



Equal and Exact Justice to all Men, of Whatever State or Persuasion, Religious or Political.—Thomas Jefferson.

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, JUNE 16, 1892.

NUMBER 24.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

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

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES,
ASSOCIATE EDITORS,
C. P. BOLLMAN, W. H. MCKEE.

THE purpose of the action, in reference to Sunday closing at the World's Fair, sprung upon the House of Representatives on May 25, is said by its supporters, to have been to try the temper of the House on this subject, preliminary to the contest over the appropriation of five millions and the Sunday closing proviso to be inserted in it.

THE vote in the House of nearly four to one to close the Government exhibit on Sunday ought to satisfy the advocates of legal religion in politics of the complexion of the House on this question. Yet they are not satisfied. By this overweening zeal they may yet throw obstacles in their own pathway. The House has shown itself ready to follow their lead, and even in some degree submit, without remonstrance, to their threats. The representatives have been numbered and their standing and pedigree taken in reference to this subject. Arrangements have been made to put the political thumb screws upon them at home, and word has gone out that, whether they desire it or not, they are to be forced to go on record upon the matter in the House. This is to furnish data for the use of the political boycott which a paragraph in many of the memorials has held before congressmen as awaiting their opposition or their neutrality in the Sunday closing of the World's Fair by act of Congress.

ALREADY the dignity of several senators has been ruffled by the open threat that their re-election would be conditioned on the attitude which they assumed as to the demand from the religious aristocracy

among their constituents. Every succeeding step in the progress of the matter makes it more and more evident that this warning as to the future contents of the church ballot box was not intended as an idle threat. And certainly it would not do to underrate the efforts of these political religionists if they are able to multiply votes in the same ratio that they have been able to repeat petitions. And yet, the present Congress of the United States is by no means composed entirely of men who feel themselves compelled to truckle to the erroneous views and insolent demands of any man or class of men. On the contrary many of them are, as some have already expressed themselves, of such a stamp of mind and fibre of character as not to brook any semblance of being put upon compulsion in their public acts.

It yet remains to be seen, when the crack of the religious party whip is heard, whether congressmen will come under the yoke at its behest like dumb, driven cattle, and at the call of their names obediently assent to the demands of their drivers.

THE evidence now in, even if there were no other proof, is sufficient to show, that, whatever value the party of religious legislation places upon the legislative expression it had from the House of Representatives on May 25 and 26, if members are not lashed too bitterly, or bullied too prominently, they will, yet, during this session, record themselves as assuming to consecrate this, in consonance with Justice Brewer's decision, a Christian Nation, and declare, that as such it shall accept its national religion hereafter from the White House and the Capitol.

But if, on the contrary, the boycott and bulldoze should react against itself, in this Congress, it would only be gathering strength for the next, in which the members could be brought more generally and more completely to their knees to pray to their spiritual advisers for their weekly bread with the full acceptance of the proviso that it can be buttered only on the Sunday side.

THE arrogance of the party of religious politics does not fail of expression in any of its public utterances as to the manner in which the different propositions to guide and control the morals of the world, at the World's Fair, were treated by the members of the House of Representatives. They had previously taken the measure of the House, but the vote showed an unaccountable shrinkage. The roll had been called in the lobby, and more than one hundred members had answered in the affirmative. These, it seems, were expected to vote "aye" upon any and all moral and religious questions, pertaining to the World's Fair, which might be sprung upon the House. When blushing Columbia should be brought before them, with fingers over her eyes, and apron corner in her mouth, asking with self-conscious femininity that the American standard of purity in art should be discovered by a congressional investigating committee, and enforced in the art rooms of Chicago; and when the political prohibitionists should ask Congress to prohibit Colonel Shepard's guests at the World's Fair from drinking their champagne, or their claret, outside of their twenty-five thousand dollar apartments; or when the Presbyterian and Methodist parsons appear with their revised census of Michigan and Ohio, in which the weird voices of so many millions who have no place or habitation, petition that Congress shall enforce for them a quiet Sunday for religious devotion at the World's Fair;—if any one of these were broached, or any two, or all three of them combined in one amendment, it was evidently expected that the entire contingent, which it was supposed had been gathered, would vote as one man, no matter how absurd, or paternal, or papal, the legislation might be that was asked. In this they attempted too much. They went outside of their commission. A legal enforcement by the central Government, of the outward semblance of virtue, or sobriety, is something they never will attain to; but the compulsory acknowl-

edgment of Sunday sacredness is something which may be yielded without the sacrifice of a single personal gratification; when they asked for this alone the House gave it to them by an overwhelming majority, just as far as the character of the subject matter before them would permit.

THIS party of religious legislation has a commission, but its commission does not cover the entire scope of paternalistic action which it may occur to them to ask Congress to take. On the contrary, the field of their success is limited to the creation of a certain papal similitude, and their success in this will not reduce, but rather increase, sensuousness and sensuality.

But they waste no sorrow, even now, over the failure of the accompanying measures. That which makes the action, so far as it has gone, seem to them valueless, is that the House did not rise to an utter disregard of even the semblance of legislative propriety, and affix the condition of Sunday closing of the entire Fair, as a prerequisite to the further appropriation of any money by the Government for any purpose whatsoever connected with the Fair.

Congressmen recognize now, and always will, that they can not make the world virtuous by clothing statuary and turning nude pictures to the wall, or make the people temperate and sober by assuming control over the restaurants of the World's Fair for six months. Why then is it that they will not just as clearly see that the assumption of authority to enforce Sunday rest, by Congress, will not make another Christian, or save a single soul?

The questions of legislative propriety and jurisdiction deter them from giving their sanction to the first two measures; why should not the same reasons, existing in still greater degree, coupled with the knowledge that the religious factor involved should preclude all legislative action on the subject, cause them to refuse also their sanction to the last. It did not. Why not? W. H. M.

In Jail for Conscience' Sake.

LAST Friday the final judgment of the Circuit Court of Henry County, Tenn., was pronounced in the cases of the four Seventh-day Adventists convicted on the previous Friday of maintaining a public nuisance by Sunday work, done on their farms near Springville, in said county. The sentence of the Court was that each of the defendants should pay a fine of one dollar and the costs of the prosecution, amounting to nearly twenty-five dollars in each case, and that "the defendants stand committed until the fine and costs are paid."

Only one of the defendants was financially able to pay the fine and costs on the spot, and he declined to do so because it being a matter of conscience the Court had no just right to impose a fine. The others would have taken the same course even though their means had been ample. All four were of course committed to jail where, unless the costs are paid by friends, they will remain at a credit of twenty-five cents per day until the demands of the law are satisfied, which will require nearly three months each.

On being arraigned for sentence three of the defendants made each on his own

behalf, a motion for a new trial on the ground that while it had been proved that they had worked on Sunday contrary to the statute, it had not been shown that said work was a nuisance, or that anybody was disturbed by it. Indeed, so far as the disturbance was concerned every witness testified that he was not disturbed, and they were of course the nearest neighbors of the defendants. The Court held, however, that the gist of the offense was in doing work on Sunday publicly, in violation of the civil law, and that it was not necessary to show that anybody was actually disturbed or annoyed by it. To do work publicly within the meaning of the law is to do it when it may be observed whether it is actually seen or not. Thus one who worked on Sunday habitually, even if he were never seen at work on that day, might be indicted and convicted on his own confession. In fact, in the case of the defendant who was not convicted, the Attorney-General asked the witnesses if they had ever heard him say that he worked on Sunday. It so happened that they had not, or could not recall it certainly, and so the State failed to make a case. The effort and the decision of the Court, which was for the most part in the exact words of a decision of the Supreme Court of the State in a like case, show, however, the possibilities bound up in this law, made, not by the Legislature, but by Blackstone and adopted by the Supreme Court of Tennessee and adapted especially to meet the cases of conscientious observers of the seventh day, because of the so-called evil influence of their example!

