



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

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, JULY 28, 1892.

NUMBER 29.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 48 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 following private letter, which we are permitted to publish, will be readily understood by all those familiar with the facts in the cases of the Henry County, Tenn., Adventists, suffering imprisonment for working on Sunday:—

Henry Co. Jail, Paris, Tenn., July 17, 1892.

Mr. ————*Dear Brother:* I will drop you a few lines to let you know how things are shaping themselves here. Brother Dortch's time was out yesterday, and he went home. His buggy has been levied on, and is advertised to be sold on the Sabbath to pay the State costs, amounting in his case to \$10.65.

The sheriff came in last evening and told us that we would have to go out on the public road and work at forty cents per day to pay the rest of our costs. One of the jail committee says that we will have to work on the Sabbath. We do not know what we will have to suffer when we refuse to work on the Sabbath.

It is going to be very hard on us to go out in the hot sun to work after being shut up so long. I tell you things are closing in on us very fast. To be a Seventh-day Adventist in Tennessee means a great deal. Old laws in regard to fines and costs that have been covered up and ignored for years are being looked up in order to inflict heavier punishment on us. But we are of good courage in the Lord.
Your brother in Christ,
W. S. LOWRY.

It will be remembered that in the trial of the writer of this letter, the Attorney-General said:—

The Constitution guarantees to him, and to every other citizen, the right to keep Saturday if he sees proper, . . . and guarantees to him the same protection that is given to other citizens of this commonwealth, . . . but he must not work on Sunday.

But now this is changed; and the law of Tennessee affords this man no protection in keeping Saturday, the seventh day, but compels him to work on that day under

the penalties usually inflicted in prisons for breach of prison discipline. It is absolutely false that Sunday laws leave people free to keep another day.

ANOTHER illustration of how Sunday laws do not leave men free to observe another day, was furnished some time since in Maryland. The facts were published in THE SENTINEL at the time, but we give them again: April 23, 1892, William E. Hubbard, a Seventh-day Adventist was summoned to testify as a witness in a lawsuit in Chestertown, Md. He declined to be sworn or to testify on the ground that as it was the Sabbath he could not conscientiously testify. The Judge said:—

The law says that we shall observe but one day as the Sabbath, and that day is commonly called Sunday; and sir, you must either testify or go to jail.

The young man went to jail for his fidelity to his religious convictions. He certainly was not left free to keep the seventh day.

ARKANSAS furnishes still another recent illustration of the freedom (?) enjoyed under Sunday laws to observe another day. Only a few weeks since, John Huddleston, a Seventh-day Adventist living near Van Buren, Ark., was summoned to serve on a jury. He went to the Judge and asked to be excused on the ground that he could not conscientiously serve on Saturday, as he regarded that day as the Sabbath. The Judge answered: "I do not recognize your Sabbath. You have got to obey the laws of the State." We have not yet learned the finale of the case, but certainly Mr. Huddleston was not left perfectly free to observe any day. Even if he was finally excused it was only by the courtesy of the Judge, and no man is free who is dependent on the whim of another for the right to obey his conscientious convictions.

SUNDAY laws leave nobody free, for one is not free to do that which he is compelled to do. Freedom to do implies equal freedom not to do. Nobody thinks of saying,

"I am free to pay taxes;" or, "I am free to do jury duty;" or, "I am free to pay duty on imports." On the contrary, a man says, "I must go and pay my taxes;" "I have been summoned on a jury and must serve;" or, "I will have to pay \$500 duty on those goods from Liverpool." The good citizen is willing to do all these things when he feels that the good of the country requires it, but he never speaks of being free to do them; he does them from obligation, not from volition.

THE Chicago Tribune, of July 10, quotes "a leading attorney" of Paris, Tenn., as denying that there is in the cases of the imprisoned Adventists any element of persecution. In this, however, he directly contradicts Judge Hammond, of the United States District Court, who, while in sympathy with Sunday laws and the enforcement of them, said in the case of the late R. M. King:—

It is a somewhat humiliating spectacle to see the Sunday advocates trying to justify the continuance of Sunday legislation . . . upon the argument that it is not in conflict with the civic dogma of religious freedom. *It surely is.*

Yet in the face of every constitutional provision, State and national, touching the question, Judge Hammond persists in justifying this palpable conflict with the civic dogma of religious freedom, by still arguing that—

the bare fact that the mass [of the people] desires Sunday as the public day of rest, is enough to justify its civic sanction; and the potentiality of the fact that it is in aid of the religion of that mass might be frankly confessed and not denied.

In this the Judge not only admits that which the "leading attorney" of Paris denies, namely, that enforcing the Tennessee Sunday law against observers of the seventh day is religious persecution, but he attempts to justify it. If this principle is to prevail, all that is required to make religious persecution again general is the demand of the "mass" of the people. And that in this we do not misrepresent Judge Hammond is evident from his own words, as follows:—

It is also noticeable that the early Christians com-

menced their assaults upon the old religions by a disregard of their holy days, and for this they were first persecuted by the law, as they [*sic*] now persecute therewith the Jews and the Seventh-day Adventists.

We are not by any means ready to admit that it is the early Christians who *now* persecute the Jews and the Seventh-day Adventists. Neither the early Christians nor any other Christians, either now or at any other time, ever did persecute. If any man persecutes, he is not a Christian. It is true that the early Christians were persecuted, precisely as the Jews and the Seventh-day Adventists are now persecuted, but the persecution was then heathenish, and so it is now. The law by which the persecution was then legalized and justified, was but the manifestation of the "inexorable tendency of the logic" of the pagan "principle of human conduct," and such only it is now.

National Religion in Congress.

THE honorable Senate and House of the Congress of the United States have both passed the proviso of Matthew S. (aint?) Quay respecting religion at the World's Fair. To be sure the House refused to appropriate the five millions of dollars for the Fair recommended by the Senate and to which the Sunday closing proviso was attached, but nevertheless this was too good an opportunity to stab constitutional religious freedom to the heart, to be let slip, and consequently the religious proviso must be passed although it be void in effect in this special instance. The legislation as to the World's Fair appropriation was first inserted into the sundry civil appropriation bill that all possibility of a presidential veto might be avoided; being incorporated into the appropriations for the running expenses of the Government it must stand with the entire bill. Then the Sunday closing proviso is passed by the House, in the face of the defeat of the appropriation, in order that the appropriation may of necessity carry the proviso in case the conferees of the House and Senate should decide in favor of the appropriation and it finally be granted. Thus, in any case, the Sunday closing proviso follows the appropriation. The appropriation, with Sunday closing, if adopted, becomes an integral part of the bill providing for the running expenses of the Government. And, whether the appropriation is granted or not, whether the Fair is closed on Sunday or not, the congressional attitude is still the same. The Constitution is stultified. Congress has made a law respecting religion. In the Senate no division was taken upon the Sunday closing question. It seemed to pass by a large majority. In the House the Sunday closing was concurred in by a vote of 147 to 61 with 120 not voting. And this because the honorable congressmen are willing, as the New York *World* pithily puts it, "to sacrifice both the Fair and its usefulness in order that they may make an insincere and hypocritical pretense of a piety which they do not practice."

