



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 27, 1891.

NUMBER 34.

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.

“CHURCH and State both have the mission to further human happiness, each in its own way. But neither Church nor State has any right to prevent any man from enjoying the free exercise of his opinions.”

“DESPOTIC governments, in which there is an established religion, may with some consistency enact Sunday laws, but in this free country, where the Constitution provides against the establishment of any religion, they are absolutely out of place.”

FOR the State to favor the Christian religion so that to profess it would promise temporal advantage, would be to put an immense premium upon hypocrisy; and there is already entirely too much of the profession of religion for only what can be gained in this world by it politically, financially, and socially. Moreover, for the State to sanction the evil principle, and promote the practice, would bring upon the country such a flood of corruption as it would be impossible for civil society to bear.

LET us not be misunderstood. We do not deny for an instant, but rather assert forever, that the principles of the Christian religion received into the heart and carried out in the life will make good citizens always. But it is only because it derives its sanction from the divine source—because it is rooted in the very soul and nourished by the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit. This, however, the State of itself can never secure.

This at once carries us into the realm of conscience, upon the plane of the spiritual, and it can be secured only by spiritual forces, none of which have ever been committed to the State, but to the Church only.

Religious Toleration versus Religious Rights.

HON. RICHARD M. JOHNSON well said in 1829, in his report to the United States Senate on Sunday mails:—

If the principle is once established that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum. We shall, if consistent, provide for the erection of edifices for worship of the Creator, and for the support of Christian ministers, if we believe such measures will promote the interests of Christianity. It is the settled conviction of the committee, that the only method of avoiding these consequences, with their attendant train of evils, is to adhere strictly to the spirit of the Constitution, which regards the general Government in no other light than that of a civil institution, wholly destitute of religious authority. *What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are exercised not in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which Government can not deprive any portion of citizens.*

The idea is that free men spurn toleration; and very properly so, too, for that which is *tolerated* is exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence. That is what the word means. Webster says:—

Tolerance. 1. The power or capacity of enduring; the act of enduring; endurance. 2. The endurance of the presence or actions of objectionable persons, or of the expression of offensive opinions; toleration.

Tolerate. To suffer to be, or to be done, without prohibition or hindrance; to allow or permit negatively, by not preventing; not to restrain; to put up with; as, to tolerate doubtful practices.

Toleration. 1. The act of tolerating; the allowance of that which is not wholly approved. 2. Specifically, the allowance of religious opinions and modes of worship in a State when contrary to, or differing from, those of the established church or belief.

That which government merely tolerates it might properly prohibit. Toleration is the granting of an unmerited favor, not the acknowledging of a natural right; hence, in the Virginia convention

of 1776, Madison objected to the use of this word in the Declaration of Rights. It was proposed to provide that all men should “enjoy the fullest toleration in the exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience, unpunished and unrestrained by the magistrate.” But, as noted in “American State Papers,” page 99, Madison opposed the use of the word “toleration.” He pointed out the distinction between the recognition of an absolute right and the toleration of its exercise; *for toleration implies the power of jurisdiction.* He proposed, therefore, instead of providing that all men should “enjoy the fullest toleration in the exercise of religion,” to declare that “all men are equally entitled to the full and free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience.”

In 1827, Lord Stanhope voiced the same sentiment in the British House of Lords. He said: “The time was when toleration was craved by dissenters as a boon; it is now demanded as a right; but the time will come when it will be spurned as an insult.” Philip Schaff and Judge Cooley have also both emphasized the same distinction. The former says: “In our country we ask no toleration for religion and its free exercise, but we claim it as an inalienable right.” The latter declares that in this country we “have not established religious toleration merely, but religious equality.”

Thus it is seen that the distinction between religious toleration and religious rights is not merely a figment of the mind, but a living reality seen and acknowledged not only by lexicographers, but by statesmen. And not only that there is a distinction, but that toleration is opposed to rights, for it is a denial of them. In the face of these facts, how puerile is the claim of the *Christian Statesman* that National Reformers are the real “guardians of freedom”! Folly could scarcely go further.

THE SENTINEL has repeatedly arraigned these self-styled reformers before an intelligent reading public, and has as often

convicted them upon their own testimony as conspirators against religious liberty. But because of a denial which has recently been entered by the *Christian Statesman*, we revert to the subject again.

In the *Statesman* of August 13, of the present year of grace, we find the following "eloquent words," as the *Statesman* puts it "of the lately deceased Dr. Jonathan Edwards, spoken at the National Reform Convention in Cooper Institute, in New York, in 1873:"—

Our objectors, then, may learn that they are merely a body of men who are in their turn feeling the inconvenience of dissent. And they may be reminded that under our proposed amendment all the essentials of their citizenship will be none the less secure to them than they are now.

The atheist is a man who denies the being of a God and a future life. To him mind and matter are the same, and time is the be-all and the end-all of consciousness and of character.

The deist admits God, but denies that he has any such personal control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he ever manifests himself and his will in a revelation.

The Jew admits God, providence, and revelation, but rejects the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ as sheer imagination, or, worse, sheer imposture.

The Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.

These are all, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we can not help. They must be named from him [the atheist]; they must be treated, for this question, as one party.

What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic, for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man. . . . Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon. The atheist may live, as I said, but, God helping us, the taint of his destructive creed shall not defile any of the civil institutions of all this fair land! Let us repeat, atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They can not dwell together on the same continent.

In the light of the plain distinction already noted between toleration and rights, the words of Dr. Edwards are utterly indefensible, except from the standpoint of the bigot; yet the *Christian Statesman* quotes them for the express purpose of defending them. It says:—

The bloody Nero dressed the Christians who were condemned to death in the skins of wild beasts, and gave them to dogs to be devoured. THE SENTINEL imputes to friends of National Reform sentiments and purposes as foreign to their real spirit and designs as those skins were to the hapless victims enshrouded by them, and then summons the watch-dogs of human freedom to make an end of them.

The *Statesman* has placed THE SENTINEL upon the right side. Such sentiments ought to be destroyed by the "watch-dogs of human freedom," and THE SENTINEL is proud to summon them to the work. Nor

do we impute to National Reformers sentiments and purposes foreign to their real spirit. Of the truth of this the *Statesman* itself furnishes the evidence in the very article under review. In its defense of the sentiment uttered by Dr. Edwards, it says:—

He said expressly, "The atheist may live, as I said;" and again: "They [our objectors] may be reminded that under our proposed amendment all the essentials of their citizenship will be no less secure to them than they are now." Though there was "nothing out of hell" which he would not tolerate as soon, yet he expressly declared he would tolerate even the atheist. But he did not propose to surrender to the atheist the Government of the United States.