CHAPTER 2, section 2289, of the Code of Tennessee, provides that,—

if any merchant, artificer, tradesman, farmer, or other person, shall be guilty of doing or exercising any of the common avocations of life, or of causing or permitting the same to be done by his children or servants, acts of necessity or charity excepted, on Sunday, he shall on due conviction thereof before any justice of the peace of the county, forfeit and pay \$3.00, one-half to the person who will sue for the same, the other half for the use of the county.

Section 2290 provides that,—

any person who shall hunt, fish, or play at any game of sports, or be drunk on Sunday, as aforesaid, shall be subject to the same proceedings and liable to the same penalties as those who work on the Sabbath.

This is all that the law of Tennessee says on the subject of ordinary labor, business, or sport on Sunday, and the fine of three dollars is the only penalty provided by the Legislature for violation of the law. The courts have, however, discovered a way of greatly increasing the penalty, namely, by proceeding against the habitual violator of Sunday as a *public nuisance*. And of necessity in order to give color and apparent consistency to the charge, indictments for Sunday labor charge that it is done "publicly, notoriously, and continuously," and that it "was and is to the great annoyance of the people of the county." This particular phraseology is used because the gist of a nuisance is that it annoys. Webster says:—

Nuisance, 1. That which annoys or gives trouble or vexation; that which is offensive or noxious.
2. (*Law*.) That which incommodes or annoys; something that produces inconvenience or damage.
Nuisances are public when they annoy citizens in general; private, when they affect individuals only.

Thus it appears that in law a nuisance must be something which produces inconvenience or damage. To obstruct a high-

way unnecessarily, and repeatedly, or to do it a single time and not promptly remove the obstruction would be a nuisance. For instance, A wishes to move a building from one side of a public road to the other side of the same road. The necessary obstruction of said road during the time absolutely necessary to move the building across it would not be in law a nuisance, though it might occasion some inconvenience. But if A were to continue the obstruction by carelessly, negligently, or willfully leaving the building standing in the road longer than necessary, he would be guilty of a nuisance.

Another phase of nuisance would be the maintenance of something producing an offensive or unwholesome smell. A glue factory would be a nuisance in close proximity to human dwellings but not in some place sufficiently remote to prevent the odor from being a real annoyance in the neighborhood.

But work quietly done on Sunday in rural districts is not and can not be a nuisance in any proper sense of the word. Any disturbance occasioned by it could be only mental, and must arise from the intolerant feelings of the one annoyed by it rather than from the work itself. Indeed, that this is true is shown by the decision of Judge Hammond in the case of R. M. King. The Judge said:—

By a sort of factitious advantage, the observers of Sunday have secured the aid of the civil law, and adhere to that advantage with great tenacity, in spite of the clamor for religious freedom, and the progress that has been made in the absolute separation of Church and State. . . . Sunday observance is so essentially a part of that religion that it is impossible to rid our laws of it. . . . As to the non-observer, he can not be allowed his fullest personal freedom in all respects; largely he is allowed to do as he pleases, and generally there is no pursuit of him, in these days as a mere matter of disciplining his conscience; but only when he defiantly sets up his non-observance by ostentatious display of his disrespect for the feelings or prejudices of others.

This shows that religious "feelings or prejudices" of the majority are to be protected by this *un-common* law against nuisances, for as the writer is informed by the Attorney-General himself, people living in other parts of the county are quite as much annoyed by the Sunday work of these Adventists as are their immediate neighbors. This shows too plainly to be mistaken the character of the annoyance and the reason for the prosecution, which is in fact only religious persecution. A good many people see these cases in just this light, and the imprisoned Adventists have the sympathy of the best people in the county, especially of their neighbors and of the business men of Paris and Big Sandy, who would trust any of the persecuted men to any amount that he might ask, for they know that not one of them would accept credit beyond his ability to pay. C. P. B.

Paris, Tenn., June 8, 1892.

They Want the Government Fully Committed.

It is interesting and instructive to note the extreme dissatisfaction with the action of the House of Representatives on the amendment, offered in consideration of the sundry civil bill, to condition the remainder of the appropriation for the Government exhibit at the World's Fair upon the Sunday closing of the entire Fair. The *Christian Statesman* entitles an article upon the subject, "Our First Battle a Bull Run"; and says the vote of 131 to

36 to close the Government exhibit was "one of no value, as it only requires what Mr. Blaine as Secretary of State ordered at Paris and Vienna," and again on the editorial page declares:—

The first (but not final) decision in Congress as to the morals of the next World's Fair is that it shall be conducted (if the management so desire), not on the Anglo-Saxon plan of London and Philadelphia, but on the Franco-German plan of Paris and Vienna, with no Sabbath closing required except of the Government exhibit, which Secretary Blaine would have closed at Chicago, without the aid of Congress, as he did at Paris and Vienna. If this decision should be confirmed, the Fair would celebrate, not the discovery of America in 1492, but the foreignizing of America in 1892. . . . Let it be swiftly and strongly shown that an American Fair cannot expect Americans to sustain it.

And again upon a very clear and accurate statement of the status of the question at Washington, presented by a correspondent, the *Statesman* comments editorially:—

We consider the defeat in this preliminary skirmish as much more serious than he regards it, because of the probability he mentions that "the bill appropriating more money will not pass at all," in which case we shall have no chance to defeat Sunday opening in the larger battle. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the Senate or President should secure to us, by non-concurrence with the House on the pending bill, the conditions voted down. . . . Dr. Gray of the *Interior* thinks that if Congress refuses the five millions and it is furnished by private parties, the management will pay no heed to moral considerations. The Government will, in that case, have twice missed its opportunity to prevent this result.

THE *Political Dissenter* is also in the same dissatisfied frame of mind, and speaks of what it expected and what it requires from congressmen and from its own following, with no less assurance than the *Statesman*. It says:

Mr. Stone's amendment provided that no portion of the money should be paid to the management unless they filed with the Secretary of the Treasury a written agreement that the gates of the Exposition should be closed on the Sabbath. This provision on a preliminary vote seemed to be about to carry, together with a further provision that no intoxicating liquors should be sold at any time on the Fair grounds. The vote on this last amendment was 87 to 80 in its favor. But the next day, May 26, many of the professed friends of temperance and the Sabbath proved untrue to their sacred cause. Only 27 stood firm on the first vote to 122 against the proposed provision. Col. Stone forced another vote by tellers, which brought out a somewhat larger vote on each side—43 to 134. He has expressed his determination to compel a yea and nay vote, and thus put every man on record. The provision, which was adopted to close the national Government building on the Sabbath, and prohibit the sale of liquors in it, is a virtual grant of full liberty for Sabbath violation and drunkard-making elsewhere.