Senator Peffer, of Kansas, who has not been so long in public life as to have lost his native candor of speech, said during the debate in the Senate:—

Mr. President, I do not care to go into a discussion of the theological history of Sabbath observance or of the keeping of Sunday. It is sufficient for my present purpose to know that though it may be true that in every State of the Amer-

ican Union the laws recognize the day commonly called Sunday and attach penalties for what is termed the desecration of that day, in truth in not one of the States is the law practically observed. We here at the capital of the Nation, though to-day we are engaged in a theological discussion concerning the observance of the first day of the week, are in the habit of receiving our mail twice every Sunday. We are in the habit of going away from the city and of returning to the city; we are in the habit of going up and down the river; we are in the habit of going out on little private excursions of our own, taking care of ourselves during Sunday the same as we do during other days.

I mention this, Mr. President, not for the purpose of expressing dissent from senators who feel differently about the matter, nor do I wish it to be understood that I do not desire the observance of Sunday, or that I do not desire the setting apart and the consecration of a rest-time for the people, but my object is to call the attention of the Senate while we are discussing this matter to the patent fact that a great deal of this talk of ours about the observance of Sunday is sheer hypocrisy. That is a strong word, I know, but there is a great deal of truth in it, and I do not know how better to express my feeling upon the subject.

Mr. Morgan, senator from Alabama, said:—

This proposed law, Mr. President, in one sense prohibits the free exercise of religion. To-day there is attempted a union of Church and State. What is this demand that this money shall not be appropriated to-day for this great Exhibition, except that the church demands that it shall have assistance in closing those gates by act of Congress? Who but the church makes this demand? Not one church, but many churches. Some churches are opposed to it, it is true. Not only, Mr. President, is it the union of Church and State, but it is an attempted union of politics and religion.

We have had a little bit of experience on this subject, and I want to show how sacred and how safe the Sabbath is in the hands of the Congress of the United States. We have three laws on our statute books in regard to the Sabbath. One of these laws prevents the faculty of West Point from compelling the boys to continue their studies on Sunday; another just like it relates to the faculty at Annapolis. Notwithstanding that, however, according to the Rules and Articles of War, and the universal practice in the Navy and also in the Army, we have our Sunday morning reviews, in which we ascertain the condition and strength of the Army in all particulars.

There is only one other general law which we have attempted to pass on this subject, which illustrates very forcibly, I think, the morality of Congress in dealing with the Sabbath. Here is the utmost endeavor of Congress in respect to the observance of the Sabbath heretofore. I will read it:

Sec. 3283. No malt, corn, grain, or other material shall be mashed, nor any mash, wort, or beer brewed or made, nor any still used by a distiller, at any time between the hour of 11 in the afternoon of any Saturday and the hour of 1 in the forenoon of the next succeeding Monday; and every person who violates the provisions of this section shall be liable to a penalty of \$1,000.

There the Congress of the United States expressly authorizes the distillation of ardent spirits under its law, but when they come down to 11 o'clock on Saturday night they put on "the livery of the court of heaven to serve the devil in," and they exempt from 11 o'clock on Saturday night until 1 o'clock on Monday morning out of the period of time when there shall be any work done in the making of whisky.

There is a union of Church and State. There is a union of politics and religion. Brew on, malt on, distill on, mash on, work for the devil until 11 o'clock on Saturday night, then suspend until 1 o'clock on Monday morning and go to work again, says Congress. That law stands there; and that, I repeat, is the utmost endeavor of the Congress of the United States in preserving the sanctity of the Sabbath!

Mr. President, I think we ought to drop this subject, unless we can do better than that. I think we had better leave it to our constituents, our friends, our people, this grand and splendid people of the United States, to direct themselves and their children and their friends, through moral influence and moral power and through the light and blessedness of religion, into higher walks of life. Congress can not guide them there. Congress serves the mammon of unrighteousness whenever it has a chance—never fails to do it. It was the wisest of all the provisions in the Constitution of the United States, or rather in the amendments, that Church and State should be divorced from each other.

Senator Sanders, of Montana, very pertinently spoke for the great unrepresented majority:—

If it be true that one thirty-second part of the

citizens of the United States have expressed to Congress the opinion that they ought to make, as a condition precedent to an appropriation of this character, the closing of the gates of that Exposition one-seventh of the time, it nevertheless remains the duty of Congress to stop and enquire in behalf of the 63,000,000 people who have not thus expressed themselves, whether that is wise or no.

Again Mr. Morgan, of Alabama, most aptly said:—

Mr. President, after the impassioned address of the senator from Georgia [Mr. Colquitt], upon the subject of this Sunday amendment proposed by the senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Quay]—and I think the argument naturally arises out of the excitement and feeling, to say nothing of the animosity, which have been excited here towards certain classes of people—that Congress ought to be very careful not to interfere in those matters of legislation which have reference entirely to church affairs.

I thought when I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Constitution of the United States separated Church and State, that I had pretty good ground to stand on to justify myself in obeying what I conceive to be my duty under that instrument and to oppose on this floor the connection of Church and State.

Here is a measure which originates entirely with the Senate, a Republican body, with a Republican committee, with a Republican chairman, and a Republican majority throughout. They brought in this bill for the purpose of assisting the World's Fair, and certain other Republicans who thought that there might be a good chance to make political capital out of this business, proposed to amend this bill by inserting a provision against opening the gates on Sunday. The most astute politician in this Chamber, or perhaps in the United States, originated that amendment, and the last one who was on the floor, the senator from New York [Mr. Hiscock], referred to the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives and said that this amendment would not be welcomed over there.

Others in both the Senate and the House, from whom there is no space to quote now, had the courage and the statesman-like sense to oppose this measure yet it passed the Senate as a party vote, and going to the House fulfilled there the stricture of Mr. Morgan as to its being a measure brought forward and to be used for political capital, for while the House defeated the appropriation it passed the Sunday closing clause in deference to the aggressive demands of a misguided religious sentiment.

When commenting some time ago upon the decision by Justice Brewer that "this is a Christian Nation," the question was asked, "What next?" That has been answered. What next? W. H. M.

The Present Standard of Justice.

REV. CHARLES FERGUSON, Rector of St. James Church, Syracuse, N. Y., in an open letter of advice to the locked-out laboring men of Homestead, Pa., who recently had so desperate a conflict with the Pinkerton men, says:—

Demand just what the public conscience demands and nothing more. You will thus repel the charge of lawlessness and put yourselves in accord with the supreme law of the land and the court of final appeal. For the public welfare is the supreme law, and the public conscience is the final interpreter of that law.

Make no threats, then, but trust your case to the conscience of the country. There are most evident signs on every hand to-day that that conscience is clear and uncorrupted.

Rest your case on the public conscience. You can not win against that; you can not lose if that be on your side.

This shows what sort of a foundation we have for justice and just dealing in this country at the present time. There is not an appealing to the fundamental principles and the inalienable rights of mankind, but to the capricious standard of public sentiment. This is exactly in harmony with the *ipse dixit* of Judge

Hammond, in his decision in the King case, wherein he says:—

The courts can not, in cases like this, ignore the existing customs and laws of the masses, nor their prejudices and passions even, to lift the individual out of the restraints surrounding him because of those customs and laws before the time has come when public opinion shall free all men in the manner desired.

