



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

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 27, 1890.

NUMBER 47.

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.

THE *Union Signal* notes the fact that "the closing work of the Woman's Temperance Alliance (non-partisan) was to vote down, after thorough discussion, a resolution in favor of Sunday closing of the Columbian Exposition, upon the ground that it had nothing to do with temperance." And the Woman's Temperance Alliance did just right.

THE *Burlington Hawk-Eye* was not far wrong, as to the purpose of the National Reformers, when it placed over one of the Sabbath Convention reports, in large headlines, these words: "*The Fourth Commandment! A Series of Conventions to Secure its Observance.*" "We are convinced," says another Iowa paper, in commenting upon this, "that this 'Sabbath-rest' movement originated in a fanatical, religious zeal, and that its success will depend upon the continuous manifestation of such a spirit. Force is the method sought to be employed. The persuasive elements of the gospel have no place in such schemes." And this is the truth.

MR. CRAFTS says:—

When it is asserted that the movement to secure a law of Congress against Sunday work in Government service is really an effort of ecclesiastics to unite Church and State, I am accustomed to hold up some of the petitions that have been smutted by the hands of the toilers as they have signed them while at their work.

Well, when Mr. Crafts denies that the movement which he represents is primarily, and indeed almost wholly, a religious one, we are accustomed to quote his own

words: when asked if the needed physical rest could not be secured without any reference to religion, his answer was, "Take the religion out and you take the rest out." And so we say, Take the religious motive out of Mr. Crafts's work and there would not be energy enough left to move a thistle-down.

The Civil Sunday.

AT the National Reform Convention held in Washington City last spring, Judge M. B. Hagans, of Cincinnati, gave a long address upon the "civil Sabbath." The first half of it was devoted to a historic parallel which he finds between the time of Nehemiah and our own. And of the time of Nehemiah, he says:—

Both Jews and Gentiles were guilty of performing what the American statutes on this subject denominate common labor on the Sabbath, and were clearly violating the command of God which subjected the Jews, at least, to the severest penalties and direst judgment.

But, says Mr. Hagans:—

Nehemiah was not troubled with the modern contrivances of police courts, grand juries, witnesses and jury trials, and I may add lawyers, in enforcing his authority as both mayor and chief of police, so to speak, in Jerusalem.

Indeed he was not. The form of government under which Nehemiah acted was a theocracy. It was a government of God and the laws were the laws of God. Nehemiah was only the representative of God, and needed not to be troubled with the modern contrivances which Judge Hagans mentions. After showing the summary effects of the triumphant result of Nehemiah's action, it seemed to dawn upon the mind of Mr. Hagans that his example was proving too much both for the "civil Sabbath" and for all systems of government; consequently he attempted to apologize after this sort:—

Now, I am not here to commend or approve such proceedings against our modern violators of Sabbath laws, except in so far as they may find authority in the statutes of several States of this Union. Under our institutions the wielding of such summary power would be highly dangerous, indeed im-

possible and wrong to the last degree. But, oh, that we had mayors with the resolution and backbone of Nehemiah!

Well, if under our institutions the wielding of such summary power would be dangerous, and impossible, and wrong to the last degree, what in the world does he want with mayors, with the resolution and backbone of Nehemiah, who he says was both mayor and chief of police? Suppose they had in Cincinnati such a mayor as Nehemiah, what could that mayor do so long as he was "troubled" with "the modern contrivances" of police courts, grand juries, witnesses, jury trials, and lawyers? What then would become of his resolution and backbone? And if Nehemiah had been troubled with these contrivances would it have been possible for his resolution and backbone to accomplish the summary result which Judge Hagans applauds?

The Judge's apology is as bad as the presentation of the example for which he found it necessary to apologize. The trouble is that he endeavored to fit two things together which are absolutely incongruous. The example of Nehemiah never can be cited as a precedent on any subject under any form of government but a theocracy, and when it is cited as an example in any instance in the United States, it can be so only upon the theory that the government of the cities or States of the Union and the Union itself should be a theocracy, and should dispense with such "modern contrivances" as police courts, grand juries, witnesses, jury trials, and lawyers. In other words, dispense with the modern contrivance of government by the people.

This also shows the utter impossibility of advocating Sunday laws upon any other than a religious basis. A theocracy is essentially a religious government. Sabbath laws belong only with a theocracy. Sunday laws being advocated upon a theory that Sunday is the Sabbath, likewise are inseparable from a theocratical theory of government. In such a theory Sunday laws originated—with such a theory they belong, and every argument in behalf of Sunday laws is, in the nature of the case,

compelled to presuppose a theocratical theory of government.

Nor can this result be avoided by calling it the "civil Sabbath." To call it the "civil Sabbath" and then attempt to support it as such by arguments, everyone of which rests upon a theocratical basis, is simply to demonstrate that the title of "civil Sabbath" is simply a contrivance to save appearances, and is essentially a fraud.

After having argued what he called a "civil Sabbath," through nearly fourteen columns of the *Christian Statesman*, persistently asserting all the time that it is civil, yet being forced by the necessity of the case to argue for it as religious, he closes his long disquisition with these words:—

Such a day, if no more than the civil Sabbath, observed according to the requirements of law, will furnish a perpetual education to the soul, bringing refreshment to the body, and turn the hearts of men to Him who made the Sabbath for man.

If such a result as that can follow the observance of a "civil Sabbath" according to the requirements of the law of the States of this Union, then what need is there of any other means to furnish perpetual education to the soul and turn the hearts of men to God? And if that would be the effect of statutes enforcing a civil Sabbath, what could be the effect of statutes enforcing the religious Sabbath? The education of the soul and the turning of the hearts of men to Him who made the Sabbath for man are religious exercises. Any law or any effort which will accomplish this is religious and nothing else, and when a statute, though called civil, is intended to accomplish any such purpose it is a religious statute.

When such a long disquisition, by such a man, upon the civil Sabbath, follows such a course and ends in such a way, as does this by Judge Hagans, it is as clear a demonstration as needs ever to be, that Sunday legislation is religious legislation, and that only; that Sunday laws are religious laws and nothing else, and that the "civil Sabbath" is only a mask for the religious Sunday.

A. T. J.

Old Time Moral Laws.