What has become of the one hundred or more members of the lower house of Congress who had expressed themselves in favor of closing the Fair on the Sabbath? In our issue of May 2 we gave the names of nearly a hundred of these professed friends of the Lord's day. And yet only twenty-seven stood firm at first, and only forty-three under the pressure of a vote by tellers. This vote says to the managers of the Fair, "Go ahead and keep it open Sabbath days and all, and make all the money you can by Sabbath desecration and the liquor traffic." And thus the responsibility of this double iniquity rests on the the United States Government. We call, therefore, on all loyal Christians, to come out and be separate both from the Fair, and from the Government that has determined its immoral character.

It is remarkable how full an expression this incident has brought out, from these organs of the party of political religion, of their dissatisfaction with anything short of a complete governmental assumption of control of the morals and religion of the Nation. They are filled with such an insane desire for this that they, as well as their congressman who presented this amendment, are unable to see why a provision should not be tacked on to the

appropriation for the Government exhibit by which the Government would virtually boycott the Fair, to which it has already fully committed itself in every possible legislative way, unless its managers sign and deliver an agreement not to open on Sundays. That there should be or should have been such a possibility in the mind of any one shows such an unreasonableness upon this question as makes them willing to undertake almost any puerility which appeals to them to be for the furtherance of their ends. And the end which they seek is not so much Sunday observance, in itself, as that the supreme civil authority of the State shall set the seal of its approbation upon it, and give its signet ring to those who desire to create an "American Sabbath" by law. The propagation of religion is secondary, their first thought is the creation of a Protestant similitude to the Papacy.

W. H. M.

A Judicial Profession of Christianity for the Nation.

[Extract from an address by A. T. Jones, delivered at Battle Creek, Mich., May 14, 1892, as reported in the *Review and Herald*.]

On the 29th of February, 1892, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision that does more than any constitutional amendment could possibly do, or Congress either, to make the image to the Papacy. All that remains is to give life to it by the enforcement of whatever religious observances any bigots may choose, who can control the civil power.

Several years ago, Congress enacted a law forbidding any aliens to come to this country under contract to perform labor or service of any kind. The reason of that law was that large contractors in the United States, and corporations of great wealth who wanted to increase their wealth with as little expense as possible, would send agents to Europe to employ the lowest of the people whom they could get, to come over and work. They would pay their expenses over, and allow them to work it out at very small wages after they got over here. This was depreciating the price that Americans should receive for their labor, and therefore Congress enacted a law as follows:—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership, or corporation, in any manner whatsoever, to prepay the transportation, or in any way assist or encourage the importation or migration of any alien or aliens, any foreigner or foreigners, into the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia, under contract or agreement, parol or special, expressed or implied, made previous to the importation or migration of such alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners, to perform labor or service of any kind in the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia.

A certain church corporation in New York City hired a preacher in England to come here and preach for them. They contracted with him before he came. He was an alien, and came over under contract, to perform service for that church. The United States District Attorney entered suit against the church for violating this law. The United States Circuit Court decided that the church was guilty, and rendered judgment accordingly. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, upon writ of error.

The Supreme Court reversed the decision, first upon the well-established principle that "the intent of the law-maker is

the law." The court quoted directly from the reports of the Senate Committee and the House Committee who had the bill in charge when it was put through Congress; and these both said in express terms that the term "laborer" or "labor or service," used in the statute, was intended to mean only manual labor or service, and not professional service of any kind. Therefore, that being the intent, and the only intent of the law, and the intent of the law-maker being the law, the Supreme Court reversed the decision of the lower court, and said that the act complained of was not a violation of the law.

So far as this goes, the decision is perfectly proper, and it needed to have gone no further. But between that paragraph and the closing paragraph of the decision, the declaring of this Nation to be "a Christian Nation," this making of the image of the Papacy, was put in, as much out of place as anything could possibly be. It is altogether false; it is totally subversive of the Government of the United States as the people established it at first, and virtually makes an image to the Papacy. So I turn to that part of the decision.

After reviewing the act of Congress, the reports of the committees, etc., and deciding that the law had no such intent as the lower court gave it, the Supreme Court proceeds thus:—

But beyond all these matters, no purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, State or national, because this is a religious people. [Everybody knows that this is not true.] This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation.

Suppose it be granted that this is "historically true," what kind of religion was this "historical" religion? Was it of a kind that the people of the United States now desire to see perpetuated? We shall presently see what kind it is; and that whatever be the kind, or whether the people desire to see it perpetuated or not, it is perpetuated by this decision.

In order to get it before you in the most forcible way, I will first run down to the end of the decision, and show the interpretation and application which the court makes, of the Constitution as it respects religion. After citing "historical" statements which show that the Roman Catholic religion might be the religion of this Nation; which establish the righteousness of religious test-oaths as a qualification for office; which require belief in the doctrine of the trinity—the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, of course—and in the inspiration of the Old and New Testaments; and which establish the righteousness of Sunday laws,—after citing statements which establish the legality of all these religious things, then the court quotes from the First Amendment to the Constitution that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," and upon this, flatly declares:—

There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and re-affirm, that this is a religious Nation.

Now when I read these "historical" statements, and you see what they say, and what they mean, you will know that in the estimation of the Supreme Court of the United States, that is what the Constitution of the United States means. I begin to read as follows:—

From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affir-

mation. The commission of Christopher Columbus, prior to his sail westward, is from "Ferdinand and Isabella, by the grace of God, king and queen of Castile," etc., and recites that "it is hoped by God's assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be discovered," etc.

What religion did Ferdinand and Isabella have in mind when they issued that document? What religion did they profess? And what religion did they possess, too? Does anybody know?—(From the audience, "Catholic religion.") Yes, the Catholic religion. And not only that, it was the Catholic religion with the Inquisition in full swing. For it was Ferdinand and Isabella who established the Inquisition in Spain under the generalship of Torquemada; and who, because Spain was a "Christian nation," sentenced to confiscation of all goods and to banishment, every Jew who would not turn Catholic. And by virtue of such religious activity as this, Ferdinand and Isabella fairly earned as an everlasting reward, and by way of pre-eminence, the title of "THE CATHOLICS." And that is a part of the historical authority by which the Supreme Court of the United States makes American citizens "a religious people," and by which that court makes this a "Christian Nation"!

Now that is quoted to prove that this is "a religious people," and "a Christian Nation;" and it is declared that the language of Ferdinand and Isabella, and the language of the Constitution of the United States "have one meaning."

Then in view of that quotation and this decision, should it be wondered at if the Catholic Church should claim that this is so indeed, and should demand favors from the Government as such? Everybody knows that the Catholic Church already is not slow to take part in political questions, to interfere with the Government, and to have the Government recognize the Catholic Church and give it money from the public treasury. The people know that this is already the case. And now, when the Catholic Church is virtually recognized by official action of the Supreme Court, and when the Supreme Court declares that this is what the Constitution means, should it be thought strange if the Catholic religion should claim that this is correct, and act upon it?

It is true, the Supreme Court does not stick to this side of the question all the way through, but turns over to the Church of England, and to Puritan Protestantism. But this rather intensifies than modifies the danger, as it opens the way for a strife among these religions, to see which shall be indeed the religion of the Nation. This decision opens the way for that thing to be done.

