**“Front Page” American Sentinel 5, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Advocate* of this city notices a recent case at law, in which a verdict was brought into court on Sunday, and says:- {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 41.1}

Colonel Ingersoll, for the defendent, rose to move to set aside, for for a new trial. Judge Ingraham declined to transact any business on Sunday, beyond the mere receiving and recording of the verdict necessary to relieve the jury, and told the anti-Christian to wait till Monday. If the latter and his abettors (some of them nominal Christians) get their way, there will be no rest-day in this country. {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 41.2}

The SENTINEL is not an admirer of Mr. Ingersoll, nor are we in sympathy with his views upon religious questions, but we fail to see in the facts stated by the *Advocate*, any justification for the fling made at that gentleman and “his abettors.” We have no idea that Mr. Ingersoll wants any judge to do business on Sunday if he doesn’t want to, nor do we know of anybody who wants the laws of the land so changed that courts shall uniformly do business upon that day. If judges and other court officials want to observe Sunday religiously or otherwise, nobody ought to object, and the SENTINEL does not object; but it does object to laws requiring those to observe Sunday who do not wish to observe it, and that whether they religiously observe another day or not. {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 41.3}

**“Sunday Slavery” American Sentinel 5, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days* repeats its dismal wail about “Sunday slavery,” and says that “if it is not abolished, it will soon number more millions than the Africans who were emancipated by the civil war and the Constitution of the United States.” Why don’t the *Pearl of Days* make a test and carry the case of one of these Sunday slaves to the United States courts under that amendment to the Constitution which abolished slavery in the United States? Or does the *Pearl* understand that is was only African slavery that was abolished in the United States? If that is the only way the *Pearl of Days* understands the Thirteenth Amendment, then we would say for its benefit, that neither the word “African” nor any other qualifying phrase is in that amendment. The amendment says that “neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a penalty for crime, shall exist in the United States.” And that will cover Sunday slavery as well as any other kind. At least the probability that it does, is worth risking a case upon in the United States courts. Let the case be presented. {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 46.1}

**“Not a Valid Reason” American Sentinel 5, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Lever* says that “the saloon is to-day a greater hindrance to the cause of Christianity than all others;” and inquires, ‘What will become of the Republican and Democreatic voters for sustaining parties that keep the saloon as a stumblingblock between God and humanity?” We do not know what will become of them. But granting the saloon is the greatest hindrance to the cause of Christianity, it is not the only hindrance; and if the Government is to abolish the saloon in the interests of Christianity, and because it is a hindrance to Christianity, then having done so much, why should it not go on and abolish the next greatest hindrance to Christianity? and the next, and the next, until it has abolished every one that there is in the world? If the Government is to take away one stumblingblock between God and humanity because it is such, then why shall it not continue the work and take away every one? If the Government is to do this, what is the Church for? And if government can do this, what was the Church instituted for? If it can be done by law what is the use of the gospel, and what was the use of instituting the gospel? The truth is that the reason which the *Lever* and the third party Prohibitionists, as a whole, present for prohibition, are not valid reasons at all. They are not worthy of recognition by government, nor are they worthy of the support of any man. They mean nothing short of an absolute union of Church and State. Of course they deny it, and we grant that many of them do not see it. It is true, however, whether they see it or not. Prohibition upon a proper basis is a proper thing, and a good thing, but prohibition upon the basis advocated by the *Lever*, the *Voice*, and such papers, would be an unmitigated evil. {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 46.2}

**“A Question” American Sentinel 5, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

In Brooklyn, N.Y., four persons were convicted and fined from $100 to $500, for refusing to give to certain children medicine prescribed by physicians, choosing rather to treat the children by other means. They were people who believe in the “faith cure,” and the children died, hence, the prosecution and the punishment. This has caused much discussion in the public press, some taking one side and others the other. All that we shall say just at this time is simply to inquire, How would it do to impose such a fine upon those who do not believe in this method of treatment-the doctors for instance-every time they lose a case? {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 46.3}

**“Back Page” American Sentinel 5, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have received the first number of the *Southern Sentinel*, published at Dallas, Texas. It is devoted to the same cause as the AMERICAN SENTINEL. We heartily wish it success. May such Sentinels be posted all along the line. {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 48.1}

The “call” for that National Reform convention, lately held in Cincinnati, was signed by eighty-two persons. Seventy-three of these were preachers, the rest were made of eight laymen and one woman. And yet they try to pass that off as a representative “citizens” meeting, simply in the interests of the State! {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 48.2}

SECTION 11, of Article 1, of the Constitution of the new State of Washington, contains this sentence: “No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or to the support of any religious establishment.” Yet, as plain as that is, it was attempted when the Legislature met to have a chaplaincy established for the State and the legislative sessions to be opened with prayer. The scheme failed as it was proper that it should. The word “exercise” shut off that relic of the union of Church and State. {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 48.3}

