



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

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 9, 1890.

NUMBER 2.

The American Sentinel.

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

EDITORS,
E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES.

THE Sunday-law workers are quite accommodating. If in any of their conventions there are not enough of those who openly favor religious legislation to carry their plans and resolutions on a religious basis, they will very obligingly declare the whole thing to be civil only and secure the indorsement upon that basis. Very accommodating indeed they are; but calling a religious or ecclesiastical thing "civil" does not make it any the less religious. Sunday legislation is religious legislation under whatever name it may be proposed. And religious legislation is forbidden by the Word of God.

WITH the view of raising the "standard of morality of both sexes, and stimulating the fervor of their religious belief," the young emperor of Germany has, it is stated, issued an edict intended to put down dancing among the youth. Under the new order dancing is not to begin until after noon, is not to be kept up after 8 in the evening, and none except school children are to be allowed to join in the giddy round or the solemn square. Young people who are being prepared for confirmation are absolutely forbidden to appear at dances or to dance; and all parents and guardians of the young are called upon to use every means in their power to keep their children or pupils from dancing, and they are advised to substitute games for the popular form of recreation. Bismarck, it is said, opposed the ukase, saying:—

"That policy will be sure to make the young people dance all the harder. Who knows but it may come to pass that dances will be held in secret, like political agitatory exercises, and that the devotees of Teipsichore will have their heads turned with seditious politics as well as with the comparatively harmless dizziness of the waltz?"

Germany, it might be well to remember, is a church and State country. Religion is taught in the public schools, and in various ways God is recognized as the source of all power; yet with the single exception of France, no so-called Christian country equals it in infidelity. It requires something more than imperial edicts, legislative action, and official red-tape to make Christians. We do think that professed Christians should not desire to dance; but if they do, no amount of governmental interference will make the matter one whit better. There is no merit in not doing a thing when there is no opportunity to do it. Hot-house Christians have never been a success.

The New Blair Sunday Bill.

DECEMBER 9, 1889, Senator Blair of New Hampshire, re-introduced his bill for a national Sunday law.

The first thing to be noticed about this bill is the title and the important modification of it as compared with the title of the original bill introduced in the Fiftieth Congress, and as compared with the title proposed by the American Sabbath Union a year ago last December. The title in the original bill read:—

"A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship."

This title threw the bill so open to criticism on account of its religious aspect that the American Sabbath Union asked that it should be made to read as follows:—

"A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the Lord's day, commonly known as Sunday, as a day of rest, and to protect its observance as a day of religious worship."

This however was pronounced by Senator Blair as stronger and more interfering than the other.

By the experience of the past summer, the advocates of the Sunday law have themselves learned that this has a stronger religious cast than can well be defended in legislation, and therefore, the title of the

bill as now introduced, is stripped of its religious cast and is made to read simply thus:—

"A bill to secure to the people the privileges of rest and of religious worship, free from disturbance by others, on the first day of the week."

If this title described the real object of the bill it would be a very innocent measure, *provided* it were true that the people have not already secured to them the privileges of rest and religious worship free from the disturbance of others, not only on the first day of the week, but at all other times. It is a fact, however, that there are no people in all this land who have not the privileges of rest and religious worship free from disturbance by anybody on the first day of the week, and all other days and nights of the week. The workers for Sunday law know this full well. The field secretary of the American Sabbath Union made a tour of all the States and Territories the past summer in the interests of Sunday laws. In Portland, Or., and in San Francisco, he complained especially of the loose way in which Sunday was observed. The writer of this article was present at the field secretary's Sunday meeting in Portland and twice in San Francisco, and Mr. Crafts knows that the worship of the congregations to which he preached in those cities, and to whom he complained of the sorry manner of Sunday observance in those cities—were not disturbed in the slightest degree, nor was there any disposition on the part of anybody to disturb them. This he knows as well as we know it, and this they all know.

This being the title of the bill let us inquire how the object of the bill, as declared in the title, is proposed to be accomplished. Section 1 reads as follows:—

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person or corporation, or agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation, or in the service of the United States in time of peace, except in the necessary enforcement of the laws, shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity and

mercy and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as Sunday, or during any part thereof, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section."

That declares that no person within the jurisdiction of the United States shall perform or authorize to be performed, any *secular* work, labor or business to the disturbance of others upon the first day of the week. Now secular means, "pertaining to this present world, or to things not spiritual or holy; relating to things not immediately or primarily respecting the soul but the body; worldly." Therefore this bill proposes to prohibit all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States from performing or authorizing to be performed on Sunday any work, labor, or business pertaining to this present world or to things not spiritual or holy. It proposes to prohibit them from performing any work, labor, or business relating immediately or primarily to the body, (works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted); to prohibit them from doing anything worldly, that is, pertaining to this world or to this life. Consequently, the only kind of works that can properly be done on Sunday under that bill are works that pertain to another world, works that pertain to things spiritual or holy, works respecting the soul, and the life to come.

Now we should like for some of these Sunday-law folks to tell us how the Congress of the United States is going to find out, so as authoritatively to state, what work, labor, or business it is that properly pertains to another world, on Sunday or at any other time. More than this, we should like for them to tell us how Congress is to find out whether there is any other world than this, and especially how it is to find this out and make it to be so clearly discerned that the recognition of it can be enforced by law upon all the people? We should like, also, for some of these to tell how Congress is to discover what work it is that properly pertains to the people's souls on Sunday; or indeed, whether the people have any souls? How is Congress to know whether there is a life to come? And if Congress shall discover all this to its own satisfaction, then will Congress insure to all the people a happy issue in that life to come, upon condition that they will observe the Sunday laws?

