



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 12, 1891.

NUMBER 44.

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.

EVERY human being is intended to have a character of his own, to be what no other is, to do what no other can do.—*Channing.*

THE religious idea can never be separated from Sunday. No enforcement of its observance, distinctively from other days, can be divorced from that inbred religious idea, any more than the physical and moral characteristics of the father and mother can be eliminated from the child. This child of the Church and a religious holiday ("the Venerable Day of the Sun") is, by birth, by inheritance, and by unbroken habit throughout its existence, a religious day,—nothing else.

CHURCH theology and true religion are not necessarily synonymous. They may be antitheses; or, the one may be a non-essential drapery concealing essential truth. Too close a discrimination cannot be made between them, for the first is of man, transitory, imperfect, while the second is the expression of the eternal verities of God.

Commentary, exegesis, human interpretation, when applied to things divine, must be subjected to the most merciless criticism. There is but one crucible in which the dross of error can be separated from the fine gold of truth and that is the literal, inerrant Bible. When God gave his Word to man he made no provision for theology. If it were not for theological misinterpretation the masses might to-day understand the Bible. Through theological error the inconsistency, between the

biblical behest "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," remember to keep it holy, and the practice of first day observance, has arisen. To support this error the abomination of religious laws must be invoked, and thus the true guide of life is lost sight of entirely, and the plain teaching of Scripture becomes of no effect. Theology then becomes the exponent of the religion of man while the Bible voices the religion of God. At present, however much the fact may be concealed, the two antagonize each other. That there will be a contest directly on this ground, and what the result of this contest will be the Revelation of God foretells.

Is This the Nineteenth Century, or Is It the First?

JESUS CHRIST came into the world to set men free, to make known to all mankind the genuine principles of freedom, and of religious freedom above all. The Roman Empire then filled the world,— "the sublimest incarnation of power, and a monument the mightiest of greatness built by human hands, which has upon this planet been suffered to appear." That Empire, proud of its conquests, and exceedingly jealous of its claims, asserted its right to rule in all things, human and divine. As in those times all gods were viewed as national gods, and as Rome had conquered all nations, it was demonstrated by this to the Romans that their gods were superior to all others. And although Rome allowed conquered nations to maintain the worship of their national gods, these, as well as conquered people, were yet considered as only servants of the Roman State. Every religion, therefore, was held subordinate to the religion of Rome, and though "all forms of religion might come to Rome and take their places in their Pantheon, they must come as the servants of the State."

The Roman religion itself was but the servant of the State; and of all the gods of Rome there were none so great as the

genius of Rome itself. The chief distinction of the Roman gods was that they belonged to the Roman State. Instead of the State deriving any honor from the Roman gods, the gods derived their principal dignity from the fact that they were gods of Rome. This being so with Rome's own gods, it was counted at Rome an act of exceeding condescension to recognize, legally, any foreign god, or the right of any Roman subject to worship any other gods than those of Rome. Neander quotes Cicero as laying down a fundamental maxim of legislation, as follows:—

No man shall have for himself particular gods of his own; no man shall worship by himself any new or foreign gods, unless they are recognized by the public laws.

Another principle, announced by Mæcenas, one of the two chief advisers of Augustus, was this:—

Worship the gods in all respects according to the laws of your country, and compel all others to do the same, but hate and punish those who would introduce anything whatever alien to our customs in this particular.

Accordingly, the Roman law declared as follows:—

Whoever introduces new religions, the character and tendency of which are erring, whereby the minds of men may be disturbed, shall, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished; if to the lower, punished with death.

The Roman Empire filled the world. Consequently, there was a government ruling over all, in which religion and the State were held to be essentially one and indivisible.

Jesus Christ gathered to himself disciples, instructing them in his heavenly doctrine; bestowed upon them the divine freedom, the soul-freedom, which he alone can give; endued them with power from on high; and sent them forth into the world to preach to every creature this gospel of freedom, and to teach all to observe all things whatever he had commanded them.

He had commanded them to render to Cæsar only those things that were Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's. This statement was the declaration of the

principle of the total separation of religion and the State; and in the mind of every true disciple, it was a divine command, inseparable from the divine life, and supported by divine power.

In the exercise of this right, the disciples went everywhere, preaching the word, and calling all people to the joy of the salvation of Christ, and to the freedom which that salvation gives. But it was contrary to the principles of Rome. It was actually forbidden by the laws. Laws, too, and principles, which were of established usage long before Christ came into the world. The law forbade the introduction of any new religion, but the Christians introduced the new religion. The law especially forbade the introduction of any new religion, the tendency of which was to disturb men's minds. Of all religions, the Christian religion appeals most directly and most forcibly to the mind. In the very letter which the Apostle Paul wrote to the Christians in Rome, he said to them: "Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind," and "with the mind I serve the law of God." The law commanded all to worship the gods according to the law. The Christians refused to worship any of the gods recognized by the law, or any other god but the God revealed in Jesus Christ.

According to Roman principles, the Roman State was divine. Cæsar was the embodiment of the Roman State, and was therefore divine. Divine honor was therefore exacted toward the Emperor; and, as a matter of fact, the worship of the Emperor was the most widespread of any single form of worship known to Rome. He was the chief Roman divinity; accordingly, under the Roman system, that which was due to God was due to Cæsar. Consequently, when the Christians refused to render to Cæsar the things that were God's, and render to him only that which was Cæsar's, it was a refusal to recognize in Cæsar any attribute of divinity. But as Cæsar was the embodiment of the State, to deny to him divinity was to deny likewise divinity to the State.

The preaching of the gospel of Christ, therefore, raised a positive and direct issue between Christianity and the Roman Empire. And this was an issue between two principles—the principle of the freedom of the individual conscience, and therefore the principle of the separation of religion and the State; as against the principle of the union of religion and the State, and therefore the principle of the absolute subjection and enslavement of the individual conscience. Rome refused to recognize the principle of Christianity, and Christianity would not yield the principle. The contest was carried on two hundred and fifty years through streams of blood and untold suffering of the innocent. Then Rome, by an imperial edict, recognized the justice of the Christian

principle, and the right of every man to worship whatever God he pleases, without any interference on the part of the State. The principle of Christianity had triumphed.