When such a standard as this is called for and upheld by both judges and priests, we may well join the lamentation of the prophet Isaiah, "None calleth for justice, nor any pleadeth for truth. . . . Judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen into the street, and equity can not enter. Yea, truth faileth; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey."

The fact that conscientious observers of the fourth precept of that code which God himself spoke on Sinai and wrote with his own finger on stone, have been spied upon, arraigned before magistrates, condemned in the courts, and are this day confined in prison walls, is a sufficient comment upon and condemnation of such a standard, and attests to the correctness of the application of the scripture just quoted to the present condition of things in this Government.

W. A. COLCORD.

As It Was Then So It Is Now.

LIKE the four Adventists now in the Henry County, Tenn., jail, the subjects of persecution for conscience' sake have always been accused of contumacy. In pagan Rome, even those governors who cared little for the worship of the gods, and had nothing to gain either in wealth or influence by persecuting the Christians, could see in their refusal to obey the laws made in aid of paganism, nothing but willful obstinacy and downright stubbornness. As related in the "Two Republics," they regarded such willful disobedience to the law to be much more worthy of condemnation than even the disrespect to the gods. Such an one was Pliny, who said, "Let their confessions be of any sort whatever, this positiveness in inflexible obstinacy deserved to be punished." Many of the governors "would sooner pardon in the Christians their defection from the worship of the gods, than their want of reverence for the emperors in declining to take any part in those idolatrous demonstrations of homage which pagan flattery had invented, such as sprinkling their images with incense, and swearing by their genius."

Still others were disposed to be favorable to the Christians, to sympathize with them in their difficult positions, and to temper as far as possible the severity of the laws against them. And when the Christians were prosecuted before their tribunals, they would make personal appeals to induce them to make some concession, however slight, that would justify the governor in certifying that they had conformed to the law, so that he might release them,—not only from that particular accusation, but from any other that might be made.

Such governors would plead with the Christians to this effect, "I do not wish to see you suffer; I know you have done no real harm, but there stands the law. I am here as the representative of the empire to see that the laws are enforced. I have no personal interest whatever in this matter; therefore, I ask you for my own sake that you will do some honor to

the gods, however slight, whereby I may be relieved from executing this penalty and causing you to suffer. All that is required is that you shall worship the gods. Now your God is one of the gods; therefore what harm is there in obeying the law which commands to worship the gods without reference to any particular one? Why not say, 'The Emperor our lord,' and sprinkle a bit of incense toward his image? Merely do either of these two simple things, then I can certify that you have conformed to the law, and release you from this and all future prosecutions of the kind."

When the Christian replied that he could not, under any form or pretense whatever, worship any other god than the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ; nor honor any other by any manner or offering; nor call the emperor lord *in the meaning of the statute*, then the governor, understanding nothing of what the Christian called conscience, and seeing all of what he considered the kindest possible offers counted not only as of no worth but even as a reproach, his proffered mercy was often turned into wrath. He considered such a refusal only an evidence of open ingratitude and obstinacy, and that therefore such a person was unworthy of the slightest consideration. He held it then to be only a proper regard for both the gods and the State to execute to the utmost the penalty which the law prescribed.

Another thing that made the action of the Christians more obnoxious to the Roman magistrates, was not only their persistent disregard for the laws touching religion, but their assertion of *the right* to disregard them. And this plea seemed the more impertinent from the fact that it was made by the despised of the despised.

Is It in Christ's Commission to His Followers?

THE Boston *Traveler* quotes the following from the *Congregationalist*:—

This is how the Church should enter politics. She should enter them in the person of every member. She should enter them through every door through which she can force her way. She should be found at the caucus. She should be heard from at the polls. She should make enough commotion to prove that she is alive at every session of legislature, city council, or board of select men. She should know all about the financial situation of town, city, county, and State, and should do what she can to improve that situation.

She should completely understand the management of the public schools, and determine the character of school boards and school teachers. She should have a most weighty opinion, carefully formed, and most enthusiastically expressed, regarding every matter of public interest. Every member of the church should do all these things. We shall differ from and with each other in our conclusions about some things, no doubt, but if we have the right spirit, and if we engage in political life for the sake of our Lord and Master, we shall soon see the devil's hosts fleeing before the onset of the victorious army of saints.

The title of this extract was, "The Church in politics." But where is the Church of Christ told to use any such methods in causing the "devil's hosts" to flee before it? The position in the *Congregationalist* presupposes the idea that the nominal Church is right, and if its decrees could be carried out, sin and misery would vanish, and earth would be turned into a "paradise below." The Church of the Middle Ages thought the same thing, and the history of the ecclesiastical tyranny of those times forcibly discloses the fatal mistake.

A. O. TAIT.

Intolerance in Tennessee.

LAWYERS may split hairs upon the question whether this is or is not a Christian Nation, but real lovers of liberty desire that there shall be in the whole land the utmost realization of that absolute religious freedom and immunity from persecution for opinion's sake in matters of religion which it was the aim of the Federal Constitution to assure. It is true that making its own beneficent declaration for religious freedom the Constitution left to the States absolute power on the subject, and any of them might if they chose establish a creed and a church and maintain it, but such has not been the desire of any of them. Throughout the Union religious tests in the matter of the elective franchise and of office-holding have entirely disappeared, save that the new State of Idaho has entered the Union containing a clause in its fundamental law disfranchising members of the Mormon Church merely as such sectarians.

This is a Christian Nation in the sense that it is not a pagan, a Mohammedan, or a Buddhist nation, but as Judge Cooley says, "The law does not attempt to enforce the precepts of Christianity on the ground of their sacred character or divine origin. Some of these precepts, though we may admit their continual and universal obligation, we must nevertheless recognize as being incapable of enforcement by human laws. That standard of morality which requires one to love his neighbor as himself we must admit is too elevated to be accepted by human tribunals as a proper test by which to judge the conduct of the citizen, and one could hardly be held responsible to the criminal laws if in goodness of heart and spontaneous charity he fell something short of the good Samaritan." He declares further that "Christianity is not a part of the law of the land in any sense which entitles the courts to take notice of and base their judgment upon it, except so far as they can find that its precepts and principles have been incorporated in and made a component part of the positive laws of the State."

