



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 10, 1891.

NUMBER 48.

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.

You will find it impossible to kill a principle, although you may take the life of the men who confess that principle.—*Adolph Fischer.*

“CONCEALMENT, evasion, ambiguity, are the resort of those who cannot remain silent, and yet are afraid to speak. Great openness and frankness are powerful prepossessions in favor of the truth.” These sentences express facts which are given a loftier significance in the words of the Apostle Paul, “Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech.”

At no time in the history of the world has there been such an opportunity as at present, for the use of plain speech, in the fear of God, to make clear to the minds of the people the fallacy of the subtle and ambiguous reasonings, by which they are being led to accept man's law in the place of God's law; church creeds in the place of the Bible; and ecclesiastical dogma as the rule of civil affairs.

LORD MACAULAY ironically says, that in matters of conscience “majorities are all right when I'm in the majority; but all wrong when I'm in the minority.”

To illustrate, take the case of the infidel. Has he no rights? He has no convictions or scruples as to religious observances. Would it be right for the Christian, who might be in the majority, to compel the infidel to observe a Christian institution? It would be all right and proper if it would be right for the infidel,

who might be in the majority, to forbid such observance. But if one is wrong so is the other.

It must, therefore, be clear to all, that the only position for the civil government, or local authorities, is simply to protect every man in his rights. If we should try to compel a man who is not a Christian, to act as do the Christians, we should only make a hypocrite of him who otherwise would be a good citizen, and thus he would become a dangerous man, and hence a dangerous citizen. Let us be consistent, and look at this question from the standpoint of the Golden Rule. “Therefore all things, whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.”

The Rights of the People.

IN our study of the opinion of the Circuit Court of the United States for the Western District of Tennessee, as expressed in Judge Hammond's *dictum* we have had to dwell upon the subject of the rights of the individual with respect to religion and religious observances enforced by law. We have found that in the whole *dictum* there is nowhere any recognition whatever of any such thing as the rights of the individual conscience; no right of the individual to choose for himself in religion or religious observances. Everything must be submitted to the dictates of the majority, it matters not what that majority may declare or demand. In short the will of the majority is made absolute in all things. The State is made supreme and absolute, and the individual is completely swallowed up and absorbed therein. The majority alone have rights, and these are bestowed by the State.

This point was merely referred to in the quotation and discussion last week. The point is worthy of fuller examination, therefore we quote:—

The crime is in doing the thing forbidden by law, harmless though it be in itself. Therefore, all that part of the argument that it is not hurtful in itself to work on Sunday, apart from the religious sanctity

of the day, is beside the question. It may be that the courts would hold that repeated repetitions of a violation of a law forbidding even a harmless thing, could be a nuisance as tending to a breach of the peace. . . . That is to say a nuisance might be predicated of an act harmless in itself, if the will of the majority had lawfully forbidden the act, and rebellion against that will would be the gravamen of the offense.

Now in view of this statement, please read carefully the following:—

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain *unalienable rights*; that among these 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; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is *the right of the people* to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

In declaring that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, there is declared not only the *sovereignty* of the people, but the entire *capability* of the people. And in declaring the equal and inalienable right of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, there is declared the entire capability of every man to enjoy life, and liberty, and to pursue happiness as he may think best, and he may choose for himself, so long as he interferes with no other man's equal right to the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This is the only limit that ever can rightly be set to the exercise of this right, and this limit is set in the very declaration itself. Indeed the declaration, in itself, presupposes that men are men indeed, and that as such they are fully capable of deciding for themselves as to what is best for their happiness, and how they shall pursue it.

Therefore no government, no law, can ever of right forbid the doing of anything that is harmless in itself.

Governments are not formed to interfere with or to restrict inalienable rights; but to *secure*, to guard, to make firm the

enjoyment thereof. These rights men already possess as men, by virtue of being men in society, and not by virtue of government. These rights were theirs before government was; they were *their own* in the essential meaning of the term. These rights men "do not hold," says Stanley Matthews, "by any sub-infeudation, but by direct homage and allegiance to the owner and Lord of all,"—their Creator, who has endowed them with these rights.

It is not the prerogative because it is not the purpose of government to put any restriction, limitation, or qualification, upon these rights, but solely to *secure* them.

For the rights of man, as man, must be understood in a sense that can admit of no single exception; for to allege an exception is the same thing as to deny the principle. We reject, therefore, with scorn, any profession of respect to the principle which, in fact, comes to us clogged and contradicted by a petition for an exception. . . . To profess the principle and then to plead for an exception, let the plea be what it may, is to deny the principle; and it is to utter a treason against humanity. The rights of man must everywhere, all the world over, be recognized and respected.—*Isaac Taylor.*

The plea that the doing of a harmless thing, or even the repeated repetition of it, to an infinite extent, could ever tend to a breach of the peace is most puerile, and is as despotic as it is puerile. The idea is this: You are going quietly on your way doing something which is harmless in itself. But I see you. And I am of so splenetic, irritable, and despotic, a disposition, that out of sheer wickedness I attack you. A breach of the peace has been committed; but lo, instead of punishing me for the breach of the peace, a law must be enacted *forbidding you ever again to do that harmless thing!* And this, forsooth, because it tends to a breach of the peace! You must submit to be robbed of your inalienable right, and be compelled to surrender it a tribute to the overbearing demands of my tyrannical disposition. The innocent citizen must be made a slave, and the tyrannical meddler must be clothed with power. Such an idea is the very essence of despotism. In such a conception there is no recognition of any such thing as inalienable right. Such a government would be an unmitigated tyranny.

Therefore, let it be forever repeated, that no law can ever justly be made forbidding the doing of anything that is harmless in itself. Such a law is wrong and essentially tyrannical in itself. Such a law is—not simply an *utterance* but—an *enactment* of a treason against humanity. And it is no less so when formulated by judicial or parliamentary legislation, than by the arbitrary decree of a despot. Such ideas of law and government have no place under the Declaration of Independence or the United States Constitution.