Then paganized bishops, ambitious of absolute power, through a dark intrigue with the Emperor Constantine, succeeded in establishing a union of the Catholic religion with the Roman State, and thus perverted to the interests of the Papacy the victory which had been so nobly won, and again Christianity had to take up the contest in behalf of the rights of conscience, and of the separation of religion and the State. And again through torrents of blood, and untold suffering of the guiltless, for more than a thousand years, the Papacy made its way to the place of supreme authority in the world.

Then came the Reformation, announcing anew to the world the Christian principle of the absolute separation of religion and the State, and the rights of the individual conscience; and by an unswerving exercise of the divine right of dissent, established Protestantism. But sad to say, even Protestantism was presently perverted, and the Christian principle was violated which gave it of right a name in the world. Then the contest had still to go on, as ever, through blood and suffering of the innocent, by the Christians' exercise of the divine right of dissent, of the freedom of conscience, and by a protest against a false Protestantism in Geneva, in Scotland, in England, in New England, in Virginia, and all the other American Colonies, except Rhode Island alone.

Then arose the new Nation, declaring before all people that "all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed;" and, when the national Government was formed, recognizing and establishing, as an example to all the world, and as a principle of the Government itself, *the Christian principle of the absolute separation of Church and State, and therefore the divine right of the free exercise of the individual conscience*; requiring of men that they render to Cæsar only that which is Cæsar's, and leaving them absolutely free to render to God that which is God's, or not to render it at all, even as the individual might choose in the exercise of his own personal individual right of conscience.

Thus, after ages of bloodshed and suffering, through fearful persecution by Paganism, Catholicism, and false Protestantism, the Christian principle of freedom of conscience and the separation of religion and the State was made triumphant before all the world.

Much has been said (none too much, however) in praise of the wisdom of the

fathers of this Republic in establishing a Government of such magnificent principles, but it would be an impeachment of their common sense to think of them that they could have done any less, or any other, than that which they did. The history of those ages was before them. They saw the sufferings that had been endured in behalf of the rights of conscience, and which had been inflicted in every instance by religious bigots in control of the civil power. Were they to shut their eyes upon all this, and go blindly blundering on in the same course of suffering and of blood?

Both the history and the philosophy of the whole matter is expressed by Madison in that magnificent memorial and remonstrance which he wrote in behalf of the free exercise of religious belief in Virginia, the principles of which were likewise, by his influence, embodied in the national Constitution. He said:—

A just government, instituted to secure and perpetuate it [public liberty] . . . will be best supported by protecting every citizen in the enjoyment of his religion with the same equality which protects his person and his property; by neither invading the equal rights of any sect, nor suffering any sect to invade those of another. . . . What a melancholy mark is the bill of sudden degeneracy. Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of citizens all those whose opinions in religion do not bend to those of the legislative authority. Distant as it may be, in its present form, from the Inquisition, it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other is the last, in the career of intolerance. . . . Torrents of blood have been spilt in the Old World in consequence of vain hopes of the secular arm to extinguish religious discord by proscribing all differences in religious opinion. Time has at length revealed the true remedy. Every relaxation of narrow and rigorous policy, wherever it has been tried, has been found to assuage the disease. The American theater has exhibited proofs that equal and complete liberty, if it does not wholly eradicate it, sufficiently destroys its malignant influence on the health and prosperity of the State. If with the salutary effects of this system under our own eyes, we begin to contract the bounds of religious freedom, we know no name which will too severely reproach our folly.

The lessons of history were not lost upon the noble minds that formed the Government of the United States. The blood which had been shed, and the sufferings which had been endured, both in the Old World and in the New, bore their fruit in the right of the free exercise of religion guaranteed by the supreme law of the new Nation—the right of every citizen to be protected in the enjoyment of religion with the same just and equal hand that protects his person and his property. This right, in the meaning and intent of those who declared and established it, is the right of "equal and complete liberty," of complete religious freedom, the bounds of which should never be contracted. This is the sense in which the doctrine of the free exercise of religious belief is declared and established by the Constitution of the United States, and by the Constitution of Tennessee, and the several States which

have followed the example of the national Constitution.

Now, in view of history and these facts, please read the following extract from Judge Hammond's *dictum* on the question of religious freedom:—

This very principle of religious freedom is the product of our religion, as all of our good customs are; and if it be desirable to extend that principle to the ultimate condition that no man shall be in the least restrained, by law or public opinion, in hostility to religion itself, or in the exhibition of individual eccentricities or practices of sectarian peculiarities or religious observances of any kind, or be fretted by laws colored by any religion that is distasteful to anybody, *those who desire that condition must necessarily await its growth into that enlarged application.* But the courts cannot, in cases like this, ignore the existing customs and laws of the masses, nor their prejudices and passions even, to lift the individual out of the restraints surrounding him, because of those customs and laws, *before the time has come* when public opinion shall free all men in the manner desired. Therefore it is that *the petitioner cannot shelter himself just yet behind the doctrine of religious freedom* in defying the existence of a law and its application to him, which is distasteful to his own religious feelings or fanaticism, etc.

Is it possible that the history of eighteen centuries has taught no lesson that can be learned by a court of the United States? Can it be possible that the streams of blood that have been shed, and the fearful sufferings that have been endured, in behalf of the rights of conscience and the free exercise of religion, have been in vain? Do we indeed stand in the first century instead of the nineteenth? And from there are we to "await the growth" of the principle of religious freedom into such an enlarged application that religion and the State shall be separate; and that every man may enjoy the free exercise of religion, according to the individual conscience? Is it true that the time has not yet come when men can be counted free from religious oppression?—from religious observances enforced by law, "in spite of religious freedom and in spite of the progress that has been made in the absolute separation of Church and State"? Is it true that from such oppression men cannot shelter themselves yet behind the doctrine of religious freedom?

Again, we can only inquire, and in astonishment, too, Has the history of the past eighteen centuries no lesson upon this subject that can be learned by a court of the United States? Have the sufferings through these centuries for this principle all been endured in vain? Has the work of our governmental fathers been utterly in vain? Do we truly live in the nineteenth century and in the United States, or do we live in the first century and in Rome?