According to the *Colorado Graphic* of January 18, the people of Denver are losing interest in the Sunday-closing crusade, inaugurated there some months since. At a recent meeting in the interest of the crusade, which the Denver *News* described as “another of those great meetings,” it is stated that only one hundred and seventy-two persons were present, by actual count, “including forty-one ladies and ten or more children.” This certainly does not look very much like “a great popular uprising,” especially in a city of the size of Denver. One great trouble about this movement is, that while its real object is the exaltation of Sunday, it professes to be primarily a temperance movement. A great many temperance people see this, and hence stand aloof from the movement which would otherwise have their support. That sort of prohibition which proposes to compromise with the saloons, allowing them six-seventh of the time in which to carry on their business, is not worthy of the name of temperance, and not a few are beginning to see it. {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 48.4}

The National League for the Protection of American Institutions, by its Law Committee, has reported the form of an amendment to the national Constitution, which it intends to ask shall be adopted. It reads as follows:- {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 48.5}

No State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or use its property, mony or credit, or any power of taxation, or authorize either to be used for the purpose founding, maintaining or aiding any church, religious denomination or religious society, or any institution, or undertaking under sectarian or ecclesiastical control. {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 48.6}

That might be made a part of the Constitution of the United States, and yet, under the decisions religion could be taught and religious exercises conducted in the public schools in all the States where it is now done. Such, however, is not according to American principles, therefore the League’s proposed amendment ought to be amended at once. {AMS February 7, 1890, p. 48.7}

February 14, 1890

**“Front Page” American Sentinel 5, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Detroit (Mich.) *Free Press*, makes the following good point against those preachers who propose to have Monday morning’s paper printed Saturday night, before midnight:- {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 49.1}

“There is a minister in Minnesota who thinks a Monday paper can just as well be prepared Saturday night. His congregation should keep a sharp lookout on him. A man with a notion of that kind is quite capable of ringing in a 10-year-old sermon on his people for a fresh one.” {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 49.2}

Miss Willard finds that the non-partisan Woman’s Christian Temperance Union movement is proving to be of more importance than she suspected. It seemed to be a very light thing at the time of the National Convention in November last, but now there seems to be some alarm; for she has found it necessary to issue a national address, pleading for the old organization “to be kept up,” and saying that “local branches must be maintained so long as a single white ribboner is left.” We wish success to the non-partisan movement, and hope that that movement may bring the temperance work back to its original intent, and to sound principles. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 49.3}

**“For Policy’s Sake” American Sentinel 5, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Freethinkers profess to be decidedly opposed to Sunday laws everywhere. Yet the *Truth Seeker* reports from “a friend” in the Washington Legislature, the following words:- {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 53.1}

A majority of both houses are really Freethinkers but many of them are also politicians, and would make no break that would hurt their politics; but yet I am in hopes, and encouraged to think that I can get through a Sunday law that will be quite liberal. I am convinced that the majority of the members would prefer none, but for policy’s sake, we will have to have something. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 53.2}

The politician takes precedence of the *free thinker* there. The Freethinkers are much like many other folk with whom they find so much fault. The *Truth Seeker* very properly remarks, that “comment on that state of things is almost superfluous.” The American Secular Union needs to hurry along with its one thousand-dollar prize manual of “the purest principles of morality.” It is much needed in the Washington Legislature right now. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 53.3}

**“Back Page” American Sentinel 5, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Secretary of the Philadelphia Sunday-law Association, Rev. T. A. Fernley, reports that there are in that city “283 Personal Liberty Leagues, representing 35,000 men, who will next autumn show their hand in politics” in opposition to Sunday laws. Can the Church carry on a political contest with such an element as that and keep herself pure? Merely to contemplate such a prospect ought to convince the Church instantly and once for all that such is not the field where she is to put forth her efforts. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.1}

We have full verbatim reports of all the speeches made in the Washington City Sunday Law Convention. As soon as we can get them turned from short-hand into type-written copy, we hope to print them with comments, in the SENTINEL, if possible. The speeches are so thoroughly representative of the movement we want all our readers to have them. They may, however, prove to be too long to print in the SENTINEL, with the necessary comments. If that should be the case we hope to be able to issue them as a number of the *Sentinel Library*. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.2}

One of the chiefest sophistries of the Sunday-law advocates is couched in the would-be innocent inquiry, “If Congress has the right to say that eight hours shall be a day’s work, why has it not the right also to say that six days shall be a week’s work?” To this there are several answers:- {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.3}

1. In making eight hours a day’s work, Congress does not attempt to define what particular hours shall compose the day, as it is asked to do in the enactment of a Sunday law. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.4}

2. Congress does not declare that if anybody works more than eight hours for a day he shall be fined one hundred or a thousand dollars, as it is asked to do in the enactment of a Sunday law. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.5}

3. These men have never asked, nor has it ever been proposed by anybody, that Congress shall say that six days shall be a week’s work. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.6}

Let Congress, in order to make eight a day’s work, undertake to enact a law declaring that no person or corporation shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business, except works of necessity or mercy; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement or recreation; nor shall any mails or mail matter be handled or transported in time of peace; nor shall there be any military or naval drills, musters or parades, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship; before eight o’clock A. M.; between twelve o’clock M. and one o’clock P.M.; or after five o’clock P.M.; of any day-let Congress attempt to enact such a law as that, and we think the people could readily see the difference whether the preachers would or not. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.7}

