



Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.—*Thomas Jefferson.*

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 11, 1890.

NUMBER 36.

## The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN,

W. H. McKEE.

A CINCINNATI paper well remarks that "it is to prevent working people from enjoying themselves on the 'American Sabbath' that all the efforts of the Law and Order Leagues are directed. The Carnegie library in Allegheny City, it has been decided, must be kept closed on Sunday; and when, please tell us, can the Carnegie labor slaves benefit by the library except on Sunday?"

"MUCH," says the *Christian Advocate*, "is made of the sacrifices which the Christian religion requires. Infidels protest against such a demand as unjust, and merely nominal Christians consider it a great hardship." We suspect that this accounts for the efforts of Sunday-law advocates and other religious legislationists, to secure the passage of laws that will practically eliminate all necessity for sacrifice on the part of those who profess Christianity. The road to life is to be made broad by civil law.

THE *Mail and Express* is very much concerned about a union of Church and State in Turkey. In its issue of August 5, it says:—

The dangers and evils that are inherent in a union of Church and State, have been revealed in the riots in Constantinople against the Armenian Patriarch, which compelled his resignation. The Patriarch's conduct shows that he would have encountered no violent opposition had he held merely his ecclesiastical position, free from entanglements with the Turkish Government.

It was as creditable to the Patriarch that he was

urged to reconsider his resignation, as it was that he refused any longer to occupy the position in which he was incapable of protecting his people and yet subject to violent and irrational popular demonstrations, because he was powerless for good.

Could there be a more glaring illustration of the folly and injustice and outright wickedness of the union of Church and State, which the ambitious and scheming Roman Catholic hierarchy would be glad to see consummated in this country?

All that the *Mail and Express* says of a union of Church and State is true; but Romanists are not alone in working for such a union in this country. Many so-called Protestants are quite as much at fault as are the Romanists. Indeed the only difference between them is, that, while the Catholics want government pap for Romanists, Protestants want it for the upbuilding of Protestantism.

### The Idaho Test Oath.

WE are asked by a contemporary in Idaho, what is our opinion of the Idaho test oath, and Mormonism in general? THE SENTINEL has given its opinion of that phase of Mormonism which consists of polygamy; so that part of the question has been answered. As for Mormonism in general, apart from its polygamous doctrine and practice, it is akin to the National Reform Association, the American Sunday-law Union, and their allied organizations, in that it involves a union of Church and State, and aims to accomplish and constantly to carry on that which it involves. Therefore Mormonism in general, whether practicing polygamy or not, is only evil; but as polygamy is an essential part of the *ism* the whole thing is doubly evil.

We are willing to give our opinion of the Idaho test oath; and that opinion is that *it goes too far*. The article published in THE SENTINEL, of last week, on the subject of polygamy, shows, and justifies us in saying, that if the Idaho test oath stopped with the prohibition of bigamy and polygamy, no one could have any just cause to criticize it. But that oath does not stop there. It goes so far as to

prohibit every religious duty, that a majority of the people of Idaho might decide to be wrong.

We here print the test oath, putting in italics that point wherein the oath goes too far:—

I do swear (or affirm) that I am a male citizen of the United States of the age of twenty-one years (or will be on the sixth day of November, 1888); that I have (or will have), actually resided in this Territory four months and in this county for thirty days next preceding the day of the next ensuing election; that I have never been convicted of treason, felony, or bribery; that I am not registered or entitled to vote in any other place in this Territory; and I do further swear that I am not a bigamist or polygamist; that I am not a member of any order, organization, or association which teaches, advises, counsels, or encourages its members, devotees, or any other person to commit the crime of bigamy or polygamy, or any other crime defined by law as a duty arising or resulting from membership in such order, organization, or association, or which practices bigamy, polygamy, or plural or celestial marriage as a doctrinal rite of such organization; that I do not and will not, publicly or privately, or in any manner whatever, teach, advise, counsel, or encourage any person to commit the crime of bigamy or polygamy, or any other crime defined by law, either as a religious duty or otherwise; that I do regard the Constitution of the United States and the law thereof and the laws of this Territory, as interpreted by the courts, as the supreme laws of the land, the teachings of any order, organization, or association to the contrary, notwithstanding, so help me God.

That phrase, "or any other crime defined by law either as a religious duty or otherwise" is where this oath goes too far. This makes the State of Idaho supreme and absolute in everything religious as well as civil.

There is a question now agitating the whole country which will serve as a forcible illustration of what we mean. There is a strong demand being made on all legislative bodies, from Congress to the Legislature of Idaho, that laws shall be enacted compelling everybody to observe Sunday, and making it a crime to do any work on that day. Now there are a considerable number of people in the United States, and there are some in Idaho,—Seventh-day Adventists, and Seventh-day Baptists—who do not recognize Sunday

as a day to be observed in any way different from any other working day. They work on that day. They teach that it is right to work on that day. Yet, if the State of Idaho should enact such a Sunday law, as is demanded by those who are working for Sunday laws everywhere, this test oath would disfranchise every Seventh-day Adventist, and every Seventh-day Baptist in the State,—not for anything that is wrong, nor for anything that injures any soul on earth, but simply because Sunday laws make a crime of honest work; and these people from honest conviction would work on Sunday, even though the law prohibited it. For nearly a year, Tennessee has been carrying on a series of persecutions of some of these people for committing such a heinous crime as plowing corn and hoeing potatoes on Sunday. Tennessee has no such test oath as Idaho. If she had, every Seventh-day Adventist, every Seventh-day Baptist, and every Jew who stood by his honest convictions would be disfranchised. Idaho has the test oath, but we believe has not as yet any such Sunday law. If Idaho should adopt such a Sunday law as Tennessee, or should Tennessee adopt such a test oath as has Idaho, then it would soon be seen that such a test oath accomplishes a great deal more than was contemplated when that oath was made a part of the law. And it would be a great injustice too. To work on Sunday is not a crime, and never can properly be made a crime, and therefore to disfranchise whole peoples for Sunday labor would be itself a crime against society.