There is upon the statute book of Tennessee some such law regarding the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, as is found in the statutes of Illinois, but it would be impossible in Illinois to give that statute any such construction as has been given in Tennessee, not by a State court alone but also by Federal court, whereby citizens of Tennessee have been subjected to most outrageous abuses of their liberty. There are in Tennessee, as in almost all other sections of the Union, persons who hold tenaciously to the commandment that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord. They do not follow the mass of Christians and substitute Sunday for the ancient Sabbath. Having sacredly observed the seventh day these devotees pursue their ordinary vocations Sunday. In Obion county a citizen who plowed corn in his own field Sunday was prosecuted before a justice of the peace and fined. The fine was paid. Such punishment did not placate the prosecutors. The man was indicted as guilty of the crime of public nuisance in that he had unnecessarily engaged in his secular business and performed his common vocation of life on Sunday, work represented as not necessary and not done as a matter of charity, and in the doing of which there was a disturbance to the community in

which it was done and an offense to the moral sense of the public. He was found guilty upon this indictment and fined \$75 and costs. The case went to the Supreme Court of the State. The judgment was confirmed. A writ of *habeas corpus* brought the convict before the Federal Court of the western district of the State, and that court would not assume to say that there was wrongful conviction or any lack of due process of law. Several like convictions have been had. There was no pretense, except in the indictment, that anybody had been at all disturbed by this secular employment. The peace was in no way threatened. No more was proven than that the Christian neighbors were scandalized that the law should be thus broken. And the great commonwealth of Tennessee has at its mercy some half-dozen patient, industrious, well-meaning citizens, religious beyond the ordinary practice of ordinary Christians, and so holds them because of an intolerance which, whatever may be the technical law, is opposed to the very spirit of our republican institutions.

There seems to be no remedy for it, and these men must serve out their sentences. But the sooner Tennessee places itself, through its legislature, upon a par with liberal, right-minded people everywhere in the republic the better it will be for both the moral and the material prosperity of that State.—*Chicago Times*.

False Lights on the Shore.

THE *Jewish Messenger* flatters itself that the platform of the Society of Christian Endeavor is "a plea for the unification of the human race," and says:—

Here is an opportunity for the Society of Christian Endeavor to aid in quenching the fierce and destructive fires of bigotry, race hatred, and religious prejudice. Let this society, in its strong union of creeds, raise its voice against the warfare waged for centuries against the Jew. Let its members develop and stimulate a genuine brotherly feeling for their Jewish neighbor, in whose faith and in whose doctrines the Christ they worship was born and reared.

The *Sun*, in commenting upon this, and other favorable expressions in reference to the great Christian Endeavor convention from Jewish papers, finds in it all a pleasing "evidence of the great fact that in this country, the believers in every creed not only maintain the rights of all creeds, but can live together in peace with mutual good will."

It is sad that this is not true. One of the most prominent and dramatic incidents of the whole convention was the enthusiastic expression of a determination not to "maintain the rights of all creeds." The opportunity to aid in quenching the fires of bigotry and religious prejudice was there, but it was ignored at its very inception. The hope of the *Messenger* was blighted before it scarcely had budded.

This marvelous society, numbering so many tens of thousands of those who are just at the age when the maturing mind receives its most lasting impressions, is made one immense school of political religion where the legal enforcement of Sunday observance is taught as one of its principal religious tenets. The Christ whose worship they profess was indeed a Jew, and he observed the seventh day, but that will not prevent them from scorning the day he kept and persecuting all who observe it whether Jew or Gentile seventh day keeper.

Everything that appeals to the imagination clusters round this organization, but it is training its members to be the determined upholders of as great an error as the world has ever seen. The beautiful enthusiasm of youth will in a few years harden into the stern determination to realize in practical form the lessons in religious law now being learned. These youths and maidens whose hearts are now so full of tender religious sentiment will be the persecutors of the soon coming years. It is the inevitable result of the errors they have been taught. How great is the responsibility of those who are teaching them these errors! W. H. M.

Don't Tinker With It.

In every stage of the world's history there has arisen a class of men bent on improving the world and its Creator. At this time a class of "evangelists" pops out and wants the Sixteenth Amendment.

Ostensibly, the object of the Sixteenth Amendment is to protect the public school system. In reality it is a fight between Catholics and Protestants—all Christians.

The divorcing of Church and State is one of the pretenses of the "evangelists." We have always supposed that before there could be a divorce there must have existed a marriage. The facts of a marriage not existing between Church and State in this country is no fault of those "evangelists." This Sixteenth Amendment is purposed to be made to, or tacked on to the Constitution of the United States. It is well known that the Jews, as a class, throughout the United States of America are the staunch friends and supporters of the public school system, and the best evidence of their faith in the free school system is that ninety-nine per cent. of all Jewish children born in this country attend the public schools. It is further known that the Jews ask as little preference or favor in the public schools as any other class of citizens. We might add without subjecting ourselves to the charge of egotism, that the Jewish children in the public schools compare favorably in point of intelligence, deportment and regularity of attendance with any class attending these schools. With all this we are opposed to any interference in this matter in the shape of constitutional amendment. We would not tamely submit to any encroachment upon the school law, any attempt to engraft upon it any color of so-called religion. We want it free—absolutely free—from any taint of the church by whatever name you may call it. We do not, however, think it advisable to tinker with the Constitution of the United States on this question. It is foreign to the spirit, character, object or scope of the United States Constitution to cumber it with this matter.

What is the Constitution? It is "the fundamental law of a free country, which characterizes the organism of the country and secures the rights of the citizen and determines his main duties as a free-man."

The Federal Government has nothing to do with the public schools. The public schools depend entirely upon State laws, State provision for their support and State control of their affairs.

While each State is independent of the other, a comparison of the modes, methods and systems of public instruction in the different States of the Union shows

them to be very similar in character and form, so that practically we have one system of free education throughout this country. We may attribute this result to the fact that it is left to the good sense of the people of each State to control its own affairs in this particular. To this extent we favor State sovereignty.

Some people are determined at all hazards to do good, but they think they can not do it except through legislation, and when repulsed at that they resort to constitutional amendment. We scout the idea of any such forced good. England, from which we derive our system of jurisprudence, has no written Constitution. What then would those irrepressible "goodies" do there? The only resort open to them would be an act of Parliament. Now, in this country, Congress, not having any control over State education, could only meddle itself by a federal school system. This it has wisely refused to do.

We have not forgotten the Blair bill. It follows then that the only source of power on the school question is the State—there the people have a direct voice in the matter and what they want in this particular they can and will have. Here let it remain. We are fully aware that the Catholic clergy would like the share or portion of school tax paid by Catholics to be under their control so that they might the better support their parochial schools. There are, however, honorable exceptions to this rule. No fear on this score need be entertained, for the reason that the people, the Catholic people, rise above their teachers. Let this question be left in the hands of the people themselves.—*Jewish Times and Observer*.

Some Scraps of New England History.*

THE Puritans having planted themselves in Massachusetts, and having established there a theocracy, were not slow, as we have already seen, to use their power against all dissenters from the established religion. In 1631 Roger Williams landed in Boston, and as the death of Higginson had left a vacancy in the church at Salem, the church called Williams to fill his place; but as Winthrop and his "assistants" objected, Williams went to Plymouth Colony.

The leading minister in Massachusetts Colony at this time was John Cotton. He distinctly taught the blessedness of persecution in itself, and in its benefit to the State, in the following words:—

But the good brought to princes and subjects by the due punishment of apostate seducers and idolaters and blasphemers, is manifold.

First, it putteth away evil from among the people, and cutteth off a gangrene, which would spread to further ungodliness.

Secondly, it driveth away wolves from worrying and scattering the sheep of Christ. For false teachers be wolves, . . . and the very name of wolves holdeth forth what benefit will redound to the sheep, by either killing them or driving them away.