It will be of interest to those who have supposed from the representations of Mr. Crafts and his co-workers that the working men were everywhere clamoring for a national Sunday law to know that instead of shouting themselves hoarse for the Blair Sunday bill, the Trades Union of Syracuse, New York, at a meeting held in that city, on the 28th ult., adopted resolutions against that measure. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.8}

We derive our information from the Syracuse *Evening Herald*, of January 29, which also states that the City Hall had been named as the place for a mass meeting in opposition to Sunday and other religious legislation, but it has been decided that a larger auditorium must be procured. The American Sabbath Union should at once send some one to Syracuse to look after their fences and instruct the laboring men more perfectly in the way of National Reform. They are evidently laboring under the impression that they can rest when tired without a law of Congress to tell them when to rest and how they shall rest. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.9}

At Ottowa, Canada, a great stir has been created among the ones who want to be religious for others as well as themselves, because of the playing of the game of “hockey” within the grounds of the Governor-General. This is a game of ball, played with a club having a curved end. One of the prominent ones of the opposition put their case in the following statement:- {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.10}

As a member of the Christian religion in this city, I must enter my protest against the practice lately introduced of hockey at Rideau Hall on Sunday. The fact that young men are asked seems so like a command that it requires some fortitude to refuse, and when clergymen’s sons and bald-headed old men are both seen there desecrating the Lord’s day the public ought to take steps towards discountenancing such proceedings. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.11}

The other side, by one of the Governor-General’s staff, state their side of the case thus:- {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.12}

I do not understand why the people of Canada should interfere in what is purely a private matter. If Lord Stanley sees no harm in hockey playing on Sunday I cannot see that Canadians have any right to say what day shall be set apart for recreation at the Government House. His Excellency has English precedent that the people at home do not regard a game of hockey on Sunday as so very criminal. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.13}

We should say to the opposition there, if it requires more fortitude than your young men have to refuse to play ball on Sunday the best thing you can do is to cultivate in them sufficient fortitude to enable them to refuse. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.14}

The delegates to the World’s Sunday School Convention, held in London last summer, addressed a communication to all the crowned heads of Europe, in which they “earnestly petitioned their majesties, by the use of their personal influence and constitutional power, to ‘secure for the day of weekly rest the place given it in that decalogue which all Christian lands recognize, and for the good of the people, and for the glory of God, promote its recognition as a delight, holy unto the Lord.’” The Czar of Russia has his constitutional machinery in quite good working order for complying with the petition. But how will it work with the Sultan of Turkey? Is he considered a crowned head or did they leave him out? {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.15}

January 27, the directors of the Young Men’s Christian Association of Milwaukee, Wis., gave formal notice to the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, of that place, that the Union could no longer have the use of the Association building. The reason is that “having allied themselves with the Prohibition party,” the women must be treated as other political organizations are and therefore must be excluded from occupying the rooms of the Association. We think that a very proper action on the part of the Young Men’s Christian Association. The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union has ceased to be anything but a political club, and its work anything less than a continuous political campaign. We hope that by some means the Union may be enabled to discover this, and turn once more to its proper, legitimate, and chartered object-the promotion of Christian temperance, and that by Christian methods. The management of the Young Men’s Christian Association, which through all the ups and downs of the day has kept it straight on its Christian course clear of all entanglements, is worthy of the highest admiration on the part of everybody, as it has it on the part of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. {AMS February 14, 1890, p. 56.16}

**“Front Page” American Sentinel 5, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* remarks of Colonel Ingersoll’s recent article on “God in the Constitution” that “the bold Atheism which it inculcates, and on which the writer rests his opposition to religious acknowledgment in political constitutions, will create a powerful revulsion of feeling in favor of the National Reform movement.” It ought to do nothing of the kind. It is true that Mr. Ingersoll’s hatred of Christianity is plainly shown in everything which he says, but it does not follow that because he is unreasonable and intolerant that Christians should be so too. Proper opposition to so-called National Reform rests not upon any real or supposed demerit in Christianity, but upon the fact that National Reform would, if carried out, set up men in the place of God, and thus overthrow the very religion which it is designed to maintain. The truth or falsity of the Christian religion cuts no figure whatever in the case, and the sooner both Christians and infidels come to see this fact the better, and the more hope there will be of maintaining the religious liberty enjoyed under the national Constitution as it is. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 57.1}

**“Queer Christians” American Sentinel 5, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Mail and Express* insists that the late political campaign, in Salt Lake City, for the power of the city government, was a contest between Mormons and Christians. It calls the successful ticket “the Christian ticket.” The result it magnifies as a “Christian victory.” And in its pean, it says:- {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 58.1}

It is as remarkable as creditable that the disturbances of the peace were so few and slight; but the leaders on both sides were determined to control their own forces and keep them from violence, and on the side of the Christians there was ample provision of deputy marshals, detectives and special police for the prevention of any considerable amount of either fraud or disturbance. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 58.2}

That doesn’t look as though these “Christians’ were much better than other people. When it comes about that “provision of deputy marshals, detectives, and special police” must be made to prevent Christians from committing “any considerable amount of either fraud or disturbance,” then the fewer of such Christians as that there are in the world the better. And even then, it seems that the intention was only to prevent any *considerable amount* of fraud or disturbance! as though small or an inconsiderable amount of either were perfectly compatible with the Christian profession! {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 58.3}