The observance of the day of rest is a religious duty only, and its obligation rests wholly between the individual and the Lord of the Sabbath. It has no bearing whatever upon any relationship of a citizen to his fellow-citizens or to the State. And no State can ever have any right to legislate upon the subject in any way. Every State that does so puts itself in the dominion of God, assumes his jurisdiction, and demands of men that they render to the State that which is to be rendered to God only.

This is the defect of the Idaho test oath; it makes the State supreme in everything, not only in civil affairs, but in all things religious, not only in things that pertain to the State but in those things which pertain only to God. Under penalty of disfranchisement this oath obliges every citizen of Idaho to swear that he does not, and "will not publicly, or privately, or in any manner whatever teach, advise, counsel, or encourage any person to commit the crime of bigamy, or polygamy, or any other crime defined by law as a religious duty or otherwise." Whatever, therefore, the State of Idaho shall define by law to be a crime, whether it be a religious duty or anything else, that is to be laid aside by every person in

that State. If that State should define it to be a crime to pay any allegiance, whether as a religious duty or otherwise, to a foreign potentate or power, then every Roman Catholic in Idaho would be disfranchised. And this is precisely the claim that has already been made under the precedent. But the claim is as wicked as the law would be. And as before shown, if the State of Idaho should define it to be a crime to work on Sunday, then every Seventh-day Christian, and every Jew would be disfranchised, or else would have to give up his religious convictions and cease to be religiously what he is.

Therefore, as this test oath makes the State supreme in religious things, as well as in civil, it goes too far. If it confined itself to men's relationship with one another, with the relationship of the citizen to his fellow-citizen, or to the State, then nobody could object, and it would accomplish all that it does accomplish in prohibiting polygamy as it really does; but when it goes far beyond this and puts itself in the domain of God, and makes itself supreme in all things religious, in all matters of religious duty as well as otherwise, then in that it has gone too far.

The Mormon Church, like the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and the leadership of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, confounds civil and religious things. In this confusion the Mormon Church, under the garb of religious claim, wants to practice that which is uncivil. In this test oath the State of Idaho also confounds civil and religious things. And in this confusion, the State of Idaho prohibiting what is uncivil goes away beyond and asserts authority to prohibit whatever may be religious. The Mormon Church has the inalienable right to profess and practice whatever religious doctrine it pleases; but it has not the right, under the claim of religion, to practice that which is uncivil, as polygamy essentially is. The State of Idaho has the absolute right to prohibit anything that is uncivil, under whatever claim it may be practiced; but the State of Idaho has *not* the right, either to assert or to claim authority to prohibit anything that may be a religious duty. In the confusion of religious and civil things the Mormon Church occupies one extreme, the State of Idaho occupies the other. The Mormon Church, in its assertion of right to practice polygamy, is civilly wrong. The State of Idaho in its assertion of right to prohibit religious duty, is religiously wrong. The Idaho test oath, so far as it pertains to bigamy or polygamy, is *right*, because bigamy and polygamy are essentially uncivil. The Idaho test oath, so far as it assumes jurisdiction of religious duty, is *wrong*, because with religious duty no State can ever of right have anything to do.

A. T. J.

#### Religion Belongs not to the State, but to the Individual.

THE State can have no religion of its own, in behalf of which to frame laws, simply because the State being composed of individuals, it has no existence when separated from those individuals, except in a figure. Religion being a personal matter which each individual member of the State must have for himself, if at all, the State does not need a religion, and could not have one if it would, because no person in the State has power to transfer his religion to the State. If the State has a religion, it must get it from the same source from whence it comes to each individual. But, as the State has no existence outside of its citizens, it can have no religion outside of that which its citizens profess. And the matter of having religion, is left to each individual to decide as he wills. Rev. 22:17. As previously shown, these individuals who form the State, have individual consciences and responsibilities, for which each must singly give account to God. Rom. 14:12. This being true, the State cannot have accountability outside of the individual accountability of those who compose it. And, if the State is not morally accountable, it certainly can have no personal attributes, and therefore no necessity for a religion of its own. More than this: religion operates upon both the head and the heart of the individual, in order to the salvation of the soul. But the State having no personal attributes, has neither a judgment to be convinced, nor a heart in which to receive religious impressions, nor yet a soul to be saved in the world to come.

The State cannot, therefore, make laws touching religion on the plea of its own responsibility; and the citizens do not need such laws, because each one is personally responsible to another tribunal infinitely higher than the State, for his standing in morals. Then all that the State can do, is to make laws prohibiting any man, or any set of men, from interrupting others in the enjoyment of their peculiar form of worship. Any law violating this principle, would work gross injustice to the whole people.