THIS was a period when the so-called "blue laws" were most rigorously enforced, not only in Connecticut, with which tradition associates them, but in Massachusetts. In the former colony no food or lodging could be given to a Quaker, Adamite or other heretic. No one could run on the Sabbath day or walk in his garden or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting. No one could travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair or shave on the Sabbath day. No woman could kiss her child on Sabbath or fasting day. Whoever brought cards into the colony paid a fine of five pounds.

No one could read the Book of Common

Prayer, keep Christmas or saints' days, make minced pies, dance, play cards, or play on any instrument of music except the trumpet, drum, or jewsharp. Liquor drinking was regulated, and the use of tobacco was tinkered incessantly. No one under twenty-one years, nor any one not previously accustomed to it, could take tobacco without a physician's certificate. No one could take it publicly in the street or in the fields or woods, except on a journey of ten miles. Nor could any one take it in any house in his own town with more than one other person taking it at the same time. This last injunction was leveled at the so-called "tobacco parliaments." About 1645 the Massachusetts magistrates were greatly troubled that the people would tell lies. — *Weeden's "First One Hundred Years."*

That was paternalism in government pure and unadulterated! And that is what the National Reformers are using their untiring efforts to again bring into force in this country in the ostensible interests of the "poor workingman." Their paternal care for him seems to be more in the matter of resting on the first day, than in providing work for him the other six days in the week, as thousands of men in enforced idleness can testify.

President Westbrook on the Bible in the Schools.

"SHALL the Bible be read in the public schools?" was the subject of a speech by President Westbrook, at the Portsmouth Secular Congress. He, of course, gave a negative answer to the question, and supported it by the following reasons (actual and so-called), which he dwelt upon at considerable length:—

1. Because there is no common agreement as to what constitutes the Bible.
2. Because there is no common agreement as to what parts are historical and what parts are allegorical.
3. Because there is no common agreement as to what doctrines are taught in the Bible.
4. Because it contains so much that is cruel and obscene.
5. Because the moral is so mixed up with the immoral that there is great danger of contamination by contact.
6. We might just as well go one step further and say that we object to the reading of the Bible in our State schools because of its defective morality.
7. Because the teachers can so manipulate it in reading as to favor their own particular views.
8. Because it would not secure the object contemplated.
9. Because it is a violation of the secular principle of the Constitution of the United States, and of the Constitutions of the several States, which forbids the teaching of sectarianism at the public expense.

We quite agree with Doctor Westbrook in his conclusion, namely, that the Bible has no proper place in the public school; but must dissent from several of his "reasons." Indeed, the last three are about the only real reasons given, and one of them will hardly bear investigation. We

will examine the several reasons by number.

1. It is true that there is no common agreement as to what constitutes the Bible, but that fact is not a *reason* why it should not be read in the schools. There is universal agreement as to what constitutes the Book of Mormon and the Westminster Confession of Faith; yet it would not be proper to read them in the public schools. The reason that the Bible is rightfully excluded is because it is a religious book, and the State cannot properly teach religion.

2. The Doctor's second reason is of no more force than the first. It is true that the difference of opinion to which he alludes does exist, but even if there were perfect agreement on this point the reading of the Bible in schools supported in whole or in part by the State, would be no less objectionable than it is now. Were this not the case a book of selections might be compiled embracing only such passages as are universally admitted to be either historical or ethical. But the fact is that the entire value of the Bible is due to the fact that it is religious; it belongs therefore to a realm beyond the jurisdiction of the State, and therefore the State should let it alone.

3. A common agreement as to the doctrines of the Bible would not alter the case one particle. It is not the business of the State to teach religion, and no agreement, however perfect, could possibly give to civil government a jurisdiction that does not naturally belong to it.

Reasons 4, 5, and 6, are substantially the same, and are utterly false and misleading. The Bible is so far from being an immoral book that it contains the purest morality. But it is not our purpose to dwell on that phase of the question. The Bible is not a football to be kicked about between contending parties and to be judged by school-boards. The State has no right to sit in judgment upon it and to decide that it is too immoral to be read in the public schools. Even President Westbrook must admit this, for if one State or one school board could properly exclude the Bible because in its opinion the book is immoral, another State or another school board might properly admit it because in its opinion it is moral. The very nature of the book places it above the jurisdiction of States and of school-boards. It comes to us as a supernatural thing, a revelation from God, and thus appeals to the consciences of men, and binds them under penalties entirely beyond the power of human governments either to enforce or to remit. This it is that places it beyond the domain of civil government and removes it far beyond the jurisdiction of school-boards and town meetings.

Each man must accept or reject the Bible for himself, and the consequences of his decision he must abide. It is a matter

between his own soul and his God, and the State has no right to exert its influence to turn him either this way or that.

To put it in the most concise form, President Westbrook and those who hold with him, object to the Bible in the school *because they do not believe it*; this being the case did they believe the Bible they would stand shoulder to shoulder with those who demand that it shall be read in our public schools. But by assuming this position they virtually demand that the State shall decide that the Bible is not the word of God; but the State has no more right to make such a decision than it has to decide the contrary. To say that the State shall decide that the Bible is not the word of God, that it is, on the contrary, an immoral book unfit to be read in public, is to assent that it might properly decide that it is a moral book and decree that it shall be read in the schools. The only tenable and consistent position is to demand that the State shall let the question severely alone.

C. P. B.

Sunday Laws of Europe.

AN earnest effort will unquestionably be made this winter to secure a re-enactment of the Sunday law by our Legislature.

Rev. N. R. Johnston of this city is one of those most actively engaged in this project of reviving the old penal Sunday legislation, which some years ago was abolished. Mr. Johnson sends to an evening paper a summary of recent legislation in some European countries on this subject, and seems to think that we in California should follow suit. From this summary it appears that in Austria, in order that the printers may have a rest day, it has been decreed that no newspapers shall publish a Monday morning issue, and in Germany the Socialists have introduced a bill before the Reichstag "forbidding all industrial occupations on Sundays and holidays."