These are not captious questions, they are entirely pertinent. For when it is proposed that this nation by legislative acts shall commit itself to the guardianship of the affairs of the world to come, of men's souls, and of another life; and when the people are asked to consent to it; it is strictly proper for the people to inquire,

How shall the State make that thing a success?

The truth is, that the State can never have anything to do with the world to come or with the question as to whether there is one to come at all. The State can never have anything to do with men's souls or with the question as to whether men have any souls. The State can never have anything to do with the life to come or with the question as to whether there is any life to come. No State will ever reach the world to come nor will any State ever, in the least degree, be partaker of the life that is to come. The State is of this world wholly, it has to do only with the affairs of this world, and with men as they are in this world. The State has to do only with men's bodies, and to see that the lives which men lead are civil.

Nor do we raise these questions because we doubt that there is another world or that there is a life to come. We are fully persuaded that there is both another world and a life to come. But the discerning of this is a matter of faith, and that on the part of each individual for himself alone. Nobody on this earth can discern or decide this for anybody else. We thoroughly believe that there is both another world and a life to come, and anybody in this world has an equal right not to believe it if he chooses so to do. We have the right to believe this without the sanction of the government; and any other man has a right not to believe it, and that without any interference by the government. We deny the right of any of the Senators or Representatives in Congress to decide any of these matters for anybody but himself.

SEC. 2. "That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal-route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: *Provided*, That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the Postmaster-General shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter and shall make regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: *And provided further*, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week."

Upon this, under its first proviso, we would ask: How many letters would be stopped on Sunday after the thing got into good working order? Under this same proviso there is another clause that is of more serious moment, especially to those who observe Sunday. That is the clause which refers to "the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest." Are the people who believe in keeping Sunday

ready to have the government regulate their observance of that day? Are they ready to have the State assume the prerogative of deciding what is the due observance of that day as a day of worship and rest? This is what they do when they consent to the enactment of such a law as the Blair Sunday Bill is. Every man who believes in keeping Sunday, when he consents to this bill, resigns his religious liberty. He resigns his right to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience and yields to the government the right to dictate how he shall observe that day as a day of worship. The fact is, that in this thing the people who desire to keep Sunday and who believe that it should be religiously observed, have more at stake than any other people, and it is a mystery that they cannot see this. It is a mystery that the leaders in the movement cannot see that they are deliberately robbing themselves of the dearest rights known to man. The mystery is solved, however, by the fact that the lust for power has blinded them to the consideration, not only of the rights of other people, but of their own rights. It is in behalf of the rights of those who believe in keeping Sunday and of worshiping according to the dictates of their own consciences, no less than in behalf of the rights of all other people, that the SENTINEL carries on its uncompromising opposition to all manner of governmental sanction or interference in the matter of Sabbath observance.

State regulation of the religious observance or worship, of the day, is the inevitable outcome of the legislation that is proposed, yet it is not intended by the managers of this movement that the State shall do this of itself. They intend that the church shall assume the supremacy and dictate the action and wield the power of the State. Thus a union of church and State, the rule of the despotic tyranny of a hierarchy will be the inevitable outcome of this legislation. It cannot be escaped when once the legislation is begun.

SEC. 3. "That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation who shall willfully violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same."

With such a penalty upon the exercise of honest occupations and such a premium upon idleness, the government ought to be able soon to create enough evil to ruin itself, which it surely will if the thing should be carried into all the States.

SEC. 4. "That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in the time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the first day of the week."

When everything shall have been forbidden the soldiers, sailors, marines and cadets, as is here proposed, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, suppose that they do not want to assemble for the observance of religious worship, will they then be assembled for that purpose? And how are they to know what is the "due" observance of religious worship in the meaning of the law, except they shall be instructed? Having gone so far in religio-political chicanery after the manner of Constantine, they might take the next and requisite step also, according to the example set by him, and teach them the "due" observance of religious worship, as he did, by having them to assemble and repeat at a given signal a prayer also enacted by Congress and adapted to the governmental authority of the United States.

SEC. 5. "That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered or for labor performed or for the transportation of persons or of property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same."

This section is identical, word for word, with the one in the original bill. Whenever anybody receives any pay at any time for work done on Sunday, the first man that will sue for the money, is to have it. It makes no difference who he is or where he comes from if he finds out that anybody has received money for work done on Sunday, all he has to do is to enter suit, and the law says he shall have it.

This section aptly befits the cause to which this bill is committed. The only effect the bill as a whole can have upon those who are not really religious is to compel them to be idle, and this section simply proposes to put a further premium upon idleness by compelling the man who chooses to work rather than to be idle, to pay the idler for the exercise of his own honest industry. The lazy loafer who will never do anything if he can help it, can spend his time watching the industrious citizen, and if he can detect him in committing the heinous crime of performing any honest work on Sunday, for which he shall receive any pay, the loafer can recover from the industrious man a sufficient amount to support him in his idleness several days. This is a fine thing indeed, an excellent provision of law, for the loafers.

