



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

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 22, 1892.

NUMBER 50.

## 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.

Volume 7 of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL closes with this number. The initial number of Volume 8 will bear date of January 5, 1893. We will issue no paper next week.

In a "Round Table of Good Reading" in the *Christian Statesman*, Oct. 8, 1892, the editor-in-chief, Mr. W. F. Crafts, sets forth the following:—

It would not do the average American a bit of harm to be put through a course of genuflections and prostrations after the Greco-Russian style. It might help to moderate some of his impudence to be made to kneel oftener; even to get his face fairly in the dust, as I have seen in the case of well-dressed ladies, black-coated civilians, and officers in gold lace, as well as poor folks.

And it is into the hands of such men as this that the governmental power of the United States has been surrendered! Doubtless the people will discover it when it is too late for deliverance from the cruel exercise of it.

A CORRESPONDENT writing from Alma, Mich., under date of December 6, says:—

This place has just been visited by Rev. W. F. Ware, Secretary of the so-called American Sabbath Union. Mr. Ware spoke on the evils the Church had to contend with. The first evil was the non-attendance at church of their own members. The cause of this, he said, was, first, the running of Sunday trains and Sunday excursions, Sunday picnics and Sunday papers. Then the Sunday saloons and the train of evils that follow them, such as the great strikes.

Then leaving these without suggesting a remedy, Mr. Ware attacked the Seventh-day Adventists, which, according to his idea of evil are worse than all the rest, from the fact that "they are not law-abiding citizens." In proof of this he cited his hearers to the State of Tennessee, where they have good Sunday laws, where four men had been put in jail and worked in the chain-gang and still would not obey the law. He also stated that they were not "evangelical" because they believe that the spirit can not live without the body. And then came the remedy for these evils, the repeal of the exemption clauses in the States where they exist. When this is done, which he said would surely be, then "the sect which has its head-quar-

ters at Battle Creek must die and be buried without a coffin."

This shows the animus of Mr. Ware's work. It is not the first time that he has given expression to just such sentiments. But he should possess his soul in patience. Persecution has not yet killed the Adventist sect in Tennessee, in fact, it has had thus far the contrary effect; and as our correspondent remarks, "he may find that they will die as hard in Michigan as in Tennessee."

### An Interesting Mass-meeting in Chicago.

THE AMERICAN SABBATH UNION ROUTED BY THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS, AND THE TABLES TURNED IN FAVOR OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY FOR ONCE.

DECEMBER 13 and 14, 1892, the American Sabbath Union, an organization formed conjointly by some of the leading religious denominations of this country for the enforcement of Sunday observance by law, held its fourth annual session in the city of Chicago. According to previous arrangements mass-meetings were held in four of the largest churches of the city Tuesday night, December 13, at each of which certain of the leading speakers and workers in the Union gave addresses, giving their reasons, if reasons they may be called, for enforcing Sunday observance by civil authority, for desiring to close the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday by act of Congress, and inveighing against Mayor Washburn, the local Fair Directory, and all others who have dared to ask or petition Congress to repeal its Sunday-closing act of last July.

One of these meetings was held at the South Park Methodist Episcopal Church, corner South Park Ave. and Thirty-third St., and Rev. H. H. George, of Beaver Falls, Penn., who is general field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, was the leading speaker appointed for this place for the evening. A moderately sized audience, consisting of perhaps not far from one hundred persons, assembled in the spacious church to listen to what was to be said. With Rev. H. N. Axtell, of the Methodist Church, in the chair, Mr. Day, State Secretary of the Union for Indiana, opened the meeting by reading a portion of the 17th chapter of Jeremiah, and offering prayer. Rev. Mr. George spoke quite

enthusiastically for a time in regard to the work of the Union, directing his remarks chiefly to the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, and the petition which has recently been gotten up and quite extensively circulated for the repeal of the Sunday-closing act of Congress, and the opening of the Fair on Sunday, with the machinery stopped and religious services provided for within the gates. For Congress to repeal its action touching this matter he thought would be a long stride heathenward, and a fatal blow to an institution upon which more perhaps than any other, he said, the Republic rested.

Following Mr. George's address, Mr. Locke, a merchant of Englewood, spoke for a short time upon the aspect of the laboring men and the Sunday rest, after which a series of resolutions was introduced for consideration and adoption. The resolutions consisted of a protest against Congress in any way rescinding its act for closing the World's Fair on Sunday, and a gentle suggestion to Mayor Washburn that in going to Washington and championing the Sunday opening cause he was not attending to his business and would better be home enforcing the Sunday laws of his State and city. The resolutions were put to vote without discussion or comment, and to the evident astonishment of Mr. George and his friends the "noes" seemed to have it. A rising vote was called for, which developed the fact that by actual count a majority of ten or fifteen of those present were opposed to the adoption of the resolutions.

#### WANTED TO HEAR THEIR REASONS.

The gentlemen who had presented and read the resolutions at once requested that some one of those who had voted against their adoption be called upon to state his reasons for voting thus; in response to which a call was made for "Mr. Jones." What followed soon developed the fact that Alonzo T. Jones, editor of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, of New York, a paper uncompromisingly opposed to religious legislation, was in the audience, and that the South Park M. E. Church being in the vicinity of a considerable population of the religious denomination known as Seventh-day Adventists—a people coming to be quite well known as ardent champions of religious liberty and opposers of governmental interference in matters of religion,—quite a number of these had come out to see and hear what was going on, though, as they stated, with

no preconcerted plan to "pack" the meetings. On account of the inclemency of the weather and an apparent indifference on the part of that class which it might naturally be supposed would be largely represented at a mass-meeting of this kind, the Adventists, contrary to their own expectations, as they afterward stated, found themselves in the majority. And inasmuch as the meeting was a mass-meeting, and all present were called upon to vote, this people, expressing themselves in accordance with their conscientious convictions, necessarily voted the resolutions down, and unceremoniously and quite unexpected turned the scales of the American Sabbath Union against itself.

#### THE REASONS GIVEN.

Mr. Jones being called upon, begun by explaining why he and his people had voted against the resolutions. He said that so far as the opening or closing of the Fair on Sunday was concerned they would not turn their hands over whether it was opened or closed; but that they were opposed to the resolutions presented, as the resolutions were a protest against Congress repealing an unconstitutional act. He stated that Sunday legislation was religious legislation and religious legislation wholly, citing in proof the fact that the Sunday closing measure was asked for upon the ground of the fourth commandment, as interpreted by Congress, and statements of Senator Hawley and the Senate Chaplain at the time the measure was secured. Though at first denied by several in the audience, Mr. George admitted this to be so, as his own argument had already abundantly proved.

Mr. Jones then proceeded to show that the powers of the general Government were delegated powers only; that according to the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, the powers not delegated to the general Government were reserved either to the States or to the people, and consequently inasmuch as the Government had never had delegated to it the power to legislate upon religion and religious questions, Congress had no right whatever to legislate upon this subject. He further declared that the Government was positively and expressly forbidden to legislate upon such matters by the First Amendment to the Constitution which says, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" and that therefore Sunday legislation on the part of the Government was unconstitutional, and that those who by threats of loss of votes had secured such legislation had forced Congress to override the supreme law of the land, as Article Six of the Constitution declares the United States Constitution to be; and it was consequently with ill-grace they were pleading for obedience on the part of others to minor laws.

A third point made, was to the effect that Mr. George and the National Reform Association to which he belongs know this legislation to be unconstitutional, for, for the last twenty years and more they have been laboring to secure a religious amendment to the Constitution, in order that this very kind of legislation might have an "undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land;" but that having secured the legislation without first having secured the amendment, they could not possibly be ignorant of the fact that the legislation is unconstitutional. This

fact Mr. Jones made very emphatic and clear, and no attempt was made by Mr. George in his reply to answer it.

