



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

VOLUME 8.

NEW YORK, JUNE 15, 1893

NUMBER 24.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS, { CALVIN P. BOLLMAN.
WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

Adventists and Sunday Opening.—With characteristic recklessness the *Christian Statesman* asserts that the temporary order of a State court requiring the World's Fair to be kept open on Sunday was granted by a Hebrew judge to a Seventh-day Adventist. The fact is that the suit was brought by Ex-Congressman Wm. Mason, of Chicago, at the instance of Mr. Clingman, a prominent stockholder, and not an Adventist. Seventh-day Adventists were interested in the case only so far as it touched the question of the right of Congress to do indirectly that which the Constitution forbids it to do, namely, to pass any law interfering with the free exercise of religion. The Adventist position, consistently maintained from the first, has been that the managers of the Fair had a right to open it on Sunday or not to open it, just as seemed to them best, all things considered; and that they should in this matter be alike free from congressional bribes, un-American and unchristian boycotts, and legal processes, just as any other private or semi-private business enterprise should be free.

The so-called Protestant churches of the land, largely under the leadership of the *Christian Statesman*, were not satisfied to leave the managers of the Fair free to take their own course in the matter of Sunday closing; and failing in more drastic measures, they, by threats of political boycott, induced Congress to purchase Sunday closing. Adventists were interested in the Clingman injunction suit only so far as Judge Stein's decision restores to the whole people the rights wrested from them when Congress, at the behest of overreaching sectarian zealotry, took money belonging to the whole people and appropriated it to the support of a religious institution recognized by only a portion of the people.

Even had this money been appropriated in the interest of a vast majority of the

people, which it was not, the action would still be without warrant, either of sound principle or American law. The preservation of inalienable rights demands that civil government shall let religion alone; while the Constitution of the United States forbids Congress to make any law in any way interfering with its free exercise. From any standpoint except that of the sectarian bigot, more concerned for his dogmas than for the rights of his fellowmen, the action of Congress in conditioning the appropriation on the observance of a religious institution was utterly indefensible.

ON this subject the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, the denominational organ of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, published at the headquarters of the denomination, Battle Creek, Mich., says in its issue of June 6:—

We were hailed by a friend upon the street the other day, with the exclamation, "Well, you have the answer to your prayers, and the Fair is to be opened Sunday." No, we replied, we have put up no prayers, nor signed any petition that the Fair be opened on Sunday; that is to us a matter of indifference. All our contention has been that Congress should keep its hands out of that with which it has no business to meddle. We refer to the matter simply to show how the position of the Seventh-day Adventists is misapprehended. No divine law, or sanction, or example would be violated by keeping the Fair open on Sunday. But if those within whose jurisdiction the question of opening or closing on that day, or on any other, properly comes, desire to close it, let them do so. We have nothing to say. What we object to is, Congress, contrary to the Constitution, legislating upon religious questions. And no word would have been heard from Adventists on the subject had not religious bodies, so called reform associations, and Sabbath unions, begun to besiege Congress to set up its authority and enter the fatal path of religious legislation. So, whatever may come, let no one lay it at the door of the Seventh-day Adventists.

In perfect keeping with this expression from the *Review and Herald*, is the following from the *Signs of the Times*, another Adventist paper published in Oakland, Cal., by direct authority of the General Conference of the denomination:—

No credit is due the World's Fair management for Sunday opening. It is a matter of policy all the way through, policy at the sacrifice of principle. Principle was sacrificed in the first place in the action of Congress, because the \$5,000,000 were wanted, and now the Fair is opened contrary to agreement with United States Congress, because more money is wanted. That Congress should vote the Fair any appropriation they desire is all proper,

but the matter of the Sabbath the Government had no right to meddle with; that ought to have been left to the local directory.

This is not a new thought with the Adventists. The position of the denomination has been similarly defined before, both by the *Review* and by the *Signs of the Times*. We have also repeatedly said the same thing. If, as the *Christian Statesman* intimates, any Adventist has assumed any other attitude than this, he has done it as an individual (which, of course, he had a right to do), and not as a representative of the denomination. B.

What Constitutes a Union of Church and State.

AN opinion very generally entertained is that the recognition and support of a single sect is essential to a union of Church and State, and that as no sect or church is in the majority in this country, there never can be in this Nation any such union. But those who entertain this opinion have read history to very little purpose. Nevertheless, it is only fair that one who holds this view should be permitted to state it. In the *Christian Statesman*, of April 10, 1890, Rev. W. J. Coleman, Professor of Political Science in Geneva College, Pennsylvania, and a prominent National Reformer, in attempting to show that a union of Church and State was impossible in this country, said:

In the phrase, "union of Church and State," there can be no doubt as to the sense in which the word "State" is used. . . . The State means the Nation, or whole body of people. . . . The word, "church" may mean: (1) a building where worshipers meet; (2) those who gather in such building, or a congregation; (3) a body of believers acknowledging the same ecclesiastical authority, or denomination; (4) the collective body of believers in the world. These acknowledge no central authority, and are not combined in any human organization; (5) the aggregate of religious principles and ideas in a community. . . . The union of the State with the Church, taken in the first, second or fourth sense, would be impossible. . . . When, however, we turn to the third and fifth meanings, we reach the heart of the whole difficulty.

Referring, then, to the claim that the adoption of this "aggregate of religious principles and ideas" would be a union of Church and State, Professor Coleman says:—

We deny this *in toto*, and declare that when the

State adopts an idea or principle, it does not constitute such a union.

But a denial is not proof, and so we must examine the facts before we can feel warranted in accepting this disclaimer, explicit though it be.

The Professor then makes the merely technical argument that "a principle and a State not being of the same species can not be united." This is specious, but will not bear investigation. Put the principle, or idea, in the shape of a civil statute, thus making it possible for those who adhere to that idea to force it upon others, and it will be found to be a very substantial thing. Of course, as one has well expressed it, the fruit of such a union can be only "a sort of mule animal, capable only of destroying, and not of breeding up;" but this disproves only the propriety of the union, not its possibility.