We do not for a moment suppose that those who ran the anti-Mormon Campaign considered that they were doing so as Christians or that Christianity entered to any extent into the contest. We only notice the facility with which Col. Elliot F. Shepard manufactures Christians. This is perfectly consistent with the theory and methods of the American Sunday Law Union, of which he is president. It is another strong reminder of the times of the fourth century when fraud and violence were commendable if only committed in defence of orthodoxy. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 58.4}

**“The Puritan Idea” American Sentinel 5, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

In Dr. Herrick Johnson’s address on “Sunday newspapers,” which has been circulated widely as a campaign document by the abettors of religious legislation, occurred the words, “Oh, for a breath of the old Puritan,” meaning that what the speaker wanted was a return to Puritan habits and customs. In the recent annual meeting of the Iowa Sabbath Convention, Mr. Gault said that what was wanted in Iowa was a wave of Puritanism. From these and other expressions we learn that the Puritan idea of government is the model for National Reformers of whatever stripe. A few quotations from a standard work may enable those who are interested to know just what kind of government a Puritan government would be. In a late work by Professor Fisk, of Harvard College, entitled, “The Beginnings of New England,” is the following with the account of the exodus of the Puritans from Holland:- {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 58.5}

All persons who came to Holland and led decorous lives there, were protected in their opinions and customs. By contemporary writers in other countries this eccentric behavior of the Dutch Government was treated with unspeakable scorn. All strange religions flock thither,” says one: “It is a common harbor of all heresies, a cage of unclean birds,” says another; “The great mingle-mangle of all religions,” says a third. In spite of the relief from persecution, however, the Pilgrims were not fully satisfied with their new home. The expiration of the truce with Spain might prove that this relief was only temporary, and, at any rate, complete toleration did not fill the measure of their wants. Had they come to Holland as scattered bands of refugees, they might have been absorbed into the Dutch population, as Huguenot refugees have been absorbed in Germany, England, and America. But they had come as an organized community, and absorption into a foreign nation was something to be dreaded. They wished to preserve their English speech and English traditions, keep up their organization and find some favored spot where they could lay the corner-stone of a great Christian State. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 58.6}

This language is not written in any spirit of captious criticism. The author manifests a spirit of fairness, and writes in an impartial manner, simply giving historical facts. That he did not charge the Puritans with inconsistency is seen from the following, which very clearly sets forth the Puritan idea:- {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 58.7}

It is worthy while to inquire what were the real aims of the settlers of New England. What was the common purpose which brought these men together in their resolve to create for themselves a new home in the wilderness? This is a point concerning which there has been a great deal of popular misapprehension, and there has been no end of nonsense talked about it. It has been customary first to assume that the Puritan migration was undertaken in the interests of religious liberty, and then to upbraid the Puritans for forgetting all about religious liberty as soon as people came among them who disagreed with their opinions. But this view of the case is not supported by history. It is quite true that the Puritans were chargeable with gross intolerance, but it is not true that in this they were guilty of inconsistency. The notion that they came to New England for the purpose of establishing religious liberty, in any sense in which we should understand such a phrase, is entirely incorrect. It is neither more nor less than a bit of popular legend. If we mean by the phrase “religious liberty” a state of things in which opposite or contradictory opinions on questions of religion shall exist side by side in the same community, and in which everybody shall decide for himself how far he will conform to the customary religious observances, nothing could have been farther from their thoughts. There is nothing they would have regarded with more genuine abhorrence. If they could have been forewarned by a prophetic voice of the general freedom or as they would have termed it, license-of thought and behavior which prevails in this country to-day, they would very likely have abandoned their enterprise in despair. The philosophic student of history often has occasion to see how God is wiser than man. In other words, he is often brought to realize how fortunate it is that the leaders in great historic events cannot foresee the remote results of the labors to which they have zealously consecrated their lives. It is a part of the irony of human destiny that the end we really accomplish by striving with might and main is apt to be something quite different from the end we dreamed of as we started on our arduous labor. It was so with the Puritan settlers of New England. The religious liberty that we enjoy to-day is largely the consequence of their work, but it is a consequence that was unforeseen, while the direct and conscious aim of their labors was something that has never been realized, and probably never will be. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 58.8}

The aim of Winthrop and his friends in coming to Massachusetts was a construction of a theocratic State which should be to Christians, under the New Testament dispensation, all that the theocracy of Moses, and Joshua, and Samuel had been to the Jews in Old Testament days. They should be to all intents and purposes freed from the jurisdiction of the Stuart king, and so far as possible the texts of the Holy Scriptures should be their guide, both in weighty matters of general legislation, and in the shaping of the smallest details of daily life. In such a scheme there was no room for religious liberty, as we understand it. No doubt the text of the Scriptures may be interpreted in many ways, but among these men there was a substantial agreement as to the important points, and nothing could have been farther from their thoughts than to found a colony which should afford a field for new experiments in the art of right living. The State they were to found was to consist of a united body of believers; citizenship itself was to be co-extensive with church membership; and in such a State there was apparently no more room for heretics than there was in Rome or Madrid. This was the idea which drew Winthrop and his followers from England at a time when-as events were soon to show-they might have staid there and defied persecution with less trouble than it cost them to cross the ocean and found a new State. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 59.1}