Government is supposed to be founded in justice. Courts are supposed to be courts of justice. But we should like very much indeed for somebody to show upon

what principle of justice this section is founded, and by what principle of justice any court can be guided in enforcing the provisions of it.

SEC. 6. "That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, District, or Territory into another State, District, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good shall not be deemed violations of this act, nor shall the provisions of this act be construed to prohibit or to sanction labor on Sunday by individuals who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day than Sunday as the Sabbath or a day of religious worship, provided such labor be not done to the disturbance of others."

This section is identical with the same section in the original bill down to the directions for the construction of the act. In the original bill the provisions of the act were to be so construed as "to secure to all the people the religious observance of the Sabbath day." But the bill as now presented is to be so construed as neither to prohibit nor to sanction labor on Sunday by those who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day than Sunday as the Sabbath or a day of religious worship. Thus the government proposes to allow labor on Sunday by those who observe another day, yet it carefully refrains from adding to the permission any such sanction as would imply that it is right for such people to work on Sunday.

Yet nobody can be partaker of this permission, unless he *conscientiously* believes in, and observes another day than Sunday as the Sabbath or a day of religious worship. The conscientious belief in and observance of a day, therefore, as a day of religious worship, is required by the government in those who do not want to keep Sunday; and as the other sections of the bill require that Sunday shall be duly observed as a day of religious worship; that nothing shall be done that day except that which pertains to another world; to that which is sacred and holy; to the souls of men; and to the life to come; it is manifest that the object of the Blair Sunday-Rest Bill is the enforcement of THE RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE OF A DAY.

Consideration of the whole bill makes it plain that the modification of the title, to which we called attention at the beginning of this article, is so utterly disingenuous as to be fairly open to the direct charge of fraud. The object of the bill is *not* to secure to the people the privilege of rest and worship upon the first day of the week. It is to *compel* them to rest and to religiously worship on the first day of the week, or else on some other day if they do not choose to do it on Sunday. The modification in the title is simply to disarm suspicion; and the exemption of those who

conscientiously observe another day as a day of religious worship, is put into the bill for no other purpose than to checkmate the opposition of the seventh-day observers. This would be manifest from the bill itself, even without anything further, but they have not left it to be gathered from the bill only. Mrs. M. E. Catlin, superintendent of Sabbath Observance Department of the W. C. T. U. for the District of Columbia, has distinctly declared it in these words: "I think that we have taken the wind out of their sails by giving them an exemption clause." During the past summer Dr. Crafts has denounced the Seventh-day Adventists as the chiefest opponents of the bill, and they propose now to check this opposition by this provision in the new bill. But from what we know of that people, we hardly think they can be caught by any such chaff as that.

Nor is this the only effort that is made to disarm suspicion and check opposition. In some places the organizations that are formed auxiliary to the American Sabbath Union, take the name of "Civil Sunday" associations. And in conventions where they cannot carry resolutions indorsing the Sabbath as a religious institution, they will modify them so as to carry them in favor of Sunday as a civil institution. By such modifications and compromises, they hope at last to succeed. But whatever turn they may take, now or in the future, will not relieve them from the just charge of desiring the enactment of a national law for the enforcement of the religious observance of a day; because their real intention has been clearly revealed in the first step taken; and whatever modifications they may afterward adopt, will not in the least change the original intention, but only the appearance, and that simply for policy's sake.

The only safe and consistent position to occupy in relation to Sunday laws is the position maintained by the AMERICAN SENTINEL, that of uncompromising opposition to every form of Sunday law that may be invented. Such legislation means only mischief, and let the opposition be carried on everywhere more vigorously than ever.

A. T. J.

Religion and Law.

[This article from the *American Standard*, San Francisco, Cal., is a good illustration of the beauties of governmental interference in matters of religion, and religious education.]

WHAT will seem to most people a strikingly unjust decision was recently handed down by the judge of a New South Wales court. The case in brief is as follows: A father, professing the Roman Catholic faith, dies and leaves the guardianship of his daughter to his wife, also professing the Roman Catholic faith. For ten years the child is taught the faith embraced by both of its parents. At the end of the ten years the mother became a member of the

Church of England, to the tenets of which she held until her death, which occurred three years later. During these three years the child is a professing member of the Church of England. Upon the demise of her natural parent the child is left to the guardianship of two members of the mother's church. At this point the father's relatives step in and demand that the child—now perhaps fifteen years of age—shall be brought up in the faith of the father. The judge in equity held in favor of the latter.

In making up his decision the justice claimed, unwittingly and unintentionally, no doubt, that the jurisdiction of an English equity judge extends beyond the grave, beyond the confines of earth and to the domain of heaven itself. He asserted, and cited much supporting authority, that religious belief is not the result of conviction, nor developed by the exercise of the reasoning faculties. It is simply the practice in maturity of dogmas instilled in youth. He piled up authority to prove that this child's natural guardian and teacher, its mother, had no more importance in the eyes of British law than the wooden Indian in front of a cigar store. He is, no doubt, a learned judge, and we all know that learned judges, in both Great Britain and the United States, are enabled to find any given quantity of law in support of whatever opinion they may advance. But an intelligent, fair-minded person will find it difficult to free himself of the suspicion that this English judge was influenced by something beside the law in formulating his opinion."

Some Wholesome Suggestions to Ministers.