The whole body of believers, Professor Coleman says, may properly be called the Church. But he assumes that they recognize no central authority. This is, however, a mistake, as he himself shows later on in his own article. The Church, in this broad sense, does recognize a common authority. All denominations more or less fully recognize God as the great moral Governor, and his law as that by which all men will be judged; in short, the revealed will of God is the authority recognized by the Church in this broad sense; and it is this same authority that the churches demand shall be recognized as the supreme law of the United States, thus making the law of the Church and the law of the land one and the same. If this would not be a union of Church and State, in all essential particulars, it would be hard to say what would constitute such a union.

"The American objection to a union of Church and State," says Professor Coleman, "is founded on the evils which such a union has produced in the nations of the Old World. The phrase, therefore, has an historical sense, and to take it from that sense is to give it a new meaning with which to deceive people, who suppose that we are talking of the same kind of a union of Church and State that produced the evil results. The union of Church and State found in history has always been the union of an organized State with an organized Church. In England the State is united with the Episcopal Church, in Scotland with the Presbyterian Church, in Prussia with the Lutheran Church, in Spain with the Roman Catholic Church. . . . This is the kind of union of Church and State that the American people are opposed to."

But why go back only four hundred years for examples of a union of Church and State? Why not go at once to the fountain head of all corrupt church establishments, namely, Rome in the fourth century?

Every one who is familiar with the history of the first four centuries of the Christian era knows that the first union of Church and State was nothing more and nothing less than that which Professor Coleman insists would not now constitute such a union. Constantine did only that which the Supreme Court and Congress have done, namely, he made the nation Christian by adopting the Christian religion as the national religion. Then the bishops of the Christian Church, that is, of the whole body of believers, came together and decided what was the Chris-

tian religion; and thus was formed the nucleus of what has for centuries been known as the Roman Catholic Church.

To say that only a union of religion and the State is desired, and not a union of Church and State, is to say that the Church and religion can be separated. But this is impossible. Constantine only adopted the Christian religion; he did not make any denomination the State Church. He had no thought of such a thing. Neander testifies that it had become Constantine's "favorite plan to unite together all his subjects in the worship of one God." That is he wished all to become Christians; not necessarily to come together in one organic union, but in one faith so broad that all could assent to it. The emperor "represented the questions in dispute as being nothing but rash, speculative questions, standing in no connection whatever with the essence of Christianity." He reasoned, no doubt, as men do to-day, that even if all could not see alike on all points, they ought to upon essential doctrines, and therefore he wanted some authority to decide what were the essentials. And that is just what is said now about the differences which separate the various denominations. These, we are told, are minor differences; and that which they demand and which the Government has recognized is what they term the fundamental, non-sectarian principles of Christianity, those things upon which all can unite, not in the sense of forming one organic whole, a single denomination, but in the sense of giving united moral support to these principles. And this is just what they did in the time of Constantine; they simply agreed that Christianity, in the abstract, should be the recognized religion. But as soon as the bishops had decided what was Christianity, a church began to crystallize around the creed which contained their definition of Christianity. And it was inevitable that it should be so. It could not have been otherwise. And it is the same now.

February 29, 1892, Justice Brewer, speaking for the Supreme Court of the United States, declared this to be a Christian Nation. This was at once urged as a reason why Congress should require the closing of the Columbian Exposition on Sunday; and in taking that action Congress did define Christianity to the extent of declaring Sunday observance a necessary part of Christianity. So that already we have taken the second step in the path which Rome trod fourteen hundred years ago, namely, having by decree of the Supreme Court made Christianity the religion of the Nation, we have by act of Congress begun to define that religion, or in other words, to formulate a national creed.

Of course nobody intends that this shall result as it did in Rome. Nobody wants to make any denomination the State Church, but it is none the less the truth, that the adoption of Christianity by the Nation constitutes a union of Church and State just as truly as such a union was formed in the time of Constantine the Great. It is true, as Professor Coleman says, that "the phrase, union of Church and State, has an historical sense;" but it is also true that that historical sense is just as inseparably connected with the history of the Church in the fourth century as in the fifteenth, or at any other time.

Of the relation of the Church to the

State during the early part of the fourth century, Neander says:—

With the commencement of this period the Church entered into an entirely different relation to the State. It did not merely become a whole, recognized as legal, and tolerated by the State—which it had been already from the reign of Gallienus down to the Diocletian persecution—but the State itself declared its principles to be those to which everything must be subordinated. Christianity became, by degrees, the dominant State religion, though not entirely in the same sense as paganism had been before. Church and State constituted, henceforth, two wholes, one interpenetrating the other, and standing in a relation of mutual action and reaction. The advantageous influence of this was that the Church could now exert its transforming power also on the relations of the State; but the measure and the character of this power depended on the state of the inner life in the Church itself. The healthful influence of the Church is indeed to be perceived in many particular cases, though it was very far from being so mighty as it must have been had everything proceeded from the spirit of genuine Christianity, and had the State *actually* subordinated itself to this spirit. But, on the other hand, the Church had now to struggle under a great disadvantage; for instead of being left *free*, as it was before, to pursue its own course of development, it was subjected to the influence of a foreign secular power, which in various ways would operate to check and disturb it; and the danger, in this case, increased in the same proportion as the political life with which the Church came in contact was corrupt.

And this is exactly the relation which the leaders in church circles insist exists between the State and the Church in this country; and this is the nature of the temptation to which they expose the Church. They demand that the Christian principles, the principles of the Church, shall be those to which everything shall be subordinated; and already the Church, as such, participates in political matters.

But being under one law, governed by one principle, what was the result in Rome? Let Neander answer:—

The supreme magistrates now considered themselves as members of the Church, and took a personal share in its concerns; but it was no easy matter for them to fix the proper limits to this participation.

And who can doubt that like causes, which exist in this country to-day, will presently produce like results? Now that the civil authorities have been called upon by the churches to decide a purely religious question, as in the matter of closing the World's Fair on Sunday, can the Government ever be separated from the interpretation and administration of the divine law, which, in the matter of the Fair, was so misconstrued by Congress? Certainly not; it is inevitable that either the civil power will rule the Church or the Church will dominate the civil power, as it has already done in the matter referred to; and as between two such evils there is small choice.