The Puritans simply followed the customs of their time. Religious liberty was a thing unknown. Roman Catholicism and intolerance have been synonymous from the beginning. The Church of England was as intolerant as the Roman Church. The Puritans had not advanced far enough to perceive the error of the principle of religious intolerance, only they did not want the intolerance extended to themselves. They did not think that the Church of England ought to be intolerant, because they could see her errors, but, feeling sure that they themselves were right, they were equally sure that their opinions ought to prevail, and ought to be imposed upon others. In all New England, in the days of the Puritans, there was only one man who was far enough ahead to perceive that religion was a matter that rests with the individual, and not with the civil government, and that man was Roger Williams. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 59.2}

Although the Puritans were intolerant, and persecuted others even as they themselves had been persecuted, they are not to be stigmatized as bad men. They thought they were right. They were but little removed from the darkest period of Roman superstition and oppression, and they had before them no example of perfect religious freedom. In consideration of their circumstances we can make allowance for the ideas of government which they had, and honor them for that spirit of independence which was perpetuated in their children, and which resulted in the complete religious liberty which was finally established in this country. But while we may make allowance for those men, considering their time, what allowance can be made for men who have before them the history of one hundred years of religious liberty in the United States? and who can compare its glorious work with the work of the religious despotism of the Old World? Those who in this age would institute the Puritan idea of government, must be either deplorably blind or else wickedly selfish. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 59.3}

E. J. W.

**“Back Page” American Sentinel 5, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days*, in giving “Reasons for Sabbath Laws,” says:- {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.1}

“The powers that be are ordained of God.” If “of God,” why not for God? {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.2}

The answer is, Because God has forbidden it by his word. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.3}

In the Washington City Sunday Law Convention, it was again stated, and the statement was let go without a sign of contradiction, that Rev. W. F. Crafts “is the American Sabbath Union.” This same statement was officially made last summer by one of the District Secretaries of the Union. We knew it before, but it is well to have authoritative statements in confirmation of the fact. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.4}

We have before explained in these columns that Colonel Elliott F. Shepard, president of the American Sabbath Union, owns *the Mail and Express*, a daily evening newspaper of this city; and that that paper, through its “Pearl of Days” columns, is the official organ of the American Sabbath Union. Colonel Shepard is quite a pious man. So pious is he, indeed, that he prints a verse of Scripture every day at the head of the editorial columns of his newspaper; and occasionally, perhaps as evidence of an extra quantity, he embellishes this by printing an advertisement of an intoxicating drink at the foot of the same columns, to say nothing of the same thing in other parts of the paper. For instance, in the issue of February 10 (and this is not the first time that it has been done), at the head of the editorial columns, he printed this text:- {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.5}

For he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth through the power of God. For we also are weak in him, but we shall live with him through the power of God toward you. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.6}

And the same day, at the foot of the editorial columns, stood this other thing thus:- {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.7}

Piper Heidsieck Sec-The favorite everywhere. - Adv. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.8}

Now “Piper Heidsieck Sec” is a popular brand of champagne, possessing all the intoxicating qualities of champagne generally. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.9}

The *Christian Advocate* suggested, a short time ago, that the printing of texts of Scripture at the head of a daily newspaper “is a matter of taste.” Yes, no doubt. And it is altogether likely that the printing of “Piper Heidsieck Sec-the favorite everywhere”-at the foot of the same columns is also a matter of *taste*. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.10}

Since this was put in type we have received the *Mail and Express* of February 12. 1 Peter 2:7, 8, is printed at the head, and “A popular sparkling wine-Piper Heidsieck Sec,” at the foot of the editorial columns. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.11}

Speaking of the Chinese, the *Mail and Express* says:- {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.12}

Those who are willing to become American citizens, adopting our ways, customs, religion, and language, ought to be admitted to all the rights of American citizenship. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.13}

Is “our religion,” then, to be made a test of citizenship? By the way, Mr. Shepard, what is “our religion”? Is it the religion of the New Testament or of the saloon? Is it expressed in 2 Corinthians 13:4, or in “Piper Heidsieck Sec”? The president of the American Sabbath Union ought to be able to tell, and we hope he will. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.14}

A convention of the liberal thought women of the country will be held in Willard Hall, Washington, D. C., February 24 and 25, 1890. The object of the Convention is to form a national organization for the purpose of opposing the demands for religious legislation that are already so loud, so frequent, and so persistent. The call for the Convention says: “In order to help preserve the very life of the Republic by rousing public attention to the constantly increased danger of a union of Church and State, it is necessary that liberal thought women should unite in a national society for combined work.” {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.15}

This is a worthy object by whomsoever it may be desired, therefore we wish the coming Convention abundant success both in the organization and in the work proposed. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.16}

All persons in harmony with this are invited to correspond with Matilda Joslyn Gage, Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., Willard Hotel will be the headquarters of the Convention; and speakers, delegates, and visitors are requested to report there, to Mrs. Gage, on their arrival in the city. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.17}