The jurisdiction of the Government is both derivative and limited. It is limited with regard to the co-ordinate departments; more nec-

essarily is it limited with regard to the constituents. The preservation of a free government required not merely that the metes and bounds which separate each department of power be invariably maintained, but more especially that neither of them be suffered to *overleap the great barrier which defends the rights of the people.* The rulers who are guilty of such an encroachment, exceed the commission from which they derive their authority and are tyrants. The people who submit to it are governed by laws made neither by themselves nor by any authority derived from them, and are slaves.—*James Madison.*

The truth and the *sum* of this whole discussion is that the views propounded in the *dictum* of Judge Hammond in the King case, are all the way from one hundred to nineteen hundred years behind the times; they are as though history had never been written; they are a parody upon progress; a travesty upon justice, and are subversive of every principle of the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution—they would sweep away every right either civil or religious that is therein declared or secured, and would again establish the same old despotism both civil and religious which cursed the world for seventeen hundred years, and against which the Declaration and the Constitution are, and were intended to be, an everlasting protest.

A. T. J.

The Kingdom of Christ.

That the "one undying enthusiasm" of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and of the National Reformers generally, namely, "that Christ shall be this world's king," in the sense of ruling over the world, or any part of it, in its present condition, is opposed to the plain teaching of the Scriptures of truth, will appear from an examination of a few texts bearing upon the subject.

Christianity was not established as a national system. Its redeemed will be "of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues" (Rev. 7:9), but no nation in the aggregate will ever be saved. Even Israel, a nation ruled directly by the Lord under inspired leaders and teachers, never developed a generation of sincere believers. In establishing the gospel, James said that God "did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name." Acts 15:14. It was necessary to have a separate people, with its priesthood and genealogies, both to represent in types the work of Christ, and to identify him as the seed of Abraham and the son of David, in fulfillment of the promises and the prophecies. But that necessity no longer exists, and therefore Christ "hath broken down the middle wall of partition," (Eph. 2:14), putting no difference between Jews and Gentiles (Acts 15:9), ordaining that "in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Acts 10:35. The gospel of Christ is a gospel of faith—of personal piety. And the work of faith is

a work of preparation for admittance to the kingdom of Christ; as Peter says "to them that have obtained like precious faith with us," that if they add to their faith the Christian graces, they shall never fall, "for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." See 2 Peter 1:1-11. It is a denial of every principle of the gospel to talk of "Christ coming into his kingdom in the United States" by means of a popular vote or a constitutional amendment.

But many seem to entirely misapprehend the present position and work of the Saviour, and the nature of the authority which he now possesses by the gift of the Father. It is a fact plainly taught in the Scriptures that the Father, at different times, confers authority of an entirely different nature upon his Son. Christ himself makes an announcement of this fact when he speaks of his occupying *two thrones* at different times, and for different objects. We refer to Rev. 3:21, where Jesus testifies thus to John: "to him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in *my throne*, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in *his throne.*" The differences of these thrones, and of the objects of Christ's occupying them, we will notice.

Of the Father's throne we say:—

1. It is the throne of the dominion of the whole universe. "God, the Judge of all," sits upon it, and before it must come the actions of all the subjects of the Creator, and from it must go forth the decisions which concern the eternal destinies of his creatures.

2. That throne is in Heaven above. It is not, and never was, upon this earth.

3. Upon that throne Christ sits as a priest—a mediator or intercessor for our race. In this he fulfills the type of Melchisedec, who was "king of Salem, and priest of the Most High God." Heb. 8:1 says: "We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the Heavens." See Paul's argument in chapters 5 to 9. Christ is a priest after the order of Melchisedec, because his priesthood is on a throne—the throne of his Father in Heaven. In this it differs from the priesthood of Aaron. And only in this sense is he a king at the present time—a priest-king. All his present rule and authority is in harmony with his office and character of a mediator or advocate. It is not the authority of an executive, or of one who punishes sinners. His authority in that respect is in the future.

4. His occupancy of that throne is limited in regard to time; his priestly kingdom he will deliver up; his advocacy or work of mediation will end. 1 Cor. 15:24-28.

5. We have no genealogy of Melchisedec, and, accordingly, Christ has no pred-

cessor or successor in his priesthood. He sprang from a tribe which could have no priesthood in Israel, and he alone is priest on the throne of his Father.

6. While sitting upon the throne of his Father in Heaven, he is expecting and waiting for a gift of power and authority of another nature. "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Ps. 110:1 "After he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." Heb. 10:12, 13. His Father puts his enemies under his feet, but not till his priestly reign on the throne of Heaven ends. 1 Cor. 15:24-28.

Of his own throne we may say:—

1. It is the throne—not of his Father in Heaven, but—of his father David. "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." Luke 1:32. "God had sworn with an oath to him [David], that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." Acts 2:30.

2. The throne of David was not in Heaven. The first dominion or rule over Israel as a nation, was from Heaven, because their government was originally a theocracy. But the throne of David was in every respect distinct from the throne of universal power whereon Christ now sits.

3. It is counted Christ's own throne, because he was born heir to it, and his genealogy from David had to be preserved in order that his claim to it might be recognized.

4. His reign upon this throne will never end. "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke 1:32, 33.

5. Jehovah promised to establish the throne and seed of David forever. "Also I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth." Ps. 89:3, 4, 27. The Revision says: "The highest of the kings of the earth." Therefore it was prophesied of Christ, David's son, that, when the kingdom is given to him, "all people, nations, and languages should serve him." Dan. 7:14.

6. David had no priesthood, and his son and heir can have no priesthood on his throne. As has been proved, the priesthood of Christ is on the throne of his Father in Heaven. Hence his reign upon the throne of David is not a priestly reign. When he is given power over the nations, according to the promise of the Father, the fulfillment of which he has yet in expectation, he will no longer be a mediator or Saviour of sinners.

The points of difference between the *two reigns* of Christ, and of the *two thrones* upon which he reigns, are plainly brought to view in the Scriptures. It is

only by confounding the circumstances of the two reigns, and misapplying the Scriptures in reference thereto, that the "National Reformers" make their positions appear somewhat plausible.

It must be remembered that "*his enemies* are put under his feet." When the nations are subdued under him, they are his enemies still. And what will he do with them when they are given to him? The second psalm answers this question: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." And with this agree all the prophecies. Thus in Dan. 2, the kingdom of Christ is represented—not as converting the nations and incorporating them into itself, but—as breaking in pieces and destroying them. They are not brought into subjection to a mild sway of gospel grace; for there is no gospel grace offered to sinners after Christ ends his priesthood and receives his power over the nations. The kingdoms of earth will be dashed in pieces, broken, destroyed; they become as the chaff of the summer threshing floors, driven away by the wind, so that "no place is found for them." To represent all this as the conversion of the nations, and their adopting the gospel of the kingdom as their "national religion" is to greatly pervert the Scriptures. It is crying "peace and safety" when destruction is impending. 1 Thess. 5:1-3.