The National Reform movement of the nineteenth century, as seen in our land to-day, is the National Reform movement of the fourth century over again. Then, under stress of so-called Christian influence, the State declared the principles of the Church to be those to which everything must be subordinated, and the Supreme Court and Congress does the same thing to-day at the behest of an aggressive minority. Can we hope that the result will be different? The demand as now formulated is that "Christian morality shall be taken as the ultimate standard of right, and that all our laws shall conform to this standard." This simply means to make the divine law, or rather that which the courts and Congress may hold or the Church decide to be the divine law, the fundamental law of the land.

It must then be superior to the Constitution, and human judges must administer the divine law, and decree punishment for its infraction! As before stated, the Church and the State must both be governed by the same law; in the Church it must be known as ecclesiastical law, in the State as civil law; but it is the same law. This is simply what was done in the Dark Ages; and the evils of a union of Church and State are inseparable from such a system, whether it be called a union of Church and State, or only a union of religion and the State. But call it what you will we have it in the United States to-day, and time alone is required to develop it, so that it shall be seen as clearly as we now see it in the history of Rome.

C. P. B.

Chicago Correspondence.

The United States vs. the World's Fair.

THE second open Sunday of the World's Fair has passed. The attendance on both days has been large, although the people did not come in such great numbers as was expected. The quietness and good order of the crowds, which were double or treble the ordinary week-day attendance, was very marked. No drunkenness or disorder of any kind occurred on either Sunday, and it was evident that all who came were there with the earnest purpose to see and to learn and gain the most profit possible from the exhibition.

The second open Sunday was upheld by a peculiar series of legal events. First, the World's Fair Directory determined, two weeks previous, that in view of the failure of the Government to keep its contract in the matter of the souvenir coins, it had freed the Fair management from its obligation to close Sundays, and passed resolutions abrogating the Sunday-closing regulation; second, this resolution to open on Sundays, the World's Fair Commissioners failed to modify,—it therefore stood, authoritative, according to the action of the Board of Directors; third, in the case brought by Ex-Congressman Mason in behalf of a stock-holder of the World's Fair, to restrain the World's Fair Directors from closing the park, in which the Fair is situated, to the people on Sunday, a temporary injunction was granted and the final hearing set for ten days; fourth, in the meantime the United States brought its action in the United States Court to enjoin the World's Fair authorities from opening the Fair on Sunday, and this case received a three days' hearing, closing on Friday, June 2,—the judges reserving their decision until Thursday, June 8. Thus quite a remarkable combination of circumstances supported the directory in holding the Fair open on Sunday, June 4.

The bill filed by District Attorney Milchrist in behalf of the Government for the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, is a lengthy document and cites the act of Congress providing "for celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, the mine, and sea, in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois;" and also the Sunday-closing proviso in the Civil Sundry bill, and the action of the directory and commissioners thereon. The bill pleads farther, that the

directors and commissioners are still bound by this Sunday-closing action and charges a *conspiracy* wherein the World's Columbian Exposition corporation with others is conspiring and confederating, and are "assuming to be in possession and control of the said Exposition and grounds and have usurped and are attempting to usurp an unlawful authority over the same, and assume to have the right to open and control the said gates and said grounds for the admission of the public thereto on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, during the continuance of the said Exposition, and that by reason of such unlawful claim and authority to open said gates and grounds to the public on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday . . . notwithstanding the fact that the said unlawful assumption and the attempt and purpose as aforesaid to open the said grounds and Exposition on Sunday are in direct contravention of the terms of the said act of Congress."

The plea in the bill that the Columbian Exposition corporation and others "are conspiring and confederating together and are assuming to be in possession and control of the said Exposition and grounds," gives the key-note to the whole contention made by the attorneys for the Government. Their claim, made in various forms by each of the counsel for the Government, was in substance that the selection of the site and its approval by the United States Government and its acceptance at the time of dedication combined with the legislation which has been had upon World's Fair matters, in effect, constituted Jackson Park for the purposes of holding the Exposition and for the time during which such Exposition was held there, a Government reservation. They held that during that time the Government had the same authority over the Exposition and the Exposition grounds which it would have over the navy yards, forts, or any other property distinctively dedicated to Government uses and accepted and occupied by the Government. These averments were not made in such precise language, but the arguments were based upon just such a supposed state of facts.

The answer on the behalf of the Columbian Exposition Company to the bill of District Attorney Milchrist was fully as lengthy and gave also a history of the legislation in behalf of the World's Fair by Congress and of the selection of Jackson Park as a place for the holding of the Exposition, citing in connection therewith, in full the Park Commissioners' ordinance entitled, "An ordinance to allow the use of Jackson Park and the Midway Plaisance for the purposes of the World's Columbian Exposition." The action of Congress in making its several appropriations for the Exposition is then cited, and the condition attached to the souvenir coin appropriation treated as a contract, and the plea made that when the Government failed in the performance of the contract in full on its part, and retained a portion of the souvenir coins, the authorities of the Columbian Exposition were freed from the further fulfillment of the contract on their part. It is denied that there is any law either State or national, forcing the Board of Directors to close the Fair on Sundays, and the entire Federal control over the Exposition and its site and the local corporation, is denied. Mention is made of the restraining order issued from the Superior Court by Judge Stein in ac-

cordance with plea that the Columbian Exposition "had by its certain rules and orders excluded the public from admission to said Jackson Park and Midway Plaisance, in violation of the act of the legislature of the State of Illinois creating said parks, and praying that said defendant be enjoined from prohibiting the use and enjoyment of said park by the plaintiff and other citizens on Sundays or any other day of the week" and that "said case is still pending in said Superior Court, that it has jurisdiction, and that such jurisdiction was taken by said court prior to the filing of the complainant's bill herein."