A. T. J.

UGHT not the Church to be ashamed to ask the aid of civil laws for its success? Has it come to this, that the eternal God needs the aid of the civil laws of weak, sinful man to maintain his Church?—*Colorado Graphic.*

Consecrated Common Sense.

THE Rev. Josiah Strong lately delivered an address at the dedication of Christ's Mission at 142 West 21st Street, this city, where Rev. James A. O'Connor has instituted an organized work for the evangelization of Roman Catholics, and in the course of his remarks expressed himself in these definite terms of unmistakable truth:—

I want to talk on the subject of our personal responsibility to God, which Daniel Webster once called the most solemn thought that ever came to him, and in this connection I will read from the first Book of Kings, chapter xiii. . . . I suppose that account has troubled all of us more or less; judged by human standards that would seem to have been a very severe punishment for a very slight error of sin. . . . When the king wanted to reward him, and said, "Come back and eat with me," and invited him to dine at the royal palace, the prophet said, "No, I will not go back for half of your house, because I was commanded not to eat bread or drink water with you." And yet when the false prophet beguiled him and said, "I, too, am a prophet, and I have a message from God which says 'Bring him back and eat with him,'" he returned and ate with the false prophet, and in doing so doubtless thought he was obeying God. He at first refused to accept that invitation on the same ground that he refused the king, and only when the prophet said, "I have the word of the Lord for it," he turned back, and for that he was slain—a conscientious, courageous man, a prophet of God.

I think we get a little light on that penalty if we bear in mind what truth God evidently intended to emphasize by the magnitude of the punishment. I think God meant to teach, and teach in such a way that all ages should remember it, the absolute sacredness of the relations of the individual soul to God; that no one is to come between the soul and God himself. That was the lesson. God himself had said to the prophet, "Do not eat or drink in Bethel." He himself had given the directions. Now if God had wished to countermand that command the prophet should have waited until God himself had spoken. It was not enough that somebody else should come and say, "I, too, am a prophet of the Lord," and give him another command. If a soldier had been summoned by his commanding general and received specific instructions to discharge certain duties, which he proceeded to do, and another soldier said, "I bring a message from the commanding general countermanding that order," that first soldier ought to say, "I received my orders distinctly from headquarters; if the general wishes to countermand that order I must have the countermand from his lips or in writing over his name."

Now, my friends, God gives his commandments directly to us. Did you ever think of the form of the ten commandments in the twentieth chapter of Exodus? They are not plural in form and not in the third person. It is the second person singular every time, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image." "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."

It is "thou," "thou," "thou." God's commands are sent direct to the conscience of every one of the human race. He is talking to you personally, alone, as if there were no other human being in all the world. *God did not give one conscience to a community to dictate to each individual of that community. He did not give one conscience to the Church. He gave as many consciences as he gave souls.* Every moral creature in the universe has a conscience, and hence God lays his command personally upon every individual soul. Sin is a personal matter—wholly so. Whenever I commit sin it is against God, something between him

and me. . . . God not only has made us individually, giving every one a conscience, and addressing his commands to us separately and personally; but because we are personally sinners he has loved us personally, and Christ has died for us personally. Christ did not die for the Anglo-Saxons as a nation, nor for the Irish as a nation. Christ died for every man. . . . As Paul said, "He loved me, and gave himself for me," something personal, nothing between him and God, close personal relations. And then we are told, "Every soul shall give account of himself to God." *God did not give my neighbor a conscience for me and make him accountable for me. God did not give me a conscience for my neighbor and make me responsible for him to give account of his sins. Every soul shall give account for itself to God.*

There is the great mistake of that prophet. God had come to him personally, and he allows another soul to come between God and him, to turn him aside from duty. God comes directly to every soul. He comes to your conscience and lays upon that a duty. You have no right to allow a minister, you have no right to allow a priest, you have no right to allow a church, you have no right to allow a human being or institution to come between your soul and God. . . . It is because God is infinite that he can descend to every human being. Now, we lump mankind; we lump the nations—the Germans, the Irish and the English; we know very few individuals. . . . We generalize because we are ignorant; but infinite knowledge does not lump mankind, and does not classify. God knows every individual spirit, and every individual sparrow, and not one of them falls to the ground without his knowledge. God knows every individual human being and every heart among us. Just because God is infinite he knows us every one and he is concerned with all that concerns us. . . . Let us remember that every human being is sacred before God; let us remember that every single soul is precious enough for Christ to die for that soul, and for God to desire it to come to him personally, without suffering anything to come between him and that soul. Why, that is the great object of our discipline in this life, to bring us into close personal relations with God. That is what God is striving for year after year, week after week, by his teaching and discipline to bring us into close personal relations with him. *Are we going to suffer an institution, a human agency to come between him and us and tell us our duty? That is not God's teaching.*

This is consecrated common sense. In what intense contrast is its clear statement of scriptural truth with the theory that "the State is a moral person, a moral agent, a being with true moral character and accountability," and endowed with "responsibility immediately to God himself."

Dr. Strong's words are in absolute antagonism to the paternal, papal, doctrines of the National Reform Association.

W. H. M.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *Duluth Tribune* remarks that "it is passing strange that ministers, who rest the entire week from manual labor, should be the first to discover that the toiling masses need rest. I should think the worn out laborer would be first to discover that. But this is not the case; for not a single labor organization has a lecturer in the field pleading for a Sunday-rest law. It looks a little suspicious to see religious men pleading for a civil law to protect a religious institution."

Have Christians the True Idea of Liberty?

At the Temperance Congress held on Staten Island, one of the questions on the programme for discussion, August 5 and 6 was, "Can a Minister or other Member of a Church consistently support High License?"

A man who is an earnest worker at the head of an order established for the training of boys in habits of purity in word and deed, and in the principle of total abstinence from intoxicating beverages, pronounced the form of the question an insult. He gave his reasons for advocating high license, chief of which was, that it was better there should be a smaller number of saloons to present temptation to youth.

The attitude of mind in a large majority of the members of the Congress was that dealing in alcoholic beverages is criminal, and that a Christian cannot be a partaker in the crime, consistently, by consenting to any license of the traffic.