As the intentions of Ferdinand and Isabella did not reach the part of the continent now occupied by the Government of the United States, the court now proceeds to introduce documents which give to Protestantism the prior right here, and which do in fact make this the national religion, so I read:—

The first colonial grant, that made to Sir Walter Raleigh in 1584, was from "Elizabeth, by the grace of God; of England, France, and Ireland, queen, Defender of the Faith," etc.; and the grant authorizing him to enact statutes for the government of the proposed colony; *Provided*, That "they be not against the true Christian faith now professed in the Church of England." Language of similar import may be found in subsequent charters, . . . and the same is true of the various charters granted to other colonies. In language more or less emphatic, is the establishment of the Christian religion declared to be one of the purposes of the grant.

This establishes as the religion of this Nation and people the religion "professed in the Church of England" in Queen Elizabeth's time. What religion was this? The queen's title of "Defender of the Faith" will help us to understand this. That title was obtained in this way: Henry VIII, Elizabeth's father, wrote a book against Martin Luther and the Reformation. He sent a copy of his book to the Pope. In return, the Pope bestowed upon him the title and dignity of "Defender of the Faith." And this was the Catholic faith.

What Attitude Ought the Church to Take toward Politics?

[Conclusion of the paper lately read by the Rev. J. H. Benson, before the Methodist ministers' Monday meeting, of La Crosse, Wis.]

TAKE, for example, the life of Paul; he never declared himself on Roman policies, although there was an outward and ordinary occasion for it; but it was the measure of great wisdom in him to remain silent as to outward operative forms, and work away on that which he knew would change the whole of them for the better. His appeal was to the divine life in the human heart.

Look at the political reforms of England, which were led on by the elder Pitt, and obstructed by Walpole; they were born and received their momentum in religious revivals of Whitfield and the Wesleys. It is certainly a misfortune that this swift moving age gets impatient of these unseen and slow, yet tireless, forces of man's inward life. I refuse to believe that the great social evils with which we are now struggling, would have been in existence to-day if the Church had been faithful to her bestowed powers and opportunities.

The Church can not espouse any political method; for the Church of Christ needs equal evangelical influence over men of all political creeds. This it can not have, if even semi-officially, it takes up any partisan measure to carry it to its issue. No doubt it were possible for the religious life of this country to take up a question of political expediency and urge it to a successful issue; but the procedure would be extremely hazardous, because, if successful, there would be a coming down from the high grounds of revealed truth, and a committal of the Church to the uncertainties of the campaign. It would be a flushing of the energies of the religious life with hopes of a speedy and short way forbidden in the gospels; and when once there is a committal to this sort of work, it must continue, as there would be no chance of retreat from it; and when defeat comes, as it probably would, as change in the policy and form of law in this country is frequent, there would then be brought against the policy of the Church the repulsive force of an organized majority, against which the Church is not likely to prosper. It is the mission of the Church, by the gospel, to save all classes, in all parties; and if, from its borders should come the advocacy of any partisan measure, those who are not in harmony with that measure would be estranged, and rightly so, for such a measure is not the property of the Church. It is unwise for a church to take any political attitude that would produce among organized classes any irritation against it. There is but one step

from hatred of a church, to hatred of religion. The Church can not afford to take any position that will fan the disaffection between the secular and the sacred spirit.

The Church as Christ made it is a spiritual body, designed to preserve and nourish its own spirituality and to convert unbelievers to the Saviour. Its high province is to hold, and to hold forth, the truth of God in Christ. There is an enormous amount of error afloat on this subject, simply because Christians go to the world to know how they ought to live, when they should go only to God's word; where they will find that the soul's relation to God is the first and the main thing, and that the Church is the spiritual household of faith, the fruits of which faith, in doing good to every one as we have opportunity, are to be seen in the Christian *individual* life.

These are times of more or less ecclesiastical tinkering with politics. Many of our people are not drawing the line. The unwritten law of fitness applies with equal force to national party conventions, and church associations. In a national party convention, candidates are nominated and a platform of principles is declared. There is no unfitness in such a proceeding. But, before adjournment, suppose the convention sends out a committee to bring in a report on "Predestination," or the "Mode of Baptism," or "The Admissability of Women to our General Conference." What would be the result? The Nation would laugh at the blunder, and the blunder would be a defeat. Whenever church associations voice themselves on the political expedencies, they go beyond their bounds, and blunder. All such proceedings go out in the name of the church, and they take their place as part of the problem of the political calculator. All political matters are out of place in a deliberative church assembly.

There are churches and preachers, unconsciously it may be, in the double business of politics and religion. This is the open and century-long policy of Rome, and because of her efforts to perpetuate her power along political lines, she is a menace to the Nation. If a church is committed formally to a partisan issue, rather than to the broad patriotism that knows no party, it is committed to a policy that will work the destruction of liberty as we understand it; but, first, and most fatally, it works the destruction of vital religion among the people. A church thereby destroys the power by which it wields the supreme truths of religion.

The churches of America are now suffering from the clash of political antagonisms within their own ranks, through the haste of those who say that their religious and political convictions are never to be separated, but to be uttered indiscriminately on all occasions. If this sentiment should prevail, and this state of things become general, the denominational church life of this country would soon sort itself according to political affiliations.

If the Christian life fades; if the Christian forces are so only in name; or if the secular spirit, in the popular mind, comes to be more efficient in the overthrow of social evils than the religious; it will, of course, come to that supremacy in which it will absorb everything.

The mingling of the Church and the world is to the sad detriment of the Church and without the slightest good to the world. Instead of leading the soul upward to a holy contemplation of Christ,

they lead them into the dust and turmoil of political actions, where the soul becomes smirched and loses its power to rise to heavenly contemplations. Let the Church hold high and fast the standard of Christ's cross; and let this be the first and main work of the Christian Church, and then the people will be better fitted to discharge the personal duties which belong to them, both as men and citizens. So will the Church best work to purify our politics, and to serve the State.

Look at the sequel of Hamilcar taking his boy, Hannibal, nine years old, and laying the child's hands upon the altar and teaching him to swear eternal hatred to Rome. Hannibal, a man, became Rome's invincible enemy. He maintained his army for seventeen years in the very heart of Italian territory, and as long as he lived, even when he was without an army, in exile, his very name was a terror to the Roman Senate.

So the Church, in relation to the social and moral evils of the day, has no higher or more hopeful duty than by hearthstone and altar to imbue the hearts of the Nation's children with the unpictured horrors of, and with unchanging enmity toward, these evils. If the Christian Church will promptly discharge her great responsibility here, then from the cradles of the present shall arise the Hercules-like victors who shall rid the coming civilization from the power of these evils.

"This Evil Concern."

THIS reprint from the *Christian Nation*, of June 1, does not need any comment.

"We give an extract recently sent by THE AMERICAN SENTINEL of this city to the students of the University of Ann Arbor, Mich.:-

THE SENTINEL deploras any attempt on the part of Christianity to secure political favors, as a confession of weakness which must be humiliating to every true Christian, and a just cause of reproach to every non-Christian. It believes with Madison that "religion and government will both exist in greater purity the less they are mixed together." Hence from a patriotic conviction of duty it is unalterably opposed to any movement which looks to an alliance between them. That there are decided tendencies in this direction at the present time may be easily seen (the proposition to close the World's Fair by law on Sunday is a good example) and every loyal citizen must sooner or later determine his own attitude toward such questions. Thus THE AMERICAN SENTINEL occupies an important field in that it discusses them fully and impartially.