Despotic governments, in which there is an established religion, may with some consistency enact such arbitrary laws, but in this free country, where the Constitution provides against the establishment of any religion, they are absolutely out of place. Does Mr. Johnston imagine that our people would enact a law like that in Austria forbidding the issue of a Monday morning paper because work on it has been done on Sunday? Or does he suppose it would be possible here to secure and enforce a law like that which the German Socialists ask for, forbidding all industrial occupations on Sundays and holidays? Mr. Johnston is an intelligent man and he is well aware that our Constitution, as it stands, does not favor but opposes such legislation as this which, though nominally in the interests of the laboring man, is really in the interests of a religious creed; and it is for that reason, undoubtedly, that

he has joined the "National Reform Society," as it is called.

The avowed object of this Society is so to amend the United States Constitution as substantially to make what is called "Evangelical Christianity" the established religion. Mr. Johnson is doubtless honest and sincere in his opinions favorable to such changes, but he will find that the people do not want and will not have them.—*Morning Times, Oakland, Cal.*

Sound Advice.

It seems that out in Oregon some barbers have sent up a petition to the Legislature, asking it to compel them to close their shop on Sunday; and upon this the *Free-thought*, of San Francisco, pointedly comments as follows:—

The barbers of Oregon ought to have more sense than they display in the petition for Sunday-closing laws which they are circulating. Some of them desire to close their shops on Sunday, as they have a perfect right to do, and for that reason they ask that those who do not share their wish shall be forced to coincide with them. Here is the petition to the Legislature, circulated for signatures in Portland, East Portland, Albina, and Astoria, and which is to be presented all over the State:—

We, the undersigned, being engaged in the business of barbering in the State of Oregon, and wishing to have one day of rest each week, most respectfully petition your honorable body to enact a law making it unlawful to keep open any barber-shop or to carry on or conduct the business of barbering on Sunday.

The Legislature of the State should reply to this petition somewhat as follows:—

Gentlemen of the Barbering Business:—Your petition asking that a law be passed making it unlawful to keep open any barber-shop or to carry on or conduct the business of barbering on Sunday, has been received. In reply this honorable body would state that it will do nothing of the sort, for the following reasons:

First, It does not own the barber-shops of the State, and therefore has no control over them.

Second, This honorable body has no power to declare any business unlawful on one day of the week that is lawful upon other days of the week.

Third, It is beyond the scope of this honorable body to provide rest-days for barbers or for those engaged in any business or calling; but, on the other hand, this honorable body will not interfere if the barbers choose to rest not only one day of the week but seven. We would respectfully refer the matter to the gentlemen engaged in the business of barbering.

Fourth, This honorable body would respectfully suggest that there may be persons engaged in the barbering business who would prefer to accommodate their customers by shaving them on the first

day of the week, commonly called Sunday. This is their right, and we cannot interfere with it.

Fifth, Those of our petitioners who desire to rest on Sunday are cordially invited by us, and not only invited but urged to do so. It is clearly within their right, and we will protect them in it. To this end, it would be advisable for proprietors of barber-shops to carefully lock the doors of their places of business on Saturday night, and to refrain from unlocking them on Sunday morning or at any time throughout the day. It is already provided by law that any person forcing or breaking his way into a barber-shop is liable to arrest and punishment for felony.

Sixth (and lastly), We should regard such a law as you propose as an impertinence and an invasion of individual rights. As aforesaid, we respectfully decline to pass any such law. It is our function to protect liberty, not to outrage it.

Religion in the Schools.

A CONFERENCE of the Protestant denominations of the State of New York, called to discuss the question of "moral instruction in public schools," and to devise methods for its furtherance, was held in the council room of the University of New York, on November 17 and 18, with Rev. Howard Crosby in the chair. Delegates to the number of about fifty were present from all parts of the State, representing different denominations. The Baptists, alone, refused to take part in the Conference, taking occasion, in declining the invitation, to express themselves as unalterably opposed to the teaching of religion in the public schools of the State. The Secretary of the Conference in reporting the attitude of the different denominations toward the purpose of the meeting attempted to break the force of this positive expression of opinion from the Baptists by saying that they had evidently misapprehended the purpose of the Conference, but the clear and succinct statement of their reasons for failing to send delegates, contained in their reply to the call, was sufficient evidence that they understood the ultimate result to which these movements tend even better than those who planned and called the meeting.

The views and purposes which the Conference was intended to develop may be drawn from the subjects of the addresses upon the programme, which was accurately followed. The following are the topics for discussion:—

1. "The problem before us;"
2. "How can religious teaching in public schools be secured and rendered effective?"
3. "Statistics of moral instruction and religious exercises in the public schools of the State;"
4. "What do our Constitution and laws hold as to religious teaching in public schools?"
5. "What does expediency dictate as to any religious exercises in public schools?"
6. "How far does expediency dictate that State-supported schools should inculcate the principles of

morals and religion?" 7. "What should be the ground and character of the instruction in morals in our public schools?" 8. "What should this Conference do to carry out its views upon this subject?"

William Allen Butler struck the keynote in sympathy with the feeling which was apparently held by the majority of those present when he said:—

We find that while there is in this State an absolute divorce of Church and State and a controlling mandate against interference by the State with the freedom of religious opinion and worship, there is not and never has been, any divorce between Christianity and the State, or between the State government in its administration and the Christian religion as revealed in the Scriptures. On the contrary, it was settled long ago, and cannot now be disputed, that Christianity is a part of the common law of this State, as it was a part of the common law of England, at the time when New York ceased to be a Colony of Great Britain and became a sovereign State.

It was Mr. Butler's conclusion that the laws of the State would uphold the Department of Public Instruction in requiring religious instruction in the public schools to a specified extent. This address was extremely well received by the Conference and voted to be published and given a wide distribution. The address, however, did not meet the views of all. One delegate took exceptions to it in an able speech during which he very properly characterized the argument drawn from Blackstone's declaration that "Christianity is part of the law of the land," as arrant nonsense in fact, however strong it might be in legal precedent. Rev. W. H. Ward, editor of the *Independent*, also shocked the general sense of the meeting by saying:—

We may consider it as settled that religion is not to be taught in the public schools. The American people will not trust the State to teach religion.

Although these unexpected differences of opinion threw something of a damper upon the enthusiasm of the meeting, still the business committee reported favorably a series of resolutions, which were adopted, in which it was declared that the State and religion were inseparable, and that the practical truths of religion should be inculcated in the public school system. A committee of from one to three from each Protestant denomination in the State was appointed to carry on the work, and further the interests of "moral instruction in the public schools." W. H. M.