In conclusion, Mr. Jones remarked that although not affecting the principle of the legislation involved, it was nevertheless a fact that Sunday was not the Sabbath of the Bible anyway; that Saturday, the seventh day, was the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, and not Sunday, the first day; and that the American Sabbath Union was therefore not only overriding the supreme law of the land, but the supreme law of the universe.

This sort of argument was rather too much for Mr. George to take gracefully. When he got the floor again he said he smelled an odor similar to that which he encountered while lobbying with Congress last summer, and expressed his opinion of the Seventh-day Adventists in terms not the most complimentary, accusing them of being "anarchists," and thanked the Lord there were so few of them in comparison to the "forty millions" of people he claimed were behind him and his cause. He cited them to the Haymarket rioters, of Chicago, a few years ago, and to their fate, and although admitting the right of the Adventists to attend the meeting, seemed much incensed at its taking the turn it did, and the resolutions thus failing to carry.

#### "THE BATTLE OF THE GIANTS."

The chairman of the evening, Rev. Mr. Axtell, it must be said to his credit, kept his balance well, and allowed fair play all the way through. Several turns were taken by the speakers, both of which were ready and forcible in their utterances, and both being exceptionally tall and well-built, the scene altogether reminded one of what modern history styles the debates between Lincoln and Douglass, "the battle of the giants." It was indeed an interesting occasion, and religious liberty for once in these days of departure from truth and justice, gained a decided victory. A few others participated in the discussion, which lasted until half past ten o'clock, when Mr. George and his friends withdrew from the scene with anything but an air of triumph. They had evidently encountered not only numbers but arguments which they could not successfully meet.

The Seventh-day Adventists evidently had as much right to attend and take part in this meeting as any other people, it being advertised as a "mass-meeting;" especially is this so in view of the fact that they were invited to speak and give their reasons for their action. But the chagrin which this defeat caused and the indignation which it created in the American Sabbath Union may be understood to some degree from the following statements made by members of the Union in its meetings at the First Methodist Church, the following day. Rev. Mr. McLain styled the course of the Adventists "disorderly conduct," and when a proposition was made to send a telegram to the House Committee on the World's Fair, announcing the result of the four mass-meetings, he further remarked:—

I think the facts ought to be stated that we had four meetings; but in a surreptitious, and, in our judgment, a very unbecoming way, through an organized effort on the part of the enemies, they undertook to capture one of our meetings; and that very thing made public will heap contempt on any such course. I believe it ought to be made public; and I believe we ought to enter a vigorous protest against any such imposition in a line of this sort. I am very much opposed to any such course.

That a few men, calling themselves men, should come into a meeting organized properly as we had organized that meeting, and show themselves in that manner, ought to be treated with indignity and contempt, and the Government ought to know about it, that is the Committee [the House World's Fair Committee] ought to be notified in regard to it; and it ought to be shown to the people the unfair and improper methods used by those who are opposed to this movement.

Following these remarks the secretary of the convention, Mr. Thompson, of Ohio, said:—

If the committee on resolutions should bring in a resolution to censure these people I think it would be entirely proper.

Such are the illiberal sentiments and such the animus of the "Union" which is seeking to maintain what it has already secured from Congress in the way of closing the World's Fair on Sunday, and to force upon the people its ideas of religion and the Sabbath by law.

#### ADVENTISTS NOT SURPRISED.

It may not be inappropriate just here to state that such treatment as is indicated by the utterances just quoted, as well as the charge of "anarchy" made by Mr. George, is no surprise to the Seventh-day Adventists. For years they have not only been looking for this very condition of things to be brought about through a controversy over the Sabbath question, but predicted that these very charges would be made against them in consequence of their loyalty to God and his commandments. The following paragraph from a work published by them as long ago as 1884, entitled, "The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan" (Vol. IV., p. 409), is in evidence upon this point:—

Those who honor the Bible Sabbath will be denounced as enemies of law and order, as breaking down the moral restraints of society, causing anarchy and corruption, and calling down the judgments of God upon the earth. Their conscientious scruples will be pronounced obstinacy, stubbornness, and contempt of authority. They will be accused of disaffection toward the government. Ministers who deny the obligation of the divine law will present from the pulpit the duty of yielding obedience to the civil authorities as ordained of God. In legislative halls and courts of justice, commandment-keepers will be censured and misrepresented. A false coloring will be given to their words; the worst possible construction will be put upon their motives.

And in the same work (pp. 444, 445) the statement is further made that,—

In the last conflict the Sabbath will be the special point of controversy throughout all Christendom. Secular rulers and religious leaders will unite to enforce the observance of the Sunday; and as milder measures fail, the most oppressive laws will be enacted. It will be urged that the few who stand in opposition to an institution of the Church and a law of the land ought not to be tolerated, and a decree will finally be issued denouncing them as deserving of the severest punishment, and giving the people liberty, after a certain time, to put them to death. Romanism in the Old World, and apostate Protestantism in the New, will pursue a similar course toward those who honor the divine precepts.

From these statements it is evident that this people are not ignorant either of the nature of this movement to establish Sunday as the Sabbath of this Nation and enforce its observance upon the people, or of the bitter persecution that is finally to result from it. Two further paragraphs from the same work (page 410) are so much to the point we insert them here:—

The dignitaries of Church and State will unite to bribe, persuade, or compel all classes to honor the Sunday. The lack of divine authority will be supplied by oppressive enactments. Political corruption is destroying love of justice and regard for truth, and in order to secure public favor, legislators will yield to the popular demand for a law enforcing Sunday observance. Liberty of conscience,

which has cost this Nation so great a sacrifice, will no longer be respected. In the soon-coming conflict we shall see exemplified the prophet's words: "And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."

Our land is in jeopardy. The time is drawing on when its legislators shall so abjure the principles of Protestantism as to give countenance to Romish apostasy. The people for whom God has so marvelously wrought, strengthening them to throw off the galling yoke of popery, will by a national act give vigor to the corrupt faith of Rome, and thus arouse the tyranny which only waits for a touch to start again into cruelty and despotism. With rapid steps we are already approaching this period. When Protestant churches shall seek the support of the secular power, thus following the example of that apostate church, for opposing which their ancestors endured the fiercest persecution, then will there be a national apostasy which will end only in national ruin.

These predictions are in rapid process of fulfillment. The statement that "in order to secure public favor, legislators will yield to the popular demand for a law enforcing Sunday observance," has already been fulfilled. Every one who is acquainted with the facts knows that this is exactly the ground upon which the Sunday closing of the World's Fair measure was secured from Congress last summer. Threats of loss of votes upon the part of the churches, and the acknowledged fear on the part of the legislators that to refuse to comply with the demand of the churches would not be "wise statesmanship" and would endanger the likelihood of their "coming back here again" were precisely the elements which conspired to accomplish the unconstitutional result.

Thus, clearly have the course and results of this movement been marked out in the literature of this people. In conclusion, we wish to ask the reader, in view of all the facts in the case, and of your own eternal interests, upon which side of this controversy do you think it wise for you to stand?

W. A. COLCORD.

### One Day's Political Religion in Congress.

THE proceedings of the second session of the Fifty-second Congress are already characterized by many of those incidents which would be apt to such a great council of religion as Chaplain Butler of the Senate declared that body resembled when discussing the Sunday closing of the World's Fair.