"Some idea of the extent to which this evil concern has pushed the circulation of its pernicious literature may be had by reading the following clipping:-

In publishing work they are especially strong, operating five large houses located at Battle Creek, Mich.; Oakland, Cal.; Basel, Switzerland; Christiana, Norway, and Melbourne, Australia. They have also branch houses in London, England; Chicago, Ill.; New York City, and Toronto, Canada. These houses print papers and books in 14 languages. The present worth of the four principal publishing houses is estimated to be \$953,261.03. Their literature consists of many bound volumes, pamphlets and tracts, from the \$4 subscription book to the penny leaflet. About 1,200 canvassers will be engaged in selling the books of the denomination the present season (1892), and the sales now reach annually over \$700,000.

"Referring to this notice and clipping we have received the following letter from a student at the University:-

MR. J. W. PRITCHARD—*Dear Friend:* A few days ago I received the inclosed notice from the Ann Arbor agency of THE SENTINEL. They seem to be supplying all the students and people of the town. The inclosed slip shows their publication work. We stand as a church for the idea that an oath to the United States Constitution or any

unchristian Constitution is a dishonor to Christ. About all the chance the voters of this country have had to hear this truth is from our own church pulpits. Possibly we have reached about 10,000 voters in this way, which is less than one in 1,200. Yet we wonder why the work moves slowly.

Yours, J. M. C.

"Times without number, in private and in these columns, we have insisted on the necessity for a wider distribution of our literature, for more aggressive National Reform work by our church as a church along our high water mark lines, and for the ultimate establishment of a publication house on a sufficiently generous plan to enable us to reach all Christian people with our arguments. *We must* get among the people, get our literature into their hands, our arguments into their heads, and persuade their hearts by our zeal for their salvation."

Some Queer Old Laws.

"UNCLE JOE" Brown, of the County Clerk's office, is one of the queerest men in the court house, and also one of the best informed. Whenever any question of an especially puzzling nature comes up for settlement and no one else can answer it the seekers for information go back to the room where "Uncle Joe" works, and he explains it to their satisfaction. This sort of procedure is a matter of daily occurrence, and the old gentleman's encyclopedical knowledge is proverbial.

The other day after a delegation of information-seekers had learned what they were in search of they hung around "Uncle Joe's" desk to hear some of his reminiscences which their questions called up fresh to his memory.

"It is strange how the old laws cling to the statute books," he said meditatively. "In the Eastern States many of the strict colonial laws stand unrepealed on the books. Of course where they conflict with the more advanced ideas of to-day they have become dead letters. I was the victim of an attempt to revive one of the old statutes myself when I lived in Washington City a good many years ago. I was the manager of the Washington Gas Works, and some religious enthusiasts brought a prosecution against me for violating the Sabbath by operating the works on Sunday. I knew that unless the works ran on Sunday there would be no gas on Monday night, and on the ground of public necessity felt sure I would be sustained in the suit.

"To my surprise I found the law not only exactly against me, but learned that it was supplemented with severe penalties. For the first offense the penalty was a heavy fine, and for each succeeding offense a term of imprisonment. I finally had to settle the case out of court by the payment of a considerable sum of money and the granting of some concessions. That law still stands on the books, but I have heard of no attempt to enforce it since my unhappy experience.

"The queerest of the ancient laws which has been allowed to remain unrepealed in the District of Columbia is one which makes it a crime to deny belief in the Holy Trinity, and fixes the punishment at imprisonment. If that law was suddenly put into force to-day it would cause a lively agitation. It was on the books when John Quincy Adams was President of the United States, and he was a pronounced Unitarian. Every Sunday he would go to the little Unitarian Church down on Sixth Street and lead in the sing-

ing. There was a strange spectacle during all that administration of the President of the United States living in open violation of the law."—*Indianapolis News*.

Mr. Crafts and the Printers.

UNDER the sub-head of "Compositors and Pressmen," in the *Christian Statesman*, of May 24, 1892, I find the following statement:-

The seven-days' newspaper means seven days labor for hundreds of hard working men every week. "Nine out of every ten of us want the seventh day of rest," say these toilers.

This statement will excite nothing but contempt for Mr. Crafts among printers, not only because of his ignorance of the conditions that surround them, but for his self-appointed championship of them and their wants. The fact is, every printer knows that there is no such thing as seven days continuous work for compositors on seven-day morning papers. By a law of the International Union a printer can only work six days continuously; on the seventh day after six days of continuous labor his case must be represented by some one else, for at least twenty-four hours. Each man is left free to select his period of rest, so as not to hinder the progress of the business. Thus Mr. Crafts could hold cases on the morning paper (if his intelligence was such as would pass muster), and not work on Sunday or any other one day out of the week.

But not only is Mr. Crafts' position absurd on the foregoing proposition, but it is foolish and uncalled for from the consideration that no printer on a morning paper ever really works more than five days in the week,—consideration not only for his own health, but a desire to give the poor "sub" a chance for a living weighs more with the printer than any law Mr. Crafts could ever have enacted.

Instead of the printers appealing to Mr. Crafts for help in these premises, they do not need his guardianship in any respect whatever. They are not only abundantly able to take care of themselves, but they can see through the flimsy drapery of the subterfuge that would use them as cat's paws to secure his coveted union of Church and State. Mr. Crafts must not assume that printers are ignorant of the past. They have fortunately read some history, and know how "the successors of the prophets" have used laws which were secured by just such base and fraudulent means to oppress the innocent, and they know, too, that the darkest crimes upon the pages of history were perpetrated by these so-called "successors," etc., when they had secured power.

Mr. Crafts is not only ridiculous, but his mistaken zeal has made him foolish.

R. W. ROBERSON.

As Observed.

POLICE JUSTICE—Well, officer, what is the charge?

Police officer—Breakin' the Sunday law, yer 'Anner.

P. J.—How is that?

P. O.—Shure, he was tryin' to get into O'Connor's be th' frunt door instead uv the family intrance.—*Puck*.

It is in darkness that one should carry a light.

The Church Bar.

REV. DR. W. S. RAINSFORD, Pastor of St. George's Church, this city, has advanced a novel idea in regard to the solution of the saloon problem. In a recent interview Dr. Rainsford said to a reporter of the *Evening Sun*:—

You can not stamp out an evil such as saloons. I have never advocated attempting reforms in this way, and I do not believe that they are practicable.

What we must do is to provide substitutes which will not be tainted with vice and unwholesome surroundings. In such a thickly populated city as ours to attempt to do away with saloons is simply impossible. But we can do the next best thing, and that is, we as a Christian community can provide the beer demanded by those who want it, and elevate the standing of the saloon to a level which it has never occupied.

Business men of the churches can open saloons and run them profitably. I do not mean to give away the beer, but to sell it at good prices with a profit. Let the saloons maintain themselves. They could do so. I only wish that I myself had the money with which to demonstrate that this is the only successful way to deal with this problem.

Would I sell whisky in these saloons? No, I don't think that I would, but beer, light wines, coffee, and chocolate, I certainly would. Reading rooms could be introduced and the saloons made an attractive place of resort, without intemperance.

What is more, I would have them open on Sunday during the proper hours, but they would be so managed that they would conform strictly to the laws and in no way evade or break them.

Of course "proper hours" for Sunday opening of saloons would be hours that would not interfere with church services. The idea is not likely to become popular, however.

To Read or Not to Read.