This is not a disavowal of the mischievous sentiment voiced by Dr. Edwards; it is simply a defense of it; a declaration that National Reform proposes to substitute toleration in this country for rights; they will tolerate the atheist, *i. e.*, all who oppose them, including the Seventh-day Baptists, just as they would tolerate lunatics and conspirators. And this they tell us is the best possible safeguard of religious liberty! Believe it, ye who can! As for THE SENTINEL, it will ever insist that all men are entitled to full and perfect religious liberty, not as a favor to be granted them by government, but as an inalienable right with which they have been endowed by their Creator. The time has come when toleration is spurned as an insult. In this country only cravens would think of accepting it; only bigots would propose it. C. P. B.

"The Sentinel's Slip."

UNDER this heading, *Freethought* of July 25, published a criticism on an article of the writer's, in THE SENTINEL. The "SENTINEL'S slip" consisted, according to *Freethought*, in saying of a true theocracy: "This is, and must ever remain, the perfect ideal government."

The reasons given in THE SENTINEL for this statement are as follows. "God is infinite in goodness and in wisdom. Because he is infinite in goodness, he always *desires* what is best for the people, and what is best for them is always the best for his own honor and glory. Because he is infinite in wisdom, he always *knows* what is best—knows it better than any one man in the nation, and better than the majority of men in the nation. Therefore a true theocracy to every devout believer in God, must ever remain the ideal of government, far in advance of monarchy or republicanism."

Now, even *Freethought*, if it will for a moment lay aside the sectarian prejudice of agnosticism enough to think freely, can not deny one of those propositions. To deny them is to deny the goodness and wisdom of God, and to deny God's goodness and wisdom, is to deny his existence as God. This is atheism, and not agnosticism. *Freethought* may deny that God

ever did or ever will reveal himself to humanity for the purpose of such government, but that does not affect the ideal. It still would be something to dream over and long for.

The Bible asserts that God will thus reveal himself to humanity, and that he will not only give them his perfect law of liberty, but that he will write that law not on statute books merely, but in the hearts of his subjects; so that they will keep it, not from fear of punishment, but because they love it and want to keep it. Thus will all restraint of law be changed to restraint of love, and the perfect ideal be realized in a redeemed world. Now *Freethought* may deny that all this will ever be, but it cannot deny the ideal—it can not deny that if a perfect God saw fit to thus write a perfect law in the hearts of his subjects, it would be the only perfect liberty of which intelligent beings are capable.

Now a perfect ideal is never perfectly realized in an imperfect world, and the writer did not assert that the theocratic ideal was even on the start, perfectly realized by Israel.

The fact is it was never realized at all, for from the very foot of the smoking mountain they rebelled against God. The Israelites were a barbarous, ignorant race, from which the shackles of slavery had just been broken. They were utterly incapable of true liberty, till right ideas of truth and justice had been implanted in their hearts; and yet they were the only people who had preserved, even though imperfectly, the sublime truth of the unity of Deity. That one God sought to reveal himself to them in such a manner as to make them capable of liberty.

He first gave them his perfect law, a law that even *Freethought* can not improve upon. The design of that law summed up, was to bring all men to the worship of this one God, as father; thus uniting them in one family of brothers and sisters, so making them capable of true liberty.

It was necessary to the realization of the ideal of liberty, that this law should be more than written on tables of stone; it must be written in the heart, so that men of their own free will will want to do the things it requires.

God was revealed in infinite love, by the gospel of his promised Son, to do this very work; but this gospel "did not profit them not being mixed with faith in them that heard it."

Even as *Freethought* does to-day, "they stumbled at this stumbling stone," Christ, so rejecting him, the law could not be written in their hearts. Therefore to restrain their brutal passions, and prevent complete anarchy, it was necessary that the motive of fear be brought in play by severe penalties. All those imperfections in the government of Israel, which *Freethought* points out, and which the writer

deplores as much as *Freethought* can, were either the necessities of the barbarism of the times, or the results of that barbarism. In either case they were the result of the *revolt against* the divine ideal of government, which can only be realized by faith, and not the result of its realization. As a true theocracy perfectly realized in the heart of each individual, as it will be in the redeemed world, is the most perfect liberty; so a false man-made theocracy, enforcing its so-called, divine laws, upon the outward man, without power to change the heart into harmony with these laws, is the most perfect of despotisms. It may be that *Freethought*, bound by its prejudice against God and the Bible, and redemption through Christ, can not think freely enough to appreciate these sublime truths, but to the Christian intellect as well as heart, they are evident and precious.

G. E. FIFIELD.

Religious Freedom.

[This article is from the *Denver News*, of August 4. THE SENTINEL is not so sanguine as is the *News* that such laws will ever be obliterated, nor do we agree that the State has any duty whatever in legislating in regard to Sunday from any standpoint any more than any other day. Nevertheless the article is excellent in the main, and is worthy of more than cursory reading.]

THE *News* of yesterday announced the decision of Judge E. S. Hammond, of the United States District Court, in a case of an interesting nature which was appealed from the Supreme Court of Tennessee. R. M. King is a Seventh-day Adventist, and was convicted of Sabbath-breaking by plowing on Sunday, which verdict was sustained in the higher State Court. The Federal judge refused any relief to the defendant, who was remanded to suffer fine or imprisonment. The Court evaded decision upon the constitutionality of Sabbath laws, and reached its conclusion upon the fact that "King was convicted under the process of Tennessee law, and it is not in the province of the Federal Court to review the case, religiously or otherwise, or dictate a prosecution, but if the law has been violated this fact never shields the law-breaker." The Court adds that the offense may be harmless in itself, "because, as the petitioner believes, God has not set apart that day for rest and holiness, and yet if man has set it apart in due form by his law, it must be obeyed as man's law if not as God's law."

This prosecution has gained considerable notoriety, King's case having been espoused by the Adventists of the United States, who secured Don M. Dickinson for the defense. Without doubt it will be taken to the highest tribunal, to test the measure of religious liberty that is guaranteed by the national Constitution.