Number 6, of the *Congressional Record* begins with "Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. Butler, D.D." Under its second sub-head—"Petitions and Memorials"—such documents are reported as presented by twenty-one different senators, nine of whom offered petitions upon religious subjects; one marked example being recorded as follows:—

MR. PEPPER.—I present a paper intended to be in the nature of a petition, but it refers to several different matters that are not cognizable by one committee, and I will briefly state its purport.

It is first an expression of thanks to God, and to both Houses of Congress, and to the President for the passage of an anti-lottery law, and prays for the passage of the Hatch-Washburn anti-option bill.

The next paragraph is a petition praying this body to stand by its action on the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, and not to retrace its steps in relation to the sale of intoxicating liquors on the World's Fair grounds.

The next paragraph is a petition to Congress praying for legislation to restrict immigration by consular examinations, educational tests, and a high tariff on immigrants.

The last paragraph is a petition to Congress and to the President to accomplish the submission of the proposed Sixteenth Amendment, forbidding

State Legislatures (as only Congress is now forbidden) to unite Church and State, and especially forbidding what is the very essence of such union, namely, sectarian appropriations.

This paper comes from the Presbyterian Church of Washington, Kan., and inasmuch as it relates chiefly to matters that concern the Columbian Exposition, I move that it be referred to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial.

The motion was agreed to.

MR. DOLPH.—I present a copy of the petition just presented by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Peffer]. It is a petition from citizens of Milton, Oreg. I move that the petition be referred to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial.

MR. PLATT.—What is the nature of the petition?

MR. DOLPH.—I say it is a copy of the petition which has just been presented by the Senator from Kansas, but from a different place. He has fully stated its contents, but I can give the contents if the Senator from Connecticut desires it.

MR. PLATT.—Just in a word.

MR. DOLPH.—It starts out with the following resolution:—

*Resolved*, That we rejoice and thank God, and Congress also, with the President, for the Sabbath closing of the World's Fair.

It authorizes our presiding officer to forward this and the following resolutions to the President and through our congressman and the senators residing nearest to us to both Houses of Congress, in duplicate.

It resolves further:—

That we also express our heartfelt thanks to God and to both Houses of Congress, and to the President, for the passage of the anti-lottery law some months since, and to the House for the passage of the Hatch-Washburn bill, which we hereby petition the Senate and President to complete and so suppress gambling in foods.

The paper also embraces the following resolution:—

That we petition Congress to renew its rescinded action excluding liquor-selling from the World's Fair, taken in the last session by both Houses, on the temperance ground alone, but now called for with the added reason that to allow the carrying out of the Directors' contracts for the sale of liquor would violate two laws of Illinois, and so the act of Congress by which the Fair was instituted, and which requires that the State law shall be observed in the contracts and conduct of the Fair, to which violation of State and national laws we urge the President, after due investigation through the Attorney-General, to call the attention of Congress.

Then there is the following resolution:—

That we petition Congress and the President to accomplish the submission of the proposed Sixteenth Amendment, forbidding State Legislatures (as only Congress is now forbidden) to unite Church and State, and especially forbidding, what is the very essence of such union, sectarian appropriations.

MR. PADDOCK.—It seems to me that the petition should go to the Committee on Education and Labor. It is a typewritten petition, and it is not unlikely that a large number of such petitions will come here.

MR. DOLPH.—This petition was adopted at a public meeting held at Milton, Oreg., and is signed by the presiding officer of the meeting.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—What reference shall be made of the petition?

MR. PADDOCK.—I think it should be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MR. DOLPH.—I have no objection to that reference.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—At the request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Peffer] a similar petition presented by him was referred to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial.

MR. PADDOCK.—As the Senator from Kansas is not in the Chamber at this moment, I ask that the reference of the petition presented by him be reconsidered, and that that petition and the one just presented by the Senator from Oregon lie on the table for the present.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT.—That course will be pursued if there be no objection. The Chair hears none, and the petitions will lie on the table.

The proceedings of the House of Representatives open thus:—

THE SPEAKER, at 12 o'clock M., amid general applause, called the House to order. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. Millburn, D.D.

Under the title, "Bills, Memorials, and Resolutions," is the following—read and referred:—

BY MR. DURBOROW.—A joint resolution (H. Res. 168) to provide for the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Twenty-four representatives presented petitions from their constituents; of these, thirteen referred to religious matters.

The remarkable blanket petition which occupied the attention of Senators Peffer, Dolph, Platt, Paddock, and the Vice-Pres-

dent to the extent of a column in the *Congressional Record*, as quoted above, is a good example of the religio-political atmosphere with which the church party of this country is striving to envelop the "great national council." As Senator Paddock tells us also, "It is not unlikely that a large number of such petitions will come here."

The devout thanks of these petitioners seem to be about equally divided, with blasphemous impartiality, between God, Congress, and the President. From their point of view, of course, this is not blasphemy, but highly proper; for they look to Congress as being the vicegerents of God on earth, to legislate and enforce the petitioners' interpretation of God's moral laws. Therefore there is to them no blasphemy and no inconsistency in this vast hotch-potch of devotional expression to their threefold divinity, the supposed tutelary deity of the American Sunday, God, Congress, and the President, and those civil measures, the Hatch-Washburn anti-option bill, the anti-lottery law, the prohibition of liquor selling at the World's Fair; and then to add a closing clause which shouts aloud with derision at their opening paragraph:—

That we petition Congress and the President to accomplish the submission of the proposed Sixteenth Amendment, forbidding State Legislatures (as only Congress is now forbidden) to unite Church and State, and especially forbidding, what is the very essence of such union, sectarian appropriations.

How is it possible that senators, long experienced in public life, and presumed fully conversant with the proprieties of civil affairs, can accept with unconscious gravity such ridiculously inconsequential inconsistencies, and fail to see either their inaptness to civil affairs or their glaring religious error?

Who will see and say, when these petitions, with which Senator Paddock tells us Congress is to be flooded, are considered in committee, that the last paragraph of this petition reminds Congress that it can not do, and prays that it restrict the States from doing, just what in the first paragraph it thanks God, Congress, and the President, has been done?

W. H. M.

### The Secret is Out.

It has been suspected that those people who so ardently advocate the revision of our Constitution so as to recognize Christianity as a part of the common law of the land, had something more in their mind than devotion to the pure principles of Christianity, and late developments go very far to confirm the conviction.

At the constitutional convention of North Dakota, held in the year 1889, Rev. Mr. Wylie, one of the secretaries of the American Sabbath Union, who appeared before that body, said, substantially: "As Americans we deny the old doctrine that kings rule by divine right, but we believe in the other doctrines, that the people have a divine right to rule; and since God is the source of all authority to the people, and since the Church of God, only recognizes that source, and is therefore the better element in the State, it follows that in order to have good government the Church should be the ruling power." We are to infer that the reverend gentleman believes that those men who are members of Christian churches should have the preference for all places of trust in the legislative,

the executive, and the judiciary, as well as in the army and navy, and the police departments of the Government.

At a meeting of the National Reform Association, recently held in the city of Philadelphia, the same gentleman used the following language:—

The Supreme Court of the United States has decided that this is a Christian Nation, and that is true of the people, but not of the Government. The Constitution does not recognize Christianity, and therefore is not Christian; and the consequence is that Christian men who enter politics are compelled to live a double life; in social life they conform to the customs and usages of the Church, but in their political life they must of necessity become schemers, and wire pullers, and the Church is filled up with this class of men.

It was evident that the speaker held that all this was the result of the fact that the Constitution of our country failed to give preference to these so-called Christian men, for he proceeded to say:—

However much we esteem the Constitution, we recognize that it has grave defects, and should be amended so as to be in harmony with the fact that this is a Christian Nation.