THE *Dispatch*, of Pittsburg, reports the member of the Pennsylvania Legislature, who, in 1889, introduced the bill for the repeal of certain portions of the Sunday law of 1794 as saying:—

I think my bill could be passed now without any trouble. For one thing, the crusade against the Sunday papers had not yet been inaugurated in 1889, and neither the people nor the Legislature realized the extremes to which the informers were capable of going. Why, I have been a church warden for over twenty years, and at least fairly regular in attendance on service, but I would sooner think of doing without my breakfast on Sunday than without my daily paper. It is a necessity of our civilization, and we can not do without it.

THE SENTINEL would not be understood as justifying the reading of secular papers every day in the week. Such papers ought to be banished from Christian homes on the Sabbath; but that does not justify suppressing them by civil law. True, Sabbath keeping is an individual matter, and the man who keeps the Sabbath as enjoined in Isa. 58:13, will have no use on that day for the secular news; neither will he need a civil law to bolster up his tottering morality. "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it."

A Holiday or a Holyday.

THE *Christian at Work* would have people believe that the matter of closing the World's Fair on Sunday is only "a rest-day matter." It says:—

The question has interest for religious people on religious grounds; but as treated by Congress it is not a religious question but a holiday or rest-day question—that and that only. In some quarters we meet with the statement that Congress should close the Exhibition for religious reasons. But that involves ignorance of the fundamental law of the Nation.

If that is all that is involved why is Congress asked to consider anything in connection with the question except the purely business propositions connected with it? And why do so many "religious" people threaten to boycott the Fair upon all days if it is not closed on Sunday? It is the most arrant nonsense to deny that it is a purely religious question. If Sunday were not a religious day nobody would ask to have the Fair closed. The only way to separate it from religion and religious considerations, is to separate it from Sunday, but that would destroy the question entirely, for it is the nature of that particular day that gives rise to the question. This "civil rest-day" plea is most sickeningly hypocritical.

When Doctors Disagree.

ELLIOTT F. SHEPARD of the *Mail and Express*, claims that there are in this country fifty millions of people who want the World's Fair closed on Sunday. There are some people who want to see the Fair closed on Sunday, that are either better informed than Mr. Shepard, or have more regard for the truth than he. A Presbyterian pastor, of Chicago, recently made the following statement at a Sunday-closing mass meeting.

I acknowledge that a majority want the Fair open, but suppose this is the voice of the majority, have the minority no rights? I claim that it is possible for the majority to make a terrible blunder. . . . Shall public opinion rule in this matter? I say, no.

Sam Small who recently spoke in Chicago on the same subject argued thus:—

I say that the people who want Sunday closing in this country are in the majority and the minority have got to submit.

When the religious bigot is in the minority he wants his views forced on the majority because his views are right, but when he imagines that he is in the majority he demands that the minority submit to his views because the Government is a Government of the people in which the majority rule.

Without Natural Affection.

THE London Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children recently made a public report which is horrifying to all who have not lost their natural affections. A noticeable feature of the report is that it reveals the fact that the worst and most frequent cases of cruelty are found among the so-called better classes of English society. One woman shut her little daughter, naked, in a dark closet, tied in such a manner that she died of suffocation. This woman is said not to have been an exceptional monster. English parents have been known to put pins and lighted matches in the nostrils of their children. One baby of seven months was bitten until it was half covered with blood. A boy of six years had a rope tied around his neck and he was repeatedly thrown into a canal. The perpetrators of these cruelties plead that they have a right to give their children moral discipline for the good of their immortal souls! And yet people imagine we are living in a very intelligent and altogether superior age, when burning, or even imprisoning or whipping people to save them is entirely out of the question! The fact is, that if human nature is undergoing any change, it is becoming worse; and this conclusion agrees exactly with 2 Tim. 3: 1-5.

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

NONE are more earnest for the closing of the Fair Sunday than the Chicago saloon keepers. They want to enjoy the society of the visitors that day in spiritous seances.—*St. Paul Globe*.

SENATOR QUAY is working hard to prevent a desecration of the Sabbath by holding the World's Fair open the first day of the week. Perhaps Mr. Quay believes that ought to be sacred to politics.—*Peoria Transcript*.

THE Rev. Joseph Cook claims to have discovered that the Sabbath day was kept sacred a thousand years before Abraham. Possibly. Neither New York nor Chicago was doing business at that time.—*New York Advertiser*.

IF there is a steadfast, consistent Christian in Congress, that man is Senator Morrill. He declares that if the World's Fair is closed Sundays the working people will be practically deprived of its benefits. Do the Sunday-closing people want the great Exposition exclusively for the rich?—*Indianapolis Sentinel*.

IN their efforts to close the World's Fair Sundays, the good people who are so careful of other people's morals, seem to have temporarily forgotten their own. It occurs to us to inquire whether it would be worse in morals to look at an industrial exhibit Sunday than to concoct and utter falsehoods during the week.—*Washington Post*.

IT is a little singular that the saloon men of Chicago are working quite as eagerly as the pious people for the closing of the World's Fair Sunday. Except for the great show, they would obtain a colossal trade from the hundreds of thousands of strangers in the city. The latter, of course, are not in league with the saloons, but their plan would help them all the same. The Fair may close Sunday but the saloons go on for ever.—*Troy Times*.

IF there were any need of an argument against the demand that the World's Fair be closed on the only day when those who most need it can visit it, the petitioners for that act of exclusion have themselves furnished it. The names of the petitioners purporting to come from Michigan, exceed the entire population of the State, men, women, and children, according to the census, by nearly two millions. In other words, the self-elected defenders of what they call "Sabbath observance," have deliberately forged the names of some millions of people and tried to palm them off on the managers of the World's Fair as genuine names of people who desire that exhibition to be closed on the first day of the week. It looks as if the edition of the ten commandments which those people study did not contain, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."—*Detroit Free Press*.

A LATE Sunday liquor case before Judge Lippincott, of Hoboken, N. J., is thus reported:—

The Judge displayed considerable feeling. He is usually calm and self-possessed, but on this occasion he spoke sharply and emphasized his remarks by bringing his clenched fist down on the desk. He said in part:

"Reilly was absolutely restrained from selling liquor on Sunday. We, the Court and the jury, have taken a solemn oath to enforce the law as far as we can. Of all things in the world, we can not say that we will overlook these things as that would be moral perjury. If the sentiment of the people is against this law, let the people elect representatives to repeal it. The moment the court and jury overlook the violation of one law, encroachments will immediately be made, and other laws will be violated. Let us not be led astray by ridicule on the part of some, or by the notion that there is a single law on our statute books which can be violated.

"Let it never be said that a court and jury in this

county are too cowardly to enforce the law. Remember, too, that if we allow one violation, we throw down the gates for the admission of all moral transgressions."

So it is that these excise cases are a school for practice, preparatory to the attainment of the full enforcement of Sunday laws against all.

AT Oskaloosa, Iowa, over two hundred arrests have lately been made, and five hundred informations filed for alleged violations of the Sunday laws.

A SEVENTH-DAY Adventist at Malvern, Arkansas, has received letters signed, "The City of Malvern," warning him that unless he stops working on Sunday he will receive one hundred lashes and be required to leave the State.

WATSESSING, New Jersey, and its Methodist Church, is all torn up over bicycle riding on Sunday. The Methodist minister has made a text of some young men of the town who indulge in Sunday bicycling, and partisans of both sides are waxing warm in their attack and defense of the custom.