But, because law has been instituted that justice may reign, many have come to believe that all law is justice; or, in other words, that that which is legal is legitimate. But nothing is easier than to frame laws that will pervert the ends of justice. Thus, law is generally made by a certain class of men, who, because of their political influence, can secure enough votes to solidify their opinion into legal statutes. The laws thus made, may be looking almost solely to the benefit of those who brought them into existence, and to the oppression and spoliation of all others. It may readily be seen that laws of this kind, instead of restraining in-

justice, become its most effective instrument. The proneness of men who have power, is, to abuse it, by making it the instrument of their own aggrandizement, even though their elevation cost the downfall of others. It would not, therefore, be safe to place in the hands of any set of men, the power to prescribe positive duties for their fellow-citizens, either social or religious.

It may be said that some, in a certain community, are ignorant in certain lines of thought and need enlightenment; shall we not therefore have a law to oblige them to be informed? But, if a government were permitted to so far assume paternal care over its subjects, why might it not go further at will? In the language of another, "Why should it not take away the child from its mother, select the nurse, prescribe what ballads shall be sung, what tunes shall be played, what books shall be read, what physic shall be swallowed? Why should they not choose our wives, limit our expenses, and stint us to a certain number of dishes of meat, and of cups of tea?" If government can take the first step in paternal legislation, there is no reason why it may not go the whole journey, and regulate all the affairs of life, in spiritual as well as in temporal things. But, in that case what credentials would the legislators exhibit, to show that Heaven had endowed them with intelligence and virtue above those whom they assumed coercively to teach? How would such men satisfy the unbelieving, that they were Heaven's appointed shepherds? Such an attempt could only lead to hypocrisy, discord, and social disorganization.

There are, in fact, but two ways in which Government can possibly effect its ends. These are, reward and punishment. And while these are powerful in influencing men, their effect is not to make men better, because they do not touch the heart. This point is so well set forth by Mr. Macaulay, that we here give his words:—

A public functionary who is told that he will be promoted if he is a devout Catholic, and turned out of his place if he is not, will probably go to Mass every morning, exclude meat from his table on Fridays, shive himself regularly, and perhaps let his superiors know that he wears a hair shirt next his skin. Under a Puritan government, a person who is apprised that piety is essential to thriving in the world, will be strict in the observance of Sunday, or as he will call it, Sabbath, and will avoid a theater as, if it were plague-stricken. Such a show of religion as this, the hope of gain and the fear of loss will produce at a week's notice, in any abundance which a government may require. But under this show, sensuality, ambition, avarice, and hatred retain unimpaired power, and the seeming convert has only added to the vices of a man of the world all the still darker vices which are engendered by the constant practice of dissimulation. The truth cannot be long concealed. The public discovers that the grave persons who are proposed to it as patterns, are more utterly destitute of moral principle and of moral sensibility, than avowed libertines. It sees that these Pharisees are further removed from real goodness than publicans and harlots. And, as usual, it rushes

to the extreme opposite of that which it quits. It considers a high religious profession as a mark of meanness and depravity. On the very first day on which the restraint of fear is to be taken away, and on which men can venture to say what they think, a frightful peal of blasphemy and ribaldry proclaims that the short-sighted policy which aimed at making a nation of saints, has made a nation of scoffers.—*Essays, Leigh Hunt, Par. 19.*

The foregoing statement, by Mr. Macaulay, may easily be confirmed. Look at France, during the closing days of Louis XIV. When the king became religious, he frowned on all who neglected church duties, and rewarded the pious with blue ribbons and pensions. Soon, the city of Versailles became as solemn as a convent; the marshals of the army were observed to be frequently at prayer; it became fashionable for even the great and wealthy to carry prayer-books in their pockets, and to fast during Lent. This lasted no longer, however, than the life of the king. As soon as he was dead, every one hastened to break away from such rigid lines, and to plunge to excess in licentiousness. Those, who, "a short time before, went about looking so demure, consulting the priests about the state of their souls, were now found at the midnight gaming-table, hiccoughing out atheistical arguments and obscene jests." Indeed it is said that the most dissolute of men of an earlier reign, would have blushed at the orgies that accompanied the reaction.

It was the same in England, during the days of the Puritan ascendancy. No person suspected of hostility to the church could obtain favor with the government; the theaters were closed; the fine arts were restrained, and Parliament solemnly resolved that, "no person shall be employed but such as the House shall be satisfied of his real godliness." As the result, men dressed in plain garb, wore lank hair and coarse shirts, talked through their noses and showed the whites of their eyes. When a counter-political movement came, a time of wild and desperate dissoluteness followed, and the amount of debauchery seen was appalling. In no case would like efforts result in anything else. Any government which attempts things beyond its reach, will not only make a failure, but produce the very opposite of that which it desires.

To encourage true religion, more is required than temporary reward and punishment, since, as has already been shown, these can have only an outward effect. True laws may be framed, which will punish for the practice of, or the refusal to comply with, certain forms of religion; but these laws cannot reach the seat of religion, which they should do to have the proper effect. Religion occupies a realm which it is impossible for the State to enter, or for human laws to reach. A parent, even with all the authority God has given him over his child, cannot make him religious by commanding him to be so. Whoever worships God, does so

under the guidance of his own reason and conscience, and not by the authority of another's will.

Religion, then, being a matter of private concern, something between the soul and its God, a civil government organized solely for the public good, cannot extend its agency to the administration or regulation of religion, without usurping God's prerogative, and trampling on man's rights at the same time. No human authority can divorce a soul from his obligations to the law of Jehovah, nor properly coerce one into piety, since his reason and conscience are peculiarly his own, and must remain so, as long as he lives. Man's obligations, therefore, which bind him to God, make him free in this respect, from human authority. Yet religious freedom is not freedom from all human authority, but freedom to follow the dictates of conscience without hindrance.