THE drift of the age is in the direction of "morality" by civil law, and this too often to the exclusion, or at least to the neglect of moral suasion. Instead of seeking to instruct people in moral duties, and thus lead them to practice morality from conscientious motives, even ministers are too often found appealing to the civil law to coerce men. This is a grave mistake, for while men may, and should be required under civil penalties to lead *civil* lives, it is neither proper nor possible to make them moral except by persuasion. This was the method adopted by Christ and his apostles, and it is the one which should be followed by his ministers. Directly in the line of that which we have said is the following from the *Iowa State Register*, of November 24, 1889, which contains some wholesome suggestions not only for ministers but to all who, though meaning well, are committing the grave error of attempting to reform men by making it impossible, or at least difficult, for them to do wrong.

The *Register's* article relates particularly to the temperance question, but the principle is the same as applied to other questions, and it is for this reason that we present it to our readers. The *Register* says:—

"We want to say to the preachers of Iowa at this crisis in public affairs, that in our judgment they are depending too much upon the law, and too little upon moral effort to bring about the condition of things we all desire. We have read with interest their letters and the resolutions they have adopted. We sympathize with them in their desire to banish the saloon and suppress the evils of intemperance. But we want to remind them that it takes more than a State statute to keep men from drinking, and to reform those who are slaves to the drink habit. The law is good so far as it goes, but when a human appetite and passion is the subject, it doesn't go the whole distance. There is something for the churches, something for the preachers, something for every good man and woman who wants to make the world better, to do. We notice in some of the resolutions which have been adopted at preachers' meetings within the last few days, a disposition to look still more to the legislature to suppress or stamp out whatever drinking and violation of the prohibitory law still remain.

"We believe that is a mistake. The law has done, and is doing all that the law can, to close the saloons, and to keep men from drinking. Can the preachers truthfully say that they have done and are doing all that they can? We wouldn't accuse them of willfully neglecting their duty. But have they as ministers done the best and the most they could to keep men sober, to reclaim the drunkard, to save the boys from learning to love liquor, since the prohibitory law went into effect?

"We have been watching the operation of the prohibitory law ever since it was enacted. We have been watching also the general course of the professed temperance workers toward it. We will credit the ministers with helping to enforce the law. They have preached enforcement from the pulpit. They have talked it on the streets, most of them have voted it at the polls. But when we have said that, haven't we said it all? Haven't we summed up the aggregate work of the clergy, and to quite an extent of the temperance organizations of the State? Our good friends, the preachers, have looked to the law to make and keep men sober, and have expected that would do the work which to a greater or less extent must be done in every community by personal effort.

"If the closing of the saloons had stopped drinking, we should have nothing more to say. But every well-informed man knows that it has not. It is true,

there is not as much drinking as there was when the saloons were open; but there is far too much now. It is idle to deny that a great many boys are learning to drink; that a great many men are drinking who would be far better off, and their families be far happier, if they would let liquor entirely alone. These are facts and stubborn ones, too. It will not do to ignore them; for they have a very disagreeable and painful way of forcing attention to themselves. Now what is being done to teach these boys to leave liquor alone? What is being done to show these men the folly and the harm of their course? What is being done to stir up public sentiment against the use of liquor? Not one single thing so far as we know except the single exhortation to enforce the law and keep the saloons closed.

"When was there a temperance meeting held in Des Moines to plead with men to sign the pledge and leave their drinking ways? When have our honored clergy held gospel temperance meetings to bring all the power of Christian influences to bear upon the drinking habit? When did a blue ribbon club or any other organization start out its members to find the old soaks and induce them to sign the pledge and become men again? Was any such personal work done in the last year, or the year before that? All of these good people headed by the ministers have been relying upon the law to do the work which the law never can do. They have preached sermons and held public meetings to demand that the law be enforced, but all this time there were poor fellows sinking lower and lower, and there were young men fastening the chains of appetite about their necks, and hardly a word of public protest or private entreaty has been heard.

"We do not single out Des Moines as exceptional in this respect. We do not believe its honored ministers are any more deserving of reproach or criticism than the ministers of other cities. We mention Des Moines because it is the nearest example of what we have in mind, and because it has more effectually perhaps than any other large city in Iowa, closed the open saloon. In calling attention to this neglect of moral effort, we are not asking for the return of the saloons, or pronouncing prohibition a failure. But we want to say that there is too much tendency to let the law supplant the rightful work of the pulpit and the church. Our friends, the preachers, in some of the resolutions that have been adopted recently, demand that the Legislature shall pass additional laws to enforce prohibition in counties where it is not now enforced. . . . But if the brethren will permit the *Register* to say it, there would be a good deal of work for the preachers in the river counties, even if the next Legislature should devise some scheme for closing the saloons. The saloons there are open because a majority of the people in those

counties believe that it is not a crime to sell liquor and not a sin to drink it. If every saloon were closed to-morrow, they would still think the same, and would seek at once some way to evade the law and satisfy their appetites.

"Now if our friends, the preachers, will allow us, we will tell them a way to close the saloons in every river county without any help from the Legislature. . . . Let them turn a phalanx of their best workers loose in those counties, and start an old-fashioned temperance revival. Preach temperance; sing temperance, talk temperance, reach out the hand of kindness and love to the poor drunkard, teach men that the saloon is the enemy of their homes, show them that the path of sobriety is the way to happiness, and just as quick as a majority of the people have been converted, the saloons will be closed, will stay closed. We would recommend that the district conference that demanded more legislation stop passing resolutions and move over into Scott county and go to work.