Thirdly, such executions upon such evil doers causeth all the country to heare and feare and doe no more such wickednesse. . . . Yea, as these punishments are preventions of like wickednesse in some, so are they wholesome medicines, to heale such as are curable of these evils.

Fourthly, the punishments executed upon false prophets and seducing teachers, doe bring downe showers of God's blessings upon the civill state. . . .

Fifthly, it is an honor to God's justice that such judgments are executed. . . .

And Samuel Shepard, a minister of Charlestown, preached an election sermon

*Condensed from "Two Republics."

entitled, "Eye Salve," in which he set forth the following views:—

Men's lusts are sweet to them, and they would not be disturbed or disquieted in their sin. Hence, there be so many such as cry up tolleration boundless and libertinism so as (if it were in their power) to order a total and perpetual confinement of the sword of the civil magistrate unto its scabbard (a motion that is evidently destructive to this people, and to the publick liberty, peace, and prosperity of any instituted churches under heaven).

Let the magistrate's coercive power in matters of religion, therefore, be still asserted, seeing he is one who is bound to God more than any other man to cherish his true religion; . . . and how woful would the state of things soon be among us, if men might have liberty without control to profess, to preach, or print, or publish, what they list, tending to the seduction of others.

In accordance with these principles every inhabitant of the Colony was obliged to attend the services of the Established Church on Sunday under penalty of fine or imprisonment. The fine was not to exceed five shillings, equal to about five dollars of the present day, for every absence.

About 1633 Roger Williams was called a second time to the ministry of the Salem church. This time he was allowed to take the place; but it was not long before he was again in trouble with the theocrats. He denounced their laws making church membership a qualification for office, and all their laws enforcing religious observances.

He declared that the worst law in the English code was that by which they themselves, when in England, had been compelled to attend the parish church; and he reproved their inconsistency in counting that persecution in England, and then doing the same things themselves in New England.

They maintained, as argued by Cotton, that "persecution is not wrong in itself. It is wicked for falsehood to persecute truth, but it is the sacred duty of truth to persecute falsehood." And, as stated by Winthrop, that "we have come to New England in order to make a society after our own model; all who agree with us may come and join that society; those who disagree may go elsewhere; there is room enough on the American continent.

Roger Williams told them that to compel men to unite with those of a different faith is an open violation of natural right; and that to drag to public worship the irreligious and the unwilling, is only to require hypocrisy. "Persons may, with less sin, be forced to marry whom they can not love, than to worship whom they can not believe." Accordingly he insisted that "no one should be bound to worship, or to maintain a worship, against his own consent."

At this the theocrats inquired with pious amaze, "What, is not the laborer worthy of his hire?" To which Roger replied in words which they could not fail fully to understand, "Yes, from them that hire him."

The view that the magistrates must be chosen exclusively from membership in the churches, he exploded with the argument that with equal propriety they should select a doctor of physic, or a pilot of a ship, because of his standing in the church.

Against the statements of Cotton and Shepard and the claims of the theocrats altogether, as to the right of the magistrate to forestall corrupting influences upon the minds of the people, and to punish error and heresy, he set the evident and everlasting truth that "magistrates are but the agents of the people, or its trustees,

on whom no spiritual power in matters of worship can ever be conferred, since conscience belongs to the individual, and is not the property of the body politic; . . . the civil magistrate may not intermeddle even to stop a church from apostasy and heresy; this power extends only to the bodies and goods and outward estate of men."

The theocrats raised the alarm that these principles subverted all good government. To which he replied: "There goes many a ship to sea, with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common, and is a true picture of a commonwealth or a human combination or society. It has fallen out sometimes that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks, may be embarked in one ship; upon which supposal I affirm that all the liberty of conscience that ever I pleaded for turns upon these two hinges, that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews, or Turks be forced to come to the ship's prayers or worship, nor compelled from their particular prayers or worship, if they practice any." "The removal of the yoke of soul-oppression, as it will prove an act of mercy and righteousness to the enslaved nations, so it is of binding force to engage the whole and every interest and conscience to preserve the common liberty and peace."

He also denied the right of the compulsory imposition of an oath. The magistrates had decided to require an oath of allegiance to Massachusetts, instead of to the king of England. Williams would not take the oath, and his influence was so great that so many others refused also that the government was compelled to drop the project. This caused them to raise a charge against him as the ally of a civil faction. The church at Salem stood by him, and in the face of the enmity of the theocrats elected him their teacher. This was no sooner done than the preachers met together and declared that any one who should obstinately assert that "the civil magistrate might not intermeddle even to stop a church from apostasy and heresy," was worthy of banishment. A committee of their order was appointed to go to Salem and deal with Williams and the church "in a church way."

Meantime the people of Salem were punished for choosing him for their teacher by the withholding of a tract of land to which they had laid claim. Williams was ready to meet the committee at every point in expressing and defining his doctrines, and in refuting all their claims. After the committee had returned, the church, by Williams, wrote letters to all of the churches of which any of the magistrates were members, "that they should admonish the magistrates of their injustice." By the next general court the whole of Salem was disfranchised until they should apologize for these letters. The town and the church yielded. Roger Williams stood alone. He was able and willing to do it, and at once declared his "own voluntary withdrawing from all these churches which are resolved to continue in persecuting the witnesses of the Lord," and "hoped the Lord Jesus was sounding forth in him the blast which should in his own holy season cast down the strength and confidence of those inventions of men." In October, 1635, he was summoned before the chief representatives of the State. He went and "maintained the rocky strength" of his position,

and declared himself "ready to be bound and banished, and even to die in New England," rather than to renounce his convictions.

By the earnest persuasions of Cotton, the general court of 1635, by a small majority, sentenced him to exile, and at the same time attempted to justify the sentence by the flimsy plea that it was not a restraint of freedom of conscience, but because the application of the new doctrine to their institutions seemed "to subvert the fundamental state and government of the country." In January, 1636, a warrant was sent to him to come to Boston and take ship for England. He refused to go. Officers were sent in a boat to bring him, but he was gone. "Three days before he had left Salem, in winter snow and inclement weather, of which he remembered the severity even in his old age. 'For fourteen weeks he was sorely tost in a bitter season, not knowing what bread or bed did mean.' Often in the stormy night he had neither fire, nor food, nor company; often he wandered without a guide, and had no house but a hollow tree. But he was not without friends. The respect for the rights of others which had led him to defend the freedom of conscience, had made him the champion of the Indians. He had learned their language during his residence at Plymouth; he had often been the guest of the neighboring sachems; and now, when he came in winter to the cabin of the chief of Pokanoket, he was welcomed by Massasoit; and 'the barbarous heart of Canonicus, the chief of the Narragansetts, who loved him as his son to the last gasp.' 'The ravens,' he relates, 'fed me in the wilderness.'"

The Honor Not Theirs.

In some mysterious manner, the Puritans have acquired great fame as the founders of a republic, the fathers of our system of public education, the establishers of freedom of speech and religious equality, and so on through the list of political, religious, and social blessings the Americans enjoy. "The claim has been so often made for them," remarks an exchange, "that the Puritan refugees from England are supposed to have a patentee ownership of most of those things of which this country is proud, such as refusal to be taxed without representation, township government, freedom of worship, and education for everybody."