The arguments presented by all the different counsel for the Government, hinged entirely upon the plea of supreme jurisdiction of the general Government over the Fair and the entire control of its business operations; the Local Board and the commissioners being agents of the Government doing its will and subject to it. This plea, of course, included also the right to make all rules and regulations deemed desirable including Sunday closing and the duty of the Local Board to submit thereto. To this plea a portion of the argument of attorney Edwin H. Walker was as follows:—

For the first time the Government comes into court and claims complete jurisdiction over the Fair, but the 50,000 stockholders and those who have loaned \$5,000,000 to the Exposition will never yield jurisdiction until ordered to do so by a mandate of this court. The claim of jurisdiction is without mandate of law. The directors have never by action or word tried to minimize the Fair as a national concern. We have never admitted that the Government was to have control of the enterprise. This local corporation, organized to control the Fair by express assent of the Federal Government, is not yielding at this late day. Certain organizations are behind this prosecution who have cried out that the law-breakers should be punished. If the directors, who have endured all their censure, are guilty of the wrongful act, they should be censured by the court of public opinion. While I admit that this is a Christian Nation I claim that I have the privilege to exercise my right to a free conscience without any dictation from any outside agency. Congress did not pass a law closing the Fair Sunday. Congress knew such a law would have been unconstitutional and repugnant to the principles of the Constitution. There is no provision in the acts of Congress that would empower the representatives of the Government to contract for labor or material, or even pay a gate-keeper to watch the gates, and yet counsel for the other side informs us that the work of the Fair is done under the authority of the United States Government.

Under the act of 1890, and subsequent acts of Congress there is no intimation that the Government was to have the control of the Exposition. The petitioners contend that the Government should have the power to declare whether the gates should be open Sunday on account of the morals of the people. A court of equity has control of property and not of morals. The remedy must be sought elsewhere.

It will be clear to any one who has followed the progress of legislation in behalf of this Columbian Exposition, that the position taken by Mr. Walker in opposition to the counsel for the Government, is the true one. The idea of the supreme control of the Government over the Exposition, and the agency only, of the Local Directory composing the Illinois corporation, is a second thought and not the original intent of the act of Congress or the view taken of it by congressmen at the time of the passage of that act. Congress has carefully avoided all financial responsibility in the matter of the World's Fair, and would be, if in session now, the last to assume such responsibility and give the Government's guarantee for all financial shortages which may occur. If the United States Government is the principal and the World's Fair Directory its agent, the

principal is responsible for the acts of its agent and all who have claims, either now or hereafter, against the World's Columbian Exposition, may have recourse against the United States Government. Such a position as this, Congress has carefully avoided from the beginning.

Although in the pleadings, the constitutionality of the Sunday-closing proviso made by Congress was not impugned, yet in the course of the argument by Commissioner St. Clair and Attorney Edwin H. Walker for the Columbian Exposition, its constitutionality was several times called in question and denied. It was expressly declared by Mr. Walker that "the Government was prohibited by the Constitution from interfering,—that even if the act of March 3, 1893 had never been passed, section 4, (the Sunday closing section) of the act of 1892 was unconstitutional. When the counsel for the Government quoted the words of Judge Cooley in reference to the status of Sunday laws in the United States, Mr. Walker replied that "Judge Cooley never said that the United States could come into Illinois and enact Sunday laws."

The counsel for the Government did not fail to make the plea that this is a Christian Nation, and cited Justice Brewer's decision in the case of the Church of the Holy Trinity of New York City vs. the United States, in the support of that idea. This decision was referred to at considerable length and with the most marked assurance. The counsel for the Government also pleaded that Christianity was embedded in the laws of this country and was a part of the common law; and the inference, of course, drawn, that therefore the Government might make laws in reference to religion, and that they were properly enforced and should necessarily be obeyed.

After an interesting and exciting trial, which lasted through three days, and in a crowded court room, the case was taken under advisement by the judges, Grosscup, Wood, and Jenkins, and on Saturday morning notice was given that a decision, would be rendered Thursday, June 8.

When District Attorney Milchrist, in behalf of the Government, asked for a temporary injunction compelling the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, June 4, the court refused to act, leaving the directory to open the Fair on that day. From this action, the conclusion is drawn by some, that the court will refuse to interfere at all in the Sunday-closing matter, but that is a mere inference and therefore no data from which to give an opinion what the final decision of the court will be. If it should be decided that the United States has supreme jurisdiction and that its Sunday-closing proviso was proper legislation, and should an injunction, restraining the authorities of the World's Fair from opening on Sundays be had, the event will mark the most remarkable assumption of paternal and centralizing authority ever exhibited in this country. The question of the conflict of authority between the State Court and the United States Court will then come up; and if, in the case brought before Judge Stein, the final injunction should be granted, the issue would be directly made as between the people and State of Illinois and the general Government. Such an issue as this is sure to come sooner or later, for the upholding of religious legislation and the continuance of its growth in this country necessarily re-

quires that State rights should be abrogated and the general Government assume to itself authority over the manners, morals, and religious conduct of the citizens of the United States in general.

W. H. M.

Chicago, June 6.

The Sunday Laws of England.

ENGLAND is well provided with Sunday laws, having no less than twenty-four, all of which are in force at the present time. Of these, eleven refer to manufacturing and trading, eleven to the sale of liquor, five to amusements, five to traveling, two to the employment of young persons and women and one to elections. The first law was enacted 1354, and the last in 1887, and they are still at it. In fact Sunday laws are on the steady increase, sixteen having been made during the reign of Victoria. Surely if law can bolster up the Sunday institution this array of Parliamentary statutes should do it. But their very number only shows their weakness, for were there any power or virtue in a Sunday law, one would be enough. But when once men attempt to make others righteous by law they have before them an endless task, for they are attempting the impossible, and can only result in a barren form of legalism, such as the endless ramifications placed upon the Jews by the Scribes and Pharisees.

The first Sunday law was passed in 1354 during the reign of Edward III., and prohibits the showing of wool on the magic day. The next was in 1448, and forbids all manner of fairs and markets "on the principal feasts, and Sundays and Good Fridays." Ten other Sunday statutes also include the principal feasts of the Church, and six of these were enacted in the present reign. In this they are consistent. For Sunday is merely a church festival—a creation of the Roman Catholic Church—and stands on the same basis as other days ordained by the same church. If it is right to enforce Sunday it is also right to enforce Christmas day, Good Friday and all the rest.

But the Sunday law that is most known and respected is 29 Chas. II., c. 7., which passed 1676. It is entitled "An act for the better observation of the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday." Section 1. enacts that "all the laws in force concerning the observation of the Lord's day, and repairing to the Church thereon, shall be carefully put in execution." This itself shows the worthlessness of these laws. As soon as one is made, another has to be made to enact that the first one shall be enforced. This in itself is a confession that there was no power in the first one; and there is no more in the second, and as nothing added to nothing makes nothing, these lawmakers are just where they started, and so set to work and make another law to help out those already in existence, and so the game has gone merrily on until we now have twenty-four and the end is not yet.