That is to say, the Constitution should be so amended as to give preference to Christian men for all desirable places in government, and by this means those Christian statesmen will be delivered from the temptation to become wire-pullers and schemers, and from degenerating into political demagogues, by coming into competition with the other fellows.

The people who are advocating this theory, seem to forget that when the Constitution shall be so changed as to give preference to Christian men, that then the other fellows will be sorely tempted to become "Christian" in order to share the spoils, and instead of the Church being reformed it will have within its embrace all the rest of the wire-pullers, and the conflict will still go on.

This certainly is a novel plan for reforming the Church, but it is not entirely new, it has, however, not been made use of in this country since the days of Puritanism, and since our fathers put that clause into the Constitution forbidding that any preference should be given to men on account of their religious belief. In all other countries it has been the curse, both of the Church and the State, and will produce the same results in this country if the experiment is tried.

A Christianity that does not have power to keep men pure when it is not legalized, would not be worth legalizing, even though it were right to so unite politics and religion.

The real difficulty is not with Christianity, nor the Constitution, but with the men.

Is it not fair to infer that these so-called Christian statesmen, following the example and spirit of the times, have allowed their selfishness to so far get the better of them that they are not willing to remain on an equal footing with other men, but are seeking a monopoly for themselves, a legalized preference over all other men, thus revealing their supreme selfishness, for no other class of men in this country has ever had the effrontery to demand the right to rule to the exclusion of all others.

This demand is not born of the spirit of him who said, "My kingdom is not of this world."

When the legislative department of this country shall have enacted righteous laws that bear equally upon all the people, the executive be faithful to see that the laws are righteously administered, and

the judiciary render just and equal judgment,—certainly not till then, if then, can we justly set up the claim of being a Christian Nation; but this can not be attained by merely creating an aristocracy calling itself Christian, from a class of men professing themselves for political profit to be Christian.

ALLEN MOON.

### A Confederacy.

IN a discourse delivered on Columbus Day in Hillsdale, Mich., Rev. A. E. Craig stated during the course of his remarks that he was looking for a great American church, and that it would be formed by the Catholics taking the best of their churches, the Episcopalians the best of theirs, the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, Methodists, etc., taking the best of theirs, and inscribing on their banners, "Unity."

If these churches were being melted together by the Spirit of Christ, and forming one body, it would certainly be very encouraging and desirable for the Christian. But when this "unity" is simply a confederation to enforce their dogmas and decrees by securing the aid of the State, it is, not only to the genuine Christian but to every American citizen, a question that is the most serious of anything that confronts us at the present time. All history shows that large ecclesiastical combinations entering the realm of the State, and securing and enforcing ecclesiastical laws, has resulted in great evil. And that the combining of these various organizations is tending in the direction of encroaching upon the State, and that it will ultimately end in an attempt to force the consciences of men, must be clear to those who have been watching the recent trend of events.

A. O. TAIT.

### The Reign of "the Saints."

IN reading a recent number of the *Christian (?) Statesman* (that of November 26), I find enough anti-Christian theology, and enough anti-American politics, if practically carried out in our land, to utterly ruin both Church and State; subverting our Federal Constitution, and building up over the grave of American liberty, a perfect image of the old time papal despotism.

In an article entitled, "Why Covenanters are Political Dissenters," Mr. J. M. Foster gives as the first reason, "God is not recognized as the sovereign." "The Declaration of Independence assumes that rulers derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." So this that has come to us through the experiences of millions is only an assumption. In the place of this sublime truth which universal history declares to lie at the very foundation of all civil liberty, Mr. Foster would revive the old theory of the divine right of kings and rulers; for he immediately adds, "Rulers are God's ministers. They represent God. Their authority comes from him."

Of course if rulers represent God, and not the people, and their authority comes from him, and not from the people, then they are responsible only to God and not to the people for the exercise of that authority. Every student of history knows that this always has been and still is the underlying principle of every oppressive

despotism. From the ancient tyrants of Assyria and Rome to the modern autocrat of Russia, every despotic ruler has thus sought to give to his iniquitous decrees the authority and sanction of Deity. Nor does Mr. Foster evade the force of this by saying, "God's method of communicating this authority is through the people. The whole truth is: 'Whom God and the people choose.'"

The voice of the people is here made the voice of God, and that too in things pertaining to God and his worship. This is a revival of a pagan proverb. The truth of the Bible is that the people persecuted Noah, the people crucified Jesus. The people have in every age put to death God's prophets and apostles, leaving posterity only to build their sepulchres and do them honor. Neither the people nor their rulers are supreme in matters pertaining to the moral government of God, but God himself; and his will is not revealed to any chosen rulers simply, but to each individual soul, by his Spirit, and through his word.

The second reason given why Covenanters are political dissenters is "that Christ is not recognized as the King of kings," and the failure to recognize him as such in our Federal Constitution is "treason against the Constitution of Christ." Just what the "Constitution of Christ" is, the gentleman fails to inform us. The nearest approach to a Constitution for a civil State in all His recorded words, is where he teaches the total separation of Church and State by saying: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's;" and in that other place where he plainly and solemnly declares, "My kingdom is not of this world." Both of these declarations the Covenanters seem to have forgotten; and so they present themselves to the world as the spiritual descendants of the unbelieving multitude who sought to take Christ by force and make him king.

Jesus came from the highest heaven, stooping in infinite love to lift up humanity, till even in this poor world, he was a wanderer without where to lay his head.

The human representatives of Christ, have exalted themselves above all humanity, both people and kings, till climbing up into the very seat of God, they claimed the power and the right, by their own poor human authority, to change the divine law. Jesus was the Christ. The popes have by this very exaltation proved themselves ANTI-Christ. Yet they were the logical result of that theory of government which the *Statesman* is seeking to revive. Revive that theory, and in the place of our civil rulers, we should soon again have these theocratic despots.

From another article in the same paper I clip the following. The article is entitled "Christian politics":—

Now let a single presidential canvass be conducted with the American people, on a platform which frankly acknowledges the Lord Jesus Christ as sovereign in political affairs, for servants tried and true of Christ for these chief places; let every issue be in the platform that Christ in his providence demands by placing it in national life; let them all be argued before the people by the press and speakers bringing them to the infallible test of the law of Christ; appealing to reason, conscience, love to God, love to man, love of country, love of righteousness, hate of evil, etc., etc., and would it not be one of the most tremendous instrumentalities to educate the whole people in the knowledge, love and obedience of Christ?

This looks at first thought very plausible, as error often does, but it wholly disregards Christ's declaration that his kingdom is not of this world. More-

over, it has been tried again and again, tried with the same glowing anticipations of a glorious result. All these religious motives and feelings were appealed to, to secure the election of the so-called "servants of Christ true and tried." These things were all discussed publicly and everywhere,—discussed till the discussion was parodied in the pagan theatres, and the emperor's statues in the public squares were broken down in the heat of the conflict that ensued from this Christian (?) discussion,—discussed till, says the historian, "if you enquire the price of bread in a bake shop you are told, 'The Son is subordinate to the Father.' Ask if the bath is ready, and you are told, 'The Son arose out of nothing.'"—*Stanley*.

What was the result of all this? Instead of ushering in the peaceful reign of Jesus and his saints, it ushered in the reign of the popes. Instead of introducing an era of quickened consciences, and universal enlightenment, it introduced the Dark Ages of ignorance and spiritual death. It would do the same again. These theocratic enthusiasts do not expect Jesus to come and reign in person. They assume to themselves the title of "his saints," and their narrow creed, they dignify with the sounding title of Jesus' law. Give them their way, and it would be they, and not Jesus, who would reign. *The difference is immense.*

When Cromwell sought to disband the Parliament, that he might elect a new one more favorable to his schemes of theocratic usurpation, he called a council of the officers of the army. The council was divided. General Harrison assured them that by dissolving the Parliament, Cromwell only sought to make way for the reign of "Jesus and the saints." "Major Streater alluding to Cromwell's ambitions, briskly replied: 'Jesus ought then to come very quickly, for if he delays it till after Christmas he will come too late, and will find his place occupied.'"—*Hume*.