Deference to Public Opinion.

THE Christian will do *his duty* regardless of public opinion. Though not indifferent to the good opinions of his fellow-men, and carefully avoiding all appearances even of wrong, yet he will never allow the views of his fellows to become a motive for action or non-action. Public opinion must not become conscience. Whatever the Word of God, and our conscience in obedience to the Word of God and the exigencies of the time demand, that must be done whether the world look

sweet or sour. Every one is individually responsible to his God, he is not accountable to public opinion. Nearly everything good and great which has benefited the race, has been done, at the time in direct violation and contradiction of men's preconceived notions and opinions.—*The Vin-dicator*.

Memorials of 1829-30. No. 2.

SUNDAY LEGISLATION AN ANTI-REPUBLICAN UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

To the Honorable, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, memorialists of the town of Newark, county of Essex, and State of New Jersey, being apprized of the numerous petitions presented to your honorable body, praying a repeal of the present laws for the transportation of the mails and the opening of the post-offices on the first day of the week, beg leave (in accordance with their sense of duty) humbly to memorialize your honorable body, and pray that no such repeal be made, nor any law be enacted interfering with the Post-office Department, so as to prevent the free passage of the mail on *all* days of the week, or to exclude any individual from the right to receive his papers on the first, as well as on the seventh day.

Notwithstanding, your memorialists have the fullest confidence in the wisdom and integrity of our national Legislature, they are induced to memorialize your honorable body at this time, from a fear lest the reiterated efforts of bigotry and fanaticism should finally prevail on your honorable body to legislate upon a subject which your memorialists consider is, by the Constitution of these States and the laws of nature, left free; and which, for the welfare of mankind, should be maintained so. Nor can they at this time refrain from expressing their astonishment at, and their disapprobation of, the reiterated and untiring efforts of a part of the community, who, through misguided zeal or ecclesiastical ambition, essay to coerce your honorable body into a direct violation of the principles of the Constitution, by the enactment of laws, *the object of which would be to sustain their peculiar tenets or religious creeds*, to the exclusion of others; thereby uniting ecclesiastical and civil law, and leading ultimately to the abhorrent and anti-republican union of Church and State.

Your memorialists would not presume to remonstrate, were it not that their opponents (after a most signal defeat in last Congress) have renewed their petitions with a vigor increased by disappointment, and a spirit as perseveringly determined as their premises are illiberal and unwarrantable.

Your memorialists approve of morality, reverence religion, and grant to all men equal rights, and are governed by the principles of our Constitution and the laws of our land; but we deprecate intolerance, abhor despotism, and are totally opposed to all attempts of the religions of any sect to control our consciences.

Nor can your memorialists perceive wherein their opponents are deprived of their liberty of conscience by the uninterrupted course of the mails, for if it be right for them to travel on the first day of the week, it cannot be wrong for the mails; if it be consistent for them to do *their* business on the first day of the week, it cannot be inconsistent for the mails to be made up and opened, and papers delivered, on the same day; if the traveling *they* do, and the labors they perform, are matters of necessity, and therefore admissible, your memorialists humbly suggest whether the interests of a *vast majority of the citizens of the United States*, conveyed by mails, are not matters of as great necessity?

Your memorialists, in accordance with these views, beg leave to protest against any interference with the transportation of the mails, or the distribution of letters at the post-offices, on the first day

of the week. And your memorialists, as in duty bound, will ever pray, etc. January 8, 1830.*

It will be seen from the foregoing that the reasons for the opposition of these petitioners to Sunday legislation was not on account of any opposition to the Christian religion, but like Madison's memorial in Virginia in 1775, these memorials were prompted by reverence for, and interest in that religion. There is no doubt whatever that the religious denominations are in a much better condition morally in the United States, unaided by Government, than they would have been had they all these years received assistance from the civil power. W. A. BLAKELY.

The Source of Government.

PUBLIC sentiment is a greater force, sometimes, than law; it compels more perfect obedience. In actual fact, there are people who would and do break laws to which the public are indifferent, who are most careful to respect public sentiment. The question may be asked, What is public sentiment? It is public intelligence. As the honest old Greek declared centuries ago, the character of a city is shown by the men elected to control its affairs; or, as a recent political economist puts it, "You complain of the character of the men in your State Legislature; they represent the average character of the people who placed them in power." So it is true that the standards of any community express the average character of that community. There may be a few whose standards are higher than the public standard represents, as there are sure to be some below the standards expressed; but the social, educational, sanitary conditions of every community are up to the standard that the greatest number in that community desire—no better, no worse.—*Christian Union*.

Should Be Taxed.

A CHICAGO paper has the following relative to untaxed church property in that city:

There is a vast amount of untaxed property in Chicago controlled by religious denominations. Although there are fewer Catholics than Protestants in the city, the former own 1,108 lots to the latter's 866. The average sites of the Catholic churches are larger than those of the other denominations. Fifteen lots are occupied by the Catholic Church of the Nativity. St. Columbkil Sisters of Charity have sixty-eight lots; the Jesuit Church of the Holy Family eighty lots. Nearly one-third of all the Catholic land in the city is the property of the archbishop. Of this, much is unimproved; some of the land is occupied by tenants from whom a revenue is received. A very moderate estimate of the value of all the lots in the city held by

* Published by authority of Congress in 1834.

religious bodies puts it at \$2,094,000, with the statement that it is probably twice that amount. All this property is exempt from taxation under the laws of the State of Illinois. The value of these lots is increasing rapidly, and the "unearned increment" in a few years, will make the societies that own them enormously wealthy, like the Trinity corporation in New York, for instance; and yet while the people are groaning under the burden of taxation imposed by the city government, these valuable lots enjoy the protection of the law and the advantages of a great city, without paying one cent of taxes. In other words the people generally who own property are taxed to enrich religious societies. This is most unjust and will result in evil.

Is It so Doubtful?