One more quarter of a century of public schools and other civilizing agencies which are now actively at work will obliterate the last vestige of such laws as that under which King is being persecuted for living

up to his religious convictions. Nor will the repeal of such worn out legislation be at all inconsistent with a proper recognition of the economic value of taking one day out of seven for rest, or of agreeing upon Sunday as that day out of deference to the wishes of the dominant population of the country. But it will be understood and generally accepted that only the moral force of public opinion can be employed to influence such observance, except in particulars necessary to insure freedom and protection to those who regard Sunday as a sacred day to be devoted to religious purposes. It is absurd to assume that King, taught by his religion to observe the seventh day instead of the first, was encroaching upon any one's rights in plowing land on Sunday. The case would be different were King one of a procession, with bands of music, which should choose the hour of Christian worship to parade the streets, to the disturbance of congregations engaged in their devotions. Interference in such an event would be justifiable, because it would be necessary to the freedom of worship which is guaranteed by American organic law.

The conclusions of the United States Supreme Court in King's case will be interesting, and if the record will admit of a decision upon the real issue, the result will be salutary. We badly need a fresh and conclusive ruling which shall maintain the absolute nature of American religious freedom, and the unconstitutionality of all legislation with a religious basis, by which there is discrimination for or against any class of people in this free Nation. The Court can reach no other conclusion without disregarding all precedent that applies to the question.

The principle involved in the King case is of an importance which can not be exaggerated. There has been too much denominational coquetting with both State and national governments in recent years, and it will be well to enforce the distinction which exists between Church and State, in the interest of religion as well as that of civil liberty.

Judge Cooley, in his "Constitutional Limitations," reflects the consensus of American judicial opinion when he says:

He who shall examine with care the American Constitutions will find nothing more fully or plainly expressed than the desire of their framers to preserve and perpetuate religious liberty, and to guard against the slightest approach towards inequality of civil or political rights, based upon difference of religious belief.

Various tests have been suggested by which to judge of the highest type of civilization, one writer premising that it should be measured by the quantity of soap and sugar consumed, others by the percentage of illiteracy, the statistics of crime, and so on. The truest test by far is the degree of respect which the people of a nation have for each other's religious convictions, and the measure of religious

liberty which is secured to them as an inherent right.

It is the glory of our Government that, rightly interpreted, all restraints upon religious liberty have been abolished. In that particular at least we have realized a central feature of Isaac Taylor's "Ultimate Civilization," which undertakes to shadow forth what shall be the condition of society when all the social functions are brought to their highest altitude and perfection. That author, one of the most thorough masters of English style and one of the most learned, says of religious freedom:—

The bandaging of men in respect of their religious convictions and professions and conduct is a restraint which is useless more than any other; for danger on this ground does not come if it be not created; and it is prejudicial more than any other; because religious liberty, in its amplitude and when it is enjoyed by many, does by itself render despotisms impossible.

Sunday Laws Admitted to Be Religious and Not Civil.

How men should conduct themselves toward their fellow-men civil government must decide, but as regards our duty toward God no civil government can of right have anything to do; that rests solely between man and God.

Civil government has nothing to do with what we owe to God, or whether we owe him anything or not, or whether, if we do owe him anything, we pay it or not.

George Washington said: "Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and is to be protected in worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

Our national Constitution provides that the civil Government shall have nothing to do with religion or with what pertains to God, but shall leave that to every man's conscience and his God. As long as he is a good citizen the civil Government must protect him and leave him perfectly free to worship whom he pleases, when he pleases, as he pleases, or not to worship at all, if he pleases.

In 1796, in the treaty made with Tripoli, General Washington declared: "The Government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion."

The very first amendment to the United States Constitution was adopted by the first Congress in 1798: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Our own State Constitution, Article 1., Section 11., provides: "Absolute freedom of conscience in all matters of religious sentiment, belief, and worship shall be guaranteed to every individual, and no one shall be molested or disturbed in person or property on account of religion."

The plea heretofore insisted on, and the

sophism with which some judges have sought to justify their perversion of right, justice, and the sacred provisions of the Constitution, has been that enforced Sunday observance was not a religious but a civil law; Sunday advocates declaring they did not desire a law to enforce religious observance of the day, but a civil law, a sanitary ordinance, their interest not being for the upholding of a religious observance, but loving desire to provide rest for the poor, dear wage-earners.

At last the chief organ of the God-in-the-Constitution and the Sabbath Union fanatics, representing the majority of the Protestant ministers and their churches, admit the truth, that it is not a civil enactment they are working for, but a law to compel religious observance of Sunday.

The following article is from the editorial columns of the *Christian Statesman*, published at Philadelphia, Pa., June 25, 1891:—

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL quotes with approbation the language of the Secretary of the Washington Secular Union in argument against our Sabbath laws: "Workingmen need to sleep at night. Shall we have a civil law decreeing under fine and imprisonment what time all shall go to sleep? Shall we have an act of the council compelling all persons to eat between the hours of 12 and 1? If the people of the United States do not know enough to rest on Sunday or any other day when they need rest, it is certain they much more require a law to send them to bed at night."

This reasoning is valid against those who would take our Sabbath laws exclusively on physiological or economic considerations. But the National Reform Association has not made this mistake. While appreciating the value of the argument from nature, it has always held that the only ultimate foundation for the law of Sabbath rest is found in the law of God, which has reserved one-seventh of man's time from secular uses, has made the right to rest during that portion of the time one of the chiefest of human rights, and made the obligation of rest as binding on States and nations as on individuals.

The object of Sunday laws is wholly religious. The Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, the leading Sunday-law advocate, declared: "Take religion out of the day and you take the rest out."

Joseph Cook, lecturing on Sunday laws (Boston Monday lectures, May, 1887), said:—

The experience of centuries shows, however, that you will in vain endeavor to preserve Sunday as a day of rest unless you preserve it as a day of worship. Unless Sabbath observance be founded upon religious reasons you will not long maintain it.

It being admitted that Sunday is a religious institution, any legislation, national, State, county, or municipal, in regard to its observance must be unconstitutional.

Religious zeal enlists the strongest prejudices of the human mind, and when misdirected (under the delusive pretext of doing God service) excites the worst passions of our nature. When man undertakes to become God's avenger he becomes a demon. Driven by the frenzy of a religious zeal, he loses every gentle feeling,

forgets every claim alike of justice, mercy, and humanity, and becomes ferocious and unrelenting.

