus disturbing the peace did not consist in beating drums, or doing noisy work during public service, or in making any demonstrations whatever, but in writing and talking against Calvinism, as Dr. Ludlow himself says. The sum of his offense was opposition to Calvinism. For this and this alone he was burned. And a professed Protestant in this century and in this decade, upholds the cowardly and blood-thirsty deed! Yet there are men found who say that this is too enlightened an age to allow such a thing as persecution for religious opinion. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.4}

Such talk is very similar to that indulged in by the advocates of National Reform Sunday laws. They want to protect the peace of society, they say. It was only two weeks ago that a friend of ours was talking with another gentleman concerning the barbarous Sunday law of Georgia and the conviction of Mr. Conklin for cutting saplings in the woods on his farm on Sunday. Instead of expressing the contempt and indignation which every right-minded man must feel at so outrageous a law as that of Georgia, and at the persecution of an inoffensive citizen, the gentleman seemed to take his conviction as a matter of course, and threw the blame all on Mr. Conklin, saying he knew what the law was before he went to work; he need not have suffered if he had been of a mind to avoid it. If he had not known the law, there might be some ground of pity; but when he knew the law and deliberately violated it, nobody but himself is to blame for the result. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.5}

But when the National Reform American Sabbath Union movement succeeds, it will not be necessary for the person to work in order to disturb the peace. Servetus disturbed the peace of Geneva by writing and talking against Calvinism, because Calvinism was the politics of Geneva. And so when the State “re-enacts the fourth commandment,” as Mr. Shepard and Mr. Crafts say, Sunday will be a State institution, and the individual who talks against that institution by declaring that the fourth commandment requires the observance of the seventh and not the first day, will be a disturber of the public peace. As much as this is contemplated in the statement which we have before quoted from the Western Christian Advocate, edited by Rev. G. W. Bothwell, D.D., of Oakland, Cal. Speaking of the petition against a Sunday law and the union of Church and State, in his issue of March 22, Mr. Bothwell said:— {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.6}

“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. None of these bills are aimed at them; but if they fail to appreciate the fact, they may yet call down upon themselves such a measure of public disfavor as that legislation embarrassing to them will result.” {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.7}

This is simply a threat of punishment that will be meted out to those who shall dare to protest against national religious legislation, and shall dare to teach that Sunday is not the Sabbath. It will not be necessary for them to work on Sunday; if by their preaching according to their conscientious convictions concerning the word, they strike against the established religion, they will be considered as violators of the public peace, and will meet with punishment. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.8}

Finally, as demonstrating conclusively, even to those who cannot draw conclusions, we quote the following bold declaration from a speech by Dr. Mayo in the Cincinnati National Reform Convention. Speaking of the people of the United States, he said:— {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.9}

“They will plant in the great charter of liberties an acknowledgment of the nation’s dependence on Almighty God, and its duty to conform to the laws of religious and Christian morality. They will protect the rights of every citizen, and persecute no man for his religion until that religion drives him to disobey the law which expresses the will of the majority concerning the moral duty of the citizen. And that will is always open to revision by constitutional means.” {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.10}

We do not know how anyone can ask for any stronger proof than this that the National Reform movement contemplates persecution. And note, it is not even claimed that the persecution will be for actual violation of the law of God, but for acting or thinking contrary to the will of the majority concerning moral duties, with the express understanding that that will may change at any time. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.11}

Any person who can defend so outrageous a scheme has no sense whatever of what constitutes liberty. If any National Reformer can explain these utterances so as to make them harmonize with the golden rule, and with simple justice, the columns of the SENTINEL are open to him. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.12}

E. J. W.

**“They Are One” American Sentinel 4, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman*, of September 5, contains a report of the Lakeside Reform Assembly, by the editor, T. P. Stevenson. This assembly was a joint convention of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association. The first three days were devoted to the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union work, in which addresses were given upon “Woman Suffrage” and “Sabbath Observance.” Addresses were delivered on “The Limits of Religious Liberty,” and “The American Sabbath, and How to Maintain It.” After noting the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union Conference, Mr. Stevenson introduces the work of the days devoted especially to the National Reform Association, with these words:— {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.13}

“There was no perceptible transition between the foregoing exercises and those properly relating to the National Reform Association.” {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.14}

This strikes us as very significant. It shows how rapidly the great Woman’s Christian Temperance Union is losing sight of the object for which it was established, and is becoming simply a National Reform organization. The meetings of one cannot be distinguished from those of the other. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.15}

From Mr. Stevenson’s report, we would not get the idea that the subject of temperance was mentioned in the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union Conference. Of course we are not to suppose that the subject of temperance was entirely ignored, but the report warrants us in believing that temperance remitted less attention than woman’s suffrage and Sunday legislation. We are sorry that this is so. We, are sorry that in combating religious legislation, which is evil, and only evil, we are placed in antagonism to the work of a professedly temperance organization. We believe in temperance of the strictest kind, and wish to support every temperance measure and every temperance’ organization; therefore we hope that the women of the National W.C.T.U. who believe that it should be devoted exclusively to temperance work and there are very many of them-will be able either to convert the national association, or else to fore a branch which will work in a legitimate way for real Christian temperance, and which we can support. {AMS November 27, 1889, p. 346.16}

E. J. W.