"But little by little," says a New York paper, "we are finding out that the Puritans were nothing but a lot of despots borrowing a few good ideas and evolving on their own account a great many brutal notions. The latest historian to dig up facts about these overrated patriots is a Scotchman, Mr. Douglas Campbell, who has effectually robbed them of many of their laurels. In studying the jurisprudence of colonial New York, Mr. Campbell found that the institutions supposed to have been derived from New England were not at all due to English Puritans."

Of his discoveries in New York colonial law, Mr. Campbell says:—

And here I met a series of surprises, for I encountered at every turn traces of institutions and ideas generally supposed to have been derived from England, or at least to be of New England origin, but which clearly, so far as concerned New York, were derived from a different quarter. Here were free schools, and the system of recording deeds and mortgages, lands held in common by the towns—all under the old Dutch rule; here the doc-

trine was first laid down by a legislative assembly that the people are the source of political authority; here were first established permanent religious freedom, the right of petition, and the freedom of the press. On the other hand, here were no executions of witches or Quakers, and no kidnapping and enslavement of the Indians.

In comparing this record with that of New England, the points of contrast were no less remarkable than those of resemblance, while all the deductions from such a comparison were opposed to the ideas inculcated by our current histories. From their earliest school days Americans have been told that this Nation is a transplanted England and that we must look to the motherland as the home of our institutions. But the men who founded New York were not Englishmen; they were Hollanders, Walloons, and Huguenots. The colony was under Dutch law for half a century; its population was probably not half English even at the time of the Revolution, and yet here one finds some of the institutions which give America its distinctive character, while, what is more remarkable, no trace of those same institutions can be found in England. What was their origin became to me an interesting question. New York, which was first settled, certainly did not derive them from New England, and New England probably did not derive them from New York. Could there have been a common fountain which fed both these streams, the debt to which has never been acknowledged? Of course, the Netherland Republic must have been this fountain, if one existed; but to prove its existence and the mode in which its influence was exerted on New England required an examination far outside the records of New York.

From all of which it appears, as another suggests, that "Americans will have to transfer their reverence from the Puritans to the Dutchmen of Holland, and Forefathers' Day will have to be celebrated with long-stemmed pipes and schnapps instead of in hard cider. And the Puritans who made life a burden to all who differed with them religiously will take their proper place in history as a narrow-minded colony of bigots who somewhat hastily concluded that the chief end of man was to glorify God by hanging witches, whipping Quakers, and enslaving men distinguished from themselves in savagery only by the color of their skins."

Sunday.

In the *Herald* of recent date we noticed an article with the above caption, which, with the permission of the editor, we would like to comment upon. From the general tenor of the article, we judge that when Sabbath is used, Sunday is meant, so if we use the word Sunday, do not look upon it as a misquotation. The *Herald* says: "But it is an institution which at least 20,000,000 people believe should be remembered and kept holy, and we see no reason why they should not be entitled to respect." That is right. We see no reason, either, why they should not be entitled to respect. On the other hand, we can see no reason why the 45,000,000 who do not believe it should be kept holy, should not be entitled to respect as well. The truth is, if the spirit of the Constitution was carried out, there would be no lack of respect on either hand, for the Constitution is in perfect harmony with the Golden Rule. The *Herald* further says, "We believe in one day's rest." That is right; so do we. Perhaps not the same day. But how about "the other fellow"? He, it would seem, disregards every day. How shall we decide which is right? As the day in question is a religious institution, there is no other way but the Bible; but as all are not agreed as to what the Bible teaches, and some do not believe the Bible is the word of God, what are we to do? Each one pays his proportion towards the support of the Government, which, by the way, is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people; now is

it not reasonable that the Government should deal out equal and exact justice to all classes and to each individual? Indeed it is, and that was foreseen by our forefathers, who framed the Constitution of these United States, and so they inserted in Art. IV. of that document, "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States." And, as that was not strong enough, they added, in Art. I, an amendment which reads as follows: "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This certainly ought to be protection enough for anyone, and would be if the men we place in office did not violate their oaths to support the Constitution of the United States. But what can we think of a professed Christian people, "20,000,000 strong though they be," who will bribe these officials by "petitions and promises of support," to violate their oath of office? Surely it would seem that they did not deserve much respect.

But we are happy to state that there is not one in one hundred that realize what they are doing. In fact the Christians of this country are helping to load a gun that, when it is exploded, will recoil upon themselves. The *Herald* believes in certain Sunday laws; so do we. We believe also in Monday laws, but we do not believe in discriminating between the two. A law that is good for one day is good for every day. There never was a Sunday law made yet, "exclusive of other days," but resulted in persecution to a greater or less extent. The first Sunday law was made by Constantine, A. D. 321. It was an innocent looking affair in and of itself, but it grew; the church got stronger and demanded more. And so it continued until it was so firmly locked in the embrace of civil government, that they united and became one, and over 50,000,000 martyr's graves tell the moral. All churches and all denominations are protected in their worship, and it is right they should be. Farther than this the State can not go without infringing upon the rights of others. The Sunday saloon closing business comes under the same head. It should be closed Sunday; it should also be closed Monday, and every other day. Is whisky any more whisky on Sunday than on Monday? Is there any more drunk in it one day than another? It is the same argument as in the village of Albion to-day over granting the drug stores a license. If they are granted a license, it will be because they are druggists and are befriended by officials of the law regardless of justice. It is the same with closing saloons on Sunday. It is the day to be protected, not the liquor traffic stopped. If it was, they would make a law a little stronger and stop it every day.

Now, my Sunday law friends, a few questions: "Isn't the gospel just as powerful to-day as it was in the days of Christ? Did he call upon Cæsar to help him, or did he say that they that take the sword shall perish by the sword? Did not Paul say to Timothy, that in the last days there would be a people having a form of godliness, but would deny the power thereof?—2 Tim. 3:1-5. Are there not a people of to-day who have a form of godliness that deny the power of God by appealing to Cæsar for Sunday laws? Or do they mistrust that God will have nothing to do with Sunday, and their only hope rests in Cæsar?—*W. C. Eaton, in Orleans Herald.*

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

THE New York *Press* says of the action of Congress in passing the proviso requiring the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, "The prejudice that would transgress in the name of the Founder of Christianity the very spirit of his teachings is pitiable."

INFORMATION has been received through a Danish paper, published in Atlantic, Iowa, that two hundred arrests for violating the Sunday law have been made in Oskaloosa. The chief crime for which they are charged is selling cigars on Sunday. A county official is among the number arrested.

FOR some time there have been continual efforts in Atlanta, Ga., to compel the closing of all business on Sunday. Recently this work has taken a new turn. Detectives, or paid spies, traverse the streets on Sunday, hunting "blind tigers" (persons selling liquor on the sly) and their mode of catching them is to buy a drink and then cause the arrest of the seller.