This does not suppose that any one may be privileged to carry out selfish desires under the garb of religion, when such a course would be a trespass upon the civil liberties of others. But, so long as the exercise of his religion does not trespass on the civil rights of others, the civil government cannot, in justice, interfere with his religious liberty.

J. O. CORLISS.

#### A Representative National Reformer Defines His Position.

WE are in receipt of the following note from Oakland, California, under date of August 6:—

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL, *Dear Sir:* I see you have copied the *Signs of the Times* criticism of my article, or letter, anent the action of the California Prohibition Convention in reference to the Sabbath, or Sunday law. I have this day written for the *Signs of the Times* a reply, or defense of myself. If it should appear in the *Signs*, as I hope it will next week, I ask that you copy it in THE AMERICAN SENTINEL that your readers may have both sides.

Yours respectfully,

N. R. JOHNSTON.

We cheerfully comply with Mr. Johnston's request to publish his "defense," which we give as follows, just as it appeared in our Oakland contemporary:—

EDITOR SIGNS OF THE TIMES: As copied in THE AMERICAN SENTINEL of July 31, I have this day read your criticism of my letter in the *Christian Statesman*, of May 15. Will you admit a few lines in my own defense? For I think you misunderstand me. I am sure your readers will if they do not read my letter in the *Statesman*.

1. I do not believe in a "civil Sabbath" in the sense in which you use the words. I never have said that a "civil Sabbath" is all that I favor. I differ entirely from the majority of the California people, who ask a Sunday law merely as a police or sanitary regulation. From the first of Rev. Mr. Crafts's coming here, and all the time, I have most decidedly objected to his theory of a "civil Sunday." In the *Christian Statesman* I wrote against it; and it was because of my objection to the "civil Sunday" that I wrote what I did about the action of the State Prohibition Convention. I totally reject the secular theory of government and of education alike. Others wish only a "civil Sunday;" I wish "the Sabbath of the Lord," our God the Institutor of it.

2. The only authority we have for the observance of a Sabbath—the only power that has any right to require a seventh portion of time to be observed as sacred to rest and to worship, whether it be a seventh-day or a first-day Sabbath—is the divine

Law-giver, whose will is declared in the law of the fourth commandment. Neither Church nor State has any right to make a law about a Sabbath. "The Sabbath was made [*i. e.*, appointed] for man." God appointed it. Governments or legislatures have no power except to recognize it as God's law, binding upon the people, and to see that the law which forbids work, be not trampled underfoot by open transgressors.

3. God is the Author of all moral law. He is the source of all authority. "There is no power but of God." Governments may only find out law, the divine law, and accept and codify it as the law by which the people must be governed. Especially do governments have nothing to do in legislation in the department of religion. Government's only sphere is in civil matters.

4. The law of the fourth commandment is partly religious and partly civil. It commands religious duties; it also commands civil duties. "In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, . . . nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou." That is *civil* law. Government should protect men in the enjoyment of their rights. The right to rest as God requires, belongs to the servant. If the master does not grant the right to an employe, he is a transgressor of law. Governments must protect the wronged. God requires it. Government is his agent. Thus government may legislate as to the enforcement of God's civil law for the protection of men in the enjoyment of God-given rights. Thus far I am in favor of a "civil Sabbath." Am I understood?

5. "Thou shalt not steal" is a moral, civil law. Governments have no power to either reject it or modify it. The same is true of the fourth commandment. Except by moral restraints or motives the Church has no power to prevent work on the Sabbath. But a law without a penalty is no law at all. Therefore, civil government is the only and the proper power to punish the open transgression of God's civil law. Thus far I am in favor of a civil Sabbath law. But remember that the permission or obligation to legislate about Sabbath observance is derived wholly from God. Men or governments have no such authority. The religious obligation is the only one existing; *i. e.*, we should have Sabbath laws only because God requires them and for man's good. And the principle I advocate is applicable whether the first or the seventh day should be kept holy. Which is the true Sabbath is not the question here and now. I honor the convictions of those who conscientiously believe in the seventh-day Sabbath; but I beg leave to say that I do not believe in "only a civil Sabbath." I am not in favor of "only a civil Sunday law." I prefer the fourth commandment; and the people, the Church, and the State that permit it to be trampled underfoot by lawless desecrators are false to God and to humanity.

Yours for the truth and the right,

N. R. JOHNSTON.

Having given place to Mr. Johnston's letter, we deem it only right that our readers should have also the reply made by the *Signs of the Times*, which is as follows:—

We give place to the above letter of explanation, not alone as an act of courtesy to a very estimable gentleman, with whom we enjoy a pleasant acquaintance, but also for the special benefit of the readers of the *Signs of the Times*. Mr. Johnston is an honored member of the National Reform Association. He was secretary of one of the early national conventions of that organization, and is a regular contributor to the *Christian Statesman*. Therefore when we read a statement from him, we feel that we read the thoughts of the National Reform Association. We shall doubtless have occasion to make frequent reference to that body in the future, and those of our readers who treasure up this letter will know, as well as any one can know, what its principles are on the Sunday question. We will now offer a few words of comment on the letter, section by section.