A gentleman who rode to the station with me, in commenting upon the position of the speaker, remarked that "*it ought not to be allowed to any one to express such views!*"

This sentiment was as inconsistent as it was amazing to me; because the specific purpose of the Congress was advertised to be the free discussion of all phases and shades of opinion upon the problem of the abolition of the saloon.

It seems impossible for some minds to comprehend the law of liberty, which is freedom to think, and freedom to express thought.

Faith in the potency of truth must be exceedingly weak in the person who considers it necessary to make it impossible that error shall have a hearing.

How little knowledge of the divine power have those souls who can only rely upon force and statute to bring people to act upon principles of right. A person who has enjoyed any degree of Christian life ought to know that the inward impulse and controlling force of individual life cannot be brought into accord with divine law by external restraint or formalities.

Perhaps the statute prohibitionist will say, "No, we do not expect this; but we will not consent to the outward infraction of the law. We are right in preventing by force the commission of wrong." Virtually, then, we mortals claim superior wisdom to the Deity; for, according to the divine management, human souls are left to choose their ways, and abide the consequences. They are not forced to do the right.

What Sunday worshipers need is a genuine baptism of the Holy Spirit. A soul that knows the uplifting of the worship which is "in spirit and in truth," cannot be distracted or disturbed by the dreadful spectacle of a well-behaved family sitting

in the quiet of their own premises on Sunday. If God's Sabbath is in one's soul, the motion of carriages and bicycles will not make them feel sinful.

Statutory prohibitionists, of all kinds, need more faith in the power of godliness, and less concern about its empty form. More concern to be in their own lives living examples of truth, love, and purity, and less disposition to control by force the conduct of others.

No individual is responsible for the thoughts or conduct of another. Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. The divine method of dealing with human souls, is to make every one a law to himself,—to develop individual responsibility. The law of liberty—freedom to think, to express, and to act—is indispensable to this development.

LUCINDA B. CHANDLER.

Sayings of Sunday-Law Advocates.

AN authorized exponent of American Sabbath Union principles made the following significant statement at a recent Sunday evening meeting in Chicago: "Meat markets are being closed in a certain section of this city. This will help church-members keep the Sabbath, and save ministers from preaching plain sermons."

This is the truth. The ministry are unable to keep their congregations from patronizing Sunday meat markets, and otherwise violating church discipline regarding Sunday observance, and fearing to discipline, or preach "plain sermons," they secure the enactment of Sunday laws which will "help church-members keep the Sabbath" by compelling them to act in harmony with their creed, and thus save the minister the unpleasant duty of disciplining his members, or offending them with plain sermons.

It is not difficult, on hearing these statements, to imagine one's self back in the sixteenth century, sitting in a Catholic Church listening to the priest expound the papal theory of government.

At this same meeting the pastor in charge gave utterance to the following kindred statement: "Piety cannot be preserved without the Bible; the Bible cannot be rightly taught without the Church; the Church cannot continue without the Sabbath; the Sabbath cannot be preserved without civil law." The logical deduction from this argument is that piety cannot be maintained without civil law. The pastor did not make this deduction, but it is not only the legitimate conclusion of the argument, but it is the error underlying this whole movement to secure civil recognition of religious doctrine and practice.

Another statement made at the same meeting by the Secretary of the American Sabbath Union reveals the fact that they want law to compel people to at least act as if they were pious. Said the speaker,

with great feeling: "There is no Sabbath in Chicago except the Sabbath kept by God's people." And then followed an exhortation for the enforcement of Sunday laws. Of course there is not, and there never was, and never will be, any Sabbath keeping except by God's people. It would have been just as consistent to have said: There are no Christians except those who believe the Christian religion; therefore let us make laws forcing the others to believe, or act as if they believed, in the Christian religion.

The only and all-sufficient help in securing a better observance of the Sabbath is the help of him who promised to be with the preacher of the "gospel," "even unto the end of the world." "Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help."

Fined for Shaving on Sunday.

A FEW weeks ago, the barbers of Duluth, Minnesota, formed a union, and agreed to close their shops on Sundays. All of the city barbers, however, did not join the union, and consequently were closely watched.

It was soon discovered that barber Connor had placed a chair up-stairs in one of the halls of the Spalding Hotel, on Sunday, and was shaving any one who might apply. On the 21st of October he was brought into court at the instigation of the Barber's Union, and tried before Judge Morris.

Connor's attorney contended that he had a right to shave guests of the hotel on Sunday, and he was not supposed to know whether all who applied were guests or not. The Judge decided that a barber has no more right to shave a hotel guest on Sunday than he has any one else, and that it makes no difference where his chair is located. He thought Mr. Connor did not wilfully violate the Sunday law, so he imposed the minimum penalty—a fine of one dollar and costs.

The Judge was right when he said, "A barber has no more right to shave a hotel guest on Sunday than he has any one else"; for he has a right to shave any one on Sunday or any other day, and no State or municipal authority has any right to interfere. There may be an unjust law on the statute books of the State discriminating in favor of some religionists; but the enforcement of such a law is an outrageous infringement upon the rights of every person upon whom it is enforced.

Strange, indeed, if a man has no right to shave another on a day for which neither has a regard above other days; and that, too, under a Government whose national and State Constitutions guarantee freedom of conscience in the observance of religious institutions and rites!

Most of the barbers do not care a whit for Sunday; but they see in the Sunday law an opportunity to protect their trade, while they spend the day in some pastime.

Thus a religious institution, through civil law, is made to serve worldly ambition. Every Sunday law that was ever enacted and enforced has only served to place a lower estimate on religion in the eyes of both the world and the Church. All Sunday laws spring from a selfish motive, and are to protect selfish interests, and can be productive of evil only.

E. HILLIARD

Can a State Be Christian?