Shortly after, Cromwell in person with his army to support him, dissolved this Parliament, and then another was elected composed of "the saints." The leader was called "Praise God Barebones," and from him, the Parliament was called "Barebones Parliament." Says the historian: "Though the English nation be naturally candid and sincere hypocrisy prevailed then among them beyond any example in ancient or modern times."—*Hume*. All their iniquity was checked and sanctified by prayer and fasting. Soon, however, the spirit that was guiding them all, failed to guide the Parliament and Cromwell in the same direction; so Cromwell sent a detachment of the army under Gen. Harrison to dissolve that Parliament. Coming to the House of Parliament, Harrison entered, and asked them what they were doing there. They replied, "We are seeking the Lord." Then, said the General, "You may go elsewhere, for to my certain knowledge, he has not been here these many years."

This all is but a faint picture of what will be again when the National Reformers seek to usher in the reign of Jesus and his saints. It would be far more modest for them to leave that herculean task to Jesus himself, who will certainly accomplish it in due time.

The third reason given by Mr. Foster for dissenting, is this, "The Bible is not recognized as the foundation of all law." Suppose we recognize the Bible as such, and make that recognition practical. It

would do away with all evil legislatures, and place the clergy of the country in their place to interpret the divine law in harmony with their varied creeds. The executive officers would then be but the official enforcers of the clerical will. How long would it be before ecclesiastical courts and synods, would, as in olden time, try cases for heresy, and then turn them over to the civil (?) power for punishment. The theocratic schemes of these self-styled reformers, have in them that which would subvert every department of the Government, legislative, judicial, and executive, and put all the power in the hands of the clergy. It is but too evident to every thoughtful mind, that these gentlemen are seeking for worldly power to accomplish their ends; and in so doing they are denying the sufficiency of the power of God.

G. E. FIFIELD.

#### Methodist vs. Adventists.

ONLY a short time ago we chronicled the fact that a Seventh-day Adventist had been arrested and fined in Kent County, Md., on complaint of a Methodist minister for husking corn in his own field on Sunday. It seems that this minister has not a monopoly of Methodist intolerance, for now comes a paper from the same State containing the following notice from another minister of the same denomination:—

The undersigned, with the fear of God and the public good before his eyes, would call the attention of all Christians, whether Protestant or Catholic, that there is a man canvassing in Talbot County, seeking to sell a book called, "Bible Readings for the Home Circle," and he is also talking against the observance of the Lord's day. The book is in the interest of the Second or Seventh-day Adventists. Christians, beware of his craftiness and book.

Yours,

J. D. LECATES,

Pastor of the Tighlman M. E. Church.

The foregoing copied from the Easton, Maryland, *Gazette* of Dec. 3, 1892, shows the bigotry and intolerance of those who uphold the "American Sabbath." Finding nothing in the Scriptures to sustain them, they seek by putting such notices as this into the papers to keep the people from reading or finding out the truth for themselves. The way in which it is written should show to anyone that Mr. Lecates himself knows nothing about what he is trying to warn the people against, and is therefore not capable of judging even for himself.

As for his charging the Adventists with breaking down the Lord's day, he is entirely mistaken in thinking thus; for that is just what they do not do. The Bible says that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord;" and in Isa. 58:13, 14, we read: "If thou turn thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord." The Adventists are trying to show the people that the so-called "American Sabbath," or Sunday, is not the Sabbath of the Lord, but that it is a man-made institution. The book against which this minister warns both Protestants and Catholics says nothing about the Sabbath that the Bible does not say. Mr. Lecates is simply warning people against reading the Bible, except through his eyes.

#### A Blow for Civil Supremacy of Religion.

THE order of the day just at present seems to be more or less pronounced religious war. The contest over the Sunday closing of the World's Fair is making itself felt in Congress and throughout the whole country.

In Toledo, Ohio, there is a bitter combat between Protestants and Roman Catholics over the public school question. Protestant antagonism to the Hebrew is also manifest in this case, as appears from this paragraph in the published report of the trial of one of the members of the Board of Education of the city for unjustly seeking the dismissal of teachers who were Roman Catholics. The paragraph reads:—

Miss Humphrey, another East Toledo teacher, testified that Scott said Kuhn (a Hebrew member of the board) had taken advantage of his (Scott's) absence to appoint Miss Sugarman, a Jewess, and that he (Scott) had no more use for a Jew than for a Catholic.

Further examination developed such a condition of things as this:—

Professor Hutchinson, assistant superintendent of schools, testified that Dr. Scott asked for a list of the Catholic teachers employed in the city. The list was furnished. The doctor remarked that he wanted to get rid of the Catholic teachers, and he (Hutchinson) had remarked that Miss Sullivan was one Catholic that should be kept anyway, owing to her excellence as a teacher. Mr. Hutchinson continued: "Dr. Scott wanted a Miss Beall removed, saying she was a Catholic. He also told me Miss Sugarman must not get a school. I asked him how he would prevent it if she passed the examination. He said: 'Has she got her certificate yet?' I replied, 'No, but she will.' Then he said: 'She must be marked down so low she will not get a certificate. Compton should do that; I would do it myself if I dared.'" Professor Hutchinson admitted belonging to a secret anti-Catholic society, therefore his testimony was certainly not swayed by religious bias in favor of the Catholics.

This is significant. The assistant superintendent of schools a member of a secret anti-Catholic society! Oath-bound to discriminate on religious grounds against a religious sect! Members of the Board of Education, the member on trial, no doubt, as well as others, belonging also to the same organization! Such conditions as these immediately bore their legitimate fruit as this shows—the closing paragraph of the same report:—

The city is greatly excited over the affair, which is dished up in the daily papers to the extent of pages. Several bloody affrays have resulted from the excitement, and neighbor is arrayed against neighbor, according to their sympathies.

The same sectarian contest, from a different point of view, crops out in this State; a dispatch from Saratoga says:—

There is commotion in Waterford, this county, over the reading of the Bible in the public schools. Father Emmett, of St. Mary's Church, of Waterford, demanded of Superintendent Falconer that he order the teachers to cease reading the Bible, on the ground that to do so was against the law. The superintendent declined, saying he could only act on the orders of the Board of Education. Then Father Emmett went to some of the teachers and ordered them to discontinue reading the Scriptures in school; and they stopped doing so. Last evening the priest sent a letter to the Board, calling their attention to the fact that the Bible was read in the schools, with a request that its reading be ordered discontinued. The Board deemed the demand of Father Emmett "discourteous and impudent," and entitled to no consideration, as this priest is not even a legally qualified voter in the school district. The Board passed a resolution instructing the teachers not to obey any orders or instructions except those of the Board and the school superintendent, and threatening instant dismissal if orders from "outsiders" were obeyed. *The Protestant Clergymen of Waterford have held a union meeting.*

In Pittsburg the preachers have undertaken to dictate to the city government,

and control the policing of the city. In this city Rev. Dr. Parkhurst has thrown down the gauntlet, without reservation, and the war between himself and his society, and Police Superintendent Byrnes is now to the death.

The war is certainly on already, in not a few phases. It is a contest for sectarian supremacy over Congress, the World's Fair and the Nation, for supremacy over other sects, and for control of the policing and municipal government of cities.