ON June 7, Mr. Layton, of Ohio, presented in the House of Representatives, "Resolutions of District Grand Lodge, No. 2, of the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, Ohio, protesting against the action of any and all governments, having treaty relations with the United States, whereby any of our citizens are discriminated against because of their religious faith."

THE Episcopal Church has, almost universally, maintained a neutrality in the strife to compel the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, but the Diocese of Long Island, at its Annual Diocesan Convention, lately held, has made itself an unworthy exception and passed resolutions in reference to the Sunday closing of the Fair, and also favoring the enforcement of the Sunday laws in the Long Island towns; giving special mention to Newtown, Woodhaven, Maspeth, and Bowery Bay.

THE annual summer revival of the Sunday laws of Asbury Park has begun, and this time it has the electric street cars to attack. The Sun, of June 6, has the following:—

"In spite of strong protests made by clergymen and church members here, the cars of the Seashore Electric Railway Company were running all day. A. S. Hickley, the Superintendent of the line, has published notices to the effect that in deference to the wishes of the people, as expressed in a petition sent to the officers of the company, the cars will be run on Sundays until further notice. The people who are opposed to Sunday traffic and travel threaten to apply to the State authorities. The cottage owners at North Asbury Park are deeply incensed at the attempt to stop the cars, and they in turn threaten that if they can not have Sunday cars that they will cause the arrest and prosecution of all merchants and livery stable men who do business on the Sabbath. As the ancient Blue Laws are still on the statute books, the liberals, as they are called, can make a great deal of trouble. The liberals met at the cottage of one of their members last night, and after a long discussion, decided to have the Sunday laws strictly enforced in case the church people should succeed in having the cars stopped on that day. No little amount of bad feeling has been already caused. The charter of the company, which was granted by the Board of Commissioners of the town, gives it the right to run cars on Sundays."

THIS is the way the discussion on the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, in the House of Representatives, appeared to the Washington correspondent of the Examiner:—

On Wednesday and Thursday of the week when our anniversaries were in session, the House of

Representatives was considering, in Committee of the Whole, two questions, whether the World's Columbian Exposition should be opened on Sunday, and whether the sale of intoxicating liquors be allowed. The contest was a very animated one, indeed, and you will have to watch the matter with eagle eye or they will get ahead of you yet. There is creeping on us a sentiment that all museums and expositions should be open on Sunday afternoons, at least. This opinion is cherished not only by the foreign element, but good Presbyterians of my acquaintance, after a sojourn on the continent, return converted to the new idea. In the debate which sprung up in the House Committee of the Whole over the Exposition appropriation, Mr. Johnstone, of South Carolina, introduced this amendment: "Provided, That no part of the amount hereby appropriated shall be available unless the doors of the Exposition shall be closed on Sunday." The opposition to this was most ingenious. Few members of the Committee had the hardihood of Mr. Bland, of Missouri, to pronounce all such provisions as "rot." One gentleman, a distinguished lawyer, inquired whether the laws of the State of Illinois did not cover the ground, and, again, whether the United States Government had any right to legislate on this matter. Amendments were piled on, and amendments to amendments, and substitutes. One provision laid an embargo upon nude painting and statuary, another upon gambling, another upon intoxicating liquor, and still another resolved that the Government exhibits at the World's Fair should not be opened to the public on the Sabbath day, which is Saturday. It was most ingeniously and ably argued that all such legislation is unnecessary. The Commissioners of the World's Fair are able men and know the people's wants. They understand also that there are rigid laws in Illinois on Sunday, and drinking, and gambling, and public morality. It seems like impugning their good faith to pack on the Sunday civil bill new legislation which is unparliamentary, and which at the same time would be a reflection on able men. The upshot of this parliamentary sham-battle was most amusing. What the Committee finally did pass was Mr. Dockery's substitute that the Government building, a very small part of the Exposition, should not be opened to the public on Sunday. This left Mr. Johnson on the third base, so to speak, with his side knocked out.

The motion to close the World's Fair on Sunday was defeated by parliamentary law. The Committee will recommend Mr. Dockery's substitute to the House, and we will probably have a yea and nay vote on the whole bill. The good people of Illinois have the matter in hand so far, and may or may not close the Exposition as they choose. Sitting in the gallery of the House of Representatives as a disfranchised American citizen, I have often wondered how far the voters of my country charged up to themselves the acts of the very men for whom they voted. If the Exposition is open on Sundays, it will be due to the conduct of the accredited representatives of American Christians.

So this was a sham battle? But sham battles are part of the drill in preparation for actual conflict.



FOUND AT LAST!

A POCKET SPELLER, DICTIONARY, AND MEMORANDUM BOOK COMBINED.

It gives the right orthography of all words (over 22,800) in common use, and in nearly every instance their definition. It also gives rules for the use of capitals and punctuation marks, abbreviations of names of States and Territories, letters of introduction and recommendation, definitions of commercial terms, forms of notes, due bills, receipts, letters of credit, orders for money, merchandise and goods stored, principal holidays, marriage anniversaries, combination of shades, and carefully selected laws of etiquette in social and business life, also a silicate slate for memorandums.

This Speller gives the most complete list of words in common use; it is a Speller, Dictionary, Handy Companion, and Memorandum Book combined; it is indexed; it prints all words pronounced alike but spelled differently, so they can be distinguished at a glance; it shows where the letter e at the end of a word is to be dropped when adding ed or ing; it gives a complete list of the most practical business forms; it gives the laws of etiquette in social and business life; these rules alone are worth the price of the Speller.

This Speller is bound in leather, is of convenient size to be carried in vest pocket, and its price brings it within the reach of all. American Russia leather, gilt edge, 50 cents. Sent post-paid to any address on receipt of price. Address all orders to PACIFIC PRESS, 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

"The only paper of its kind in the world"

THE MAGAZINE FOR YOUNG MEN

"Young men are a power to-day in the church and the world, and a monthly that appeals directly to them can not fail to find a wide constituency. The new periodical seems admirably adapted to fill an unoccupied niche."—Christian Intelligencer.

SUBSCRIPTION \$1.00 A YEAR, 10 CTS. PER COPY

Vol 1 JANUARY 1892 No 1

THE YOUNG MAN

"QUIT YOU LIKE MEN, OR STUBBORN"

A MONTHLY JOURNAL AND REVIEW

EDITED BY W. J. DAWSON AND F. A. ATKINS

W. E. GLADSTONE

CONTENTS

How to Avoid Error in the Future 10
Sun-Worship and Sunday 12
Fathers of the Catholic Church 14
In the Heart of the Sierras 16
The Medical Missionary 18

Published by FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY, 30 UNION SQUARE, N. Y. CHICAGO, 148 & 150 MADISON ST.

SAMPLE COPIES MAILED ON APPLICATION

PUBLISHED BY FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY, 30 UNION SQUARE, N. Y. CHICAGO, 148 & 150 MADISON ST.

FATHERS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY E. J. WAGGONER.

History repeats itself, because human nature is the same in all ages of the world. Hence, he who would know

HOW TO AVOID ERROR IN THE FUTURE

must know how errors have developed in the past. The "Fathers of the Catholic Church" shows the condition of the heathen world at the time of Christ, briefly states the principles of ancient heathen philosophy, and shows how the adoption of these principles by prominent men in the church, and the incautious lowering of the standard of pure Christianity, developed the Papacy, which was simply a new phase of paganism. The chapter on

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY

is alone worth the price of the book. Fine English cloth, substantially bound, contains about 400 pages, and will be sent post-paid for \$1.00.