Jesus said the saints will be rewarded at the resurrection of the just. Luke 14:14. The resurrection of the just takes place when Christ himself returns to the earth. 1 Thess. 4:15-17. At the coming of Christ, the saints inherit, or enter into and possess, the kingdom. Matt. 25:31-34. And they can not inherit it before the resurrection; for Paul says "that flesh and blood [man in a mortal state] can not inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." 1 Cor. 15:50. Christ's kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, which can not be inherited by dying people; they must first be immortalized by the resurrection or a translation. God hath "chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him." James 2:5. They who are rich in faith, and love God, are now *heirs* of the kingdom, and they will *inherit* it when Jesus comes and redeems them from the bondage of corruption. See Rom. 8:23 and 2 Cor. 5:4.

This brief view will suffice to show the errors of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and other National Reformers, in their application of the prophecies. They propose to set up the kingdom by a majority vote; but God will in his wrath destroy the majority and give the kingdom to a "little flock."

Religious Toleration in Maryland.

THE statement is frequently made, and appears even in some school books, that the earliest official recognition of religious liberty in this country was by a Roman Catholic in Maryland. And the impression is sometimes given that this was the origin of the American idea of freedom of conscience. The truth is, however, that while the Governor of the Colony, Lord Baltimore, was a Roman Catholic, at the time of the passage of the act of religious toleration in 1646, the Catholics had more than enough to do to hold their own against an aggressive Protestant majority; and it is not strange that Lord Baltimore favored religious freedom since his own people, the Catholics, had everything to gain and nothing to lose by it.

At that time England was Presbyterian, and with a majority of Protestants in Maryland and in the Colonial Legislature, the most natural thing for the Catholics to do was to favor entire freedom in religious matters.

But the so-called religious freedom of Maryland was not worthy the name, for as late as 1723 a law was enacted, Section 1 of which, reads as follows:—

Be it enacted by the right honorable the lord proprietor, by, and with the advice and consent of his lordship's governor, and the upper and lower houses of assembly, and the authority of the same, That if any persons shall hereafter, within this province, wittingly, maliciously, and advisedly, by writing or speaking, blaspheme or curse God, or deny our Saviour Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, or shall deny the Holy Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or the Godhead of any of the three persons, or the unity of the Godhead, or shall utter any profane words concerning the Holy Trinity, or any of the persons thereof, and shall be thereof convict by verdict, or confession, shall, for the first offense, be bored through the tongue and fined twenty pounds sterling to the lord proprietor to be applied to the use of the county where the offense shall be committed, to be levied on the offender's body, goods and chattels, lands or tenements, and in case the said fine can not be levied, the offender to suffer six months' imprisonment without bail or mainprize: and that for the second offense, the offender being thereof convict as aforesaid, shall be stigmatized by burning in the forehead with the letter B and fined forty pounds sterling to the lord proprietor, to be applied and levied as aforesaid, and in case the same can not be levied, the offender shall suffer twelve months' imprisonment without bail or mainprize; and that for the third offense, the offender being convict as aforesaid, shall suffer death without the benefit of the clergy.

It is true that this statute was Puritan rather than Catholic, as was also Section 10 of the same law providing severe penalties for Sunday labor. But that only shows that Maryland was Protestant and not Catholic; and, that in securing a statute of toleration the Catholics were actuated not by principle but by self-interest.

C. P. B.

God never intended that the pulpit, and the Church, and the press, and parental influence, should give place, in any great moral conflict for reform, to the baton of the policeman.—*Cruyer*.

"Sunday in Great Britain."

THIS is the heading of an article published in the *Westminster Review* in A. D. 1856. The article shows distinctly, that, from its very earliest origin, the Sunday Sabbatarian idea has tended both to religious and civil bondage. It shows also that in the controversy arising in the past attempts to enforce Sunday by law, almost every argument now brought forward by Mr. Crafts, and the American Sabbath Union, as something entirely new, and based on the fierce competition of our modern civilization, has been brought forward before, and fairly replied to by the friends of liberty.

The paper is very long, and space forbids to do more than transcribe a few of the most striking passages. In speaking of the well known historical fact, that the Puritans were the first people to give to the gradually developing Sunday festival the distinctly Sabbatic idea, the *Review* very aptly says:—

They invented the sin of Sabbath-breaking. They called a thing wrong, and persuaded others to treat a thing as wrong, which had been held to be right through the long ages of Christian antiquity, and is still held to be right throughout the whole of continental Europe. They proved it was wrong by arguments which would be ludicrous if they had not been so successful. However weak their logic may have been, the fact remains that they succeeded. They invented the sin, and they established it; they raised a new external standard by which men have ever since gone on judging each other's grapes and figs; they have ruined thousands who have been thrown into despair by being told they have committed this sin, and embittered the lives of thousands more who are not quite sure they have avoided it. They invented the sin of Sabbath-breaking as certainly and as effectually as the priests of Egypt and India invented the sin of killing a cow. It is frightful to think how much these sins of human invention have cost mankind, and how much the world has suffered even from men as honest as the Puritans. If the victim of a Scotch Sunday could but know the history of the day on which he suffers, he would at any rate start with something like a conviction as to his future duty.

This last is also true of the present victims of the Sunday superstition, and the Sunday laws. However this may be with the victims, the ambitious clergy, who are seeking political power, and thinking to establish a theocracy through Sunday legislation, are now, as then, not deterred in the slightest from carrying out their pet scheme by a mere matter of history.