"As we believe in short sermons, we will practice what we preach. But we would urge upon the ministers of Iowa that they must not expect the law to make men good, and pure, and noble. . . . Don't expect the Legislature to do what a higher authority than man has laid upon human hearts and hands to do. We are disposed to look to the Legislature too much to reform society. As Francis Murphy says, they have an idea in the East that the people of Iowa are trying to change the Lord's prayer so as to make it read, 'Our Father who art in the Legislature.' That won't do. Don't leave moral work to be done by the law. We don't want to see our ministers acting as searchers and informers. Others can do that. They have a work which others can't do. It is theirs to do the work which their great Example did. He saved men from their sins, but but not with the sword of Cæsar."

No Compromise.

THE *Baltimore American* thinks that progress in religious liberty "has been great during the present century—greater, perhaps, than in all its predecessors combined; and it has logically followed the spread of general knowledge." "But," remarks that journal, "there must be more progress—very much more, too—before men learn to respect those who differ from them in religious matters, and to refrain from damnatory criticism."

This point, it intimates, is to be reached by compromise. But this is a mistake; there can be no compromise in religion, as there can be in politics. Nothing can be hoped for in the direction of greater religious liberty, or even the preservation of the degree of religious liberty which now exists, except as it comes through the recognition of the divinely-established prin-

ciple that in matters of faith men are answerable, not to their fellows, but to God alone. The true doctrine is that all men, no matter what their faith, are entitled to equal rights, both civil and social. The man who sits in judgment on another in the matter of his religion, and then attempts to punish him for what he is pleased to term "heresy," simply usurps a prerogative of God.

The Province of Law.

[This article which is an abridgement of a sermon on "The Province of Law in Distinction from that of Truth" is from a discourse delivered by Rev. Benjamin F. Clark before the Executive and Legislative Department of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, upon the occasion of the meeting of the Legislature of that State in 1869. It is equally well adapted to the national Legislature and to questions now before that body.]

Gentlemen of the Senate and of the House of Representatives: As agents of the public in this commonwealth, you are called to fill honorable positions and to perform important work. In the capacity of legislators, it is highly important that you have clear and correct views respecting the province of law, that you may avoid the mistakes of others, and make your own legislation effective for good.

Among our citizens there are those who seem to think that most of "the ills that flesh is heir to" can be removed by legislation. These ask for impracticable laws, in conflict with well-established principles in political economy and in human nature. They demand legislation which will regulate the habits of the people. They demand legislation which shall force others to adopt their views and practices, and shall bring them into conformity to their standard of right. By this class of reformers, who are laboring to renovate the world by legislation, you will be approached, as your predecessors have been, with earnest petitions to frame their impracticable views into legal enactments. These impracticable men and women may urge you to pass laws to effect ends which are not within the province of legislation.

In the capacity of legislators, you will find it profitable to keep this province distinctly in view; bearing in mind that, while in a despotic government the habits of the people can be regulated by law, backed by military force, in a free government, like ours, having a sovereign in each of its subjects, this cannot be done. A despot may decide by law, which is the mere expression of his own will, what his subjects shall eat, drink and wear, and how they may talk and act; but such legislation in a republic will always prove a failure and a disaster. Understand, that the law is good if men use it lawfully; if they employ it in a sphere to which it is adapted, and for an end it was designed to accomplish. Guard against the fallacious reasonings of men who demand of law what law, in its weakness, cannot do.

If asked to remove acknowledged moral evils and to effect desired moral improve-

ments by legal enactments, refuse compliance, saying to your petitioners, It is impossible to legislate men into holiness, to force them to cultivate the Christian graces, or even to practice the common virtues. These ends must be effected, if at all, by the potent agency of truth kindly applied to the rational in man. Christ and his apostles, and their immediate successors in the Christian Church, never invoked the aid of law in their reformatory work. They were content to use the truth in their endeavors to reform men; but when the church became corrupt, its members, like some modern reformers, became self-righteous, belligerent, cruel, denying the right to think, much less to speak, in opposition to their standards.

The men trained by the great Teacher were model reformers, and eminently successful in their work. They wrought wonderful changes in the views and habits of the people whom they converted to the belief and practice of Christianity. They erected the standard of the cross, and made it attractive. Multitudes of Jews and Gentiles were effectually drawn to it by the magnetic power of the truth it contained. In proportion as persons, professedly desiring to improve human society, have imitated these model reformers, in spirit and in action, have they been successful.

What is the condition of the temperance reformation in our country to-day? Like the Christian Church, when united to the Roman State, this reformation has yielded to the embrace of politicians and been paralyzed; and the demand is felt for some bold reformer to rescue it from this polluting embrace, and bring it back into the field in which it made such great and glorious conquests, where it may make others still greater and more glorious. Temperance societies *now*, instead of being institutions for moral reform, are political organizations; and temperance lectures and temperance sermons are, in many instances, mere political harangues, which degrade the pulpit and desecrate the Sabbath.

If asked to enact laws to compel men to be virtuous, direct your petitioners to the great Reformer, and bid them imitate him. Let them be told that the law is good if men use it lawfully, in its appropriate province, which is not to reform, but to protect. Let them be told that legal protection in the use of moral means for effecting their objects is all the aid which legislation can properly afford. Let the history of the Pharisees of the Christian Church after its adoption by the Roman Emperor, of Catholic Mary, of Protestant Elizabeth, and of all other persecutors who have cruelly *compelled* persons to adopt their views and practices, influence you to resist importunate demands to frame laws for the regulation of men's habits, remembering that habits have opinions for their basis, and that opinions cannot be rationally changed by law and force.