THE newspapers throughout the country comment most unfavorably on the action of Congress in reference to the World's Fair. One Chicago paper declares that our congressional doctors of divinity must have previously read up the proceedings of the Councils of Nice and Trent, and other similar dogma manufacturing bodies, to have modeled their course so closely after their example, on the Sunday question.

IMMEDIATELY upon the passage of the Sunday closing proviso to the World's Fair appropriation the Chicago Turners, numbering some five thousand, passed resolutions condemning the action of the Senate and declaring that it would cause a falling off of at least 12,000,000 admission tickets. A delegate meeting of representatives of forty-eight labor and other societies also protested against Congress attempting to close the Fair on Sunday.

THE following paragraph is taken from an editorial in the *Rocky Mountain News*:—

"At the Omaha mass meeting, called to consider this question [Sunday closing of the World's Fair], Judge Lawrence held enforced Sunday observance to be necessary, 'so that the churches might have a chance to draw the people to church.' The churches are in a bad way if they depend for reinforcements on making things so uncomfortable out of church on Sunday that people will be drawn there as a choice between two evils, for that is about the inference to be deduced from Judge Lawrence's reason for Sunday laws."

THE *Sun* publishes this dispatch from New Orleans, of the date of July 17:—

The Sunday law was enforced at New Orleans to-day for the first time in four years, all the stores and bar-rooms being closed. This result was brought about by the agitation of the labor organizations. Four years ago the first Sunday law was passed. It was very unpopular here, where Sunday has always been a gala day, and became a dead letter almost from the start. The bar-rooms were the first to defy it. Then the cigar stands, barber shops, and finally, the clothing and other retail stores reopened. The violations of the law became so general that it bore hard on the clerks and other employees. A few days ago the labor organizations held a special session to consider the matter, at which thirty-three associations were represented. The question of the retail stores remaining open on Sunday was discussed and the general conclusion reached that the present system was oppressive to the employees.

A delegation waited on the mayor and asked him to enforce the law. Several of the retail merchants were notified and agreed to close to-day. Last night the police force was detailed specially to hunt up all late offenders, and the result was a

general observance of the law. The shopkeepers say that they favor the movement, and each says that he kept open only because his neighbors did, and because of competition.

Such things as this mark the continual growth of the movement for enforced Sunday observance, and, as is to be expected, are supplemented by congressional, legislative, and judicial action.

At the closing session of the great Christian Endeavor convention at Madison Square Garden, those present, claimed to be twenty thousand in number, adopted with great enthusiasm resolutions asking Congress to make Sunday closing a condition of further appropriations for the World's Fair. Since then the Baptist Young People have met in convention at Detroit, Mich., several thousand strong, and at that meeting this was adopted:—

Resolved, That the Baptist Young People's Union of America, in convention assembled, most earnestly calls the attention of the Christian people of America to the importance of closing the World's Columbian Exposition, and requests the House of Representatives to pass the Senate bill containing the provisions for closing the Fair on Sunday and prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors on the grounds.

Thus the National Reform kindergarten grows.

THE little village of Mosinee, Wis., is having some excitement at the present time over the Sunday closing question. An ordinance has been passed requiring all candy stores, saloons, etc., to be closed on Sunday, but butcher shops are exempted. One man has a candy store with a butcher shop in the back part. A neighbor sent to his store for some ice cream, and as soon as it was found out that it had been sold to him, the combined butcher and confection venter was arrested and fined three dollars and costs, amounting in all to about seventeen dollars.

Why it is a crime to sell ice cream on Sunday and a virtue to sell it on other days, is a question that Sunday-law advocates have not fully explained on the basis that all they want is to require a civil rest with no religion whatever in it. Why is it uncivil to allow a man to cool himself with ice cream on Sunday, and perfectly civil on other days? If the religion were taken out of the question this difference would not appear. Just so far as these Sunday laws are enacted and enforced, just that far we have a union of religion with the State.

THE New York *Press* says:—

The Chicago saloon-keeper contemplates the action of Congress in ordering the World's Fair closed on Sundays with a pious smile, and thanks heaven there is still some virtue left in the hearts and minds of our national lawmakers. Meanwhile he increases his stock of whisky and otherwise prepares for a big Sunday trade during the Exposition season.

The *Press* has the best of authority for making such a statement, for the *Wine and Spirit Gazette*, which is the organ of the saloon trade, declares unhesitatingly, that—

the liquor dealers of Chicago are among the staunchest opponents of the opening of the Fair on Sunday. If the Fair grounds are closed on Sundays thousands of visitors will most likely patronize on that day the numerous beer gardens, concert halls, and other places of amusement where liquor is sold. A golden harvest is expected by the liquor dealers of Chicago from the closing of the Fair on Sundays.

The *Christian Statesman* has denied that the liquor element of Chicago is in favor of closing the Fair on Sunday. It is a question of veracity between the *Statesman* and the *Gazette*.

THIS from the *Sheldon Mail*, of Sheldon, Iowa, is an evidence how thoroughly the leaven of Sunday law is permeating the whole country:—

Careful inquiry proves that the recent Sunday law proclamation by the Mayor of Sheldon is being generally observed. The business houses are closed all day, and the laws pro-

viding for the observance of the Sabbath are carefully obeyed. This is a credit to Sheldon, or to any other town. The violation of law and the desecration of the Sabbath is never a credit or an advantage to any community, but rather a reproach and a detriment—something to be carefully avoided. The Mayor of Sheldon is to be honored for issuing the proclamation, and the people of Sheldon are entitled to commendation for obeying it. In the vast majority of cases the violation of the law and the desecration of the Sabbath are purely matters of habit, and not the result of inborn depravity or of vicious tastes or desires. Such violations of law and of good morals usually begin in very trifling offenses. The habit is formed and grows imperceptibly, and thus, unconsciously and thoughtlessly we do evil to an extent not realized by us until our attention is called to the matter. We believe if other mayors would follow the example of Mayor Bowley, they would find the people ready to respond to the appeal. Try it.

The very simplicity of this acceptance of the authority of civil law for the regulation of the religious habits of the community, and the appeal to the mayors of municipalities to issue their proclamations, is very suggestive of the extent to which this delusion has filled the minds of even the most well intentioned.

THE Chicago *Tribune* has sent a special correspondent to interview the Seventh-day Adventists under arrest at Paris, Tenn., and a three column article appears in its issue of July 10, giving the facts in their case together with some reference to previous cases of the same nature in Tennessee, and the expressed opinions of some of the residents of the village of Paris in reference to this particular matter. The reporter quotes one gentleman as stating some very practical facts, and saying that he is "of the opinion that the State of Tennessee is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel in this matter. That in doing so the State winks its eyes on other offenses. He had seen games of cinch and baseball in Paris, Sunday, and no one was indicted. The railroads worked gangs of men right in the town limits and nothing was said. People hired livery teams and went out for pleasure Sunday and were not molested.

"When reminded that the Supreme Court's point was that it was where violations constituted a nuisance that the statute could be brought to bear, the gentleman declared that the testimony against these men did not show that the work they had done was a nuisance. On the contrary, the witnesses had stated there was no nuisance, and yet the jury had found for the State, and in his opinion it was simply catering to a sentiment in the community, which wouldn't hesitate to go fishing Sunday, but felt outraged because these men, who were otherwise harmless, observed Saturday as a day of rest."