It is not alone on the question of Sunday observance that Congress is being asked to legislate in matters pertaining to religion. Representative Compton, of Maryland, has introduced a bill-Fifty-first Congress, H. R. 423-authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury “to refund the duties paid upon a clock and a chime, of bells, imported into the port of Baltimore for the use of Saint Timothy’s Episcopal church, of Catonsville, in Baltimore County, Maryland.” Why should the duty on this clock and those bells be refunded any more than on every other clock and every other bell or bells? The answer, of course is, that these are for a church. Then upon what principle is it that this money shall be given from treasury to this church; and not an amount of money be paid from the same source to every other church in the land. And if the national treasury is to pay for the support of the playing of the tunes and the keeping of the time, of the church, why shall it not also help support the singing and the preaching carried on by the church? If this can be granted, why should not the whole of the public funds be placed at once at the service of the church? That bill is a sneaking, unprincipled thing. Let it be killed so dead that it may never be heard of again. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.18}

The *Christian at Work* notices the fact that Pittsburg, like Boston, is stirred up over the proposition made by the Catholics that they be given a proportionate share of public taxes for the support of parochial schools, and says:- {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.19}

At a public meeting just held in that city a series of resolutions was adopted protesting against any concessions to Roman Catholics by the public school authorities, and against appropriation of any money to schools which advocated principles so directly in opposition to the fundamental ideas of American Government. This is the right ground. The public schools for all, and no public moneys devoted to sectarian purposes should be the American war-cry the country over. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.20}

But if this is to be the war cry of Americans, what will become of the Educational Amendment? The only way to keep sectarianism out of the public schools is to keep religion out; but that is just what both Catholics and Protestants are determined shall not be done. They both want religious instruction, the only question between them being what religion shall be taught. Religious instruction belongs not to the State, nor to State schools, but to the home, the Church and the Church school. {AMS February 21, 1890, p. 64.21}

**“Front Page” American Sentinel 5, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the Cincinnati National Reform Convention Judge M. B. Hagans said:- {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 65.1}

The people of this city are tired of being tied to a beer barrel seven days in the week. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 65.2}

Therefore, that they may be loosed forever from the beer barrel, they want the saloon shut on Sunday. Certainly; they are tired of being tied to the beer barrel seven days in the week; tie them only six, and let them loose on Sunday, and they will all be happy. For our part we will have nothing to do with the wicked thing at all; and we will not compromise with it by asking that it be shut on Sunday only. The power that can shut the saloon on Sunday can shut it all the time. Therefore if they shut the saloon on Sunday and not all the time it shows that they do not want to shut it any of the time but Sunday. And the shutting of the saloon on Sunday only, is positive proof that it is not hatred of the saloon but love for Sunday which is expressed. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 65.3}

Poor Mrs. Mary Jones, of One Hundred and Fourth Street, was found yesterday (February 8), with a dose of laudanum in her stomach. Being a dejected and distressed creature, it was assumed that she had attempted suicide. She was seized by a policeman, dragged out of her home, sent to Bellevue Hospital, where she was pumped out, and where she is to-day a prisoner under the idiotic law which assumes to punish people for trying and failing to dispose of their lives. Mrs. Jones says that she was ill and meant to take a dose of ginger, but got hold of the wrong bottle. Perhaps the poor, unfortunate woman is fibbing, but what a ridiculous law, is that which makes an attempted suicide a misdemeanor, and thereby sets a premium upon successful self-destruction!-*New York World*. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 65.4}

True enough. And another ridiculous feature about such a law is, that it inflicts a heavier punishment upon the attempt to do a thing than upon the actual doing of it. That is, if a person attempts to kill himself and fails, he is fined and imprisoned; whereas if he actually kills himself, and even mangles himself all to pieces, he is let go scot free, with not the slightest attempt made to punish him in the least degree. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 65.5}

**“The Wickedness of Church and State Union” American Sentinel 5, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the Senate document containing the hearing (December 13, 1888) before the Committee on Education and Labor, on the Sunday-rest bill, we find on pages 65 and 66 certain statements made by Senator Blair, the chairman of the committee, and the author of the bill. He first asked Dr. Lewis the following questions:- {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 66.1}

Suppose that human beings trying to live in accordance with the will of God, re-enact his law and write it in their statute-books; is it wrong for society to put in their public law the requirement of obedience to God and his law? {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 66.2}

And then after a few words he proceeded to answer his own question in the following manner:- {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 66.3}

The will of God exists. He requires the observance of the seventh day just as he prohibits murder; and as we re-enact his law, in making a law and enforcing it against murder, so all the States have enacted laws against the desecration of the Sabbath, going further or not so far, according to the ideas of the various Legislatures. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 66.4}

Let the reader give particular attention to the idea advanced by Senator Blair, that human beings may re-enact the law of God. The same idea was advanced by Mr. Crafts in the *Christian Statesman* of May 30, 1889. Said he:- {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 66.5}

The laws of our statute-books re-enact the seventh commandment are as distinctly biblical in their origin as the laws that re-enact a part of the fourth commandment. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 66.6}