If there is a day which the Almighty desires should be exclusively devoted to his worship (and remember the proof, both biblical and historical, is that Saturday, the seventh, and not Sunday, the first, is that day), would it not be better to rely on his almighty power than on the arm of the law?—*Snohomish (Wash.) Eye.*

Nipped in the Bud.

IN the struggle for secularism—for the entire separation of Church and State—the founders of our Government had no easy time. They had to be continually on the watch lest the advocates of State-Churchism should push through some bill incorporating their religio-political ideas into the State polity. In noticing these attempts Madison wrote to Monroe as follows:—

It gives me much pleasure to observe by two printed reports sent me by Colonel Grayson, that in the latter, Congress had expunged a clause contained in the first for setting apart a district of land in each township for supporting the religion of the majority of the inhabitants. How a regulation so unjust in itself, so foreign to the authority of Congress, so hurtful to the sale of the public land, and smelling so strongly of an antiquated bigotry, could have received the countenance of a committee, is truly matter of astonishment.

It is exceedingly fortunate for the American people that this little scheme was thus nipped in the bud; for with a precedent like that, together with the sectarian leanings of some of our legislative bodies, much more money would be likely to find its way into denominational channels than does at present.

An Elder Opposes National Reform.

[THE following letter speaks for itself. The writer has our hearty thanks for his words of cheer.]

EDITOR SENTINEL: I have been taking THE SENTINEL for considerably more than a year, and like it better all the time. It is outspoken for Christianity in its purity, as well as for freedom for the citizens of the commonwealth from all compulsory religion.

I am a ruling Elder in the Presbyterian Church, but would rather lose my right arm than to see any sect or religious party get control of the affairs of the State. We would then have religious bigotry—which has always been the case when and wherever there has been a union of Church and State. There was a time when without giving the subject a little honest, unbiased reasoning, I verily thought we could, as Paul said, do God service by legislating religion into human beings, making Sunday laws and attaching a penalty for their transgression. But if we examine the "Law of love," we shall find that Christ taught us that "Whatsoever ye would that men should

do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets." This being Christ's law, to do otherwise would be unchristian.

It does seem that the eyes of many are blinded to the plain truth as it is in God's revealed word. Said Jesus, "My kingdom is not of this world;" also, "Ye are not of the world even as I am not of the world."

Jesus sent his apostles two and two to preach and teach, and told them to take no staff with them—no weapons of worldly warfare. He will come to take the world at the last day; but if the Scriptures are true He will not find it conquered by a pseudo-religious people by force of arms—by those of whom he said, "Many shall come in my name and shall say, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name and in thy name done many wonderful works?" Such are to go on quarreling and fighting until the great day of Armageddon. No, Christ's law is love, and has nothing in common with the laws of the kingdom of this world. "Keep the Church and State forever separate."

Are National Reformers Christians?

THEY claim to be. They desire to make Christ king of this Nation. They aim to establish by civil law what they call the Christian Sabbath. They are determined to have what they call Christian instruction in our public schools. Verily, on the face of it, it would look as though they were Christians. Further, they are determined to compel all to submit to their regulations, willingly, if they may, forcibly if they must. If a man who does not believe in Sunday sacredness, concludes that he ought, in duty to his family and for the interests of his business, to work upon that day, he must be compelled to do differently.

Now a Christian is a follower of Christ, one who observes his sayings. And to one of the most blessed of his sayings, known all over the world as the "Golden Rule," National Reformers are diametrically opposed: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Matt. 7:12. The term *men* includes more than the National Reformers, or Christians. It means Jew and Gentile, Barbarian and Scythian, Mohammedan and Pagan, believer and atheist. If it be right, therefore, to compel all these classes to observe any of the forms or institutions of Christianity, simply because professed Christians are in the majority, or have the power to enforce obedience, it follows, if National Reformers are Christians indeed, that they believe it would be the duty of the Jew or the pagan to enforce his forms of worship and religious institutions upon Christians, if he were in the majority or had the power.

This is the inevitable conclusion. They

say to the grossest idolater, "We are Christians, and believe the Golden Rule of Christ. Now we desire you to be a Christian. We wish you to observe the institutions of Christianity. If you do not desire to do so, we will compel you so to do." By that they say to him, "This would be just what you ought to do by us—compel observance of your gross idolatry—if our situations were reversed, and the power were in your hands." And if the National Reform theory be correct and Christian, the Golden Rule justifies religious prosecution and persecution, in all lands, of all religions. Either Christ taught that it was right to compel religious observance, or National Reformers are not followers of Christ. Do National Reformers ever read the instruction of Christ? Will they follow it? Then they will no longer be National Reformers, seeking through civil laws and penalties to propagate the religion of Christ; for National Reformers and the Christianity of Christ are diametrically opposed the one to the other.

Christ gave the Golden Rule to keep his followers from the exercise of all oppression and tyranny. And those who believe more in His sayings than they do in their own selfish greed for place and power, will never seek to enforce any religion or religious institution on their followers. But perhaps National Reformers have never learned the Golden Rule. For their sakes we repeat it again: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

M. C. WILCOX.

God and Cæsar.

ALTHOUGH for the sake of prejudicing Christian people, many religio-political reformers stigmatize our secular form of government as "atheistical," and the secularist as a "political atheist," yet it remains a fact that the words of Christ, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's," probably had more influence in the adoption of our secular theory of government than any other one thing. Those words were made the texts of sermons by ministers in all parts of the land; they were used by statesmen, conventions and legislatures; they were repeated in political disquisitions, until Christian people everywhere thoroughly understood that the Christian theory and the secular of government were one and the same thing.

Ex-President Madison had occasion to recall this fact on receiving an address at the ceremonial of laying the corner-stone of St. Matthew's Church in New York—an address which touched upon the relation of religion and the State. Speaking of the address, Madison says:—

It is a pleasing and persuasive example of pious zeal, united with pure benevolence, and of cordial attachment to a particular creed, untingered with

sectarian illiberality. It illustrates the excellence of a system [our secular theory] which, by a due distinction, to which the genius and courage of Luther led the way, between what is due to Cæsar and what is due to God, best promotes the discharge of both obligations.

The experience of the United States is a happy disproof of the error so long rooted in the unenlightened minds of well-meaning Christians, as well as in the corrupt hearts of persecuting usurpers, that without a legal incorporation of religious and civil polity, neither could be supported. A mutual independence is found most friendly to practical religion, to social harmony, and to political prosperity.