This is a new revolution. The aristocracy of religion is making it *coup d'etat*.

W. H. M.

### A Congressman's Impudence.

CONGRESSMAN MORSE of Massachusetts has written an open letter to Bishop Potter which is a regular curiosity in its way, coming as it does from a member of Congress to one of the most prominent ecclesiastics in the country. The Congressman writes to the Bishop, as follows:—

To the Rt. Rev. Bishop Potter.

REVEREND SIR: All the members of Congress are in receipt of a very adroitly written letter signed by the President of the World's Columbian Exposition at Chicago, giving reasons for and asking for the repeal of the proviso accompanying the appropriation of two and one-half millions by Congress, providing for the closing of the Exposition on the Lord's day. This letter is remarkable for what it does not say.

First, it does not say that the petitions asking for the repeal were circulated largely by the liquor dealers of Chicago, anticipating a harvest from the thousands of additional patrons who would be brought to the city from the surrounding towns and cities on the Lord's day.

Secondly, it is entirely silent in regard to hundreds of excursion trains that would be run in Chicago on the Lord's day, bring a motley crowd of Sabbath breakers, requiring the labor of thousands of additional employees on the railroads, who have petitioned against the Sunday opening.

This petition is entirely silent in regard to the fact that the unanimous voice of the churches and Christian people of Chicago (at least of the Protestant churches) is opposed to Sunday opening.

It is silent also in relation to the fact that thousands, if not millions, of our countrymen, and these certainly the best of our citizens, petitioned Congress for the Sunday closing proviso.

I write this letter to say that the communication to which I have referred addressed to members of Congress, by inference at least, represents you as in favor of such Sunday opening, and uses your name as an endorser. Will you kindly advise me whether such use of your name is authorized by you?

The awful scourge known as the Asiatic cholera is at our door. God only knows what the next twelve months may develop, or who will be its victims. In this presence can we afford to offend the Almighty by a national sanction of the desecration of the Lord's day, that we were commanded to observe amid thunderings and lightnings from Sinai? The circular is very adroit. It proposes to throw a sop to the Almighty for the desecration of his day by Sunday trains and requiring thousands of employees to work, by giving an opportunity on alternate Sundays for different kinds of religious service in some part of the ground. It proposes to compensate the thousands of employees who would be required to work on that day by giving them some other day in the week.

I can not but believe that this circular does you an injustice. Whether it does or no, I trust the good people of this country will continue to petition and pray the Almighty to save us from being numbered among and sharing the fate of the States and nations that disobey and forged God, and a national sanction of the desecration of the Lord's day will be a long step in that direction.

Very respectfully,

ELIJAH A. MORSE.

Canton, Mass., Dec. 9.

This letter emphasizes the action of Congress in deciding that Sunday is the Sabbath, and that it must be kept by closing the Fair upon that day. Not only has Congress assumed to decide this question, but a member of that body takes it upon himself to practically read out of the Christian Church a prominent minister who thinks that the Fair might be con-

sistently kept open on Sunday. Thus again is fealty to Sunday not only made the test of Christianity but adherence to certain forms of Sunday observance is declared to be necessary to entitle one to recognition as a Christian. And not only so but the thunderbolts of God's wrath are invoked against those who do not honor Sunday according to Mr. Morse's ideas of propriety.

Sunday is absolutely without any standing in the Bible. That book knows it only as an ordinary working day, but lo! under the leadership of the so-called American Sabbath Union, the popular churches of the country have made its observance, and that in a particular way, the great and all-important element of Christianity, THE test of Christian fellowship! And Congress has become their allies in this matter, and a member of Congress takes it upon himself to instruct in this regard a prominent Bishop of a prominent branch of the Church!

### IMPUDENCE REBUKED.

SINCE the foregoing was put in type, Bishop Potter has sent the following reply to Mr. Morse:—

Hon. Elijah A. Morse.

MY DEAR SIR: The use of my name in the circular to which your letter of December 9 refers, was not authorized by me, and if you had been governed by the courtesies which obtain among gentlemen, you would have given me an opportunity to say so before attacking me in the public prints. As it is, the course you have seen fit to take puts it out of my power to reply to your letter, further than to say that if you make public use of this note, I must request that you do so without mutilation or abbreviation.

Very truly yours,

H. C. POTTER.

New York, Dec. 13, 1892.

The caution that the note be not abbreviated or mutilated is not out of place. The ultra Sunday-closer will bear watching.

C. P. B.

### A Methodist "Protest."

"THE Constitution of the United States declares the people to be sovereign; Pope Leo XIII. claims to be sovereign. The Constitution guarantees freedom and justice; the Pope attacks and tries to break down all guarantees of freedom. The Constitution forbids Congress to establish any religion; papacy demands that it alone be established by law. The Constitution guarantees freedom of speech and press; papacy denounces both as a pest and a pestilence. The Constitution guarantees a fair trial by jury; papacy urges and employs the secret tribunals of the Inquisition. The Constitution forbids cruel and excessive penalties; papacy demands torture and death for heretics and claims the right to inflict it. Is this the kind of patriots the Roman parochial school makes?"

The foregoing clipped from the Chicago *Evening Post*, of November 28, is an extract from a paper on "Roman Catholicism and the public schools" read by Rev. J. J. Tobias, pastor of Lincoln St. Methodist Episcopal Church of that city, before the Methodist minister's meeting.

Apparently it is a very honest and able protest against the encroachments of a power dominated by ideas foreign to the spirit of our American institutions, but the record of the "Protestant" denomination represented by the reverend gentleman destroys much of its force. Hear him as he declares that "the Constitution forbids Congress to establish any religion;

papacy demands that it alone be established."

When has the Roman Catholic Church demanded more in the matter of religious legislation than the Methodist Episcopal Church? Has not the Methodist Church until its last General Conference received for its religious work, money appropriated by Congress. Has she not worked for the appointment of Methodist army chaplains? Has she not in company with other professedly Protestant bodies demanded the passage of Sunday laws? Has not Methodism again and again made herself felt in the matter of elections and appointments to office?

While Rome has made herself exceedingly obnoxious to every patriotic son of America, who dwells under the protection of the stars and stripes, she has not meddled in politics to the extent that Methodism and her so-called Protestant sisters have. Alas, what a pitiable spectacle! The Methodist Church, once the pride of every devout Christian, now playing the cats-paw for Rome; spending her time and energies to compel Congress to pass a law that will fix on free America the badge of the Papacy, the special mark of Roman Catholic authority—the heathen holiday, Sunday.

The Roman Catholic Church is not making much of a stir in regard to this matter, but why should she when her former bitter enemies, her own daughters, are doing the work for her?

"The Constitution guarantees freedom and justice; the Pope attacks and tries to break down all guarantees of freedom." While no right thinking man will deny that Rome in all ages has been the enemy of freedom of thought and speech, the foe of progress, the persecutor of those whom she is pleased to term "heretics," yet will the Rev. Mr. Tobias claim that Methodism has entirely cleared herself of this characteristic of her mother?

Has Methodism never censured or opposed those in her communion who presumed to think or speak contrary to her standards? For an instance of the spirit of the Roman Catholic Church in the Methodist body, consider the case of Rev. W. E. White, of Washington, D. C. Some time ago, the gentleman attended some meetings held under the auspices of another denomination, and after a time accepted at least part of their views as being more scriptural than the doctrines he had held up to that time. Not long afterwards, in the midst of a meeting in his own church, he was notified that he was not needed, and was dismissed without a ghost of an investigation or trial; without being given an opportunity of defending himself or the position he had taken on the basis of Scripture, which Methodists claim to be the "only and sufficient" rule of practice.