1. We wish that all Sunday-law people

stood where Mr. Johnston does, and would as frankly avow their belief in, and desire for, a law from a religious standpoint. We are sure that this is where they all stand, in heart; but repeated defeats on that line have taught many to conceal their real sentiments by pleading for a merely "civil Sunday." With the exception of the statement, "I totally reject the secular theory of government and of education alike," there is nothing in section 1 that we could not heartily second. We also "wish the Sabbath of the Lord our God," not, however, enforced by civil authority.

But by the above phrase, Mr. Johnston means Sunday, which is not the Sabbath of the Lord our God. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. 20:10. It was such as late as the time when Christ was on earth, and when the New Testament was written. See Mark 2:23-28. If the Lord has changed the day of his Sabbath, it has been done since his revelation was given to man, and we should like to know where the record of the change is, and to whom he committed it.

2. With the exception of the last sentence, we most emphatically say, "Good!" to section 2. But to the statement that it is the province of legislatures to recognize God's law as binding on the people, and to see that it is not trampled underfoot, we offer a most emphatic protest. That would be a union of Church and State, for it is simply a partnership between God and the State, by the terms of which the Lord is to enact the laws, and the State is to enforce them. This is just the same as a partnership in which one party furnishes the capital and the other does the work. God has not relegated to any inferior power the right or authority to enforce his laws. To think that he "that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers," before whom all nations "are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity" (Isa. 40:22, 17), should intrust the execution of his laws to those same comparatively insignificant creatures, is an insult to common sense, to say nothing of revelation.

It is a misapprehension of the fourth commandment, to assume that it simply forbids *work* on the Sabbath day. Paul says that "the law is spiritual." If it is not spiritual, it is nothing. Just what the fourth commandment does forbid is shown by its Author in Isa. 58:13: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words," etc. Now if civil government takes it upon itself to see that men do not "trample underfoot" the fourth commandment, it must see that

they do not speak their own words on the Sabbath day. A difficult task it would be, yet as difficult a task was undertaken by the Inquisition. Only the Inquisition could determine to any degree whatever whom to punish for violation of the fourth commandment. God never established the Inquisition, but a National Reform government could not be carried on without it; therefore God has nothing to do with National Reform.

3. A queer mixture is in this paragraph. Governments have nothing to do with religion, yet they must codify and enforce divine law! Since God is the moral Governor, and human governments are to enforce his decrees, yet are to have nothing to do with religion, we may ask, Whence, then, comes religion? But why should the law of God need to be codified by human legislators? Is it not sufficiently clear and concise? The idea that poor, weak, fallible mortals can codify the laws of the Omnipotent Ruler of the universe, which were spoken by his own voice, and engraved in the flinty rock with his own finger, is too monstrous an assumption to be amusing. To codify is to epitomize; to arrange or systematize; to make an orderly collection or compendium of. It is a long step in advance of having the same thing loosely arranged. Therefore, since the National Reform government would codify the laws of God, it must be a legitimate successor to that power that "opposeth and exalts itself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped."

4. Yes, you are understood quite well. "The law of the fourth commandment is partly religious and partly civil!" We have often heard this claim made, and now propose to place it by the side of one text of Scripture: "For we know that the law is spiritual." Rom. 7:14. Can you say that, Brother Johnston? or have you information of a later date than Paul's? That cannot be, for he spoke by inspiration that which he had learned from God himself; and God does not change. Facts cannot change. If the law was spiritual in Paul's day, it is spiritual still, not partly spiritual and partly something else. The idea that the moral law is partly civil is a modern invention, conjured up by presumptuous, self-seeking men, as an excuse for their attempt to divide honors with the Almighty. In saying this, we mean no disrespect to Mr. Johnston. Even the Apostle Barnabas was once unsuspectingly carried away by dissimulation.

But, Brother Johnston, you say in paragraph 1, that you don't want a civil Sunday law; you are frank in your avowal of a desire for a Sunday law from a religious standpoint; then why the reference to the supposed civil features of the fourth commandment as an aid to your plea? Why detract from its complete and perfect morality, and make it partly secular, when you don't want a secular Sunday

law? We can answer. It is because nobody can argue for Sunday laws without involving himself in hopeless inconsistencies.

If the reference to "gates" in the fourth commandment be construed as referring to city gates, then the whole commandment must be considered as addressed to the government, and not to the individual. But it is actually addressed individually to every man. Each man is to keep the Sabbath; his son and his daughter must likewise keep it; his man-servant and his maid-servant must also keep it; and also the stranger that is within his gates. That is, all who are upon the man's premises must keep the Sabbath, because if they worked, it would be the same as if he worked.

It is true that government must protect a man in the enjoyment of God-given rights; but that does not signify that it must force a man to accept that which he does not regard as a right, but which he thinks is positively wrong. Protection and compulsion are widely different. Government must protect the wronged. If a servant wishes to keep Sunday, and his employer by force and power compels him to work, then he may appeal to the law for protection, and so may any man who is forcibly deprived of his liberty. But we must confess that we have never heard of such a case since the abolition of slavery. In these days when employes strike for the most trivial causes, and almost every laborer belongs to some organization which assumes the right to dictate to the employer just how far he may go in any case, it is sheer nonsense to talk of men being compelled to work on Sunday against their will.

5. In this section we have the climax. "Thou shalt not steal" is a moral civil law." The Bible knows nothing of any such mongrel. "The law is spiritual." It is wholly spiritual. He who keeps it only outwardly does not keep it at all. Read the Saviour's dissertation on the law, in Matt. 5:19-28, and his denunciation of hypocrites in Matt. 23:25-28. Thousands of men who have never been guilty of any act of which the State could take notice, have lived in daily violation of the eighth commandment, as well as the seventh, and others.