With this direct acknowledgment on the part of Madison that our secular Government is the direct outgrowth of that great religious movement—the Reformation—and his reference to the words of Christ, we may give full credence to the following words from Bancroft, rather than accept the prejudiced slurs of those who would, if they could, destroy the grand political system of the American people—a system which commands the admiration of the world. Bancroft says: "Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the new Nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the Federal Government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and, not from indifference, but that the infinite spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power."—*History of the Formation of the Constitution, book V, chapter 1.*

Religious Legislation—Its Relation to the Civil Government.

[This article is an abridgment of an essay by William A. Westworth, a pupil of the Buffalo High School. The essay was given honorable mention, but was not admitted to be read on account of its "too radical character." The character of the paper remains unchanged. We have simply abbreviated it to accommodate it to our limited space.]

"CONGRESS shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The religious persecution which characterized the Middle Ages had shown to the founders of this Government that to the State belonged no power of religious legislation. Well could they see the effect of a union of Church and State, and well did they know that a hierarchical form of government would soon bring as great persecution upon them as had existed in the mother countries under such form; therefore the above was adopted as the first amendment to our "Constitution of Liberty."

From the fourth century the aim of the Church had been to gain, not only absolute religious, but also civil sway; this they did obtain and for many years held. Under that rule no religious tolerance

was known. Man's conscience was subjugated; freedom of thought was suppressed. But the flame at last did burst and religious liberty took the place of religious persecution.

From the wise thought of our forefathers this country has known no rupture on account of religion; and when, comparing the prosperity of this with other countries, no student of history can disclaim the advantages of such laws as ours. But even while we boast our superiority over such countries, as Russia, Turkey, and others having the church represented in the government, we are not likely to notice that even in our own land of freedom there is already arising a spirit of intolerance that would enforce religious principles on all, Christian, Jew and infidel.

Twenty-five—yes, ten years ago, such a proposition would have been greeted as preposterous, and even now, some, unacquainted with the agencies at work, would ridicule the idea.

But notice the workings of Congress for the past few years, and the repeated attempts at religious enforcement stand out prominently. The last bill was introduced by Senator Blair, May 21, 1888, and was denominated thus, "A Bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest; and to promote its observance as a day of worship." The bill was to compel all to refrain from any secular work; to prohibit carrying mail matter, transportation of goods, the paying or receiving of money, and all military or naval drills or parades. The bill applied to all whether they believed in a rest-day or not. No provision was made for any sect observing any other day of the week.

Nor did this effort comprehend all the aims of its founders and leaders, the "National Reform Party." Not only do they wish to secure some particular day as a Sabbath, but they wish to compel every man, using their own words, "to acknowledge that God is sovereign, that Christ is ruler and that the Bible is the supreme law." The *Christian Statesman* (their mouthpiece), of October 2, 1884, says:—

Give all men to understand that this is a Christian Nation, and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain by all right means our Christian character. Inscribe this character upon our Constitution. Enforce upon all that come among us the laws of Christian morality.

But the National Reform Party is not alone in this movement. The Women's Christian Temperance Union—and I speak of them with due appreciation of their foundation principles, seen in their name, that is, the suppression of the liquor traffic—has joined hands with the National Reform Association and perhaps the truest idea of their position can be gained from

the saying of the Women's Christian Temperance Union in convention in 1887:

The Women's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, national and world wide, has one vital organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one never dying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be *this world's king*—yea, verily, *this world's king* in its realm of cause and effect. King of its courts, its camps, and its commerce, king of its colleges and cloisters—king of its customs and Constitutions. . . . The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of the law through the gateway of politics.

Thus would they *make* the God of righteousness, the Creator of the universe, an earthly ruler by the corrupt means of politics, and this in the face of such authority as is found in their own, would-be, civil supreme law, the Bible, which, quoting Christ's own words, in John 18:36, says, "My kingdom is not of this world." Whom then shall we believe?

But the seed sown has not been without its effect. How many know that in the State of Arkansas during the period from April 26, 1885 to May 16, 1887, there were twenty-one cases brought to court for Sunday labor, and every one condemned, after it was proved conclusively that they observed regularly another day of worship? Such is liberty under the Constitution of the United States! Even now there is under bonds in Tennessee, R. M. King, for working on Sunday, after observing Saturday. The case has been appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. His fine of seventy-five dollars could easily have been paid but his denomination preferred to make it a test case of the constitutionality of the laws of Tennessee.

Representatives in eleven States and Territories of this boasted "free country" have promised to introduce Sunday rest bills. Stop for a moment and think of nations who have made religion compulsory; where are they? Did they succeed? You cannot drive people into the kingdom of God; they must go voluntarily. Again we are continually confronted by efforts to introduce religious instruction into our schools, and the ministers of the different denominations are trying to compromise upon something that will please all. Think of it! Compromise religion by leaving it to the decision of school boards. But while there remains the spirit of liberty, which prompted our forefathers, there never will be found a level to which all must come.

Although skepticism is not to be wished for or promoted, can this land be considered as free, and, at the same time prohibit from its shores all those who cannot accept Christianity or the promulgations of a so-called Christian Government?

I will in closing . . . say history can leave no better admonition than that spoken by the greatest law-giver of all, "Render ye therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."

NATIONAL

Religious Liberty Association.

THE *Plaindealer*, of Hastings, Michigan, speaks thus of the King case:—

As what has been accomplished in Tennessee against the Seventh-day people, may in other States be against those of other beliefs, or no beliefs, it is important that each and all be on the alert for liberty. None are safe.

At a meeting held in the Amphitheatre at Chautauqua, New York, on the 9th inst., in the interests of the American Sabbath Union, the following resolution, offered by Bishop Vincent, was enthusiastically passed:—

Resolved, That in the interest of workingmen and in harmony with the teachings of the Holy Scriptures we, the representatives of churches here assembled, respectfully and earnestly request the proper authorities to close the gates of the Columbian Exposition on the Sabbath day.

The Bishop evidently agrees with Mr. Crafts that "take the religion out and you take the rest out," and so left the religion in when writing this resolution.