You may be asked to frame laws to make men virtuous, which may be successfully used in connection with the truth, thereby combining force with persuasion. Our subject proclaims against such legislation, declaring that force and persuasion cannot be equally yoked together, and that law, being good *only* when used lawfully, is out of its province when forcibly employed to regulate either the opinions or the habits of the people. With the Judaizing teachers in mind, you cannot consistently yield to the demand for such legislation, knowing that, constituted as men are, if they attempt to use law and force instead of truth and persuasion in the work of reform, they will rely upon the former two to the exclusion of the latter. Force and persuasion nominally combined will generally constitute *simple force* in its most objectionable form; therefore legislators should resist demands for their combination.

Intent upon employing force in the reformatory department, some of your constituents, with more zeal than knowledge, demand legislation which will afford them *indirect* aid in bringing men to the adoption of their views and practices. It is a principle of law and of morals that men cannot rightfully do indirectly what they have not a right to do directly. This kind of legislation is not only impracticable, but often exceedingly mischievous. It not only fails to accomplish its object, but not unfrequently it increases the evil it was designed to lessen.

Law has an honorable and useful province, and is efficient for good when used lawfully, in accomplishing ends for which it was designed; and efficient for evil when improperly used to force changes in the peculiar province of truth. Keep these two provinces distinctly in view, and let the view influence your legislative action. Let professed reformers in our commonwealth understand that, whether in the capacity of organized churches, or of voluntary societies, formed for specific purposes, they can only receive from you protection in their work, while, in imitation of the great Christian Reformer and those trained by him in person, they may call upon sinners to repent, and persuade the vicious to change their habits and their characters, by proclaiming the terrors of the law, and describing the excellencies of virtue.

If you yield to their demand for legal authority to compel men to adopt their standard of right and propriety, you will make them like Saul of Tarsus, self-righteous, belligerent, and cruel, who breathed out threatenings and slaughter, under such authority, in the capacity of a persecutor. Saul of Tarsus undertook to reform people by force; Paul the apostle persuaded men to abandon sin and practice the Christian virtues. Saul of Tarsus was a self-righteous, cruel Pharisee; Paul the apostle was a bright ornament of the Christian Church. Saul of Tarsus was a destructionist; Paul

the apostle was a true benefactor. If you would have the reformers in our commonwealth resemble the benefactor and Christian, rather than the destructionist and Pharisee, withhold from them legislation, except in the form of protection, bearing in mind that the law is only good when used lawfully.

The National Reform Theory Reduced to Practice.

THE National Reform doctrine as set forth by Rev. J. M. Foster, a secretary of the association, is that—

“According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for the sake of, and to serve the interests of, the church.” “The true State will have a wise reference to the church’s interests in all its legislative, executive, and judicial proceedings.” “The expenses of the church, in carrying on her public aggressive work, it meets in whole, or in part out of the public treasury. Thus the church is protected and exalted by the State.”

This being the National Reform view, and it must be, for these are Mr. Foster’s own words just as they appeared over his own name in the *Christian Cynosure*, it follows that Trinidad, the “pearl of the Antilles,” is a model National Reform country. It has no established sect, but the State provides the whole church, Protestant and Catholic, “funds out of the public treasury for carrying on her public aggressive work.” A correspondent of a New York paper writing from Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, British West Indies, says:—

“Last year the government gave the Roman Catholics \$13,550 and the Anglicans \$5,815 for the upkeep of their respective scholastic establishments. The government also pays for four exhibitions or scholarships of \$750 each per annum, tenable for three years. And boys from the Roman Catholic College of the Immaculate Conception are permitted to compete for and obtain these scholarships. In addition to this, the government contributes \$5,000 a year toward the support of this Catholic college. We next find that the sum of about \$17,500 a year is paid from the public treasury toward the maintenance of the Church of England in Trinidad, and \$30,000 to the Romanists.”

The same correspondent continues:—

“And what has been the result of all this pampering by the government of the religious bodies? Has it achieved any good? I say, ‘No,’ emphatically. The lower classes are as ruffianly and black-guard a lot as any country was ever afflicted with. Concubinage is general, and only twenty-six per cent. of the births are legitimate. Thrift is almost unknown. Prostitution and vice are rampant, especially among the younger females. Gambling in its worst form is the order of the day. Burglaries have been of late very prevalent. And yet there is not one of these people who is not an adept at making the sign of the cross, and who cannot read off “Hail Mary’s” and “Pater Nosters” by the ell. The young girls, after making what is known as their first communion, lapse into dreadful profligacy.”

And this is the condition of a country in which they have that which the National Reformers propose for this land, namely, to use their own term, “a union of religion and the State.” But does this show that Christianity is a failure! By no means, it simply shows that which has

been demonstrated in much the same way wherever it has been tried, namely, that Christianity fostered and supported by a civil government ceases to be Christianity, and loses its power either to elevate people in the moral scale or to prevent them from sinking to even greater depths of vice than that in which it finds them. Many and dark have been the crimes committed in the name of liberty, but they are no more numerous, nor of deeper dye than are the abominations practiced in the name of the religion of Him in whose mouth was found no guile, and in whose life there was no sin. C. P. B.