In what position does this place civil government? The only answer that can be given is that it puts it in the place of God, and makes it at least equal with God. Nay, more, in putting it in the place of God, it puts it above God; for if the State re-enacts and enforces the law of God, supposing such a thing to be possible, it takes the law out of his hands, leaving him nothing to do, and requires man to give supreme allegiance to the State. This will be more apparent when we quote another statement made by Senator Blair, in the connection before referred to. Said he:- {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 66.7}

Now the question comes right to this point: God having ordained the Sabbath, as you concede with all religious organizations, here is the national government, which alone can make that law of God operative in this sphere of national action. Why shall not the civil government, then, re-enact that conceded law of the Almighty and make it effective? {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 66.8}

Do we not say truly that the National deform idea, as voiced here by Senator Blair, puts the State in the place of God? He ignores God and his spirit entirely, in the statement that the national Government alone can make the law of God operative. We say, with as much reverence as the subject will allow, that we cannot see what use those who hold such an idea can have for God. They have usurped his prerogative. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 67.1}

In the second chapter of 2 Thessalonians the apostle Paul describes a certain power known as the “man of sin,” the result of the working of the “mystery of iniquity.” This power is described as opposing and exalting itself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, and claiming really to be God. It has generally been considered that this language is a description of the Papacy, and we believe that that interpretation is correct; but surely it describes nothing more accurately than a government which attempts to do just what Senator Blair says this government ought to do. Therefore, everyone who believes this language of Paul to refer to the Papacy must admit that a government according to the National Reform idea would be nothing more than an image to the Papacy. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 67.2}

But there is another point to be noticed in this connection, and that is the inevitable result of putting such ideas into practice. If it were universally conceded that the civil government has the power and the right to re-enact and enforce the law of God, that would involve the conclusion that there is no more to the moral law than civil government can enforce. The result would be the universal prevalence of immorality, and immorality of the worst kind, inasmuch as the individuals would suppose themselves to be acting in harmony with divine law. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 67.3}

For example, take Mr. Blair’s statement to the effect that as we re-enact the law of God in making a law and enforcing it against murder, so all the States have enacted laws against the desecration of the Sabbath. Suppose the National Reform scheme had become triumphant, and it were understood that the Government takes the place of God, and enforces the divine law against murder, the result would be that any individual who did not in his envy and hatred toward his fellows go to the extreme of depriving them of life, would consider himself a moral man, although he might be full of hatred, malice, and envy. Take Mr. Craft’s idea that the State re-enacts the seventh commandment. It needs no argument to show that the State cannot punish man for vicious thoughts, or evil desires, or for any grade of licentiousness short of the overt act of adultery. But ministers and law-makers teach that the State enforces the seventh commandment; therefore the conclusion which the libertine would be warranted in making would be that he is a moral man if he abstains from violence. And so, when this National Reform idea shall be carried into effect, we shall have the State actually teaching vice and immorality. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 67.4}

Such a condition of things would be a union of Church and State in its fullest extent. The Dark Ages stand as the great example of the effects of the union of Church and State, yet all that was done then was the enforcement by civil government of what the Church claimed was the law of God. We think that our friends can readily see from this that when the United States or any other government, legislates concerning any one or the whole of the commandments, it effects just to that extent a union of Church and State; and the argument already given shows how dangerous to morality and pure religion is such a union. The state of morality will be just as much below the true morality as the power that presumes to enforce the law of God is below God. Are there any of our Christian readers who wish to see such a condition of things in the United States, or who will lend their influence to bring it about? {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 67.5}

E. J. W. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 67.6}
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E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days*, official organ of the American Sabbath Union, makes the following announcement in its issue of February 7, 1890:- {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 70.1}

The Sunday Closing Association, of Chicago, acting upon the Roman military principle of “carrying the war into Africa,” has prepared “a plan for the organization of the Sunday-rest people in each ward” into Sunday-rest leagues. The Constitution thus defines the purposes and terms of membership:- {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 70.2}

ART. 2.-The object of this league shall be to cooperate with the Chicago Sunday Closing Association in securing, by all proper means, freedom from unnecessary Sunday labor, and especially the closing of factories, shops, stores, and saloons on Sunday. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 70.3}

ART. 3.-This lead shall be composed of representatives of the whole population of the—ward, independent of sectarian control or party dictation. Any citizen who is in favor of the object of this Association and desires to aid in the furtherance of the same may become a member by signing this constitution. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 70.4}

Ward organizers will be appointed to carry out these provisions. Efforts will be paid to secure the selection of alderman at the coming city election who favor the closing of saloons on Sundays and the cessation of all unnecessary work on that day. No sect, faction, or special influence will control the ward leagues. The men who want to rest on Sunday will control the ward organizations, and they will have the opportunity of making their influence felt at the ballot-box, whether of independent candidates or four nominees of either political party who will favor Sunday rest. By this method of working the city, which is substantially after the long-established ways of the old political organizations, the Sunday Closing Association expects to develop, direct, and establish public opinion for practical advances upon the enemy’s works. It is “bearding the land in his den.” The idea is novel, inspiring, and bold. Its results will be watchful with interest, and example, if even partially successful on the great city of the West, will be followed in more favorable localities. It means much more than a mass meetings and strings of resolutions. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 70.5}

**“Back Page” American Sentinel 5, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Nashville *Christian Advocate* says:- {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.1}