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

IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS

—BY J. M. HUTCHINS.—

This book has been out but a short time, but it has attained a large sale. It is a book which is to all classes of readers. As a work of art it surpasses anything of the kind which has ever before been attempted. The Yosemite Valley is now the leading attraction for tourists, and it is visited every year by thousands. It is one of the wonders of the world, and this work written by a man who has lived so long amidst these scenes is one which all will be eager to possess.

IT IS A COMPLETE HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY OF THE GREAT VALLEY AND ITS MARVELOUS SURROUNDINGS.

A Book of Thrilling Interest.

All who have seen the volume pronounce it the most intensely interesting work published on the Pacific Coast.

MORE THAN ONE HUNDRED ILLUSTRATIONS.

Price, in Flexible Cloth, \$1.50; Heavy Paper covers, \$1.25.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO. Or Oakland, Cal. 43 Bond St., New York City.

THE "MEDICAL MISSIONARY."

This little monthly ought to be in the hands of every person interested in missionary work at home or abroad. The Medical Missionary is the organ of the International Health and Temperance Association, and every month contains articles of live interest which do not appear in any other publication. Each number is illustrated.

The subscription price is 25 cents a year; the sum barely covers cost of paper and printing. The subscription price may be sent in postage stamps, postal note, or postal order, as is most convenient.

Address, GOOD HEALTH PUB. CO., BATTLE CREEK, MICH.



NEW YORK, 16, 1892.
 Lock box 244

NOTE.—Any one receiving the 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.

It is stated that some of the members of the Springville, Tenn., Seventh-day Adventist Church, recently convicted of maintaining a nuisance by Sunday work, have been again indicted. Indictments have also been found against other members of the same church. It is openly the avowed purpose of the Prosecuting Attorney to "put a stop to that Sunday desecration."

THE Supreme Court of the State of Georgia has decided, in an appealed case from the Superior Court of Houston, Ga., that the statute making it a misdemeanor to hunt any kind of game with gun or dogs, or both, on Sunday, does not violate the Constitution of the State or the United States; and also holds that "Sunday," and "the Sabbath day," are synonymous in the legal and legislative language of Georgia.

THE demand made by Sunday-keepers that those who observe the seventh day shall also keep Sunday, is no more reasonable than was the like demand made by Nebuchadnezzar that the three Hebrews who worshiped Jehovah, should also bow down to the golden image which he had set up. The king did not forbid the worship of the living God; he only required a very slight and formal acknowledgment of his god and of his religion. The partisans of Sunday are less modest in their demands than was the heathen king.

THE light fine imposed by the Judge in the case of the four Adventists, referred to on another page of this paper, must not be understood as indicating a purpose on his part to discourage the prosecution of such cases or the finding of indictments for Sunday work. On the contrary, the Judge warned the prisoners that if they persisted in Sunday work in the future, the situation would resolve itself into a question of the relative strength of the law and of those who violated it, and that in such a contest the Court could take but one course.

WE are reliably informed that a number of indictments for Sunday work will be found against Seventh-day Adventists, at the next term of the circuit court in Obion

County, Tenn. In fact, the Attorney-General told one of the editors of this paper that lack of time alone prevented the finding of such indictments by the last Grand Jury, and that, "at the next term of court every man of them will be indicted." The Attorney-General also said: "Every man, woman, and child of them [the Adventists] that works on Sunday will be prosecuted until they quit it."

ONE of the most contemptible features of the recent Sunday cases in Henry County, Tenn., was that brethren were made to testify against brethren. Though the work done was alleged to be a great annoyance to the people of the county, not one witness was found to testify that he was annoyed by it; and in only two instances had anybody but Adventists, who were themselves at work, seen the defendants at work on Sunday. They only supposed that it was their habit to work on Sunday because they were known to rest upon the seventh day. The indictments were found against "five of the leading members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church," not upon evidence that they worked on Sunday, but simply because of the fact that they belonged to that church; and then the indictments were supported and four of the defendants convicted on evidence wrung from their brethren in the church.

WHAT is the lesson of the logic of the events chronicled in the last few issues of THE SENTINEL?—the Supreme Court declaration that this is a Christian Nation; judicial decisions that Sunday is the Sabbath; the result of the vote in the House of Representatives on the Sunday ice bill, and the Sunday closing at the World's Fair; the many hundred arrests under the Sunday laws all over the country; and the prosecution of honest, simple hearted, Christian men for persecution's sake! Who will take heed and learn?

THE *Christian Statesman* virtually admits that its cry of "Anarchy," amounts to nothing, when it says:—

Those who cry "Blue Laws," thereby proclaim for themselves the red laws of anarchy. After the community has incurred all the expense of making laws, they teach that every man shall use them as a bill of fare, skipping all he does not like. That is straight anarchy. Not "dirt," but defiance of the law, marks the anarchist, and anarchy is more blamable in a washed and educated American than it is in a dirty, ignorant foreigner, raised in despotism, where law itself is lawless.

Admit that law itself may be "lawlessness," and the whole question stands just where it ought to, namely, on the merits of the law. Does the *Statesman* think that the Fugitive Slave Law ought ever to have been obeyed? Does it think that laws permitting and legalizing slavery ever gave the slaveholder any just property rights in human flesh and blood? If not, how can it be that law can take from

A one seventh part of his time and give it into the custody of B? A man's time is his own just as much as is his body, and only God has a right to demand that a portion of it be rendered back to him who gave it. Human "Sabbath laws" are blasphemous because they seek to do that which only God has any right to do.

THOSE who cry "Blue Laws" do not, as the *Statesman* asserts, "thereby proclaim for themselves the red laws of anarchy." Blue Laws are codified injustice; anarchy is disorganized injustice, or the tyranny of brute force. The one is little better than the other. Whatever difference there is is in favor of disorganized injustice, for where injustice is done by individuals without the color of the law it is short lived. Where it is supported by law it has an appearance of respectability that prolongs its wicked reign.

THE Hampden (Mass.) Conference of Congregational churches, at its recent annual meeting at the First Church, Springfield, adopted, among others, the following resolutions:—

WHEREAS, we believe one of the causes which specially operates to keep business men and clerks from Sunday worship is bodily weariness produced by one's work on Saturday nights, therefore,

Resolved, That we, the members of the Hampden County conference, hereby enter our protest against the common practice of doing all their trading upon Saturday night, and that in the interest of a better Sabbath observance we earnestly recommend that the members of our churches plan to do all their shopping before 8 o'clock Saturday night.

Resolved, That we hereby request the business men in the communities we represent to favor the early closing of their places of business, and as far as possible to influence the opinions of others in favor of this movement.

Resolved, That we recommend to employers that they should make some other day than Saturday the day for the payment of wages to employes, in order that the purchases of family stores may be made earlier in the week than is now common.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be furnished to the press, and that another copy be sent to the General Association, with the request that that body may take suitable action upon the same subject.

Thus everything is to be made to bend to Sunday observance. How long at this rate will it be until the State will be asked to make laws in harmony with the underlying thought of these resolutions, for instance, that some other day than Saturday be made pay day, and all civic affairs be regulated so as to enforce the remembrance of the civil injunction to observe Sunday?

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL,

A WEEKLY PAPER

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore 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 less than 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 City