But what shall we say to this: "But a law without a penalty is no law at all. Therefore, civil government is the only and the proper power to punish the open transgression of God's civil law," which is the moral law of the ten commandments. God says, "Vengeance is mine; I will repay;" but National Reform says that God hasn't the power, and that if human governments do not administer the penalty, sin must go unpunished. Christ says that God has given the Son authority to execute judgment, and that he will do this when he comes from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire (see John

5:27; 2 Thess. 1:7-9); but National Reform says that human governments must execute judgment now, or else the sinner will go free. Could any worse insult to the majesty of Jehovah be invented? Mr. Johnston is a minister of the gospel, and we know that he is personally devout and reverent; therefore we feel the more astonished that he should champion a cause which puts man above God; yea, which sets man on the throne of judgment, and relegates God to obscurity.

We have studied brevity in noticing these points, for our space is limited; but we trust that all the readers of the *Signs of the Times* can see that opposition to Sunday laws, and to the theory which underlies them, is not simply a matter of protesting against a possible injustice to a few men; it is a religious duty incumbent on every one who has any regard for the honor of God. Human government is secular, and only secular; that is, it pertains wholly to this world and to worldly affairs. God is the only moral Governor; his government is the only moral government; his law is the only moral law; and it is wholly moral. With it man has nothing to do but to obey it. The duty of the king is identical with that of the humblest subject. Both are alike answerable to God, and to him alone, for violation of his law. So broad are its requirements, that no one can keep them except by the grace of Christ; no one can boast over another; and no one can get beyond simple, personal obedience to it, so that he can act as an overseer to his fellows.

To those who assume to exercise the prerogatives of God, he will say at the last day, "Who hath required this at your hands?" and like the man in the parable, they will be speechless; for "the lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day."

#### Some Rash Statements Examined.

DR. R. H. McDONALD, of San Francisco, has sent us a leaflet from which we make a few extracts. Printed on one side in large type is this statement:—

If the clergy of California would unite in one earnest, determined effort, we would have an effective Sunday law, and there would not be an open saloon in the State by Dec. 31, 1891.

If this is true we cannot help wondering why so much abuse has been heaped upon the Seventh-day people of that State for preventing the passage of a Sunday law, and why they have been accused of joining with saloon keepers to strike down the "Christian Sabbath." Certainly if a Sunday law is really desirable, and the clergy could secure it in so short a time by a determined effort, they ought to blame nobody but themselves if they fail to get such a law. And again, if by a

determined effort the clergy could close every saloon in California, before Dec. 31, 1891, they certainly have no room to censure those who simply refuse to assent to a Sunday-closing law, the passage of which would be to say, in effect, that saloons are all right *except on Sunday*. If the outcome of the present agitation in California should be the passage of a Sunday law, while the saloons are still permitted to prey upon the community as in times past, would it not show much more zeal on the part of the clergy in behalf of Sunday than in behalf of temperance?

On the margin of this leaflet is this remarkable statement:—

There is no instance of a people keeping the Sabbath, as a rest day, who were not free. God has joined liberty with the Sabbath.

Let us see; the Jews kept the Sabbath. From the exode until Saul—about 400 years—they were a free people. But after Saul became king they were no more free than are the subjects of the Czar to-day. The kings of Israel were absolute monarchs, as appears from a number of scriptures. Before Saul was anointed, the Lord commanded Samuel to tell the people just what kind of a government they would have.

And Samuel told all the words of the Lord unto the people that asked of him a king. And he said, This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties; and will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep; and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the Lord will not hear you in that day. 1 Sam. 8:10-18.

David and Solomon were wise kings, but like Saul they were absolute rulers. We may judge of the character of at least the latter part of Solomon's reign, from these words of the people to his son, Rehoboam, who succeeded to the throne upon the death of his father:—

And all the congregation of Israel came, and spake unto Rehoboam saying, Thy father made our yoke grievous: now therefore make thou the grievous service of thy father, and his heavy yoke which he put upon us, lighter, and we will serve thee. 1 Kings 12:3, 4.

But instead of granting this reasonable request of the people, Rehoboam answered them, saying, "My father made your yoke heavy, and I will add to your yoke; my father also chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions." 1 Kings 12:14.

And future kings were no better, so far

as freedom for the people was concerned. The history of both Judah and Israel is, for the most part, a history of misrule and oppression; and yet the Jews were nominally a Sabbath-keeping people; and during a great part of their history, they certainly kept the Sabbath more strictly than any nation now keeps Sunday. But they were not a free people. This proves nothing against Sabbath-keeping; and these facts are not stated to cast any reflection upon Sabbath observance, but only to show how utterly unfounded is the statement published by Dr. McDonald, that "there is no instance of a people keeping the Sabbath, as a rest day, who were not a free people." The statement is without the least foundation in fact, and like many other goody-goody statements, is made for the purpose of persuading people who have no religious regard for Sunday, to keep it from motives of personal advantage. The only correct motive for Sabbath observance is a sincere desire to obey God; and where this motive is lacking, no law however rigidly enforced, can make a people Sabbath-keepers in any proper sense of the term.