"THERE is not," says the *Denver News*, "one chance in a thousand that the legislation advocated by Mr. Crafts will be enacted. It is very doubtful if five million adult persons could be found in the United States to favor it, when its scope is understood. The misfortune is that in trying to stamp Sunday with a character that is repugnant to our civilization, there is danger of repelling millions of people from its support as a day of national rest from toil. No more efficient means can be found for antagonizing all Sunday laws than an attempt to force the religious convictions of one class on another in respect to Sunday observance."

"Dr. Crafts refers to the Sunday legislation on the statutes of many of the State as proof that public opinion would sustain the legislation he wants. It is true that many laws are in existence which do not accord with the grand conception of religious liberty that was entertained by the founders of our Government, and that was given expression in the national Constitution for Federal guidance. But Mr. Crafts might have added that in most cases such laws have no force, no attention being paid to them—which is a truer indication of popular sentiment."

Church and State.

SAID Andrew Melville, a Scotch Presbyterian, to King James VI. of Scotland (James I. of England):—

I must tell you there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland. There is King James, the head of the commonwealth, and there is Christ Jesus, the King of the Church. It is to be understood of these two kingdoms they are both of God. But they have different provinces and jurisdictions and are not to be confounded. One of these is of this world, is set up for the protection of life and property, and uses for this end temporal rewards, pains and penalties. The other is spiritual, and contemplates the spread of the knowledge of God, the promotion of morality, and the production of such graces as faith, and hope and charity. Its rewards and penalties stretch beyond this world into the other.

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.

A Rabbi on Religious Liberty.

[The following paper is a speech delivered by Rabbi David Phillipson before the late Secular Congress at Portsmouth, Ohio. It has not previously appeared in print, and at our request was furnished to us by the Rabbi for publication in THE SENTINEL. The paper is a manly discussion of the question; the introduction, a merited rebuke to those who would make secularism and infidelity synonymous terms. Space has compelled us to somewhat abridge this paper.]

It may appear strange to many to see a preacher on this platform. I must confess that after some things I heard last night, it appears somewhat strange to me also, but as I have never been given to running away I shall stand my ground here, too. When I was requested to deliver an address before this body I was informed upon inquiry as to the purpose of this Union, that it had been formed with the object of emphasizing the necessity of the separation of Church and State in all their departments. Being in thorough accord with this, I consented to come, and I expected that all the addresses would be devoted to elucidating the principles of religious liberty in its various lights. I was not prepared to hear statements such as were uttered here last night: fierce attacks upon the Bible, upon religion, upon the preachers, etc. I feel inclined to cry to the speakers, "Shoemaker, stick to your last."

If this society has been formed to promulgate the principles of the separation of Church and State, then why not stick to this text? It seems to me that well-nigh anything but this was spoken about. For example, last night we heard the Bible called a barbarian book. If the Bible were understood, no such expression would be applied to it by even the greatest extremist. It is true, and I do not for a moment deny, that there are passages in the book which designate a lower state of morality than we have reached to-day. It is true that there are sections which we would not have our children read, but

with all that there is no justification for calling it a barbarian book.

If it were fully understood that the Bible represents in its various books a religious development, that it is the record of the religious progress of the Jewish people from idolatrous and anthropomorphic beginnings to the religion of the prophets, one God and one humanity, a point that the world has not come to even to-day, no one would be guilty of naming it a barbarian book. It says among other things in that Bible, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Would you call this a barbarian book? It says in that Bible, "Thou shalt not oppress the stranger." Would you call this a barbarian book? The fifteenth psalm in that Bible, in answer to the question, "Who shall dwell in God's holy place?" answers, "He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness and speaketh the truth in his heart; that uttereth no calumny with his tongue. Doeth no evil to his neighbor and bringeth no reproach on his fellow-man; in whose eyes the despicable is despised, but that honoreth those who fear the Lord; that sweareth to his own injury and changeth not; that putteth not out his money for interest and taketh no bribe against the innocent." Would you call this a barbarian book? The prophet Micah states as the highest object of life, "To do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God." Would you call this a barbarian book? These are but a few sentences which occur to me as I stand here; numberless others of like import could be quoted. Surely they do not sound very barbarous.

It must never be forgotten that the Bible is at once a historical record of the Jewish people, and the storehouse of eternal truths. The portions of the book dealing with the life of the people in Palestine are of historical value only; the other parts are the everlasting and undying truths by which, and through which, mankind has been helped onward and upward; they will endure forever, for truth is undying, and they express the truth of religion and morality, the truth of God. Whatever else they are they are not barbarian, for in many instances the words of the prophets and psalmist still stand above our vaulted civilization, and not the most bitter opponent of the Bible will call our civilization barbarian. But enough of this.

Another speaker of last evening made a savage attack upon the preachers. (Here the speaker took occasion to answer this also, and to show how this had nothing to do with the subject in hand). After this introduction, called forth by what I heard here last night, I will proceed to a discussion of the theme for the consideration of which I came to this meeting.

The principle of the separation of Church and State lay at the foundation of this Government, and if during the hundred

years of its constitutional existence the American Nation has grown false to its inheritance, if there is any danger that this bulwark of our liberties be overthrown (and the very foundation of a society of this kind is proof of the existence of this danger), then can we none too strongly by word of mouth and of pen, and by active interference protest against it, for it is the mission of the American Republic the duty it owes to itself and to the world, to the present and the future, to realize the fullest demands of liberty, and among the very first of these demands is the erection of a separating wall between Church and State in all their departments, as is so well set forth in the platform of this society. But you will pardon me if before I discuss the bearings of this subject in the present, I ask you to transport yourselves with me to the closing half of the last century, for then it was that the spirit of liberty awoke, and the beginnings which resulted in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of this country were laid in thought.

If we look to England we find the speeches of Burke, Fox, and Chatham, full of statements asserting the rights of man and emphasizing the necessity of separating religion from civil government; if we look to France, there are the writings of the Encyclopediac philosophers, of Diderot and Rousseau, there are the speeches of Mirabeau, the leaders of thought who were largely instrumental in hastening the coming of the cataclysm, the French Revolution, which marks the commencement of a new era in European history; the writings of these Frenchmen also largely influenced the minds of the founders of this Government. If we look to Germany, there was Kant in philosophy, whose reasonings inaugurated a new philosophical *regime*; there was Schiller, the literary apostle of freedom; there was Lessing, the noble and pure, who, in his beautiful drama, *Nathan the Wise*, preached the strongest sermon on religious toleration that the world had yet heard.