After quite a lengthy account of the use of the Sunday festival, and its gradual metamorphosis into the modern Sabbath, the paper continues:—

The doctrine of the Sabbath was imported from England into Scotland, about the close of the sixteenth century, and as the rigor of Scotch Puritanism had by that time greatly increased, an innovation which was so much akin to the Puritan spirit, found ready acceptance north of the Tweed. The different bodies of spiritual governors immediately set to work, driving people to church, fining them, imprisoning them, and bewildering them with petty regulations, until, finally, they had cut off all liberty of action. Several collections of the ordinances of the Kirk session have been published

recently, and there we have the whole record of this mournful but ludicrous history. There are scarcely any contemporary documents which equally set before us the life of the quiet homely citizen of the day, or show more clearly under what a frightful spiritual bondage he was gradually falling. All games were strictly prohibited. One man is "set at the pillars" for playing at bowls on the Sabbath; another is fined twenty shillings for playing at football. Salmon fisheries gave especial trouble; some resolute sportsmen even bade defiance to the elders of the Kirk, and fished in spite of them. But generally, their tyranny was only too successful. We read of an unfortunate widow having to pay eight marks "for having spits and roasts at the fire in time of sermon." Even peaceful exercise, and walking in the fresh air, was rigorously put down. "Vaging" in the streets, or a stroll to Castlehill, was punished with imprisonment. An unhappy sinner named David Dugall was censured for "going to Cramond on the Lord's day morning with shoes," and was obliged to find surety against a repetition of the offense. The magistrates and their spiritual rulers were to see that the ordinances of the sessions were executed, and it was directed that they "shall go up and down upon the Lord's day, after the afternoon sermon, and cause take particular notice of such as shall be found forth of their houses, vaging upon the streets, and cause cite them before the session, to be rebuked and censured." The climax of folly and tyranny was, perhaps, reached by the Edinburgh Session, who ordered, April 5, 1658, that "the magistrates is to cause some English soldiers goe along the streets, and those outparts above written, both before sermon and after sermon, and lay hold both upon young and old, whom they find out of their houses or out of church."

After all this, and much more, this writer asks "And now how is Sunday at the present time (1856), actually observed in Scotland and England?" This is a very important question, for as the same measures are now being advocated for securing the "proper observance" of Sunday here in this country, it is well to know what kind of an observance is thus preached. The paper continues:—

Of the Scottish Sabbath, it is scarcely possible to speak with the moderation due to any custom obtaining in a nation which possesses so many claims to respect and which displays so many signs of real religious life. The Scotch Sunday is one of the most mournful sights to be seen by one who has learned from St. Paul, the doctrine of Christian liberty. Ignorant fanaticism has made the Scotch more Judaical than the Jews, and their casuistry more miserable than that of the Talmudists. Even the Puritans, who issued their edicts against men taking a quiet stroll on Sunday through the city streets and country lanes, could hardly have believed that their descendants, two centuries later, would actually draw down the blinds on Sunday, lest their eyes should wander abroad and admire the glory of the handiwork of God. In the nineteenth century of the Christian era, in a country where the gospel has been preached by men who have freely bled for its sake; in a country which has produced rational beings like Adam Smith and Sir Walter Scott, it is actually thought a satisfactory homage to God, for men on one day in the week to draw down the blinds of their windows and only look into each others mournful countenances. If Mungo Park had discovered an African tribe that did this, what lamentations we should have had over their blindness, what subscriptions, and meetings, and schemes for their conversion. We do not mean this as a universal custom but it is one frequent enough to be quoted as a Scotch observance.

Yet it is a fact that enlightened Massachusetts, in this present year of grace, has

furnished a parallel to this picture of Scottish penance.

In a convention of the American Sabbath Union, held in Lowell last June, a minister testified that he and his wife were compelled to leave the cool front veranda and shut themselves up in the house, on account of the number of bicyclers and pleasure riders, who came thronging by. He said a good woman in Lynn, whose house was near the beach, was compelled to lock herself in a dark room, every Sunday, for fear of breaking the Sabbath. This is the kind of Sabbath which the American Sabbath Union seeks to make universal in this country. Already they have declared that there is no recreation fit for the Sabbath, outside of the home and the sanctuary. But we will close this article with one more quotation from the *Westminster Review*:—

Great efforts have been made in Scotland to stop all railway traveling whatever on Sunday. Mr. Cox combated this monstrous proposal with great earnestness; and, although he was beaten in the particular instance which gave rise to his book, he and those who have worked with him have had some success, and on the main lines communication is open throughout the week. They also managed, by great exertion and perseverance, to start a Sunday steamer on the Clyde; but the outcry of the clergy was fearful. And what does this outcry lead to? It leads, on the one hand, to an external, an unreal observance, and on the other, to gross immorality. What is a poor Scotchman to do on a day that he has not to labor, but may not go out and refresh himself in the open air? What he actually does is to soak himself with whiskey. Sunday drunkenness in the large Scotch towns had reached such a frightful pitch that, in 1854, the Forbes Mackenzie Act was passed, prohibiting the sale of all fermented liquors on Sunday. Men have begun to get drunk on Monday and Tuesday instead.

The same results will be seen here from the same causes. When the means of getting out into the country on Sunday are taken away, as also the means of amusement and instruction in art galleries, and natural history museums, etc., the result will be that social clubs will be formed, by the thousand, which, meeting on Sunday in private houses, will engage in card playing, and carousing with wines and liquors purchased the evening before.

G. E. FIFIELD.

WRITING of Alaska, Rev. N. W. Conkling says:—

The spoils system extends its wonderful sway even to these far-off shores, and the lust of office induces men to leave their homes in the States and take petty positions in this distant and isolated country. Alas, alas! there are many abuses yet to be remedied before our country becomes what it should be in accord with its name and fame throughout the earth.

So long as human nature remains what it is now, the abuses which the Doctor deplores are practically unavoidable to some extent, in civil government, but the Church might be kept comparatively free from them by keeping it entirely separate from the State. State aid corrupts the Church and does not improve the State, indeed, it corrupts both Church and State.

Should Sabbath Observance be Enforced by Law?

[Continuation of the negative argument, delivered at the annual contest of the Philomath and Adelpia Literary Societies of Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pennsylvania, June 24, 1891, by A. L. Russell (Philo.), Bulger, Pa.]

WE will all admit that all men are endowed with the God-given right of a chainless body and a fetterless brain, to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. Since that right is not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, government can have no control over it. It never gave; how dare it take away? The glory of civil law is not the destruction, but the protection, of liberty; for liberties will clash except when each gives up part for the sake of peace, and this is law. Hence I bow to its majesty and pay homage to its genius. But its realm is civil, and into that realm where power is powerless it should not attempt to go. It will best subserve the purpose of its existence when performing alone its proper functions. To worship God in accordance with the dictates of conscience is a sacred and inalienable right of man, so long as that worship does not infringe upon the rights of other men.