This law of Charles II. not only forbids all "worldly labor," but also compels "repairing to the Church" and "enacts" that "all persons shall, on every Lord's day, apply themselves to the observation of the same, by exercising themselves thereon in the duties of piety and true religion, publicly and privately." This is the pet law of a certain class of clergy and what they are most anxious to

have enforced. To do so would mean the revival of the Inquisition; for whereas by dragging a man to church and holding him in a pew they might satisfy themselves as to his *public* exercise of religious duties; the only possible way for them to find out if he has done so *privately* is to put him on the rack and wring from him a confession of his thoughts. This beautiful relic of Puritanism also practically decrees that any man may rob or knock Sunday travelers on the head and no action may be brought for the said robbery. So it would seem that Sunday traveling is unpardonable, but Sunday robbery or murder is all right.

Another masterpiece of Satan is 21 Geo. III., c. 49, passed 1780, and called, "An act for preventing certain abuses and profanations on the Lord's day, called Sunday." Section 1. has this, "Whereas certain houses . . . have of late frequently been opened . . . under pretext of inquiring into religious doctrines and explaining texts of holy Scripture, debates have frequently been held on the evening of the Lord's day concerning divers texts of holy Scripture by persons unlearned and incompetent to explain the same, to the corruption of good morals, and to the great encouragement of irreligion and profaneness. It was enacted that the keeper of such a room be fined £200 for every day such a room or house was open. The chairman was to also forfeit £100 to any one who should sue for it, and the door keeper to pay £50; which is \$1,750 in all.

And yet there are some people in America who are trying to prove that Sunday laws are not religious in character.

FRANCIS HOPE.

Belfast, Ireland.

Modern Christian Methods.

THE continued controversy over the question of Sunday opening of the World's Fair furnishes a striking spectacle of the effects of uniting Church and State, even partially. In theory we have no such union in this country, but in practice we have. In theory we say that no man's conscience shall be dominated by another's, and that no one shall force any part of his religion upon another. The Constitution expressly states that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. Yet we prove the Constitution a lie and our theories of no effect by permitting religious organizations to control the Government and make various laws for the establishment of religion, such as exemption of church property from taxation, requiring the observation of Sunday, etc. In no instance has the tyrannical nature and intolerant spirit of ecclesiasticism shown itself more strongly than in connection with the Chicago Exposition. From the start the Church power has been determined to close the gates on Sunday, and to accomplish that object has resorted to all the tricks of politics.

Petitions were sent to Congress containing names numbering more than double the population of various States; lobbyists were sent to Washington to influence congressmen; at every conference resolutions were adopted threatening that if the Fair were not run according to the wish, will and instruction of the "Christian conscience," said conscience would do all it could to injure it, both by staying away

and by inducing others to do the same. Now that the management has decided to return the Government loan, and both the local directory and the national commission have voted to open the gates on Sunday in response to public pressure, these threats are being renewed, and rule or ruin is declared to be the intention of the church element.

All this may be according to the Christianity of Christ, but it doesn't look so to us. It may be consistent with a religion which is "not of this world," and whose weapons are expected to be only spiritual ones, but it doesn't look so to us. It may be in accord with the principles of religious liberty, separation of Church and State, and equal rights, but it doesn't look so to us.—*Independent Herald*.

Was It a New Thing?

If any are still disposed to think that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, of Feb. 29, 1892, declaring this to be a "Christian Nation," and citing Sunday laws to prove it, made no new thing, let them consider the use that has been made of it and is still being made of it by the advocates of compulsory Sunday observance. Note the following:—

This decision is vital to the Sunday question in all its aspects.—*Pearl of Days*, May 27, 1892.

This is a Christian Nation.—*U. S. Supreme Court*, Feb. 29, 1892. The Christian Church, therefore, has rights in this country. Among these is the right to one day in seven protected from the assaults of greed, the god of this world, that it may be devoted to worship of the God of heaven and earth.—*Christian Statesman*, May 21, 1892.

"It is a Christian Nation, and therefore Sunday work is wrong," says the Rev. Herrick Johnson.—*Chicago Evening Journal*, April 8, 1893.

This is a Christian Nation—the Supreme Court has so affirmed—and we rejoice in the decision.—*Christian Statesman*, May, 6, 1893.

A reporter for the *Chicago Evening Journal* recently interviewed a number of Chicago divines upon the question of enforcing Sunday observance. The following is from his interview with Frederick A. Noble, pastor of the Union Park Congregational Church:—

If Sunday observance as you advocate it is considered oppressive by a majority of all the people, would you still enforce it?

Exactly as I would enforce the law in any other respect. The Supreme Court has declared this to be a Christian country, and the foundations of the country were laid in Christian truth.—*Chicago Evening Journal*, April 8, 1893.

The following also is from an interview with Rev. Dr. Withrow, pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, of Chicago:—

Would you compel others to observe Sunday in your way?

Never! I believe in the fullest religious and civil liberty. But neither civil or religious liberty means lawlessness on the part of any portion of the community. There is a Sabbath observance law on the statute books of this and most of the other States, and the Supreme Court has lately recognized the Christian Sabbath. Sunday observance is the law of the land, and that must be enforced the same as any other law. Anything less than that would be anarchy.—*Idem*.

In his "Brief" of April 1892, "in favor of keeping the World's Fair closed on Sunday," presented before the House and Senate committees on the Columbian Exposition, Col. Elliott F. Shepard quoted that part of the decision of the Supreme Court mentioning "the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath," and declaring that "this is a Christian Nation."

And Judge S. B. Davis, of Terre Haute, Ind., in an eight-page pamphlet which was generously distributed at the hearing before the House Committee on the Columbian Exposition last January, three

times cites this decision to prove the "constitutionalality of Sunday laws as affecting the Columbian Exposition."

From all this it is evident that this decision of the Supreme Court did make some new thing. It made a foundation for the advocates of Sunday legislation to stand upon which they did not have before,—an "undeniable legal basis" for which they had so long been waiting. In other words it made the image to the beast. The Sunday law passed by Congress following this decision gave life to it. Thus it was declared would be the case.