It was a remarkable period; men were throwing off the influences of old traditions; there was a wondrous activity of thought everywhere, a restiveness as though men were conscious of a vast impending change; the weight of ecclesiastical authority had rested most heavily upon mankind; there had been no such thing thought of as the separation of Church and State until this time; and even now, though many a voice was heard, yet few dwelt distinctly upon the proper province of each, and I wish to bring to your notice this morning one of these forgotten advocates of the principle that forms the basis of this Union.

I refer to the German Jewish philosopher, Moses Mendelssohn, who died in the year 1784. The Jews had no rights whatever in the Germany of that day—no

rights as citizens, no rights as men. I will not dwell upon their condition, the same in Germany as all Europe; for the treatment of the Jews by men and governments forms one of the blackest pages in the history of the world.

In spite of all the disadvantages to which he was subject, Mendelssohn rose to a very high position in the world of thought. He contested successfully with Kant, Germany's greatest philosopher, for the prize offered by the Berlin Academy of Sciences for the best philosophical treatise; he wrote the *Phaedon*, modeling it after Plato's work of the same name and treating the same subject, the immortality of the soul; his nature was so pure, his disposition so gentle, that he was called the German Socrates; his style and diction were so clear that Kant wrote that Mendelssohn's style seemed to him more fitting than any other to convey philosophical ideas clearly. One of the last books that he wrote he called "Jerusalem," and in the first part of this book he discusses the relation between Church and State.

The following sentences are extracts from Mendelssohn's treatise: "One of the greatest problems of politics is to determine the proper relation between Church and State, between civil and religious rights, so that they may not encroach upon one another nor become burdens of our social life, encumbering it with greater difficulties than attach to it naturally." "Church and State both have the mission to further human happiness, each in its own way." "Neither Church nor State has any right to prevent any man from enjoying the free exercise of his opinions." "The State has no right to appoint men to teach and enforce certain special religious opinions. Its duty in this respect consists only in appointing teachers who shall instruct the children in wisdom and virtue, and who shall spread such useful truths as the happiness of human society depend upon." "The State has nothing to do with opinions which any ruling or any subjected church or synagogue accepts or rejects; it has only to be mindful that no doctrines be spread which are subversive of the public weal; it must be watchful only of the observance of these principles in which all agree, without the realization of which in the life of the people happiness would be only a dream and virtue itself no longer virtue. Naturally the State has no right to exclude any person from the enjoyment of political right on account of his religion, because, properly speaking, if each will cultivate its own premises there can never be any collision between Church and State. Neither Church nor State has any right to arrogate to itself in matters of belief any further right than the right to teach, any further power than the power to convince, any further weapon than the weapon of reason."

All these sentences which I have quoted

are commonplaces now. . . . But we must not forget that these thoughts were expressed over one hundred years ago, and that in Germany, at least, the Jew, Mendelssohn was the first who raised his voice calling for the separation of Church and State. He felt and knew of how much unhappiness and misery, of how much war and bloodshed, of how much intolerance and fanaticism, this unholy alliance had been the cause, and in the name of pure reason and clear philosophical insight he protested against it; and it was because of this protest, uttered in this little work, that Mirabeau, the French intellectual giant, who lived and died for man's freedom, declared that this book, "Jerusalem," deserved to be translated into every language of Europe."

That book was written over a century ago, in the days of Washington and Jefferson, of Franklin and Madison, the same thoughts were agitating men in entirely different quarters of the globe. Has the world made as great progress as it should since that time? Have men become thoroughly and perfectly imbued with the idea that Church and State have each their own proper work? To those who observe and think, a backward movement is apparent in this our own day. Attempts have been made time and again to foist religion upon the Constitution, and although I am a minister of religion I shall always raise my voice in warning against any such attempt, for the world has never known any greater curse than this intermeddling of the Church in the affairs of the State.

For centuries men labored beneath this Atlas-load, and now that at last, in this country, at least, the laboring giant, man, has succeeded in throwing it off from his shoulders, who dare move one step toward placing it there again? This nation has, I believe, reached its present point of prosperity because it has kept these two departments distinctly separate. We have rested in the calm security that the liberties we have gained in this respect can never be wrested from us. Perhaps we have been too confident; perhaps we have not been wide enough awake to the attempts of so-called religionists in Washington and elsewhere.

(Concluded next week.)

To legislate for the promotion of the religious observance of any day as a Sabbath, is contrary to the Bible, to the Constitution of a free country and the rights of conscience.—*Sabbath Recorder*.

WHOSOEVER is afraid of submitting any question, civil or religious, to the test of free discussion, is more in love with his own opinion than with truth.—*Bishop Watson*.

DO YOU USE A FOUNTAIN PEN?

Then you need the **COMBINED INK BOTTLE AND PEN FILLER**, consisting of a bottle holding ink sufficient to fill a pen 8 or 10 times, with a Patent Rubber Cork and Filler, all inclosed in a neat wooden case with a screw top, making the safest, most complete, compact, and convenient article for the use of traveling men and others now extant. Weighs when filled with ink less than three ounces.

Imitation Rose-wood case, 25c.
Real Box-wood, " 50c.

Sent post-paid on receipt of price.
Address,
PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

THE SENTINEL LIBRARY

A Semi-monthly Publication
Devoted to the defense of
AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS
And the Preservation of the
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
AS IT IS.
TERMS, 75 CENTS PER YEAR.