The Church needs more power rather than more machinery. It is a malign paradox of ecclesiastical history that as power declines machinery increases. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.2}

True enough. And the power of the churches in the United States has declined, and the machinery has increased to that extent that nothing short of the machinery of the national Government is counted of any worth. And in the enactment and enforcement of the National Sunday-law, they demand that this machinery shall be set in motion. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.3}

A federation of the churches of the United States is earnestly advocated by Dr. McCosh, ex-president of Princeton College, somewhat after the mode of the Federal Government of the United States. We should not be surprised if some such scheme as that would yet be entered into by the churches. The organization of the Church upon the political model of the Empire in the fourth century was the one grand step in the organization of the Papal hierarchy. “Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say A confederacy.” Isaiah 8:12. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.4}

Under the leadership of the so-called Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, of Rhode Island, the friends of prohibition in that State, are being organized into a sort of fourth-party called the “Prohibitory League,” with the object of getting a prohibition amendment to the State Constitution adopted again. A prohibition amendment was adopted in 1886, and was repealed in 1889. and now the prohibition Woman’s Christian Temperance Union propose to have it again enacted. At this rate the Constitution of Rhode Island becomes practically of no more weight than is any act of the legislature. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.5}

It is the just pride of the American people, that their liberties are guarded by written Constitutions. When Constitutional provisions are reduced to the level of Statute law, to be enacted or repealed at the caprice of parties, then constitutional government is gone and liberty with it; and nothing remains but an unchecked and therefore unmitigated despotism. In this way the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union and the Third and Fourth party Prohibition parties are doing far-reaching and untold evil. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.6}

National Reform principles are gaining ground in other countries as well as in our own. The *Christian Statesman* of February 13 makes the following announcement:- {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.7}

A Hindoo gentleman has called a congress of Brahmin priests and learned men for the purpose of incorporating the Bible among the sacred books of India, and officially recognizing Christ as the last spiritual Avatar, or incarnation of Brahma, the supreme deity. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.8}

When they shall have officially recognized Christ, and incorporated the Bible, India will be a Christian nation of course, just as officially to recognize Christ and the Bible in our national constitution will make this a Christian nation. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.9}

Through contentions in the Legislature New York City stood in much danger of losing the World’s Fair for 1892. Mass meetings were held this week, on Tuesday, to create such a public sentiment as might bring the Legislature to concerted action. In the preliminary meeting that was held to organize for the mass meetings, the principal speech was made by Colonel Shepard of the *Mail and Express*, and one point on which he laid special stress was this:- {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.10}

Ask the ministers to pray for pleasant weather on that day, and do not do any of your preparatory work on Sunday. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.11}

But Hon. Chauncey, M. Depew said that he read in the Bible “Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God,” and on the strength of that text he spent all day Sunday in the endeavor to bring the warring factions to an aggreement, and he was successful. The mass meeting was a splendid success; but it was evident to everybody that that success was vastly more owing to Mr. Depew’s Sunday work than to Mr. Shepard’s Sunday rest. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.12}

Another step by Congress toward legislating in behalf of religion appears in a bill-Fifty-first Congress, S. 1748-introduced by Senator Vance, of North Carolina, “For the Relief of the Sisters of the Holy Cross in the City of Washington, District of Columbia,” which provides that- {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.13}

From and after the passage of this act a certain piece of land in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, known as lot sixteen, in square two hundred and forty-seven of the plan of that city, and owned and occupied by the Sisters of the Cross, and all the buildings and grounds appurtenant thereto and used in connection therewith, in the District of Columbia, shall be exempt from any and all taxes and assessments, national, municipal, or county; and all taxes or assessments, together with the interest and penalties now due and unpaid upon said property shall be, and they are hereby remitted. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.14}

Why should the property of “the Sisters of the Holy Cross” be exempt from all taxes and assessments, any more than the property of everybody else? What is the particular benefit of the Sisters of the Holy Cross, over everybody else, to the nation, the city, and the county, that their property should be exempt from all taxes and assessments at the expense of everybody else in the nation, the city, and the county? It will doubtless be answered that this is church property, and that all church property is exempt. Then we would ask the same questions in regard to all the church property in the nation. Why should the people be required thus to pay tribute to the churches? If Congress can require that this measure of tribute shall be paid by the public to the churches, why can it not also require that all the revenues required by the churches shall likewise be paid by the public? If so much shall be done when it is asked, what is to hinder the doing of all the rest as it shall be asked? Our comments upon the bill concerning the clock and bells are to be applied to this bill also; and of this, too, we say, Let it be killed. And let every other like it be annihilated throughout the Union. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.15}

The Fresno (Cal.) *Inquirer*, a live newspaper published in the metropolis of the San Joaquin Valley, has a “Department of Church and State and Temperance,” ably edited by N. J. Bowers, a former contributor to the columns of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. We are glad that the secular press not only in California, but very generally throughout the country, is waking up to the importance of this question; and this is the more encouraging from the fact that a large majority of the secular papers are opposed to so-called National Reform, and to the schemes of the American Sabbath Union. We bid the *Inquirer* Godspeed in its new departure, and trust that it will add greatly both to its popularity and to its influence. {AMS February 27, 1890, p. 72.16}