C. P. B.

REFERRING to the fact that several prominent clergymen of this city have been, as clergymen, taking a great interest in politics, with the avowed object of purifying the municipal government, the *Christian Union* says:—

There are several reasons why, in our judgment, the clergy should not take an active part in political organization, even if it be dubbed non-partisan. They are not often skillful organizers of practical movements. Their function is to teach truth, not to conduct affairs; and while occasionally the same man is equally good at both, more frequently the man who drops the first function to undertake the second, drops a higher for lower office; and he who undertakes to fulfill both fulfills neither. The American people are jealous of the interference of the clergy in political administration. The attempt to carry on the State by the Church has been very thoroughly tried in the Old World, and the success of the experiment has not been such as to encourage a repetition of it in the New World. Cardinals have not purified statecraft in France, nor have bishops sanctified the House of Lords in England. Ministers are but men, and when they drop the vantage-ground which their profession gives them for quiet and unselfish reflection, and enter the environment of other men, they become much like them. If the minister goes into politics, he is certain to take concern for his church with him, and then the question often stares him in the face between service of the Church or the State, the two not infrequently seeming to present conflicting claims upon him.

NATIONAL  
RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.



DECLARATION of PRINCIPLES.

We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ.  
We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.  
We believe in supporting the civil government, and submitting to its authority.  
We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.  
We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.  
We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation by the civil government; that we and our fellow-citizens may enjoy the inestimable blessings of both religious and civil liberty.

OFFICES.

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY;  
225 A ST., N. E. WASHINGTON; 28 COLLEGE PLACE, CHICAGO.

C. ELDRIDGE, - - - - - President.  
W. H. MCKEE, - - - - - Secretary.

"THE American Sabbath Union," says the *Pearl of Days*, "has presented an earnest appeal to the Commissioners of the World's Columbian Exposition to be held in Chicago, asking them to decide that the Exposition shall be closed on Sundays. It is understood that the Commissioners will meet in Chicago, on October 7. The officers of the Union, in making this appeal, ask the co-operation of all the friends of the Sabbath throughout the land."

ON a recent Sunday, a party of young men, of the city of Washington, were playing ball outside of hearing distance from any dwelling, but were arrested by the police, on the strength of the common-law decision, recently issued by the Commissioners, that ball-playing on Sunday is contrary to the Christian religion, and that the Christian religion is a part of the common law, and, consequently, of the law of the District of Columbia.

When the case was brought to trial, the Court and prosecuting attorney ignored the legal lore of the Commissioners, and tried the case under an ordinance prohibiting the playing of ball in streets, avenues, and alleys. The counsel for the ball players argued that the law had not been violated, although he attempted to placate the Court by acknowledging that the young men might better have been in church.

The policeman *thought* that they were playing on a line with the extension of Seventeenth street; the Judge therefore held that they were playing in the streets, and imposed a fine of five dollars.

Such things as these are sufficient evidence that wherever the authorities are infected with National Reform doctrines, religious regulations will be enforced, even outside of the law. What then will be the condition of affairs when all the religious legislation asked for has been secured?

THE advice of the Sunday Union in respect to the establishment of Law and Order Leagues throughout the country, for the enforcement of Sunday laws, has taken root, and in several localities has already reached the fruit-bearing period. A prominent instance, which the daily press is now noticing, occurs in Wheeling, West Virginia, where the League has undertaken to enforce the Sunday laws to the letter. A "special" says that on Sunday, August 31, it was impossible to purchase anything in Wheeling, other than necessary medicines, and mentions it as the intention of the League to stop the publication of the Sunday papers.

The dispatch declares, however, that "owing to the absurdly extreme measures taken, there has been a revulsion of feeling throughout the city."

It is noticeable that the press comments do not take exception to the principle involved, but only criticise the action taken by the League as extreme and beyond what public opinion will uphold.

These organizations will continue to push the enforcement of religious laws and city ordinances to the farthest limit in which they can secure the application of the penalties attached, until at last, and not far in the future, this country will find itself under the rule of a religious oligarchy. The Religious Liberty Association was organized none too soon.

THOSE who wish to do so and who have not already had the opportunity of so doing, or who have neglected it, are requested to sign BOTH of the following petitions and send them to W. H. MCKEE, 225 A Street, N. E., Washington, D. C. If room for more names is desired the petition may be cut out and pasted on to a sheet of legal cap.

To the Honorable, the House of Representatives of the United States:—  
We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way give preference to the principles of any one religion above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion; but that the total separation between religion and the State, assured by our National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the United States:—  
We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way give preference to the principles of any one religion above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion; but that the total separation between religion and the State, assured by our National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it.





NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 11, 1890.

NOTE.—Any one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

THE Czar of Russia, who is the head of the Greek Church, demands that the Pope shall address him as an equal, which the Pope refuses to do. A Western paper thinks that the Pope has the better claim to pre-eminence, since he is the bigger humbug. But to us this seems like "snap judgment," for since each, being but a man, claims to be the head of "the only true church," how can the claim of one be any more preposterous than that of the other?

"EVERY Sunday," says the *World*, "which finds thousands of people in our large cities without means of lawful and innocent recreation and refreshment, deepens the popular determination to make our laws conform to the conditions and customs of a cosmopolitan population." The determination ought to be to make our laws conform to justice, and to the natural rights of the citizen. This they can never do as long as they are used to enforce the observance of any religious institution whatever.