The following numbers are now ready, and will be sent to any address post-paid on receipt of price:—

- No. 1 *The National Reformed Constitution.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 2 *Religious Liberty.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 3 *Evils of Religious Legislation.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 4 *The Blair Sunday Rest Bill.* Price, 7 cents.
- No. 5 *The Blair Educational Amendment.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 6 *Purity of National Religion.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 7 *National Reform and Rights of Conscience.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 8 *The American Papacy.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 9 *The Salem Witchcraft.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 10 *National Reform is Church and State.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 11 *What Think Ye of Christ?* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 12 *Bold and Base Avowal.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 13 *The National Reform Movement an Absurdity.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 14 *The Republic of Israel.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 15 *National Reformed Presbyterianism.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 16 *A Lutheran View of the National Reform Movement.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 17 *Religion and the Public Schools.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 18 *The National Sunday Law.* Price, 25 cents.
- No. 19 *Rev. W. F. Crafts Against the Editors of The American Sentinel.* Price, 10 cents.
- No. 20 *Romanism and Civil Liberty.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 21 *Why We Oppose Religious Legislation.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 22 *The American Sabbath Union and Human Rights.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 23 *A Civil Sunday Holiday.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 24 *Blair's Sunday Rest Bill and Joint Resolution, introduced December 9, 1889.* (Exact copies, with notes). Price, 1 cent.
- No. 25 *Civil Government and the Decalogue.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 26 *National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 28 *A Religious Political Movement.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 29 *Arguments on the Breckinridge Sunday Bill. The Object and Price of Exemption Clauses.* Price, 10 cents.
- No. 30 *A Civil Sabbath. What It Amounts to.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 31 *Union of Church and State. What Constitutes Such a Union?* Price, 1c.

Address:
Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
OAKLAND, CAL.
Or, **Atlantic Tract Society,**
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

SIBERIA AND THE NIHILISTS

WHY KENNAN WENT TO SIBERIA,

By **William Jackson Armstrong,**

(Late Inspector General of United States Consulates.)

This is one of the most intensely interesting and thoroughly reliable contributions to literature on Russia and the Nihilists ever published. It comprises Mr. Armstrong's famous lecture on "Siberia and the Nihilists" (delivered first in Cooper Union, New York, and afterwards by special request of many eminent men in Lincoln Hall, Washington), together with some exceedingly interesting letters and newspaper criticisms from the pens of the author and George Kennan, the Siberian traveller.

EVERYBODY SHOULD READ THIS BOOK,

because no one can be intelligent upon the subject of which it treats without familiarity with its contents. Besides, the book is a powerful stimulus to that love of liberty so essential to the maintenance of free Government.

It contains some pointed and caustic criticisms upon Mr. Kennan's defense of the Russian Government after his first visit to that country, and explains

WHY KENNAN WENT TO SIBERIA

the second time. The *Century* articles which were the result of that visit fully justify the position taken, and the statements made by Mr. Armstrong in 1883.

160 PAGES, PAPER COVERS, PRICE 25 cents.

PACIFIC PRESS, NEW YORK, N. Y., and OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.

GOOD FOR ALL TIME!

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW

THIS PAMPHLET CONTAINS THE ARGUMENTS IN BEHALF OF THE RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS, AND IN OPPOSITION TO THE BLAIR SUNDAY-REST BILL, WHICH MR. JONES PRESENTED BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, DECEMBER 13, 1888.

Mr. Crafts has pronounced the report as published

"MIGHTY INTERESTING READING."

And Mr. Jones' comments make it more so. His argument is enlarged to what it would have been without Senator Blair's interruptions, objections, and counter-arguments, and is accompanied with answers to all of his objections and counter-arguments. As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially Legislators, lawyers, judges, and other public men. The argument is based on Scripture and history, constitution and law, showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday bill, an analysis of the Sunday laws and other religious legislation of the different States, the

Sunday-Law Movement of the Fourth Century,
AND THE
Sunday-Law Movement of the Nineteenth Century.
The Methods Used in Securing Indorsements to the Petition for the Blair Bill, and the Workings of Such Sunday Laws as are Proposed for the United States.

The Work Contains **192 Pages** and will be Sent Post-paid on Receipt of **25c.**

Send for it! Read it! Send it to Your Friends!

Address all Orders to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

TEN LECTURES

ON

NASAL CATARRH

Its Nature, Causes, Prevention, and Cure, and Diseases of the Throat, Eye, and Ear, due to Nasal Catarrh; with a chapter of

CHOICE PRESCRIPTIONS

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Medical Superintendent of the Largest Medical and Surgical Sanitarium in the World.

The work consists of 120 pages, and is embellished with a colored frontispiece and **SIX BEAUTIFULLY COLORED PLATES**, besides many illustrative cuts of the throat and nasal cavity in health and disease. This little work costs only 30 cents, and is in great demand.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

HEALTH FOOD CRACKERS

HEALTH produces wealth; and good health can not be made of poor material. The agitation of this health question for some years in the past has created a demand for

HEALTHFUL FOODS,

in the manufacture of which we have for the past ten years been engaged. The demand having constantly increased, we have found it necessary to greatly increase our facilities by the addition of new and the latest improved machinery, etc. We are now well equipped, and prepared to fill all orders, and to extend our business into new fields.

Our Foods and Crackers are made from the choicest grains and are strictly pure, justly entitling them to the name above given.

SAMPLE PACKAGES

Of assorted Health Food Crackers sent post-paid on receipt of fifty cents. Write for descriptive circular and price list to

Battle Creek Bakery Co.,
163 WEST MAIN ST.,
Battle Creek, Mich.

IS THE PAPACY IN PROPHECY?

BY THE

Rev. Thomas W. Haskins, M. A.,
Rector Christ Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

The above is the title of a treatise written by the author at the request of the Ministerial Union of Los Angeles, California. It grew out of a discussion upon the present aspect and aims of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, the author taking the ground that the rise, progress, present and future condition of the temporal power known as the Papacy, or Vaticanism, is outlined in the prophecies of Holy Scriptures with sufficient accuracy to determine what the "Papacy" is, and what is to be its future development and ultimate end.

PAPER COVERS, 25 CENTS.
CLOTH COVERS, 60 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Address,

Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK;
12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.,
Or, **LOS ANGELES CHURCHMAN, 35 California**
Bank Building, Los Angeles, Cal.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET

Neat, cheap, serviceable. They perfectly secure pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it cannot fall out when stooping. Can be easily and safely attached to any part of the clothing. A small investment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or pencil.

PRICES.

- No. 1 Russia leather, for 2 pens 10c.
- No. 2 " " " 15c.
- No. 3 " metal back, 2 pens, 15c.
- No. 4 " " " 20c.
- No. 5 Sealskin, for 2 pens, 15c.
- No. 6 " " " 25c.
- No. 7 Russia Leather, for 4 pens 25c.
- No. 8 Sealskin, " " " 40c.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets superior in every particular to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

THE BEST DUPLICATING INKS

FOR USE WITH

"CYCLOSTYLE," "MIMEOGRAPH,"
"COPYGRAPH."