Civil and moral government, separately ordained by God, belong to different realms. Civil government punishes crime alone. Moral government deals solely with sin. Crime pertains to man's relations to man, while sin pertains to man's relations to God. The name civil government declares its object to be the regulation of overt acts only. It can neither recognize, define, nor punish sin. Now Sabbath desecration is sin, and not crime; hence it must follow that civil government cannot of right legislate in regard to Sabbath observance. Now immoral thoughts, judged by moral law, are immorality, and are punishable by that law. Hatred is murder; the impure thought, adultery; covetousness, idolatry and robbery. But since civil government can not discern these hidden transgressions, it cannot punish them. Yet, in order to enforce morality, civil courts would have to comprehend, define, and punish such immorality and irreligion. This they can not do; hence, such legislation is not the prerogative of civil government.

The intent of the civil lawmaker is *civil law* alone, not moral or religious law. He is to enact the will of the people into law. True. Then why not moral and civil law combined, since both are for the good of the people? The answer is plain: The people never had such power to delegate. God is the only moral governor, his law the only moral law, and the people can not enforce a moral rule for themselves without usurping the prerogative of God, and thus becoming a condemned Uzzah, seeking to steady the ark of God. Yet Justice Field says the law should enforce morality. Now as the author, governor, and interpreter of moral law is the

only means by which men can become moral, so also must the enforcement of morality pertain to God alone. While morality in the hearts of the people is the only guard against vice, it does not follow that the State can define, enforce, or in any way invest it with the sanction of the law.

More than once an almighty hand has traced the immutable distinction between moral and civil law. Once, when giving to man the commandments on two tables of stone. Again, under the new dispensation, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Everybody interprets the word "Cæsar" to mean civil government. Let us apply the crucial test of Christ: Show me the Sabbath. Whose superscription does it bear? Whose but that of the Most High? No civil emblem is engraved thereon; render, therefore, unto God the things which are God's—not to Cæsar, not to God under the direction of Cæsar, but to God alone.

The affirmative asserted the right of government to enforce morality or religion for the good of the people. If our Government has that right, all governments have the same right. The expressed object of the Roman law was the good of the people and their religion. Having the right to enact, they had the right to enforce. Therefore under his hypothesis no blame can be attached to Rome for persecuting the Christians, nor can those slaughters be called persecution; for the enforcement of right laws can never be persecution. It is not persecution to punish the criminal. He but suffers the penalty of violated law. Now if majorities shall rule, the religion of the majority will be the *adopted* religion; and if civil legislation in religious matters be right, they may force that religion on the minority, and such will not be persecution; for the enforcement of right laws cannot be persecution.

But it may be objected that our law punishes the violation of some of God's commandments, as murder, robbery, etc. This we deny. These are not punished as violations of the moral law, but as crimes, and hence as violations of the civil law. Says Rev. Mr. Crafts: "The law forbids murder, stealing, adultery, not as offenses against God, but as crimes against man. The law has to do with the relations of men to each other, and not with the relation of men to God." Here the learned divine admits that it is not the prerogative of civil government to enforce religious institutions, and states our position exactly. Were they enforced as God's law, the truly repentant murderer or robber, being forgiven before God, would be guiltless before the State, and must go free; and were he to repeat the crime and his repentance seventy and seven times, still he should go unwhipt of justice. Manifestly such a basis of civil

law would be the destruction of all law and all government; hence it is not sound policy for the State to attempt to exceed its jurisdiction. The Supreme Court of Ohio says: "United with government, religion never rises above the merest superstition; united with religion government never rises above the merest despotism; and all history shows us that the more completely they are separated the better it is for both."

The fact is evident that religion has full protection under the laws against disturbances of meetings (and these the American Bar Association says are not Sabbath laws), and painfully realizing that if such laws are upheld at all it must be on human reasons, they claim that they seek the protection of the workingman. The claim asserts that men are compelled to work on the Sabbath, and hence can not secure needed rest. Now such a state of affairs exists only in slavery. No man works in our land but of his own free will. Let the foremost advocates of Sabbath laws testify, and falsify the assertion. Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts says, in his address on the civil Sabbath, "I have searched the world over in vain for an affirmative answer to the question, 'Did you ever know a man financially ruined by refusing to do Sunday work?' I have found scores of instances where conscientiousness in the matter led to promotion; none where it led to poverty." A. E. Waffle says, in his \$1,000 prize essay on the Lord's day, "Hundreds of inquiries have been made, and no case has been found in which one suffered permanent injury or loss because he refused to work on Sunday." Thus, by their principal advocates, this claim stands convicted of being entirely without foundation.

A Well-Founded Suspicion.

THE American Sabbath Union has been threatening for more than a year to invade the State of Michigan, and organize it in behalf of their work, but for some reason, unknown to the writer, they have deferred their action until the present time. One thing, however, is certain; they knew that it was the stronghold of the Seventh-day Adventists, and possibly they deferred visiting that State until their organization was strong enough in other States to give them the amount of courage necessary to face such inveterate enemies to their work as they hold the Seventh-day Adventists to be.

On Monday, Nov. 16, a mass meeting was held in the principal Methodist Episcopal Church of Jackson, and Rev. F. W. Ware of Grand Rapids, the Secretary of the American Sabbath Union for Michigan, attempted the first county organization in the State. Previous to this, however, he had tried to show the citizens of that city the necessity of organizing in behalf of the preservation of the "Ameri-

can Sabbath," which almost wholly consisted in pointing out that Seventh-day Adventists were the "organized enemies" of the American Sabbath Union in that they zealously opposed their desire for stringent Sunday laws.

The sequel showed, however, that he had mistaken the feelings of the people toward those whom he had berated, for instead of creating a sympathy in his own work, much suspicion was aroused in the community that the design of the Union was simply to oppose Seventh-day Adventists. They reasoned thus, "If it is not so, why does he make them the burden of his criticisms and abuse." So when the time came for the appointed "mass meeting," he had less than seventy-five people present, and nearly one-third of these were the Seventh-day Adventists.

Mr. C. K. Perrine was elected temporary chairman of the meeting, and when the nominations were reported, his name appeared in the list of nominees for the Executive Board. Mr. Perrine stated to the audience that he had heard his name read among those who were to serve the Society officially, but that he found it impossible for him to serve in that capacity unless he could first have the assurance of that body that the Union had no design against those who differed with them in the matter of the Sabbath day.