This is not an attack upon the Methodist Church, but must be considered as an examination of Rev. Mr. Tobias' arguments in the light of facts. What is here said of that body of people is more or less true of all "Protestant" denominations. They are all playing into the hands of Rome.

The Constitution does guarantee freedom; look at the freedom "enjoyed" by the Sabbath-keepers of Tennessee! If Mr. Tobias will direct his attention to the movements at Rock Hall, Kent County, Md., he will see an example of the kind of freedom enjoyed by people who presume to believe differently from the

standards of Methodism. I refer to the arrest of Mr. Judefind, a Sabbath-keeper, upon complaint of the Methodist preacher in that neighborhood. Is it possible that Mr. Tobias' ministerial brethren believe that a man has a right to freedom of thought only so long as he chooses to believe according to the iron-bound creed of their particular sect? Why, that is precisely what the Roman Catholic Church teaches; and Mr. Tobias has roundly denounced that apostate body.

The Constitution does forbid Congress making "any laws respecting the establishment of any religion." Mark you, it does not say "any particular denomination" but "*any religion*;" and yet many of these apparently rabid opponents of Rome are laboring with might and main, with pen and voice, with vote and pocket-book, aye, with threats of boycott, to fasten upon free America, the particular insignia of Rome.

"Consistency, thou art a jewel."

ERNEST H. RUSSELL.

### Catholicism—A Feint.

ROMAN Catholicism has assumed a prominence in its relation to the political questions of our country that has given it some prestige as an issue in the late presidential campaign; not, indeed, as a distinct plank in any party platform, but as a party influence so marked as to elicit some public comment and prophecies of approaching danger.

While there is doubtless some cause for apprehension of danger from the growing power of Catholicism, it is mainly so from the fact that Protestants, so-called, have so generally ceased to protest. But while from that point arise dark clouds that are somewhat obscuring the horizon of our fair land, from another quarter, as the smoke of a pit, there has arisen an influence that has overcast the zenith of our national glory and darkened the sunlight of liberty.

The National Reform Party, so-called, with its many allies, has done more to override the Constitution of our country, and stultify the wisdom of our forefathers who so carefully framed it, than Catholicism has ever been, or ever could be, able to do, unaided by the truckling of fallen Protestantism. We can only regard it as a feint by the arch-deceiver, to divert attention from the approach of a more deadly foe.

A. SMITH.

A Jew merchant in Findlay, Ohio, has recently been informed by the city authorities that he must keep his store closed on Sunday.

In the same town one of the ministers, in a sermon delivered a few weeks since, stated that the Church was now in a position where it could say to the world, that in order for men to be placed in positions of public trust they must be Christians. The Church is not slow to claim the advantage that they gained over politicians in the recent encounters in our national Legislature. But, oh! what a Church it will be when all the unprincipled politicians flock into it for the purpose of getting the suffrages that they are now boldly told they can not have unless they are Christians. For years THE SENTINEL has been telling the people what would be the outcome of this Church and State union; and now all can see how clearly it is being fulfilled.

### Protestants Largely Responsible.

THE result of the recent election has made the downfall of Commissioner Morgan certain. For some reasons, perhaps, this is not to be regretted although General Morgan's administration of the Indian Bureau has been better than that of his predecessors. When he came to office he found the Government committed to the support of a number of so-called Indian contract schools. These are nothing more nor less than denominational schools, supported out of the public treasury.

General Morgan declared his purpose to abolish the whole system, and in this he was clearly right, but by this declaration he provoked the everlasting hostility of the Roman Catholics, and it was a foregone conclusion that his political undoing was only a question of time. It is true that in taking the position that he did, General Morgan may have been influenced more by his opposition to Romanism, than by fidelity to the principle of absolute separation of Church and State; but be that as it may, it is to be regretted that the system which he endeavored to terminate seems likely to survive. But for this, the so-called Protestant churches of the country are very largely responsible. Had they unitedly denounced the evil in the beginning instead of becoming parties to it, by themselves accepting Government money for the support of their Indian missions, the peniculous system could not have survived. But now it is almost certain that it will not only live but that it will grow.

### He Understands It.

THE *Circuit Rider* has this paragraph from a correspondent:—

"HONOR THE SABBATH DAY AND KEEP IT HOLY."

The 52d Congress has left a record in virtually closing the gates of the World's Fair on Sunday, and, in spite of the quibbling of some secular newspapers, will stand by its record, backed by the Christian people of this Nation. If a large mass of the people will patronize the saloons of Chicago on Sunday, instead of the churches, that will not be the fault of the Christian people. It will be a great deal better to off-set this by making the churches attractive and all welcome to the sanctuary, than by opening the gates of the Fair on Sunday and thus "doing evil" under the false supposition "that good may come." Senator A. H. Colquitt, of Georgia, who championed this cause is a member of our church and we are prouder of him than ever.

C. D. H.

The writer of the foregoing understands the matter; the closing of the Fair by act of Congress was secured by the churches, for the benefit of the churches, and the churches will reward those who cater to them in political things. The time has come when it is quite an object for candidates for office to belong to "our church," or at least to be in favor with the churches, and as a result politicians are almost tumbling over one another in their mad haste to secure front seats in the National Reform car.

### Two Interesting Items.

THE *Advance* claims that the Sunday resolutions from the religious societies are wholly spontaneous and in no way through the influence of the "Sabbatarian associations." Does not this item from the proceedings of the annual meeting of the M. E. Church General Missionary Committee, held last month in Baltimore, show about how spontaneous these resolutions are:—

A telegram from Rev. Dr. J. H. Knowles was

read, requesting the General Committee to protest against the present scheme to remove the Sunday closing condition from the national appropriation to the World's Fair.

A committee was appointed to do it in behalf of the body.

Another item from the organ of the Presbyterian Missionary Society, *Church at Home and Abroad* for December suggests how the Presbyterians do not work in China. In the edict of a magistrate favoring toleration of Christians, this plea is made: "Foreigners preaching in China have never used coercion nor have they thwarted the magistrates, but each Chinese may or may not embrace the (new) religion according to his own pleasure. Nor do the converts oppose the good among the people, but are themselves all loyal subjects of China."

### NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

THE Georgia Legislature recently rejected a bill providing for the reading of the Bible in the public schools.

TEN Elmira pastors, headed by Rev. Thomas K. Beecher, have declared against Sunday funerals. They agree upon the general principle that they are unwise and inexpedient, and except in cases of extreme necessity are to be avoided. Hereafter people in straightened circumstances in Elmira must bury their dead at night if they want their friends who are dependent on their daily earnings for a livelihood, to be present and assist them in paying the last sad tribute of respect to the departed. This anti-Sunday-funeral crusade is about as heartless a phase of the Sunday agitation as has yet been developed.

THE different influences brought to bear to secure the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, are many and subtle. The last seems to be an attempt to antagonize the World's Fair management and the Labor Unions on the subject of the employment of non-union labor, and turn this to account for Sunday closing. The *Chicago Times*, of December 11, has this, purporting to be the language of President Higinbotham:—

I don't care a continental what the labor leaders do in regard to the opening or closing of the Fair on Sunday. If they don't want it open, I am sure I don't. It is no more our business whether a man employs union labor, than is his color or his religion.

The special despatch from which this is taken contains also the following comment in explanation:—

Mr. Higinbotham is said to have made these remarks in reply to the criticisms of local labor unions upon the action of the Fair Directors in letting the printing of the official Exposition catalogue go to a firm which does not at all times pay the union scale of wages. Mr. Higinbotham is further quoted as saying that personally he would prefer to have the World's Fair closed on Sunday, as it means much less individual work to him if this is the case. He has been working in the interest of workingmen, he declares, when he labored for Sunday opening, and now, if the local unions withdraw their support from the Sunday opening movement, as they threaten, it is no affair of his. He is also quoted as saying that he merely followed good business principles in accepting the offer of the printing house to get out the catalogue, and in so doing, he did his best for the welfare of the Exposition.