THE question which Giotto originated, and which has been many times discussed in the *Nation*, is the question of the "Christian State," which in 1847 formed the subject of debate in the German Diet. On that occasion Freiherr von Wincke, approaching the subject quite in the spirit of Giotto, said:—

"I must confess that, in spite of the most earnest investigation, and most conscientious reflection, I cannot arrive at any clear conception of what is meant by a Christian State. I venerate Christianity highly, but the idea of religion can rest only on individual conviction. The State is a complex of individuals, but it cannot, as such, have a universal conviction. The State, it may be said, represents a moral person, but I cannot conceive that, as such, it can have a formulated religion. The idea of a Christian State is, hence, to me unintelligible. It cannot be the duty of a State to realize the dogmas of a particular confession,—to be, in a sense, the executor of the Church. But the idea of a Christian State is, perhaps, to be understood in another sense; it will, perhaps, be said that the State in its legislation, should aim at the realization of the principles of Christian morality. Religious dogmas are impossible of realization. But even here, I cannot see that the State can, in any sense, act as the executor of the Church. If it is a question of realizing the principles of Christian morality, I contend that Germany certainly cannot be regarded as a Christian State. This is evident on the most superficial comparison of the principles of our State law with the principles of the New Testament. I might even begin with the Old Testament, and with the ten commandments. Moses says: "Thou shalt not kill"; while the Minister of the Treasury, whose duties include the payment of the army, would certainly not think of condemning war in deference to the Mosaic command. Again, the New Testament says, "Swear not at all . . . Let your conversation be yea, yea, and nay, nay, for whatsoever is more than that cometh of evil," and here we have recently imposed a new oath in connection with the income tax: an oath moreover which is a great temptation to perjury. A State which runs counter to this plain command, "Swear not at all," cannot call itself Christian.

Another Christian command is "Love your enemies" and "if anyone smite thee on the one cheek turn to him the other." How can we harmonize these Christian teachings with our legislation for redress of injuries? We should have to eliminate many paragraphs from the code. How shall we harmonize our foreign policy of treaties against foreign foes with the scriptural command to love our enemies?

"I believe that if we were to hold an inquiry over the several Ministers of State we should find none of them acting in harmony with the Scriptures. Look, for instance, at the Treasury Minister, laying up treasure, in plain defiance of the scriptural command.

"My view is that it is not a function of the State to realize Christian morality, and therefore the proposition that we live in a Christian State is false."

"Christian morality has not flourished on European soil. Where the struggle for existence is so keen as with us it is vain to preach, 'Take no thought for the morrow.' There probably never was so much cant in Europe as in this age; never a period exhibiting a contrast so sharp as exists between an imported code of morals, professed for appearance sake, and the real bias of society as exhibited in its daily public discussions. Shall we ever reconcile this contradiction between profession and reality, and how? That is the great, perhaps the greatest problem of the future."—*Editorial from Die Nation, Berlin, October, 1891.*

"Some Sunset Sophistries."

REFERRING to the recent discussion of the question of closing the World's Fair on Sunday, at a meeting of the Sunset Club in Chicago, the editor of the *Chicago Evening Journal*, of October 23, makes the following comment under this heading:—

"Both sides held up their end of the argument with considerable ability, but the preponderance of logic and rhetoric seemed to be in favor of an open Sunday Exposition. Rev. Dr. Herrick Johnson championed Sunday closing, and did what he could to make the worse appear the better reason, but with indifferent success.

"Dr. Johnson's argument is one that is frequently used by the advocates of Sunday laws, but which has never met with the answer that it deserves. His argument was this: 'We are a Christian Nation. Christianity is imbedded in our national character and law. We issue proclamations asking men to give thanks. We put men on oath in the name of God.' But, as if afraid of his own conclusions, he also says: 'I recognize that the Church does not run the State, nor the State the Church. I do not believe there are a dozen men in the country who would attempt to force men to religious

belief or observance.' This reasoning, if it can be called such, strikes us as timid, sophistical and inconsistent.

"If, as Dr. Johnson claims, 'we are a Christian Nation, and Christianity is imbedded in our national law,' we regard it as a great misfortune, and should be in favor of immediately disimbedding the Christianity, and keeping it separate from law and State for all time. The world has seen too much already of Church and State. When the union turns Italy's stomach, Americans may well be nauseated at the idea of a civil Government hopelessly committed to religion of any kind. Dr. Johnson's address illustrates the dangers and evils of such a constitution. He makes it a reason for demanding that our people shall neither work nor play on Sunday, the inference being that they shall go to hear him preach or do nothing. That he should also say that there are not a dozen people in the country who would attempt to force men to a religious observance simply makes a jargon of his remarks. Looking at a picture gallery on Sunday cannot be condemned, denounced and prohibited, on any but purely religious grounds. 'Renunto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.'"

The Secular Union and Sunday.

THE charge is continually being made by those who are working for Sunday laws, that the Religious Liberty Association and Seventh-day Adventists are working hand in hand with the infidel element of the country in their continued opposition to all forms of Sunday legislation. Now it is a known fact that the American Secular Union is largely composed of skeptics as well as openly avowed infidels. And in announcing the fifteenth annual congress of this Union their leaders states that particular attention will be given to certain of the demands of secularism, among which is the following:—

The repeal and prevention of all laws enforcing the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, rather than an economic one, justified by physiological and other secular reasons.

From this article in the creed of the Secular Union, it will readily be seen that they are in favor of civil Sunday laws on "economic" and "physiological" grounds. The Religious Liberty Association, and the Seventh-day Adventists as well, maintain that Sunday is purely a religious institution, and that it is just as impossible to separate it from its religious character as it is to take the coloring matter from the Ethiopian's skin. The origin of the Sunday institution is lost in remote antiquity, but when first brought to view in history it is a heathen festival day in honor of the sun-god, thus it has its foundation laid in the heathen religion. When it was brought over into Christian-

ity and adopted as a part of the faith and practice of a large part of the Christian Church, it was brought in as a religious institution. And so it has always been religious and only so. Then to talk of it as a civil institution is the merest nonsense. And to talk of enforcing the observance of the day from "economic" or "physiological" reasons without also enforcing the religion that is in it is as absurd as it can be. And it is just as unreasonable for a Christian to favor a Sunday law as it would be for him to favor a law enforcing any other tenet of his faith. Christianity needs no human law to give it strength. It has its foundation in the words of eternal truth, and is as sure as the everlasting hills. And he who would seek civil law to uphold it, is still unacquainted with the mighty power that is in Him who is the source of all our power.