He said that in talking with quite a number of his fellow-citizens that day, grave suspicions had been expressed that the work of this organization would be a detriment to the community, because of its apparent designs upon members of the community who were esteemed as law-abiding citizens; namely, Seventh-day Adventists; and he thought that this suspicion in the minds of many had caused a lack of co-operation in the organization of the Union. He then presented the following resolution, saying that unless it could be indorsed by the body present, he should withdraw his name:—

WHEREAS, Uncertainty and misapprehension are alike in the minds of some at the attitude of the American Sabbath Union toward those who, in good conscience, observe as the Sabbath a day other than the Lord's day, therefore, that all may co-operate with us with the greatest assurance that the methods and aim of this organization are in accord with the broadest toleration and with the principles of American civil and religious liberty, be it

Resolved, That we indorse that provision in the Sunday law of Michigan which exempts from its legal penalties those who religiously observe as a day of rest, a day other than the Christian Sabbath.

This called out remarks from Rev. Mr. Ware, who said he considered the resolution unnecessary because he had assured the people already that the attitude of the American Sabbath Union would be favorable toward the Adventists, and he therefore objected to the resolution going into the minutes of the organization of the county Union. But Mr. Perrine had the chair and also the control of the meet-

ing. The resolution was put to vote and the chairman announced that it was passed unanimously. There was no enthusiasm following this, and later proceedings were very brief indeed, as little remained to be done.

Whether the American Sabbath Union has designs upon the Adventists or not, in their zeal to organize in behalf of Sunday, one thing is very evident. The attention their workers give to the Adventists in all their speeches show that this people are a source of aggravation to them; and causes those among whom the Adventists reside to be suspicious that harm is intended to these people when the Union gathers strength enough to itself to safely inflict it. All this, the Sabbath Union now denies, but as they grow stronger their real animus toward the Adventists will be seen by all. If they have no evil designs against them, it would be as well for them to be a little less incendiary in their public speeches when referring to their work, as such a course is sure to give other communities the same ground of suspicion against the work of the Union as was expressed by the meeting in Jackson, Michigan.

J. O. CORLISS.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

HANDSOME BOOKS FOR HOLIDAY PRESENTS.

FAVORITE BIBLE STORIES FOR THE YOUNG—With numerous illustrations. 16mo, handsomely illuminated board covers, 50 cents; cloth extra, 75 cents.

SAMUEL CROWTHER, the Slave Boy who became Bishop of the Niger—By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson." 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

THOMAS J. COMBER, Missionary Pioneer to the Congo—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, price, 75 cents.

BISHOP PATTERSON, the Martyr of Melanesia—By Jesse Page. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

JOHN GRIFFITH, Founder of the Hankow Mission, Central China—By William Robson, of the London Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

ROBERT MORRISON, the Pioneer of Chinese Missions—By Wm. J. Townsend, Sec. Methodist New Connexion Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

ROBERT MOFFAT, the Missionary Hero of Kuruman—By David J. Deane, author of "Martin Luther, the Reformer," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

WILLIAM CAREY, the Shoemaker who became a Missionary—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

JAMES CHALMERS, Missionary and Explorer of Ratonga and New Guinea—By Wm. Robson, of the London Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

MISSIONARY LADIES IN FOREIGN LANDS—By Mrs. E. R. Pilman, author of "Heroines of the Mission fields," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75c.

JOHN WILLIAMS, the Martyr of Erromanga—By Rev. J. J. Ellis. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

JOHN BRIGHT, the Man of the People—By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson," "Samuel Crowther," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

HENRY M. STANLEY, the African Explorer—By Arther Montefiore, F. R. G. S. Brought down to 1889. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

MEMOIRS OF EDWIN BAINBRIDGE.—The subject of this memoir is the young English tourist who met his death at the dreadful volcanic eruption of Tarawera, New Zealand, on the 10th of June, 1886. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75c.

SIBERIA AND THE NIHILISTS.—Why Kennan went to Siberia. By William Jackson Armstrong. This is one of the most intensely interesting and thoroughly reliable contributions to literature on Russia and the Nihilists ever published. Everybody should read this book, because no one can be intelligent upon the subject of which it treats without familiarity with its contents. 160 pages, paper covers, 25 cents.

CRUDEN'S CONCORDANCE—A dictionary, and alphabetical index to the Bible. Cloth, \$1.25. Sheep, \$2.50.

THE NEW BIBLE ATLAS AND GAZETTEER, with 16 colored maps by W. and A. Keith Johnson, and a very elaborate gazetteer, giving information about nearly every place which is marked upon the maps, with scripture references. 4to, cloth, \$1.50.

GINN'S CLASSICAL ATLAS—4to, cloth, \$2.50. This work contains 23 colored maps, which were projected and executed by the late A. Keith Johnson, with a complete index.

NEW HISTORICAL ATLAS AND GENERAL HISTORY—By Robert H. Labberton. This is the only atlas that has a map for every period. A map for any particular date can instantly be found by any one. It contains, now made for the first time, maps of the Chaldean, Elamitic, Egyptian, Kossean, Armenian, Hittite, and Assyrian Empires. It contains 198 maps, printed in colors, 30 genealogical charts, and is complete in one volume. 4to, \$12 pages. Sent by mail or express, post-paid. Half law sheep, \$2.75; half morocco, \$3.00.

THE POCKET ATLAS OF THE WORLD—A comprehensive and popular series of maps, illustrating physical and political geography, with geographical statistical notes, 54 double maps, cloth, \$1.00.

FOX'S BOOK OF MARTYRS; or, a history of the lives, sufferings, and triumphant deaths of the primitive Protestant martyrs—1 volume, 12mo, cloth, 50 cents.

The above named books will be sent post-paid on receipt of price.

Address all orders to the
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY.
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

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.

A RADICAL clergyman has recently declared that if Chicago opens the gates of the World's Fair on Sunday, the city should be pitched into the middle of Lake Michigan. An exchange remarks of this that such a man "should be arrested for anarchy."

THE National Religious Liberty Association is the only organization now in existence which has for its purpose the defense of both civil liberty and religious freedom, with the idea of impartial protection to both, in the knowledge that neither the civil nor the ecclesiastical authority can trench upon the sphere of the other without becoming, in either case, as well uncivil as irreligious; and does this purely, solely, and unswervingly, without fear of prejudice, party, or man, from the principles laid down in the Bible, and enunciated by Jesus Christ, who with the Father, made the world and man, and gave to humanity the right of self-government.