A Baseless Basis.

THE second article of the American Sabbath Union declares that,—

“The basis of this Union is the divine authority and universal and perpetual obligation of the Sabbath as manifested in the constitution of nature,” &c.

The Sabbath is not manifested in the constitution of nature. The statement that it is so manifested is false, and the members of the American Sabbath Union know it to be false. Rev. Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Chicago, is a member of the American Sabbath Union, and not by any means an insignificant member. If they have any such thing as representative members, Dr. Johnson certainly may be named as one. In the Congressional Hearing, in behalf of the national Sunday law, December, 1888, held by the American Sabbath Union, Dr. Johnson was one of the speakers, and in his speech he said:—

“This appointment of one day in seven is arbitrary. There is nothing in nature to indicate that division of time. There is the day of twenty-four hours, there is the month, there is the year, all these are natural divisions; but there is nothing in nature to indicate the weekly division—the observance of one day in seven. It is arbitrary, and we regard that as an evidence of its divine origin.”

These statements of Dr. Johnson are evidently true upon their face, and they just as evidently prove that the statement, as to the basis of the American Sabbath Union, is false. The divisions of time into days, months, and years, is natural; there is that in nature that clearly defines these divisions. But there is nothing in nature to mark even the weekly division of time much less is there anything in nature that would mark one of the days in the weekly division as a day to be religiously observed. The State exists and has its basis only upon the plane of the natural. It has to do with things only upon the plane of the natural. The Sabbath is based only in the action of God and is manifested only in the revealed will of God. Both of which are pre-eminently supernatural. Therefore, the State existing only in the plane of the natural, and having to do only with the natural, can never of right have anything to do with the Sabbath, or with the weekly division of time which is caused by the Sabbath. That much of the basis of the American Sabbath Union is a fraud. And as the Sabbath Union exists for the purpose of securing religious legislation in behalf of the Sabbath, it follows that the basis of the American Sabbath Union rests upon nothing more tangible than does the “baseless fabric of a dream.”

The Logic of It.

If a man should ask to be admitted into membership in a Christian church while asserting his unbelief in Christianity there is not one of the ministers of the American Sabbath Union who would admit him to membership. If anyone should ask to be baptized while maintaining an attitude of positive unbelief in Jesus Christ there is not one of these ministers who would administer to him Christian baptism. They would deny his right to have any share whatever in it. It is so also in the matter of the Lord's supper. It is *logically* so also in the matter of the Christian Sabbath. But instead of standing logically to their proposition, they inconsistently demand laws by which men, who glory in infidelity and atheism, and in their hatred to Christianity, shall be compelled to observe the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest. In other words, they demand that the United States Government shall enact laws by which all the people who are not Christians and who do not want to be, shall be compelled to act as though they were Christians. If it be the Christian Sabbath, these people have no right to consent that anybody but Christians shall keep it; and far less have they any right to compel people to keep it who are not Christians.

If the church has the right to use the power of the Government to compel men to observe the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest, has she not an equal right to use the same power to compel the same persons to observe the same institution as a day of worship? And has she not an equal right to use the same power to compel all men to observe Christian baptism, and to belong to the Christian church? In short if she has the right to use the power, where is the limit to the exercise of that right, except in her own arbitrary will? The results here suggested will follow as surely as the power is obtained. For, although the church is always illogical and inconsistent in demanding the use of the civil power, she is always strictly logical and consistent in the use of that power to the utmost limit. The only safety is in not allowing her the use of the civil power to the slightest extent.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

By A. T. JONES,

One of the Editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Scriptural, Logical, Plain, and Forcible

THIS IMPORTANT WORK SHOWS CLEARLY THE RELATION THAT SHOULD EXIST BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE AT THE PRESENT TIME, AS PROVEN BY THE BIBLE AND HISTORY OF THE PAST TWENTY-FIVE CENTURIES.

Chap. I. outlines vividly the relation that existed between "Christianity and the Roman Empire."
 Chap. II distinguishes between "What is due to God and what to Cæsar."
 Chap. III shows for what purpose the "Powers that Be" are Ordained.
 Chap. IV ably discusses "The Religious Attack upon the United States Constitution, and Those Who Are Making it."
 Chap. V unmasks "Religious Legislation," calling special attention to the Blair Sunday Bill, now pending in Congress.
 Chap. VI is devoted to the "The Sunday-Law Movement in the Fourth Century, and Its Parallel in the Nineteenth."
 These and other topics of equal interest make this treatise INDISPENSIBLE TO EVERY LOVER OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

IS A PAMPHLET OF 176 LARGE OCTAVO PAGES. PRICE 25 CENTS.

MILLIONS OF COPIES

Should be Placed in the Hands of Thinking People at once. It Clearly Defines what Position We, as American Citizens, should Sustain Toward the Effort now on Foot to Secure Religious Legislation. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

NOW READY!

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW.