To briefly sum up the points in the above is to state that the Secular Union is in favor of Sunday laws from a civil basis; the National Religious Liberty Association, and Seventh-day Adventists, oppose all such laws. Carrying the matter still farther and stating the position of the American Sabbath Union, and kindred organizations, it might be added that these have all stated their belief in a "civil" Sabbath, and that they do not want religious Sunday laws, they only want the day observed on sanitary and economic grounds. The reader can readily draw his conclusions in regard to who are working with the infidels.

A. O. TAIT.

Non-Partisan Views.

THE annual Convention of the Non-Partisan Woman's Christian Temperance Alliance, of Illinois, was recently held in the Grand Army Hall, Chicago. The report of the work of the Alliance for the past year indicated a good degree of prosperity.

In contrast with the previous action of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the convention indorsed the bichloride of gold cure for drunkenness as a valuable aid in reforming drunkards whose continual dissipation had resulted in a diseased condition of mind and body, to the extent of destroying will-power.

The organization proposes to bend all its energies in the direction of gospel temperance work, and not trammel itself with numerous side issues, political and moral,—the rock on which the old organization split.

When asked what attitude the Alliance would maintain toward compulsory Sunday observance, Miss Lathrop, Vice-President of the national organization, stated that she was opposed to adding that department, and but few State organizations had done so. The reason she gave for opposing it was, that inasmuch as they were,

by their Constitution, declared to be non-partisan, it would be unconstitutional to bar Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists from their organization, and it would be unreasonable and unjust to ask them to aid in promoting Sunday observance by precept or civil legislation.

State officers were elected for the ensuing year, and Mrs. Webster and Dr. Henrietta K. Morris were appointed delegates to the national Convention, to meet November 10 to 13, in New York City.

A. F. BALLENGER.

A YEAR ago THE SENTINEL gave an account of a conference of delegates from ten different denominations, in this State, for the consideration of the question of instruction in morals in the public schools. Of the result of this conference the *Christian Union*, of November 7, says: "The platform then adopted, and now commended by the committee, declares that, 'for the preservation of the constitutional right thus exercised by New York State, it is proper and wise that the extent to which religious exercises be maintained in any school under the care of the State be left to the general voice of the constituency of such school, with strict care that no right of conscience be violated,' but that 'for the interest and preservation of the State, expediency demands that practical morals be taught, as an essential part of the curriculum, in every public school.' It also calls upon all good citizens to watch that the appointments of school officers and teachers be governed as far as possible by their fitness; that suitable text-books in morals be provided, and that in every school in the State at least the ten commandments be taught. Upon the basis of this platform and these recommendations a 'League for Moral Instruction in Public Schools' has been formed, and will soon hold a conference on the subject somewhat similar to that of last year."

SYLVESTER F. SCOVIL, President of Wooster University, Ohio, said at the hearing of the American Sabbath Union before the World's Fair Commissioners at Chicago:—

The Sabbath laws are habitual in America. They are in possession. They came into possession on grounds of reason and experience. They have been in possession in the most brilliant experience of our history, and they are now controlling the country; and we ask that you shall not overthrow them, but shall again proclaim them in requiring the Columbian Exhibition to be kept closed on Sunday, the Lord's day.

This is a specimen of the habitual reasoning of National Reformers. It is upon the principle that whatever is, is right, provided it is that which they have established. They stretch the old legal axiom one point, and instead of saying "Possession is nine points in the law," claim that it covers ten.

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 ST., NEW YORK CITY.
1225 T St., N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.
28 COLLEGE PLACE, CHICAGO, ILL.
12TH AND CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.
267 WEST MAIN ST., BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

R. C. PORTER PRESIDENT.
A. F. BALLENGER SECRETARY.

Two National Associations.

A BRIEF EXAMINATION OF THEIR PRINCIPLES.

I HAVE before me the principles of two National Associations, as set forth in their Constitutions and declaration of principles.

From a careful study of both I conclude that the object of each is to educate the people of this Nation on what they understand to be the true relations of the Church and the State, as taught in the gospel of Christ, and in this way to advance the best interests of both the civil Government and true religion.

It is, however, very easy to see that the principles of the two organizations are in direct conflict with each other; hence, allowing that the members of each may be equally honest in their intentions and purposes, they cannot both be right in the principles they have adopted, and the methods they advocate.

From the Constitutions and declaration of principles of these associations I quote as follows:—

ARTICLE 1.—This society shall be called the National Reform Association.

ARTICLE 2.—Object.—This society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government, and to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will indicate that this is a Christian Nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.

ARTICLE 1.—Name.—This society shall be called the National Religious Liberty Association.

ARTICLE 2.—The object of this Association shall be to protect the rights of conscience; to maintain a total separation between religion and the civil Government; and by means of the platform and the press to educate the public mind on the relations that should exist between the Church and the State.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES OF THE NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

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.

From the foregoing it is evident that the plan of the National Reform Association is to unite the Church and the State; and, by law, enforce upon all citizens their view of the rites of the Christian Church, whether the citizens choose to be Christians or not: while the Religious Liberty Association holds that the Church and the State should be kept forever separate, and that all who conduct themselves as good citizens are accountable alone to God for their religious faith, and should be protected in their civil right to worship or not to worship according to the dictates of their own consciences. And further, that the religion of Christ is, in its very nature, voluntary, and can never be advanced by any outside pressure of human laws compelling religious observances.

Inasmuch as both these associations claim to be laboring to advance the Christian religion, as well as the best interests of the civil Government, two tests may be applied by which to try the justness of the claim of each that the principles it advocates are right.

First: What has been the result, as shown by the history of the past, of a practical application of the same principles?

Second: What does the Bible, which is the authority upon which the Christian religion rests, teach on the subject?

In applying the first test to the principles taught by the National Reform Association, we find an exact parallel by going back to the days of St. Augustine, under the reign of the Papacy. He wrote as follows:—

It is, indeed, better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment, or by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected. . . . Many must often be brought back to their Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain to the highest grade of religious development.—*Schaff's Church History, Vol. II., Sec. 27.*

Commenting on this theory, Neander truthfully says:—

It was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which . . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition.—*Church History, page 217.*

And further, Neander remarks that "in this way the Church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."