In concluding an editorial on the speech of Mr. Palmer in the United States Senate, with reference to the Homestead labor troubles, the *Atlanta Constitution*, of July 11, said:—

This is a time when our statesmen and leaders of public opinion should take counsel of their second sober thought before they speak. We are in great danger of mixing up moral rights with legal rights. All that can be expected in this world is the enforcement of certain plain and undeniable rights concerning life, liberty and property. If our lawmakers are going to jump into the tangled wilderness of moral rights they will become as confused and visionary as the wild reformers of the French revolution. . . . Moral rights can never be agreed upon; they can never be defined, arbitrated and enforced. They must be left to be regulated by public opinion. It is better to leave some wrongs unrighted than to plunge a nation into a mad crusade, giving Peter's property to Paul, and trying to make men love one another through the agencies of the sword and dynamite. Fortunately, the American people are too sensible to lose their heads when such questions are discussed. The Republic of Washington and Jefferson has no place in its orderly machinery for the experimental follies of either a Bellamy or a Herr Most.

The *Constitution* makes mention quite often of the arrests in that locality for Sunday labor. Why not publish a few editorials, in this strain with reference to the attempt to regulate the people's morals by the enforcement of Sunday laws.

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.

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.

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.

JAMES CHALMERS, Missionary and Explorer of Raratonga and New Guinea—By Wm. Robson, of the London Missionary Society. 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.

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.

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.

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, 312 pages. Sent by mail or express, post-paid. Half law sheep, \$2. 75; half morocco, \$3. 00.

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.

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.

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.

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

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY
12th & Castro Streets, OAKLAND, CAL. | 43 Bond Street, NEW YORK.



NEW YORK, JULY 28, 1892.

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.

THOSE officers of the law who excuse themselves when persecuting men for conscience' sake by saying, "It is the law," would do well to ponder Rev. 1:7: "Behold he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him." The poor soldiers acting under orders might well have pled, "It is the law;" yet God holds them to strict account for their part in the death of Christ. Nothing excuses participation in the persecution of the people of God.

To read that "the Emperor and Empress of Germany are much interested in the spiritual interests of their people, and are said to be taking official steps to increase religious facilities and have daily services in the churches," does not seem strange. But to read of Congress gravely debating a proposition to require the Directors of the World's Fair to provide a hall for religious services, and to invite eminent ministers to conduct Sunday services therein, is startling. What has become of the First Amendment to the national Constitution?

THE *Twentieth Century* thinks that Christianity has ceased to exist, except in name, because we now hear nothing of the Father who is a "jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation;" and because there is now no burning at the stake here as a preparation for the hereafter. But Christianity has not ceased to be because of these things. There is less genuine Christianity in the world than formerly, but not because of the modified conceptions of God's character. "God is love," and all his dealings with his creatures are tempered with love. And it is this love implanted in the heart by the divine Spirit that transforms the nature and makes the man a Christian; for "he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." The decay of vital piety in the last days, and the reason for it, is thus foretold by the Apostle Paul, 2 Tim. 3:1-4:—

This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good,

traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God.

The trouble is that men love themselves more than they love God. As a natural result they are "without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good." And so while it is true that we have not now burning at the stake, we do have fines and imprisonment for conscience' sake; and social ostracism, religious boycott, and political blackmail, all in the interests of degenerate Christianity. The more modern tortures are none the less real because more refined.

THE sophistry that justifies Sunday laws is satanic in its deceptiveness. For example, in an address before the late Methodist General Conference in Omaha, Rev. J. W. Hamilton said:—

It is true that we can not compel persons to keep the Lord's day by law, but we can compel them by law to permit all the disciples of the Lord to be in the Spirit undisturbed on the Lord's day.

As exemplified in the laws of a number of States this means that everybody must keep Sunday to the extent of refraining from their common labor upon that day; and that is just what the Sunday law advocates mean by it; they admit their inability to compel men to acts of real worship, but insist upon their right to require outward conformity to their dogmas. Rome never did more.

REV. MARY T. WHITNEY, of North Cambridge, Mass., writes thus in the *Union Signal*, of July 14, 1892:—

I have been a devoted Woman's Christian Temperance Union woman for years, and never refused to sign and circulate a petition coming from that organization until I came to the Sunday petitions; then I had to stop.

Her reason for thus refusing to sign such petitions evidently is because she does not believe in enforced idleness, or that the religious observance of a day can rightly be enforced upon the people; for while she admits that Sunday is observed as a "day of religion," she says:—

It is also a day of temptation to thousands, for "Satan always finds some work for idle hands to do," as the old proverb has it, and Sunday is a "day of idle hands."

We would that there were more who could see thus clearly into this question of Sunday laws and Sunday enforcement.

IN an address delivered at the mass meeting held in the interest of Sunday observance during the Methodist General Conference at Omaha, Rev. J. W. Hamilton, D. D., said:—

The Lord's day is a Christian institution and not a mere moralist's or a sinner's Sabbath. The Lord's day is a day unto the Lord. It is no more possible for a person to observe in a perfunctory or simply ceremonial way the sacrament of the Lord's supper, than for such an one to keep in like manner the Lord's day. The proper observance of the Christian's Sabbath is an act of worship; it is a religious duty. It was written in the Virginia bill

of rights that "religion, or the duty we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be dictated only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence." The duty to observe the Lord's day must, then, be a voluntary one; it must be with fear and trembling, in singleness of heart as unto Christ—"not with eye-service as men-pleasers; but as the servants of Christ doing the will of God from the heart; with good-will doing service as to the Lord and not to men."

If all this be true of Sunday what folly to ask for laws requiring its observance? Why not just as well ask for laws enforcing baptism and the Lord's supper?

THE *Union Signal*, of July 14, has the following:—

That was an unprecedented sight in the United States Senate last week, when Senator Quay sent a copy of the Bible to the clerk and said he wished a certain passage read as his speech on the motion he had just made conditioning the World's Fair appropriation on Sunday closing, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

The press report says:—
"During the reading of this great commandment in the presence of the modern law-givers, there was profound stillness throughout the chamber. They were familiar words and were reverently heard, but no sooner had the clerk stopped reading than Senators Morgan and Harris of the Democratic side, asked why the whole Decalogue should not be read. Senator Quay was satisfied with his presentation of the case. The octavo copy of his family Bible was at once returned to him, and locked up in his desk. The Quay amendment was passed."

What possible connection is there between the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, and closing the World's Fair on Sunday? The commandment enjoins the observance of the seventh day, which is Saturday, and not the first day of the week, which Sunday is. This scripture makes no more reference to Sunday observance than does the Declaration of Independence. Moreover, if newspapers, even of his own party, may be depended on, Mr. Quay is not straightforward in his political methods. The query arises, Do political demagogues, as soon as they espouse the Sunday law craze, become saints? No cause supported by such methods should receive the support of right minded people.

By specific governmental action, this is now both a Christian Nation and a Sunday-keeping Nation.

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.