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.—*Great Controversy* Vol. IV (edition 1884), p. 410.

When our nation shall so abjure the principles of its Government as to enact a Sunday law, Protestantism will in this act join hands with popery; it will be nothing else than giving life to the tyranny which has so long been eagerly watching its opportunity to spring again into active despotism.—*Testimony* No. 33, p. 240.

Thus it was in the creation of man. When God spoke man into existence he formed him of the dust of the ground; but he was not alive until God breathed into him the breath of life; then he became a living soul, and was capable of speaking and acting. The record in the Book of Jasher corresponding to Gen. 2:7, says that God formed man of the dust of the ground, and "blew into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul endowed with speech."

So in the formation of the image to the beast. The Government by its powers speaks it into existence. But the making of it is one thing, the giving life to it another, and the speaking and acting of it follow these first two necessary steps, it making use of these, and depending upon them, as it were, for its very existence. And all these different steps are indicated in the prophecy. First, the statement is that they should "make an image to the beast;" then "he had power to give life (margin, breath) unto the image of the beast;" and all this "that the image of the beast should both speak and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed."

And what is the speaking of the image? As long ago as 1885 this word was printed:—

The Sunday movement is now making its way in darkness. The leaders are concealing the true issue, and many who unite in the movement do not themselves see whither the undercurrent is tending. Its professions are mild and apparently Christian; but when it shall speak, it will reveal the spirit of the dragon.—*Testimony*, 32, p. 208.

So it is the Sunday movement that is to speak; and when it speaks, its language will be that of the persecutor—the voice of the dragon. Already this is beginning to be manifest. The *Christian Sabbath Watchman* for March 1893 prints the following from a speech made by Rev. Dr. Mackay Smith at the hearing in Washington:—

The Fair managers have accepted the people's money under the explicit condition that they shall keep closed Sunday. They could have refused. But now, having pocketed the money, they want to evade or crawl out of the proviso. They should be compelled to do as business men elsewhere—live up to their agreement.

Although this legislation was secured professedly in the interests of the laboring man, yet when the Central Labor Union, of Chicago, proposed to change their day

of rest to some other day and work on Sunday in order that they might visit the Fair and lose no time at their regular work, Rev. Dr. Bolton, of the Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church, Chicago, said:—

If the Union is in earnest let them try it. Then we will see if there is any law in this country.—*New York Mail and Express*, April 4, 1893.

And Rev. Dr. Henson, of the First Baptist Church of Chicago, recently gave utterance to the following:—

There is an attempt on the part of secularists to violate the Sabbath by suggesting that the Fair be kept open on the first day of the week. Congress has decided that the Fair shall be closed, and *woe betide the man who plants himself in the way of God and the will of the Nation. The Nation has spoken, and it must be obeyed.* Congress is not to be trifled with. It decided that the Fair should be closed Sundays, and it must be obeyed.—*Chicago Herald*, May 1, '93

No one who reads these statements can fail to see that there is a compelling, persecuting spirit behind this movement, and that persecution is to come out of it. But all this was involved in that first fatal step, the decision of the Supreme Court. Of this the National Reformers themselves have truly observed:—

All that the National Reform Association seeks . . . is to be found in the development of that royal truth, "This is a Christian Nation."—*Christian Statesman*, Nov. 19, 1892.

On this was based the plea for the law to close the World's Fair gates on Sunday, and who does not know that the same movement which secured this law will be the one which will demand the death decree for the extermination of those who refuse to observe the papal Sabbath? The same spirit pervades them all. The first step involved the last.—*W. A. Colcord, in Home Missionary*.

A Maryland Judas.

Millington, Md., May 31, 1893.

AMERICAN SENTINEL: Mr. Edgar Price, elder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in this place, was arrested yesterday for working on Sunday. Mr. Price is acknowledged by all to be one of the best, most peaceable, and law-abiding citizens of Millington. Mr. Price was working in his barn, which is half a mile from the home of the informant and more than a fourth of a mile from any house.

The informer is a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church and had heretofore been the recipient of many favors from the man he betrayed. Judas-like he came to the home of Mr. Price as a friend, sat at his table, partook of his hospitality, and then according to his own statement had him arrested to satisfy his church. At the magistrate's office he said he did not want to have Mr. Price arrested but, said the informer, "The church has done it." It was clear to all present at the trial that it was a case of religious persecution, and that the Methodist Episcopal Church here has simply used the informer to do its dirty work of persecution. Sunday work is a common thing in this town, and that by the very ones who have undertaken to persecute Mr. Price. Fishing is carried on all day Sundays, and at the present time goods can be bought in the store of one of the most violent opposers of Mr. Price and his faith; all this goes unnoticed. But when a man acknowledged to be a good citizen and a Christian, in the exercise of his God-given right, goes quietly about his work on Sunday

after observing the day before according to the plain letter of God's Word, he is arrested, fined and imprisoned like the worst criminal, and that by *so-called* Christians.

The following from the Centreville Record is to the point:—

News reached here to-day that Mr. Edgar Price, of Millington, who has accepted the Adventists' faith, was arrested on Monday for attending to his duties on Sunday. The informer, like Judas, ate Mr. Price's bread and butter at supper and went away and betrayed him. The informer is a member of the Methodist Church. We find that some of the professed Christians are displaying a *spirit*, but not the spirit that you find in the Word of God. His Word does not teach that one Christian should have another persecuted because he does not believe like himself.

Sunday laws of any kind are ungodly relics of barbarism, and as long as they remain in force, will be used by religious bigots to enforce their opinions on those who religiously differ with them. A dark cloud is hanging over this fair land which will soon burst in all its fury on those who obey God's word in the observance of the seventh day. The church that uses the civil power to enforce its doctrine or observances is destitute of godliness and in open rebellion against the government of God.

E. E. FRANKE.

The Christian's Duty Is Plain.

SOME of the papers are gravely advising Seventh-day Adventists to obey the Sunday laws until they can secure their repeal or modification. Indeed, one Maryland paper insists that as conscientious men they must do this for "it is a Christian duty to be subject to civil rulers." But that depends altogether upon what civil rulers require. From the days of the Apostle Peter until the present time the Christian motto has been, "*We ought to obey God rather than men.*" The blood of millions has been shed in support of this principle. The Christian can go to prison or to death, but he can not deny his faith even at the behest of civil rulers, for the instant he does so he ceases to be a Christian, and is, in fact, only an idolater, worshipping at the shrine of mammon and making a god of the State.