The logical result of a practical application of the principles of the National Reform Association is thus shown by the history of the past to produce the worst kind of religious intolerance and persecution, and to work disastrously alike to the best interests of both the Church and the State.

Like causes, under the same conditions, always produce like results. This is a law of universal application. Hence, as the hearts of men are the same to-day as in the days of St. Augustine, and the condition of society now, both in and out of the Church, is largely that of pleasure-seeking more than attending to things divine, the same as then; while the truly pious now, as then, would die rather than conform to the law of the land by renouncing their faith; and as it is the principles that actuate them, and not the name of the organization that may hold the principles, that make men what they are, the conclusion is not only logical but unavoidable, that the principles advocated by the National Reform Association carried into effect in the nineteenth century, though it be in America under the name of National Reform, will produce the same results as in the early centuries of Christianity under the name of the Papacy.

That these conclusions are not overdrawn, and that Protestants actuated by these principles will persecute those who differ from them in religious belief and oppose their views, is plain to be seen by reading the history of the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, the history of the treatment of Baptists and Quakers during colonial times in this country, and the history of the cases of

Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists who have been arrested and fined during the last five years, in the States of Georgia, Arkansas, and Tennessee, for quietly working on Sunday after they had conscientiously observed Saturday as the Sabbath.

One of the latest of these cases is that of Mr. King, of Tennessee, which has just been appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States by the Religious Liberty Association.

This is sufficient to show the practical workings of the principles held by the National Reform Association; and as these principles are also advocated by the American Sabbath Union, and the Sabbath Observance Department of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, what has been said above applies with equal force to the work of these organizations.

We now look for a parallel in the history of some nation showing the result of a practical application of the principles of the National Religious Liberty Association. The following quotations from the Constitution of the United States show that this parallel is found in our own Government:—

No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.—*Art. 6.*

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.—*Art. I, Amendment.*

The discerning reader will see at a glance that the principles embodied in the United States Constitution are opposed to a union of Church and State, and declare it to be out of place for Congress to make laws respecting an establishment of religious observances; also, that this is exactly the position taken by the Religious Liberty Association. How has the application of these principles in this Government affected the cause of religion, and what has been the effect upon the State? The ready answer of every American citizen is well expressed in the following forcible statements:—

No nation ever advanced so rapidly in all that constitutes national strength and capital.

No nation in so limited a time has developed such unlimited resources.

No nation has ever existed, the foundations of whose government were laid so broad and deep in the principles of righteousness and truth.

No nation has ever existed in which men have been left so free to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

In no nation and in no age of the world have the arts and sciences so flourished, so many improvements been made, and so great successes been achieved in the arts of both peace and war, as in our own country during the last fifty years.

In no nation and in no age of the world has the gospel found freedom, and the churches of Christ had such liberty to enlarge their borders and develop their strength.

These facts plainly show the result of the practical application of the principles held by the Religious Liberty Association. The only wonder is, that any one who has tasted the sweets of liberty, both civil and religious, under the grandest form of government ever instituted by man, should ever desire to turn back to the principles of despotism, which, with their blight and sorrow, death and desolation, have stained all their past history with blood.

The discussion of the second division of this subject must be deferred until next week.

R. C. PORTER.

Lecture Bureau of the National Religious Liberty Association.

THE Lecture Bureau of the National Religious Liberty Association is composed of competent lecturers in various parts of the United States, and any one desiring lectures upon the subject of religious liberty and the relation of Church and State, may secure a lecturer by corresponding with Allen Moon, the Secretary of the Bureau, 28 College Place, Chicago, Illinois.

Sunday at Salem, Massachusetts.

At a meeting of the Congregationalist Club, in Salem, Massachusetts, October 26, the Sunday question was discussed under the heads of "Sunday Travel," "Sunday in the Home," "Sunday Traffic," "Sunday Rest," "Sunday Reading," and "Sunday Visiting." The reports indicated that there was quite a unanimity of feeling and expression in regard to the necessity of guarding the Sunday institution and working for its stricter observance. The points, made in a speech that would characterize the whole discussion, are as follows:—

That it is manifest that the present generation is observing the Sabbath far different than was the former custom. A person now does things which he would have condemned years ago. It is God's will that we should rest one day in the week, and the Sabbath is the day appointed. Sunday riding is wrong, unless done for the Lord. Trains, horse cars, etc., all should be run, if in the service of the Lord. The speaker deemed it a blessing to have vehicles with which to convey the aged to church. He wound up his remarks by saying he always voted against Sunday camp-meetings, for which he was applauded vigorously. Sunday bicycle riding he considered the most pernicious habit of all.

It is very well to talk in this way in urging those who believe that Sunday should be observed as a religious institution, to so observe it. It is certainly the right and privilege of every one to keep Sunday, if he chooses; and it is his further privilege, undeniably, to proclaim his belief as widely as possible. But when those who have such ideas in regard to the strict observance of Sunday, believe that laws should be made in harmony with their views to compel those who do not believe in Sunday at all, or else are indifferent in regard to it, to thus observe the day, it is altogether out of place. It should ever be kept before the public mind that legislation looking toward the observance of any religious institution has been the bane of the ages, and the cause of very much of the suffering inflicted upon the human race.

Let all observe the day who will, but compel no one.

The "Civil Sabbath;" or Disguised Religious Legislation.

THE foregoing is the title of a new eight page tract just published by the National Religious Liberty Association. The idea that we can have a "civil Sabbath," wholly separate from the religious, is advanced with great earnestness in connection with the efforts being made to secure Sunday laws. This tract shows that all the intolerant persecutions of the past have been in the name of the civil power, and in obedience to the laws of the State. It also exposes the fallacy of the oft repeated assertion that man requires one day in seven for his physical rest, and refutes other erroneous theories in connection with the civil Sabbath discussion.

The tract is just the thing to be used where the National Reformers and others have been agitating this question, and if it can go in advance of them it is all the better. It should be circulated by thousands throughout the whole country.