THE Chicago correspondent of the *United Presbyterian* has heard Hon. John J. Ingalls deliver a lecture in Chicago, in which he "did not hesitate to recommend the opening of the Fair on the Lord's day." The expression of this view by Mr. Ingalls has given this correspondent such a conviction of the dangerous character of the Ex-Senator's public addresses that he feels it his duty to publish the general warning that "It is safe to stay at home, if you have no better place to go to, when he lectures in your town." This person who expects to so summarily deprive Mr. Ingalls of his audience is only equalled by that other minister who boasted, in the *Observer*, of having contributed to the financial failure of the New Orleans Exposition by refusing to attend with his family because of its Sunday opening, and threatened similar disaster to the Chicago Exposition on the same conditions. Such clerical assumptions of censorship as these would be amusing, were they not becoming so general.

REV. DR. WILLIAM A. BARTLETT, Pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., has accepted an appointment on the Board of Directors of the House of the Good Shepherd, an institution owned and controlled by the Roman Catholics under the immediate management of the Sisters of Charity. The spiritual and material prosperity of this institution is also under the especial fostering care of Cardinal Gibbons. This charity has, in common with others in the

District of Columbia, shared in the largesses of the Government, and now identifies with its interests one of the most popular clergymen of his denomination in the United States—that denomination too, which has been especially prominent in the effort to secure the enactment and enforcement of religious laws, particularly for the observance of Sunday.

This is significant, and the *New York Times* properly comments:—

The step taken in this instance is of such importance that it could not have been decided upon by any but the highest Catholic authorities in America, and it comes after due consideration of its effect. The exclusiveness of the Catholic Church in matters of this kind is universally understood. The placing of a very prominent Presbyterian minister in an important directorate is significant. . . ."

There have been other overtures toward union from Roman Catholic prelates. American Protestants have accepted them. Of what is this all significant?

THE *Great South*, Birmingham, Alabama, enumerates some of the tendencies to paternalism which mark legislation at the present time, and are to be found to a remarkable degree in the demands made upon legislatures and upon Congress, and says:—

Soon we may look for organized movements having in view the assumption by the Government of the right to regulate the morals of the people. It is time the country was being awakened to its danger.

Instead of coming soon, that time is already here. Never in the history of the world has there been such a marvellous organization of associations, unions, leagues, societies, circle within circle, as is now in existence, for this very thing of regulating the moral conduct of the people of the United States. Demanding also that the moral government of the Nation be paternalized, and Congress dictate to the citizens of this country whether they shall work or worship on the first day of the week.

AN English paper has this pointed paragraph in reference to ancient Puritan regulations.

The Puritan settlers in New England left behind them severe laws against Sunday traveling or recreation of any description. They also punished witchcraft with death, and inspired as much gloom as possible in the community. These things induced a worthy American to observe that it would have been a great deal better for the country, if, instead of the Pilgrim Fathers landing on Plymouth Rock, Plymouth Rock had landed on the Pilgrim Fathers.

Although this is rather a crushing sentiment yet it would no doubt have found an echo in the feelings of the violinist Remenyi when these same "severe laws against Sunday traveling," prevented his reaching New York in time to take part in the Seidl concert, of November 29, and caused him to telegraph; "Arrived in Springfield in time, but there is no train to New York before evening, owing to Connecticut Sunday laws. You may imagine my grief, but it is not my fault," etc.

The *Recorder* notes that he was able to wire the impossibility of keeping his engagement, and asks, "If it is right to wire, why not to run a train? If it is right to use electricity, why not steam?"

The Sunday Unionists would no doubt congratulate themselves upon such an incident as this, but for what sufficient cause? Is any one nearer heaven because of it? No, because the obedience is but an unwilling subjection to man's law instead of a glad doing of the will of God.

THE women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Canada, in convention, have resolved that the ballot in the hands of Canadian women will "bring the ten commandments back into politics."

This is no doubt so. It may be that it will be proved to be so. And when the ten commandments are *back into politics*,—What then?

THE *Tennessee Methodist*, in an editorial article makes a strenuous appeal to the people of Chicago to organize for the enforcement of the Sunday laws, and tells them that "They have excellent statutes under which to push a vigorous campaign for Sabbath observance. This would help us all outside of Chicago in our work for the closing of the great Fair on Sunday. Chicago can learn a useful lesson from her sister city of St. Paul, in the matter of municipal reform by an aroused public sentiment, and the use of long dormant statutes. There is too much involved in this matter for us to entertain a remote thought of failing. Too much is to be gained or lost in the coming final great battle for the American Sabbath, by the success or failure, in procuring the Sunday closing of the World's Fair."

It was in St. Paul that the first secret committee was appointed by the Sabbath Unionists to assist in the enforcement of the municipal regulations as to Sunday. It seems that this committee has been efficient, and the result of its efforts in reviving "long dormant statutes" is held up as a worthy example to Chicago.

UNDER the title "Sunday Harbour Labour," the *Hong-Kong Telegraph*, of October 20, has this item:—

"The following dispatch respecting the Sunday Cargo-working Ordinance was laid before the legislative council, yesterday:

Downing Street,
10th Sept., 1891

Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your dispatch No. 258, of the 5th ult., and to approve your action in opposing the bill introduced by Mr. Whitehead to amend the Sunday Cargo-working Ordinance, by extending the date for it to come into operation to the 1st of October.

I have the honor to be, etc.,

KNUTSFORD.

The officer administering the Government of Hong-Kong."

So "Downing Street" dictates Sunday Laws to the antipodes. There is a wealth of dramatic suggestiveness in this,—religious legislation by cable, from London to Hong-Kong, and at this time when China is threatened with a religious war,—which furnishes food for thought.

THE *Presbyterian* sounds the call for an organized effort, to influence Congress, and intimidate those interested in the Exposition, in this manner:—

Our petitions have been laid upon the shelf and our moral pleadings have been ignored, and there remains nothing further for us to do than to let those in charge of the undertaking know that it will not be patronized and sustained by the Christian public, if it is to be made an occasion for desecrating and repudiating our American Sabbath. Better far that the Exposition prove a complete failure, than that it should result in an European continental Sabbath. We regard the situation as critical, and think that all interested in the Sunday question in connection with this national institution should make their voices heard, not only through religious associations, but by personal letters to the directors of the Exposition as well as to members of Congress, so that the Fair shall not be opened under governmental sanction.

As the feeling upon this question of the Sunday closing of the World's Fair increases in warmth, it will be interesting to see how close this religious boycotting will come to religious bulldozing.