"One of the strangest and yet most logical results of the Christian teachings and practice (and one which has been, for very sufficient reasons, ignored by the theologians)," says the author of "Arius, the Libyan,"* "was to develop a radical and uncompromising spirit of democracy throughout the Christian communities or churches. The early Christians uniformly held that they, as Christians, belonged to a kingdom which was in, but not of, the world—a kingdom for which no earthly potentate had right or power to legislate; and this living faith loosened the bond of allegiance and dissolved the sense of obligation as to all human authority, and was the negation of the lawfulness of temporal government over the subjects of the kingdom for which they recognized no king but Christ. While, for the sake of peace, they were willing to render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, by paying taxes to that government under which they lived, and by even yielding ready obedience to all laws and customs which did not come in conflict with the higher

law of the kingdom, the rights of conscience, they universally regarded these laws as extraneous to their own organization, foreign statutes, imposed upon them from without; and, being solicitous to render unto God the things which are God's they steadily abstained from any participation in the affairs of government, and quietly assumed the right to judge for themselves whether any law, regulation, or custom, prescribed by the sovereign power, or other human authority, was or was not such as they might conscientiously obey. . . . But this fearless assertion of the rights of conscience necessarily involved the right to sit in judgment upon all human laws and the powers that ordained them, and to determine for themselves whether the law was lawful. That helpless spirit of blind obedience to the decrees of despotic governments which characterized the pagan peoples was, therefore, impossible to the Christians. . . . The logical tendency of Christianity was, therefore, to originate the idea of personal liberty for all men, unknown to the world before; to repudiate the heathen doctrine of the divine character and right of kings; to sit in judgment upon their laws, and to intelligently obey, or refuse to obey, them; in a word, to cultivate and exercise, as a matter of religious faith, that spirit of personal independence, both of action and of thought, which we in later times denominate democracy, the concrete form of which was the election of deacons, presbyters, and bishops by the people unto whom they ministered."

The Christian's duty is plain, namely, to preserve "a conscience void of offense toward God, and toward men;" but this can be done only by rendering "unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." The Christian must be in subjection to civil rulers in their appropriate sphere, for conscience' sake; but when civil government transcends its jurisdiction, and Cæsar demands that the things that belong to God shall be rendered unto the State, the Christian has no option but to disobey and suffer the consequences; to do otherwise would be treason to his divine King, even Jesus Christ, who though he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth," suffered as a malefactor because Cæsar exceeded his authority. B.

Persecution Becoming Unpopular in Tennessee.

[The following private letter which we are permitted to publish, written to a friend by an Adventist minister in Tennessee, will be of interest to our readers.]

Nashville, Tenn., June 6, 1893.

MY DEAR BROTHER: I was at Paris several days before the trials of our brethren came off, and while listening to discussions of principles involved by different parties and classes of men, had an opportunity to learn considerable concerning public sentiment.

There has been a radical change during the past year concerning this kind of work. Nobody, or but few, seem to desire the continuance of the persecution which so many have heretofore considered a necessity. Hardly an expression was to be heard, either from the witnesses summoned by the prosecution, by gentlemen about the court-house, or on the trains, in favor of depriving Adventists of a portion of their God-given time for

labor, because somebody else desired to worship on that day.

This change in public sentiment is doubtless due, at least in part, to the fact that the subject of religious liberty is being more studied and better understood than formerly.

Good men have often been led to persecute those who differed from them in religious belief. When such men saw and accepted the true principles of religious liberty, they themselves became the willing subjects of persecution at the hands of those who chose to remain in darkness. The Apostle Paul is a noted case of this class; and to many who may be led to engage in the persecutions of the last days, he may say, "And such *were* some of you; but ye *are* washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."

There were but two cases of indictments; Brethren Thomas Dortch, who was held over from last term of court, and Frank Stem. Not much more than half an hour was occupied in both these cases; and for lack of evidence that either had maintained a "public nuisance" the judge, with the consent of the jury, discharged each.

It seemed as if the presence of the Spirit of God was especially manifest in that court room during the trial of these brethren. An unseen power pervaded the atmosphere and controlled minds.

The Lord has permitted some of the persecutions of the past few years to go further than this; and in this way he has showed to such men as the governors, senators, representatives, judges, attorneys and others, of the "great State of Tennessee," the true nature of the power by which this work is being carried forward.

Thanks be to God for the change which this knowledge has produced! And the good people of this State may well join in thanking him for the powerful influence for good which has been exerted by the AMERICAN SENTINEL, through which some of this has been accomplished.

Your brother in Christ,
C. L. BOYD.

Not a Physical Question.

It is a little singular how anybody can determine that it is necessary to the well-being of man and beast that one day in seven should be "kept." Logically, if the farmer who works but six or eight hours a day in the winter should keep one day in seven, in the summer when he works twelve to sixteen hours a day ought to keep two days in seven. Such illustrations might be multiplied, all tending to show the absurdity of this rest-day business from a hygienic standpoint. All will agree that in the case of any individual there is a limit beyond which labor would be injurious, but that limit can never be fixed to a certainty even by the individual himself, and must vary infinitely with times and seasons, character of work, changing physical conditions, etc., all of which go to show that the question of rest as well as that of work should be left to each individual to determine for himself. Most people are not apt to work too much, and but for the religious question involved, no one would ever have thought of any prescribed rest day or compulsory rest at all.—*Silver Creek Times.*

*Of this book the New York Observer says: "A work of great beauty and power, and with fascinating style and intimate knowledge of the history of the early centuries of the Christian era." D. Appleton & Co., New York.



NEW YORK, JUNE 15, 1893.

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.

READ "A Maryland Judas," on page 189. It illustrates, about as forcibly as anything could do, the base uses to which Sunday laws are put.

WE erred last week in stating that Bishop Fallows had taken part in religious services "in the grounds the first Sunday that the Fair was open." The services were in the Art Palace, which is five miles from the Fair grounds. The SENTINEL wishes to state everything fairly.