This is an unexpected but a very effective way of giving trouble to those who are seeking the repeal of vicious legislation on this matter. It marks very clearly also the selfish, personal and partisan methods to which the Sunday closing element is willing to stoop. The high water mark in demagoguery and hypocrisy seems to have been reached in this Sunday closing of the World's Fair.



NEW YORK, DECEMBER 22, 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.

Volume 7 of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL closes with this number. Number 1, Vol. 8, will bear date of January 5, 1893; we will, therefore, publish no paper next week. This is according to our custom, but is mentioned for the information of new subscribers.

THE next number of THE SENTINEL will be one of special value. The leading article will be a brief but comprehensive history of the National Reform movement, and of what it has accomplished. This article has been written specially for the initial number of the new volume, and ought to be read by everybody. "Limitations to Majority Rule," and the "Christian's Duty to Obey Civil Rulers," are also among the important subjects to be treated in this number of THE SENTINEL. This paper will be No. 1, Vol. 8, of THE SENTINEL, and will bear date of January 5, 1893. Extra copies will be furnished at \$1 per hundred, or \$8 per thousand.

THE American Federation of Labor, approved on the 15th inst., by a vote of 54 to 15, the committee's recommendation that the World's Fair be opened on Sunday.

It is said that Mr. Henry W. Blair, of New Hampshire, recently elected to a seat in the lower house of Congress, proposes to re-introduce his educational bill, so persistently kept before Congress by him when he was in the Senate.

A LADY of the National Reform school of Christianity(?), writes to us from Pennville, Ind., as follows:—

You are making a great mistake in sending your wicked paper to me. I don't want one of them seen in my house. If you and your un-American friends don't want to abide by the law of this country, we will be just as well off without you. You are at liberty to go to some heathen land where you belong. But if you want to stay here, I beg of you in God's name not to try to make the people any worse than they already are. God's holy day is desecrated to such a degree already that we hardly know when our blessed holy day comes.

If you have any other day that you want to keep, that is all right, but the law of this country ought to compel every person on American soil to keep the American Sunday.

This has the true National Reform ring, and sounds amazingly like the following bit of Christian(?) sentiment uttered by Rev. E. B. Graham some years ago:—

If the opponents of the Bible [that is, the National Reform view of the Bible] do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land; and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a Government of their own, and if they can stand it, stay there till they die.

The mistake of both Mr. Graham and of our correspondent is in supposing that National Reform is Christianity, or that it is even Christian. We are not opposed to Christianity, but simply to having

something forced upon people as Christianity which is only a base counterfeit. It is impossible to enforce true Christianity.

According to our correspondent's own words there has been a total failure to preserve the Sunday Sabbath by the civil law; they have for years had Sunday laws but now can scarcely tell when the day comes. Why not cease to appeal to force and appeal to the power of God and to his word, trusting his Spirit to impress it upon hearts? There can be but one reason; the word of God says nothing about the particular day which they are determined shall be observed, and which they are determined to enforce, even if they have to banish all who oppose them.

WE are told that infidelity was responsible for the French Revolution which a century ago deluged France with blood; but what caused the infidelity? Was it not largely the result of a corrupt union of Church and State, and of the abuses which grew out of it? Infidelity hides its head in the presence of the truth, which is the power of God for the salvation of men, but it flourishes in the atmosphere of a State-bolstered religion which is always a denial of the sufficiency of the gospel of Christ. In nothing is the utter perversity of human nature more fully demonstrated than in its readiness to pervert the truth of God, and by the substitution of human inventions, deny its power to regenerate and save men. There is danger in any union which seeks to exalt men rather than God, no matter by what name it may be called.

THE following note from the author of a work quoted on page 371 of the current volume of THE SENTINEL, explains itself:

Baltimore, Dec. 13, 1892.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN SENTINEL: With many thanks for your kind mention of my little book on "The Law of Sunday," will you give me leave to suggest that your reviewer has done me a high but undeserved honor by connecting my name with the Johns Hopkins University? I am really an humble member of the Law Faculty of Baltimore University, an entirely distinct institution.

Truly Yours,

JAS. T. RINGGOLD.

We are glad to correct this error into which one of our editorial writers inadvertently fell. We wish only to give our readers the veritable facts upon every subject presented in our columns. Those who are acquainted with Mr. Ringgold's book will not esteem him less highly because he is not connected with the Johns Hopkins University; the knowledge of the facts will simply give them an added interest in the Baltimore University.

THE House Committee of the Columbian Exposition, Mr. Durborow, Chairman, has reported a bill authorizing the World's Fair managers to open the Fair on Sunday, but instructing them to stop machinery and traffic, and so far as possible manual labor on that day.

This bill is utterly unworthy of the support of any body except those who are concerned only for the financial interests of the Fair. It can be defended on no correct principle whatever. Congress has no right to say how Sunday shall be observed, or whether it shall be observed at all or not; and the only proper action for that body to take now is to simply repeal the Sunday-closing proviso, and pass a resolution declaring that the whole question is beyond the proper sphere of civil government, and that especially is this true of a govern-

ment operating under a Constitution which provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

This has been the position of THE SENTINEL all along, and we are glad to see that some of the daily papers are catching the idea. The *World*, of the 15th inst., had this to say on the subject:—

Why should not Congress take its hand completely off this matter and leave it to the discretion of the managers? What business has Congress to legislate on the subject of the religious observance of days in a country which is supposed to set all religions free and to let all religions alone?

Is it not time to recognize the fact that in this Republic the State has absolutely nothing to do with the Church, and that Congresses and Legislatures are not bodies qualified by theological training or by religious impulse to dictate to the people what Sabbaths and holy days they shall observe, or how?

A bill is also proposed simply repealing the Sunday closing proviso and leaving the matter in the hands of the Board of Directors, just where it properly belongs. We regard it as very improbable that such a bill would pass, but its discussion would serve an excellent educational purpose just now; and education along this line must always prove detrimental to so-called National Reform.

THE Supreme Court of Georgia has rendered a decision exempting telegraph companies from penalties for failure to deliver messages on Sunday. The court holds that under the code of the State it is unlawful for any person, including a telegraph company, to pursue his business or the work of his ordinary calling upon Sunday, works of necessity or charity only excepted. A well-known commercial organ says the decision might produce interesting results if it should be followed by the courts of other States having similar Sunday laws.

WE still have on hand a limited number of copies of THE SENTINEL of December 15, containing the *Arena* article "Religious Intolerance in the Republic: Christians (?) Persecuting Christians in Tennessee." These papers will be furnished at \$1 per hundred. Not a single copy of this number should remain unused. The *Arena* article alone is worth several times the price of the paper, which contains other good matter besides.

THE index to Volume 7 of THE SENTINEL will be printed at once for the accommodation of those who have kept files of the paper. Copies of the index will be furnished on application.

Persons desiring bound volumes of THE SENTINEL for 1892, should send in their orders at once, in order that we may know how many to have bound.

## 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, - - - \$1.00.

In clubs of	5 to 24 copies to one address, per year,	90¢
"	25 to 99 " " " " " "	80¢
"	100 to 249 " " " " " "	75¢
"	250 to 499 " " " " " "	70¢
"	500 to 999 " " " " " "	65¢
"	1000 or more " " " " " "	60¢
To foreign countries in Postal Union,		5 shillings

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,  
43 Bond Street, New York City.