LIGONIER, Indiana, has a pastor that is an enthusiast for Sunday laws. He has been stirring things there; and one man has been arrested for keeping a confectionary stand open on the venerable day of the Sun. This zealous divine has not openly advocated the rack, thumb-screw or stake yet, but is very mild in his threatening; he only thinks it is necessary to drive any man from town who will oppose Sunday laws. If the Lord Jesus Christ had the same spirit as the Ligonier minister, he would drive the atheist, infidel, and all opposers of his laws out of the world, and not even give them a chance to see their wrongs and repent.

With a proper regard for facts it is hard to frame a sentence like the last one so as not to say that such ministers do not have the spirit of Christ. To make the effort is only to fail.

Petty Sunday Arrests.

POLICEMAN WILLIAM WHATELY, of the Madison Street Station, entered Joseph Rifkin's dry-goods store on Sunday last and said:

"Let me have a pair of white cotton gloves."

"I don't sell anything on Sunday," replied the storekeeper, who knew Whately to be a policeman.

"That's all right," remarked Whately, "You need n't fear me."

The sale was made, and the storekeeper was arrested. He furnished bail in the police station.

The same policeman entered David Alterman's grocery at No. 113 Division Street, and asked for shaving soap.

"Come around to-morrow," said the groceryman.

"No," replied the policeman, "I want it to-day."

He was handed the soap, and the storekeeper was made a prisoner. He also furnished bail.

"I wish you would employ yourselves otherwise," remarked Justice Duffy in the Essex Market Police Court yesterday, as he held the two men for trial. "I don't like to see policemen make such petty arrests."—*New York World*, August 4.

Policeman Whately of the Madison Street Station, in citizen's clothes, went to Solomon Jacobs' dry goods store at 35 Division Street, Sunday morning. He found the door closed, but knocked until Mr. Jacobs opened it. "You can't buy anything here to-day," said Jacobs, "we are closed on Sunday." "But," the policeman told Jacobs, "I want to get ten cents' worth of ribbon for my little girl to tie her hair with so that she may go to church."

Jacobs consented as a favor to sell the ribbon. Whately then arrested him. At Essex Market Court, yesterday morning, Justice Ryan said the arrest was an outrage, and discharged Jacobs.—*New York Sun*, August 18.

That such a man as this Whately is on the police

force is a disgrace to the city. It is true that Sunday laws encourage and invite just such methods, but these arrests are none the less infamous. A man so utterly devoid of principle as this Whately has shown himself to be, is a dangerous man in any community, but he is doubly so as an officer. The most dispicable of all beings is a man who aspires to be a detective, but has only sufficient brains to adopt the very worse methods of the most unprincipled scamps that have ever disgraced the profession. C. P. B.

The Inquisition Revived.

STRANGE as it may at first glance seem that in our free country, under the blazing light of history and modern progress, there should be established a fac-simile of the mediæval Inquisition, it is, after all, only a logical necessity in the course of the development of that work which has for its aim the enforcement of religious dogmas and practices by law. Let no one, then, who has taken note of this work be surprised to learn that the modern inquisition, a faithful pattern of the ancient one, is now set up, with full facilities for the apprehension and punishment of modern incorrigible heretics!

The city of St. Paul has lately been the scene of profound agitation over the subject of Sunday rest, out of which has developed a "Rest-day League," the fifth article of the Constitution of which says:

"Committees shall be appointed as follows: The secretary shall appoint an investigating committee of four, known only to himself, the first of whom shall on the first week of each month, the second on the second, and so following, ascertain personally what violations—first, of the civil law, second, of the higher laws of God—are in progress, and report fully in writing to the secretary, who shall, in turn, inform the public authorities, so far as he can wisely do so, as to the violations of the State law, and the public as to these and all other wrongs related to the work of this organization."

This is exactly what the Inquisition did in the Dark Ages. Spies were put upon the track of all suspected persons, and as fast as they were discovered doing that which was in violation, "first, of the civil law; second, of the higher laws of God," they were reported to the public authorities, apprehended, and punished according to the approved methods of the times.

Upon the Rev. (!) W. F. Crafts, more perhaps than upon any other, rests the unenviable notoriety of following foremost in the footsteps of the long-departed Torquemada. His utterances upon the occasion are calculated to dispel any lingering doubt which might exist in the mind as to the animus of the whole proceeding. "You make the laws," said he to the assembled audience, "and we'll enforce them;" and further, speaking of the "investigating committee" of the new Rest-day League, "You furnish the light, and we'll furnish the lightning."

So then all that now remains is for the inquisitorial "lightning" to strike! L. A. SMITH.

Sectarian Bigotry in Texas.

THE following from the *Sunday Gazetteer*, of Denison, Texas, reveals about as curious a phase of combined bigotry and paternalism as has ever come to our knowledge:—

Under the head, "A Nice Question," the Fort Worth *Gazette* publishes a dispatch from Austin which conveys the remarkable intelligence that those at the head of the Summer Normal School at San Antonio are in a quandary because several sisters of charity who have been in attendance at the school have passed creditable examinations and demand their certificates. They pretend that they don't know whether the certificates should be issued or not, because "the sisters belong to purely religious orders, whose work is all done in the interest of the mother church, and their wages would go to the church, in derogation of the law that no part of the public school fund shall be used in the interest of any sect or church." The dispatch further continues that "the superintendent saw fit to refer the question to the attorney-general for his opinion in the matter."

That such a question should be raised is extremely

ridiculous. If those ladies have proved themselves competent they are entitled to their certificates, under the law, and no person can justly deprive them of them. It is no business of the State what these sisters or any of the public school teachers do with their money, and there is no violation of State law in giving the money they earn by teaching in the public schools to aid the spread of Catholicism if they want to. A Catholic school teacher has as much right to donate her money for this purpose as a Protestant teacher has to contribute her hard-earned savings to foreign missions, or to buying a new carpet for the parsonage. The law forbids the appropriation of money for the support of schools where religion is taught, and hence no teacher in a public school should be allowed to teach religion or permit religious observances or ceremonies of any kind in the school room. This is a very wise provision, and should be strictly enforced, but there should be no discrimination in the choice of teachers because of difference of religious faith, or on account of a lack of it.