It is stated that the Pope has instructed Monsignor Satolli to express to Cardinal Gibbons his thanks for the discourse recently delivered by the cardinal in favor of the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope, and to inform his eminence that the great infallible is entirely satisfied with the language and argument of the cardinal in the discourse.

A WOMAN, a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, at Ford's Store, Queen Anne's County, Md., has been arrested for sewing on Sunday. Her trial was set for the 14th inst. The woman's own brother is the complaining witness.

At the same time two male members of the same church were arrested for hauling some goods from the wharf on Sunday. In these cases the complaining witness was also the brother of one of the arrested men.

It is a strange thing that a good many papers that see no impropriety in compelling the observance of a religious institution by means of a Sunday law, think the Presbyterian Church intolerant for deposing from the ministry a member who persisted in teaching contrary to the tenets of the church. They would have the State enforce religious dogmas by civil penalties, while denying to the Church the right to maintain discipline by ecclesiastical censure. A strange inconsistency, truly!

In the injunction suit brought by the United States to restrain the Local Directory from opening the World's Fair gates on Sunday, Judge Woods announced on the 8th inst., that he and his associates failed to agree on certain points, and that each would formulate his ideas in an individual opinion. Judge Wood's individual opinion was that the injunction must issue and the gates be closed. Judge Jenkins agreed with Judge Wood on the

main point in the World's Fair injunction proceedings, and he also held that the injunction must issue and the Fair be closed on Sunday.

This decided the question. Judge Grosscup held that the Fair might be kept open. Attorney Walker at once gave notice of an appeal and asked for a stay, pending the final decision.

A CORRESPONDENT writes us that a Methodist preacher in his neighborhood recently preached a sermon in which he asserted that Sunday is the Lord's day. But the preacher's saying so does not make it so. The Sabbath is the Lord's day. Ex. 20:8, we read that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Then it is the Lord's day. In Isa. 58:13, we have these words: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day." Again the Sabbath is the Lord's day. Then in Mark 2:28, we have the declaration of our Lord that he is Lord of the Sabbath day; and again the Sabbath is the Lord's day. What difference does it make what any number of preachers say, when we can read for ourselves what the Bible says?

THE New York *Independent* is opposed to an open Sunday Fair, but it is likewise opposed to the antichristian boycott which a portion of the religious press and a great many of the Sunday preachers have been urging. The *Independent* says:—

What should be the attitude of Christian men and women toward this International Fair? They have been strongly advised to boycott it, to remove their exhibits from the grounds and to refrain from visiting it. We have never believed that such a movement could be successfully conducted. We have not advocated it and shall not do so now. The Fair itself ought not, in our judgment, to be condemned because it has been opened to the public on Sundays. It is legitimately open six days in the week. It is a legitimate Fair six days in the week. If any have lost interest in it because it is open seven days instead of six and do not want to visit it, well and good. Let them stay away. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind as to whether he shall go or not go. We can see no wrong in visiting the Fair on any week day. We do not believe any good can come from advising Christian people to stay away altogether. The churches ought not to take any such attitude. Let them make their protest fairly and squarely against Sunday opening, as they have done. But for them now to propose a boycott would be unwise, unnecessary and illogical.

The *Independent* might have added, illegal and unchristian to its list of adjectives descriptive of the boycott. It is unchristian, for it is in violation of the Golden Rule; it is illegal, for it is conspiracy.

THE Battle Creek Sanitarium is the pioneer in the health food business in this country, and has established an enviable reputation both for the excellency of its foods and for promptness and fair dealing. We have used these foods ourselves and can testify to their excellent quality. For particulars see our ad. page.

"THE violation of Sunday by opening the gates of the Fair is imaginary," says the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette*. Yes, and so is the violation of Sunday by anything else that it is proper to do on any day. It is refreshing to know that through the agitation of the Sunday-closing question the fact is becoming pretty generally recognized that Sunday sacredness is also purely imaginary.

For years Sunday laws were urged in the interests of temperance. The *Sentinel* said all the time that the real object was not to promote temperance but to exalt Sunday. Now the facts demonstrate the truth of our contention. A year ago the demand for Sunday closing was very generally coupled with a demand that no liquors be sold on the grounds; now that liquors are sold there, nothing is said of boycotting the Fair for that reason but for Sunday opening; and not only so, but the *Political Dissenter*, a National Reform paper published in Allegheny, Pa., in its issue of June 1, says:—

We admit that the use of the pressure of this pledge to stay away from the Fair carries with it an implied assurance that, if the Fair is closed on the Sabbath, the Christian people of America will support it by going to it. And much as we have been opposed to the liquor traffic of the Fair, and earnestly as we have approved a pledge to remain away on account of that feature of it, we are ready now, in view of the supreme importance which the Sabbath-closing question has assumed, to be held to the implied promise of approval and support on which the management, in case the Fair is finally and permanently closed, will say they have trusted in making the Exposition a Sabbath observing enterprise. They will naturally make their argument and appeal to Christians in this way: "In all this conflict before Congress and since, you friends of the Sabbath have declared that you would remain away from the Fair if the gates were opened on the Lord's day. We, together with Congress itself, have understood you to mean by this pledge that you would not stay away if the gates were closed. Encouraged by your implied promise of countenance and aid, Congress passed its law, and the management is accordingly running the Fair with closed gates. And now we look to you for your promised support." There is logic in this argument. And the struggle has brought out the full force of it. And if after such a conflict the gates are faithfully closed, we are constrained to say it is wise and right, in view of all that has entered into the struggle, for Christians to give the Fair their patronage and support.

This shows that Sunday and not temperance is the object aimed at. Everything is to be made subservient to this one idea, the sacredness of the man-made Sabbath, the Sunday of the Papacy, "the wild solar holiday of all pagan times."

WE take pleasure in calling the attention of our readers to the new Advertisement of the Battle Creek Bakery on another page of this paper. Nobody who has ever used these health foods will willingly do without them.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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,	- -	90c
"	25 to 99	" " " " " "	- -	80c
"	100 to 249	" " " " " "	- -	75c
"	250 to 499	" " " " " "	- -	70c
"	500 to 999	" " " " " "	- -	65c
"	1000 or more	" " " " " "	- -	60c
To foreign countries in Postal Union,			- -	5 shillings

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