Send orders to any State Tract Society, or to the National Religious Liberty Association, Battle Creek, Michigan. Price thirty-five cents per hundred. A. O. TAIT.

REPORTS are continually coming to the office of the Religious Liberty Association in regard to the earnest efforts that are being made in Michigan to render potent the Sunday laws of that State, and also to increase the sentiment favoring such legislation. The National Reformers are working hard to redeem what they consider to be lost ground in that portion of their territory.

THE tones of the "creative voice of God" were without discord, so all truth harmonizes.



NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 12, 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.

REV. FRANCIS L. PATTON has matched the famous remark of W. H. Vanderbilt in reference to the public, he says—"I know all sorts of reasons have been urged why the Fair should be kept open on Sunday. It has been said the workingman and his family cannot see the Fair on any other day. *So much the worse for the workingman.*" The *Chicago Herald* thinks, "That speech will immortalize Rev. Francis L. Patton more than all his sermons."

THE San Francisco *Examiner* prints the following item, with the accompanying pithy comment:—

California alone of the forty-four States and four Territories of the United States, is the only one without some form of a Sunday, or one day in seven as a legal rest day. Do not your cheeks tingle with shame when you think of this?—*R. H. McDonald.*

My good man, they do not. Following the commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," I fail to find the words, "Governments shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

HERE is a sample "civil Sabbath" law argument:—

It is proven by experiment that in an ordinary day of toil, a laborer loses one-sixth of an ounce of oxygen more than he regains by a night of rest, so he needs a Sunday rest to catch up. A man cannot rest properly all by himself, he must have social privileges, and cannot get them unless his family and friends and associates rest at the same time.

Neither assertion is true. It has not been proven that "in an ordinary day of toil, a laborer loses one-sixth of an ounce of oxygen more than he regains by a night of rest." Neither is it true that for the purpose of regaining oxygen a man cannot rest just as well alone as in company. The whole thing is as false as the cause, in whose support it is urged, is unjust.

THE Cincinnati *Post* says, editorially, of the concerted effort in Pittsburg to enforce the Sunday laws of Pennsylvania, to the suppression of all forms of Sunday trade, labor, and amusement, that, if the law is on the statute books, it should be enforced. "Respect for the law, whether in the estimation of many or few it may be a good or bad law, is the sheet anchor of our liberties, and our only protection against anarchy." And so the *Post* calls for the enforcement of the Sunday law,

and thinks that "the Sabbatarian Society of Pittsburg is justified in its effort." There is a serious fallacy in such a line of thought as this. The enforcement of a bad law must result in injustice and wrong. No one is justifiable in making themselves a party to injustice, whether it is possible for them to do so under color of law or not. If the Sunday law is a bad law, contrary to the principles of righteousness and equity, the Sunday Society of Pittsburg is not justifiable in its attempts to enforce it. It is a bad law. Its results can be nothing but inequity and unrighteousness. What then can this Society be justified in doing as regards this law? Manifestly nothing except to seek its repeal. And the same is true of all bad laws.

In an editorial review of "Religion in Europe" a late paper says:—

In France, and especially in Paris, it is gratifying to see how little Sabbath work is done, compared to what met the eye at every turn thirty years ago.

This is a complete refutation of the claim that in this country law is necessary to preserve the "civil Sabbath." The fact is that the workingmen will take all the care necessary of the civil "rest day." They have more than once said that they need no assistance in this matter.

THE latest reason for Sunday sacredness, and one quite without a parallel, is that given by Rev. Dr. De Witt. In his criticism upon a certain sermon, he says:

The ancient pagans named the day Sunday in honor of their chief god, the sun, which was their highest deity, and our Lord honored the day by his own ascension from the grave.

Does the Doctor mean to say the Lord honored a pagan festival? As if it were possible for Christ to so stultify himself as to intend to "honor" the breaking of the first of the commandments, when he taught that "whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

Sunday advocates must be hard pressed, indeed, for proofs of its sanctity when they bring in an argument which, like Mephibosheth, is lame on both its feet.

THE Sioux City *Journal* of October 17, publishes the following unique prayer, and attributes it to a clergyman of Quincy, Illinois:—

O, Lord, we pray that the excursion train going east on the Hannibal and St Joseph railroad this morning may not run off the track and kill any church members that may be on board. Church members on Sunday excursions are not in condition to die; and in addition to this it is embarrassing to a minister to officiate at the funeral of a member of the church who has been killed on a Sunday excursion. Keep the train on the track and preserve it from any calamity, that all church members among the excursionists may have opportunity for repentance, that their sins may be forgiven. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

This is a peculiarly interesting petition,

so simple and naive in form, and yet, between the lines "so replete with sensational information and crisp with editorial comment." And then the refreshing frankness with which the Deity is told how inconvenient a thing it is to preach the funeral sermon of one whom the Church has seen fit to call a sinner. This minister should have bethought himself of the Church doctrine of "not under law but under grace," and have directed his petition to the Illinois Legislature to repeal the Sunday law, and both he and his truant excursionists might have rested in peace.

A PROMINENT National Reformer says that the *regime* which they propose "would secure the administration of a rightly constituted government by righteous legislators, judges, and executors. It would make only righteous men, men of Christian morality—eligible to office. It would keep out of office all ungodly and wicked men. Aspirants for office, for power, for honor, or for spoils—unbelieving and immoral men—asking the dear people to make them legislators, or congressmen, or judges, or governors, would be left at home." That is, only professors of religion would be eligible to office, under practical National Reform. But that would only be to place an immense premium upon hypocrisy.

SOME people imagine that in this country there is no danger of religious oppression because of the differences between Protestants and Catholics. But on some questions these are one. Archbishop Ireland, in an address before the Board of Managers of the National Temperance Society, at a reception given him by them, in the Concert Hall of the Metropolitan Opera House, in this city, on the 13th of last April, speaking of Protestants and Catholics, said: "Thank God we stand together in demanding the faithful observance of Sunday!"

ONE of the most silly claims put forth by National Reformers is that Israel was a republic. This is a new theory coined and given to the world solely for the purpose of concealing the native iniquity of the so-called National Reform movement.

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.