THE President of the Anglers' Club of Clark's Lake, New York, has been arrested and fined in the justice court for fishing on Sunday, and carried the case to the County Court where the action of the justice was sustained, and Judge Wisner held that the question could not arise as to whether the religious repose or sentiment of the community had been disturbed or outraged, but that by force of the statute, that specific act of fishing on Sunday was made criminal.

Thus gradually, but surely, the sword of the Sabbath Union is being tempered and sharpened.



NEW YORK, DECEMBER 10, 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.

WE clip the following from a late issue of a Texas exchange: "Governor Hogg notified the County Attorney here to enforce the Sunday-closing and gambling laws, and as a consequence every saloon in the city was closed to-day, for the first time in the history of El Paso, the Monte Carlo of the West. The public gambling houses, however, did business, and made no pretense of closing."

AT the earliest opportunity a grand effort is to be made to secure the passage of a Sunday law in California. Even now plans are being laid for this. The civil Sabbath advocates insist that civil law is essential to the preservation of the workingman's rest day. The growth of Sunday rest in California in the absence of a Sunday law is a complete refutation of this argument in favor of "civil Sabbath"; hence the anxiety to secure as soon as possible the passage of a Sunday law in that State. The drift is now toward more general rest on Sunday. Now if they can only secure a Sunday law they can in a year or two claim that the improvement is due to the law.

THE following editorial outburst of politico-religious rhapsody is from the *Mail and Express*:—

Hisses are something new
For Chauncey M. Depew.

They occurred last night, Sunday, at the Academy of Music, at a meeting called—to worship God? No; "to honor and glorify Parnell," who despised and fought God to the utmost of his puny might. Was there no other night in the week that could be taken for this sacrilege? No. Hence these deserved hisses.

The literary style of this makes it worthy of being placed in the chorus of an ode to Sunday observance, composed by the Colonel of the Sabbath Union army.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *United Presbyterian*, describing a late meeting in Kansas City, says:—

On last Sabbath, the third of a series of meetings was held in the interest of Sabbath observance, but the attendance was light, and the speaking lighter. Some of the speakers severely criticised the ministers for not giving sufficient prominence to the Sabbath question in their sermons. One man, a member of one of the largest churches, who claimed for himself prominence in all efforts

for sanctity of the Sabbath, said he had never heard his pastor preach on this subject. This man however, "gave himself away" as a Sabbath reformer, when he told us of some horrible things he had seen in that morning's Sunday paper.

This is a mistake; this man was no worse than his fellows. The "Sabbath reformer" is a man who agitates for laws placing restrictions upon other people; never upon himself.

THE *Christian Union*, under the head "Close it on Sunday," expresses its views on the Sunday closing at the World's Fair, and says in reference to the legal enforcement of Sunday as a weekly rest day:—

The German Socialists are beginning to demand it, not as a day consecrated to worship, but as a day reserved for rest. A like demand is heard in whispers even in France. Here is a ground on which the religious and unreligious can and do meet. The worshiper wishes that law should preserve the quiet of the day that he may not be deprived of his rest-day by an employer or by a competition equally compulsory. Closing the Columbian Exposition on Sunday will be a national recognition of the double demand; opening it on Sunday will be as distinctly a repudiation of this demand.

Can God, Mammon, and Satan join in a triple partnership to secure the mutual observance of the Sabbath? There is a fatal inconsistency in such a supposition as this. Will the Christian recognize, or repudiate, a demand which purports to come from an alliance so obviously impossible?

REV. DR. THOMPSON, Pacific Coast Secretary of the American Sabbath Union, was in Seattle, not long since, and in an address on the Sunday question, said:—

French people are undoubtedly the most wicked in the world. The reason is they have no Sabbath. Soon we will have no Sabbath here. Even now we have seven-day newspapers, which transgress and desecrate our Sabbath with impunity. It was bad enough when we had them six days in the week, but now these seven-day issues are sacrilegious. The only way we can stop this Sunday desecration is by combining all the churches in one society.

"What in the name of sense," asks an exchange, "does Dr. Thompson mean when he says, 'it was bad enough when we had newspapers six days in the week?' Does he contemplate a suppression of all the newspapers and a return to the good old times when priests were the only repositories and disseminators of information—those times called the Dark Ages? It looks that way."

THE Baltimore correspondent of the *Examiner*, writes at some length of the last effort made by the Grand Jury of Baltimore, to revive the Sunday laws of that city, and says:—

There is a symptom of returning righteousness in the enforcement of the Sunday law. The Ministerial Union of Baltimore raised its voice and cried aloud, recently, against negligent grand juries and a conniving police force, and pledged its support to the State Sabbath Association. Strange as it may seem, the desired effect was produced, and for a few weeks arrests and indict-

ments have been numerous. Whether all this righteous indignation so suddenly aroused is a symptom of an improved moral sense, or a mere passing spasm, is a question of the future.

So this correspondent thinks that the enforcement of the statute laws of Maryland forbidding bodily labor, buying and selling, keeping open places of amusement, hunting and fishing, or dredging for oysters, on Sunday, the first day of the week, is an evidence of conformity, by the corporate soul of the city of Baltimore, to the divine law of Sabbath rest on the seventh day. Numerous arrests and indictments are proof positive, to his mind, of an awakening of the ancient and composite conscience of the civic Lady Baltimore. This misapplication of the legal theory of the corporate personality of a municipal or other corporation, in civil affairs, to spiritual and religious responsibilities is the characteristic intellectual unsoundness of the age.

By religious fiction the sacredness of the seventh day has been transferred to the first, and the burden of preserving its sanctity and maintaining righteousness, laid upon the shoulders of civil law; by an unwarranted spiritualizing of a legal fiction, applicable only to human affairs, a civic ghost is materialized. The offspring of these personified fictions is an illegal monstrosity.

ALTHOUGH the *Signs of the Times* has doubled in size, publishing a sixteen page in the place of an eight page paper, it has not increased its subscription price correspondingly. Its terms are, for single copy, one year, \$1.50. In clubs of ten or more copies to one address, \$1.25. Address *Signs of the Times*, Oakland, Cal.

WE have received a copy of the *Song Friend*, a monthly magazine devoted to music, and practical suggestions to musical students. It will prove a help to this class; and entertaining reading to any one at all interested in the art. It is published by S. W. Straub & Co., 243 State St., Chicago. The subscription price is \$1.00.

A LARGE number of subscriptions to THE SENTINEL expire during the month of December. Please notice the date on your address label and renew your subscription in good time.

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,

48 Bond Street, New York.