That such a question as this should be raised for the reason given is almost past belief. Had the objection to granting the certificates been on the ground that being devoted to the service of the Roman Catholic Church, and having adopted the peculiar garb of their order, they would necessarily, because of that peculiar dress, and naturally, because of their devotion to that form of religion, exert a sectarian influence over their pupils, it would have been more reasonable;—which however is not saying much;—for it would seem that that question could have been safely left to the local school boards employing them. As it is it seems that in the case of these sisters bigotry and paternalism have run wild. The writer is not prepared to say that objection might not properly be made to a distinctively religious garb in the public school room, but the idea that certificates should be refused solely on the ground that the persons receiving them would, if employed, devote their wages to the interest of a particular church, is utterly repugnant to the spirit of our free institutions. Paternalism could scarcely go further, and bigotry never attained a more vigorous growth even in the hot-bed of mediæval superstition. C. P. B.

THE fight over closing the saloons on Sunday still goes on in Denver, Colorado. A case has just been taken to the District Court, and Judge Bently has heard the argument as to why a rule should not be entered requiring the police commission to allow the saloons to be opened.

The Catholic Total Abstinence Union on Sunday Laws.

THE Catholic Total Abstinence Union met in Washington, D. C., August 5. In a preamble to one of their resolutions they gave as one of the reasons why they oppose the liquor traffic that it is "by its sales constantly weakening the hallowed, restraining influence of Sunday." A resolution was offered pledging the support of the Union to labor organizations, believing that it could greatly assist the laboring man in securing his rights. But an influential priest counselled that they ought to know the principles of these labor unions before confederating with them. He said they might be socialistic, and also oppose Sunday observance. In view of these things the resolution was modified so as to oppose a union with any labor leagues that were not in harmony with the Catholic Total Abstinence Union on these points.

In addition to this discussion of the Sunday question at different times during the meeting, they passed the following resolution:—

"Resolved, that we consider it the duty of all temperance men to support candidates for public office who honestly pledge themselves to labor for the enforcement of Sunday laws closing liquor saloons on that day."

The foregoing would indicate that Sunday received its full share of attention during the meeting of the Union. Let all good people bid them God-speed in anything they can do to advance total abstinence. It is one of the most laudable of causes. If they wish to use their influence to persuade people to observe Sunday better, it is surely their privilege to do so. But when they ask for civil law in its favor it is time to object. As much as the saloon is to be hated and as much as all lovers of mankind should labor to suppress it, yet to only shut it up on Sunday is a big step back instead of in advance. When the saloon is closed only on Sunday it cannot help making the impression that it is the interests of Sunday being guarded, and that the saloon is not so bad if it is only strictly boycotted on Sunday.

But this is only another of the many indications that Sunday laws are becoming very popular, and that the tyrannical reign of ecclesiasticism, that always sets the wheels of oppression in motion wherever it is allowed the power, is striving for recognition. This statement is not made because

it was a Catholic society that passed such a resolution, but because of the principle involved. The facts show that Protestants and Catholics alike will persecute when they have the power of the State at their command and are devoid of the power and enlightening influence of the Spirit of God. And just as soon as the State commits itself to Sunday laws, it advances ecclesiastical rule just that much, and opens the way for much more to follow. Protect all in their rights, but compel no religious belief, even though all the world was a unit in believing it to be right,

FAIR HAVEN, a popular summer resort on Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts, is enforcing Sunday observance. The law which has been put in force provides that—

"Whoever is present at a game, sport, play or public diversion, except a concert of sacred music, upon the evening of the Lord's day or upon the evening next preceding the Lord's day, unless such game, sport, play or public diversion is licensed by the persons or board authorized to grant licenses in such cases, shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding five dollars for each offense.

"Whoever on the Lord's day keeps open his shop, warehouse or workhouse, or does any manner of labor, business or work, except works of necessity or charity, or takes part in any sport, game or play, or except as allowed or prohibited in the preceding section, is present at any dancing or public diversion, show, game or entertainment, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding fifty dollars for each offense."

Even Mr. Crafts would scarcely have the hardihood to claim that this is a law for the enforcement of a merely civil day: it is plainly a civil ordinance requiring the observance of a religious institution; and in this respect it is not unlike all other Sunday laws; the underlying thought and motive in all of them is religious.

A PETITION is being circulated in Sibley, Iowa, asking that all places of business be closed on Sunday.

THE Government should know no Protestants and no Catholics, but only citizens.

"THERE is always retribution for persecution."

SACRED CHRONOLOGY.

BY SYLVESTER BLISS.

THIS work treats of the Elements of Chronology, the different systems, and the various eras, and gives the chronology of the principal events recorded in sacred history from the creation till the death of St. John. It also contains a vindication of the numbers of the Hebrew Scriptures. As an aid to investigation it is invaluable. The book has been thoroughly revised, and an entire chapter added, on the

PEOPLING OF THE EARTH.

This chapter is an exposition of the tenth chapter of Genesis, and gives an outline of the beginning of history and

THE ORIGIN OF NATIONS.

New and valuable notes have been added to the original text of the book, making it the most valuable work on the subject of sacred chronology extant. No student of history can well do without it. It contains a vast amount of information in small space, and so far from being dry it is as interesting as a story, which it really is. 300 pages, cloth binding, with side stamp, \$1.00.

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

ON OAKLAND, CAL.

JUST ISSUED!

CONTAINING.....

- 60 New Hymns,
- 50 New Songs,
- 40 Old Favorites,
- 10 National Songs.

Songs of Freedom

A PATRIOTIC COLLECTION

BY F. E. BELDEN.

THE ORIGINAL SONGS were written by DANKS, BUTTERFIELD, BARNES, EMERSON, HERBERT, HAKES, TOWNE, RUSSELL, OGDEN, TENNEY, DAVIS, SWENEY, BELDEN, and others.

Selected Musical Compositions by HAYDN, MENDELSSOHN, VERDI, SULLIVAN, GROOS, WILHELM, MASON, CLARIBEL, etc.

THE ORIGINAL HYMNS were written by D. W. MCCOURT, REV. DWIGHT WILLIAMS, MRS. L. B. PRICE, M. B. DUFFIE, T. R. WILLIAMSON, MRS. L. D. A. STUTTLE, JOHN TALMAN, FANNIE BOLTON, EMMA L. PARDON, ALBION F. BALLENGER, MARY L. LA FORGE, ELIZABETH ROSSER, J. J. ELLYSON, VICTORIA A. BUCK, R. F. COTTRELL, WM. BRICKEY, S. B. WHITNEY, F. E. BELDEN, etc.