THE *Dial*, of Oakland, California, makes the following excellent point on Mrs. Bateham, of Ohio, who is assisting in the California Sunday campaign:—

Mrs. Bateham illuminated her speech at the Presbyterian church, Thursday night, by saying that the people of Washington awoke after twenty years, and found that they had no Sabbath law. Dear Mrs. Bateham, Sister Bateham, do you not know that you have proved too much? See! *Without any law* the sleepy and highly religious people of old Washington observed the Sabbath well—so well as to stand in the front rank of all Sunday observing cities. If this was the result of having no Sabbath laws, why do you complain?

Friend *Dial*, you must not expect Mrs. Bateham to be consistent; but you can depend upon an Oakland audience to appreciate the dilemma in which she has placed herself and the cause which she represents.

MR. JOHN N. STEARNS, Corresponding Secretary of the National Temperance Society, has transmitted to the American Sabbath Union the following resolution, adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Managers of the Society:—

Resolved, That the Board of Managers of the National Temperance Society, in behalf of its membership throughout the Nation, earnestly protests

against the opening of the World's Fair on the Sabbath day.

This strikes us as being a little out of the line of the legitimate business of the National Temperance Society. If the managers want to throw their influence in favor of Sunday closing of the Exposition, they should do it on their own responsibility; they have no right to commit the Society upon such a question.

JOSIAH STRONG, Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, says:—

All laws may be said to limit individual liberty, but just laws restrain each in the interest of all; they draw the circumscribing line only where the liberty of one overlaps that of many. Hence, law in a much larger sense, is the guardian of liberty. This is true of our Sabbath laws. Whatever can be said against them, as infringing personal liberty, may be urged with greater force against our common school laws; they rest on the same foundation and are alike pillars of our free institutions.

Is it a sound conclusion that, "this is true of our Sabbath laws," and that "our common school laws rest upon the same foundation"? By school laws, of course, he means those which require attendance upon school for a stated period. Are laws enforcing compulsory attendance upon school, and laws enforcing compulsory observance of Sunday, parallel? They are not. Why not? Because common school education is a secular matter entirely, between the State and the parent and pupil; but Sunday observance would bring in another factor—God. Do the two rest upon the same foundation? They do not, unless the State is God, and God the State. However, that is just the proposition into which the National Reform doctrine invariably resolves itself.

LAST week we stated in a last-page note, that the Republicans of Wisconsin had declared in favor of the Bennett law; but we had not, at the time of making up our paper, seen a copy of the platform adopted by the convention which renominated Governor Hoard, and we find that we were misled by telegraphic statements, sent out evidently by those whose wish was father to their statements. That part of the Wisconsin Republican platform relating to the Bennett law, is as follows:—

The Republican party in convention assembled, declares its devotion to the common school as the chief factor in the education of the people, and pledges itself to support, strengthen and defend it. It recognizes as valuable auxiliaries in the work of public education the private and parochial schools, supported without aid from public funds, and disclaims absolutely any purpose whatever to interfere in any manner with such schools, either as to their terms, government, or branches to be taught therein.

We affirm the right and duty of the State to enact laws that will guarantee to all children sufficient instruction in the legal language of the State to enable them to read and write the same. We believe that the compulsory education law passed by the last Legislature is wise and humane in all its essential purposes, and we are opposed to its repeal, but at the same time we assert that the parent or guardian has the right to select the time of year and the place, whether public or private, and wherever located, in which his child or ward shall receive instruction, and we pledge ourselves to modify the existing law so that it shall conform to the foregoing declarations.

We further believe that all children between the ages of seven and fourteen years should be protected by appropriate legislation from the evils, physical and mental, arising from their employment in factories and similar places of work, and that adequate provision should be made for the care of children incorrigibly truant.

We are unalterably opposed to any union of Church and State, and will resist any attempt upon the part of either to invade the dominion of the other. We repudiate as a gross misrepresentation of our purposes the suggestion, come whence it may, that we will in any manner invade the dominion of conscience and trample upon parental rights or religious liberty. Our only purpose in respect to the educational policy of the State is to secure to all children within its borders, at the earliest practicable age, proper equipment for the discharge of the ordinary duties of citizenship, and to this end, alike important to the State, to the children, and to the parents of the children, we invite the co-operation and aid of all broad-minded and patriotic people.

This, we take it, comes far short of the indorsement desired by the ultra friends of the Bennett law. *America* says of it:—

While this is not precisely a straddle, it is a campaign manifesto that does not seem to stand squarely on the ground which is expected to witness the triumph of true Americanism in domestic legislation.

It is evident that the friends of the law do not find in the Republican indorsement all that they would wish to find; but it is pretty certain that there is in it all that there ought to be. As we remarked in our note last week, the law as it stands is unworthy the support of either of the great parties, and we are glad to know that it has been fully indorsed by neither party. The State will have very little trouble in guaranteeing to all children sufficient instruction in the English language to enable them to speak and write it. Every foreigner desires his child to have a knowledge of the language of the country, and every child desires such a knowledge for himself; and the fear that any considerable number of children, in any part of this country, will fail to secure the instruction necessary to enable them to read and write English, is practically groundless. The anti-foreign sentiment which is being so assiduously cultivated in certain quarters, would better be directed against foreign paternalism in government, than against the use of foreign languages in our schools. English, which is already the language of commerce in all nations, and which bids fair to supplant the French as the language of diplomacy, will certainly never fall into disuse in any part of this country.

## THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,

DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending towards a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

SINGLE COPY, PER YEAR, POST-PAID, . . . . \$1.00.

In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, . . . . 75c.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid. 5s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.