Or, any Duplicating Process in which a Stencil is used, are the

Celebrated "Redding Inks."

They Dry Fast, will not Blur nor Clog the stencil, Dry or Harden on Roller or Pallet, and are in every way

A SUPERIOR ARTICLE.

Send for Price Lists and Samples of Work Done with these Inks.

REDDING INK CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.



NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 27, 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.

AT a Sunday-law Convention recently held in Burlington, Iowa, President Blanchard, of Wheaton College, said:—

I would like to see the Christian people of this land stand aloof from political men and measures, until office-seekers agree to represent Christian principles in Christian government. If the churches would do this, political aspirants, to a man, would soon send up the cry, "What shall I do to be saved?"

No doubt of it; and the question would have no reference whatever to eternal salvation, but to salvation from political death.

"THE Evangelical Alliance at Boston," says the *Mail and Express*, "demands the closing of the Chicago Fair on Sunday. Religious public opinion all over the country is a unit on the question. The managers of the Fair cannot afford to disregard this potent fact." Certainly that is the verdict of "religious public opinion," but how about the "civil Sabbath" of which we hear so much? What is the matter with the American Sabbath Union's adjustable religio-civil rest day for the poor workingman who doesn't want to rest?

THE *Cumberland Presbyterian*, Nashville, Tennessee, is credited with the following concerning Sunday and the World's Fair:—

We heartily join the protest against the proposition to keep open the coming World's Fair at Chicago on Sundays. It may be that these protests and petitions can be made emphatic and overwhelming enough to prevent this contemplated insult to the Christian religion, this formal abolition of the Sabbath, for it will amount to that.

What a confession for a Christian paper! That which it sets forth as a divine institution, dependent upon the action of the Commissioners of the World's Fair! But bad as this is it is not all that the *Presbyterian* says:—

Those who are to decide the matter are supposed to be Christian men, and they may respect the united voice of Christian people. But to make our protests certainly effective they should carry with them something more than words. Make it certain that a Sabbath-breaking Exposition will not pay, and the Exposition will not dare to break the Sabbath. Some stronger leverage than words and entreaties should be brought to bear on the managers. These managers must make the Fair a financial success. The financial question with them is the tender nerve. The protest that touches that will be effective. If we believe in the Sabbath strongly enough to demand its preservation, to boy-

cott a fair that refuses to preserve it, it will be preserved.

If this means anything, it means, taken in connection with the previous quotation, that the preservation of "the Sabbath" depends upon the success of a threatened boycott!

A LETTER from Fayette, Missouri, dated November 16, contains the information that "William Fritz and Robert Gibb, members of a Seventh-day Adventist Church in Howard County, near Armstrong, Missouri, have been indicted and arrested for performing common labor, on their farms, on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday. The cases are docketed for trial in the Circuit Court at Fayette, Missouri, on Tuesday, December 2, 1890." By this it would seem that Missouri is anxious to put herself on record by the side of Tennessee, Georgia, and Arkansas as among the first to inaugurate a persecuting enforcement of religious laws.

THE *Chicago Times*, of the 9th inst., says:—

All attempts upon the part of the State to interfere with individual rights are inimical to that personal liberty which the Republic engaged to protect, and without which it would be the veriest mockery. When an American shall not have the legal right to follow, without wronging his neighbor, his own bent, observe his own customs, do what he will with his day of rest, worship according to the dictates of his conscience, or, if he so incline, worship not at all, and direct the education of his children, he will be in no better plight than a subject of the czar of all the Russias. Such a day will never come.

We hope our contemporary will prove a true prophet; but R. M. King's recent experience in Tennessee would lead us to think that "such a day" is not so very far in the future, even in this land of boasted freedom.

THE "Pearl of Days," of October 17, has the following from the late Rev. Austin Phelps, D.D., professor in Andover Theological Seminary:—

We live in an age in which individualism in matters of religion has run wild. The waning of authority in the Church has carried with it, on the downward grade, the restrictive duties and courtesies of Christian morals which were once subject to the common conscience of believers, in which now every one does that which is right in his own eyes.

The "Pearl of Days" does not point out the moral, but as the subject of the Doctor's paper, from which these words are taken, was Sunday observance, we presume our contemporary thinks that the State should break down this individualism by civil law and establish a standard for Sunday keeping. Certain it is that the whole work of the Sabbath Union is opposed to individualism. But unlike other systems of religion, Christianity seeks to develop individual character. It teaches men to be men, and to do that which they regard as right, whether others do it or not. It

will be a sad day for both the Church and the country when the power of the State is successfully invoked to destroy this individualism, and to bring all to a common standard regardless of their convictions.

MR. CRAFTS says:—

It is admitted, by our opponent, that it is the province of civil law to enforce man's duties to man, and especially to punish crime against man. It is exactly on this ground that Sunday laws forbid Sunday work and Sunday dissipation, namely, as crime against man. It is grand larceny to take away the toiler's weekly rest day. Ceaseless toil is slow murder.

What is it then to imprison men and take away from them by fines and costs the fruits of their labor for quietly working from choice on their own premises on Sunday, and that after having conscientiously observed another day as they believed in obedience to the law of God? This has been done repeatedly in several States, and laws which make such things possible are still on the statute books of more than one commonwealth. It is a crime against natural rights to rob a man of anything, therefore Mr. Crafts should beware of robbing men of the right to labor on Sunday if they choose so to do. Those who want to keep Sunday have just the same right to keep it that others have not to keep it, but no more.

OF the "Leland Stanford Jr. University," a California paper says:—

The articles of endowment prohibit sectarianism and direct that there shall be taught that there is an all-wise intelligent God, and that the soul is immortal. The sexes will be admitted to equal privileges in every department of study, and preparatory schools will be established for children to bring them up to the standard required for entering upon the University course.

We have no fault to find with this; Senator Stanford has established and endowed the University as a monument to his dead son whose name it bears, and he has a perfect right to have taught in it whatever he sees fit; but the proposed instruction is not unsectarian. Tens of thousands of Christians in the United States do not believe in the natural immortality of the soul, but that immortality is the gift of God, and that it is received only as a gift. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is sectarian.

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.