Selected Patriotic Hymns by BRYANT, WHITTIER, DWIGHT, DRAKE, JOAQUIN MILLER, FELICIA HEMANS, THEODORE TILTON, REV. HENRY ALFORD, REV. LEONARD BACON, etc.

120 pages, embracing a large number of songs in the interests of

Religious Liberty, Soldier's Reunions, Independence Day, Memorial Day, Washington's Birthday, Etc.,

Arranged as SOLOS, DUETS, TRIOS, QUARTETS for both Male and Female Voices, CHORUSES for both Male and Mixed Voices, PATRIOTIC SONGS FOR CHILDREN, etc.

The principal object of the book is to oppose efforts tending toward a union of Church and State.

PRICES, Postpaid:

Heavy Manila Covers, cloth joints, 35 Cents.
Strong, Flexible Cloth, cloth joints, 50 Cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO., 43 Bond St., New York City.



NEW YORK, AUGUST 27, 1891.

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 National Religious Liberty Association has announced by a circular letter to all its members that the case of R. M. King will be appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States.

ACCORDING to the *Citrograph*, San Bernardino, California, like Los Angeles, has found by actual experiment that Sunday closing of saloons does not reduce drunkenness. Whatever may be true of prohibition, Sunday-closing certainly does not prohibit.

SUNDAY, August 16, Sam Jones held forth at Prohibition Park, Staten Island. As usual he denounced "Sabbath-breakers" in scathing terms, never seeming to recognize any inconsistency in the fact that he was a party to an arrangement whereby those who listened to him paid ten cents apiece, the regular admission fee, for the privilege, and that on Sunday, the day that the noisy Georgian calls the "holy Sabbath." It is very evident that the Sunday-law advocates want a monopoly of Sunday money-getting.

THE *Christian Statesman* says there is no intolerance and no persecution in National Reform, and adds, "Nay, more, here is the highest, most efficacious safeguard against persecution. For if, as THE SENTINEL believes, the law of God forbids all persecution for opinion's sake, how then can the acknowledgment of that law by the State lead the State to persecution?"

The question is not difficult. National Reform proposes to administer the law of God, or, in other words, it proposes to make men judges of the divine law. The effect must be to put the government in the place of God and thus destroy individual responsibility to God; for if it were the duty of human government to administer the divine law, it would also be the duty of the subject of human government to obey implicitly that law as given to him by the government. It follows that under the National Reform *regime*, men would inquire not what says the law of God, but what says the interpreter about that law. In short, the real standard of action would be not the divine law, but a human and fallible interpretation of that

law, which would afford not the slightest guarantee against persecution. Moreover National Reform is not a new thing; the history of the Papacy, written in the blood of the martyrs of Jesus, tells us just what the inevitable result of human administration of the law of God must always be. All human government is force, and all force in matters of religion is persecution.

THE Christianity of to-day is no more the Christianity of the Bible, than was the Christianity of the third and fourth centuries. Yet out of those centuries came the worst system of iniquity which ever cursed the world. But this system recognized God in the government, and was used for the conservation of what was then considered vital to Christianity.

IN this Government there are rights of the people, separate from and above both the rights of the States and of the United States. There is such a thing as the rights of the States; there is also such a thing as the rights of the United States; and there is yet further such a thing as the rights of the people. In other words, there are State rights, national rights, and personal rights; and each of these is separate from both the others.

"MORAL questions," says the National Reform Declaration of Principles, "can not be determined by majorities; otherwise morals might be reversed at every election." This is true, and it is just the reason why civil government has no business to meddle with morals. It is also true that moral questions can not be decided by civil courts, otherwise there might be as many standard of morals as there were courts. We marvel that all can not see this. Government can and should require all men to practice civility, but morality is beyond the jurisdiction of earthly governments and earthly courts.

At the recent meeting held at Chautauqua, this State, in the interests of the American Sabbath Union, a resolution was adopted demanding the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday. A gentleman who was present writes us that after the resolution was read, all present, men, women, and children, were invited to vote. But they were plainly given to understand that only affirmative votes were wanted. One speaker stated that any who should vote against the resolution would be pitied like a Baptist minister who voted against the formation of the American Union. "One of the leading men got up," said the speaker, "and said to the Baptist minister, 'I pity you.'"

Having thus paved the way to a free (?) expression on the resolution in favor of closing the Fair on Sunday, the vote was taken. It was of course almost unani-

mous, but not quite, for three persons present had the courage to vote in the negative; when President Mill, of the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle, said, "I pity you." The incident was worthy of the Sunday cause.

Possibly the expression of pity was prophetic of the time when those who are engineering the American Sunday Union-National Reform-Church and State scheme shall have secured the coveted power to reduce to a really pitiable condition all who shall dare to resist them.

THE *Christian Statesman* asserts that "THE AMERICAN SENTINEL rejoices in every token of decay of the observance of the first day of the week as the Sabbath, even when the decline is due to the growth of irreligion and atheism." The charge has just as much but no more truth in it than has the charge made by papists that Protestants rejoice in the decay of Romanism in Mexico even though the decline is due to the growth of atheism rather than to the increase of Protestantism.

The following note, published in THE SENTINEL of August 13, is made by the *Statesman* the basis of the charge which it makes against us:—

It is said that reports from "Sabbath observance" societies in France and Italy show a change in the conduct of English travelers in regard to Sabbath observance. They are beginning to adopt the lax Continental customs, and to regard with indifference the character and claims of the day.

The wish was certainly father to the thought with our contemporary, for the item complained of was, with the exception of the first four words, copied verbatim from one of the great religious papers of this city. Would the *Statesman* have us suppress the truth in the interests of Sunday sacredness?

At Prohibition Park, August 16, Sam Jones gave his idea of the proper enforcement of Sunday laws thus:—

Ah, to see it like my State, Georgia. There every open saloon means a man in jail. Every engine that goes along means an engineer and fireman to be tried the next day. There, in that glorious State, the Sabbath is recognized as it should be throughout the world.

It would be difficult, however, for Mr. Jones or anybody else to show that Georgia is any better morally than are those States that have no Sunday laws, or that do not enforce those that they have. Such States as Georgia and Tennessee are living witnesses to the fact that people are no better for living under Sunday laws.

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 toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact

Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, \$1.00

In clubs of 2 to 100 copies, per year, each, - - - - 90c.

In clubs of 100 or more copies, per year, each, - - - 75c.

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

Address

AMERICAN SENTINEL,

43 Bond Street, New York.