We do not mean that a National Sunday Law is now ready, but that a treatise under this name, prepared by Alonzo T. Jones, is now ready for circulation. This pamphlet contains the arguments in behalf of the rights of American citizens, and in opposition to the Blair Sunday-rest bill, which Mr. Jones presented before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Dec. 13, 1888. Mr. Wilbur F. Crafts has pronounced the report as published

"MIGHTY INTERESTING READING,"

And Mr. Jones's comments will make it more so. His argument is enlarged to what it would have been without Senator Blair's interruption, objections, and counter-arguments, and is accompanied with answers to all of his objections and counter-arguments. As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially legislators, lawyers, judges, and other public men. The argument is

Based on Scripture and History, Constitution and Law,

Showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday bill, an analysis of the Sunday laws and other religious legislation of the different States, the Sunday-law movement of the fourth century, the Sunday-law movement of the nineteenth century, the methods used in securing indorsements to the petition for the Blair Sunday bill, and the workings of such Sunday laws as are proposed for the United States. The work contains one hundred and ninety-two pages. Price, 25 cents. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

TEN LECTURES

ON

NASAL CATARRH

Its Nature, Causes, Prevention, and Cure, and Diseases of the Throat, Eye, and Ear, due to Nasal Catarrh; with a chapter of

CHOICE PRESCRIPTIONS

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Medical Superintendent of the Largest Medical and Surgical Sanitarium in the World.

The work consists of 120 pages, and is embellished with a colored frontispiece and SIX BEAUTIFULLY COLORED PLATES, besides many illustrative cuts of the throat and nasal cavity in health and disease. This little work costs only 30 cents, and is in great demand.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

ROMANISM AND CIVIL LIBERTY

BY HON. WILLIAM JACKSON ARMSTRONG.

The above is the title of a recent issue of the Sentinel Library which contains a verbatim report of a powerful lecture delivered by this well-known speaker, in Oakland, California. Price, 4 cents. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL

AND

TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE

A THIRTY-TWO PAGE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, devoted to the dissemination of true temperance principles, and instruction in the art of preserving health. It is emphatically

A JOURNAL FOR THE PEOPLE,

Containing what everybody wants to know, and is thoroughly practical. Its range of subjects is unlimited, embracing everything that in any way affects the health. Its articles being short and pointed, it is specially adapted to farmers, mechanics, and housekeepers, who have but little leisure for reading. It is just the journal that every family needs, and may be read with profit by all. Price, \$1.00 per year, or with the 300-page premium book—"Practical Manual of Hygiene and Temperance," containing household and cooking recipes—post-paid for \$1.40. Address,

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL,

OAKLAND, CAL.

WATERMAN'S IDEAL

FOUNTAIN PEN.

HAS THE MOST RELIABLE arrangement for feeding the ink from the reservoir to the pen.

It has the same sure principle of operation (capillary attraction) and simple construction (a split) that have been used by the ordinary dip pen for 5,000 years to carry the ink to the paper.

Remember it is a combination of the BEST material, workmanship, and principle of operation. Don't waste your time or shorten your life with any other. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET

Neat, cheap, serviceable. They perfectly secure pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it cannot fall out when stooping. Can be easily and safely attached to any part of the clothing. A small investment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or pencil.

PRICES.

No. 1. Russia leather, for 2 pens . . . 10c.
 No. 2. Russia leather for, 3 pens . . . 15c.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets superior in every particular to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

THE BEST

DUPLICATING INKS

FOR USE WITH

"CYCLOSTYLE," "MIMEOGRAPH,"
 "COPYGRAPH."

Or any Duplicating Process in which a Stencil is used, are the

Celebrated "Redding Inks."

They Dry Fast, will not Blur nor Clog the stencil, Dry or Harden on Roller or Pallet, and are in every way

A SUPERIOR ARTICLE.

Send for Price Lists and Samples of Work Done with these Inks.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.



NEW YORK, JANUARY 9, 1890.

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.

THE *Christian Nation* notices the removal of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to this city, and remarks that "the firing will now be at closer range." Possible the *Nation* will now be able to shoot a little closer to the mark. Hitherto its failures to hit anything have been unparalleled by any journal with which we are acquainted, with the possible exception of the *Christian Statesman*.

THE ministers of Xenia, Ohio, have issued an address to their people, urging them to cease desecrating "the Sabbath" by refraining from burying the dead on that day, going to the post-office, reading secular papers, compelling servants to do household work, and traveling on Sunday, especially by railroad. This is all right; if the ministers of Xenia believe that Sunday should be so strictly observed it is perfectly right for them to persuade their people, or any other people, to keep it; but there the matter should end; they have no right to coerce people in such matters.

A READER asks, "Can the Sunday bill become constitutional without being voted on by the people?" There is no way in which the people can ever have an opportunity to vote directly either for or against the proposed Sunday law. If Congress passes the bill and it is sustained by the Supreme Court, it will then be, for all practical purposes, constitutional. Of course we do not think that a Sunday law would be constitutional in the sense of being in harmony with the intent of the framers of the Constitution, but it is not at all unlikely that the courts would sustain such a law as that proposed by Senator Blair.

In the late convention of the American Sabbath Union in this city the field secretary denounced certain base-ball leagues as "bands of criminals" because they play ball on Sunday, and the same convention asked Congress to pass a "civil Sabbath law." Now if the Sunday laws are "civil" statutes and forbid only that which is uncivil, then we should like very much for someone to tell what there is in the playing of base-ball on Sunday that is so intensely uncivil as to turn all who play it, into bands of criminals. In California also last summer the field secretary denounced as criminals all members of the legislature of that State who had

voted against a Sunday law, and declared that every one of them "ought to be in the penitentiary." Mr. Crafts is rather too prodigal with his denunciations properly to represent a minister of the gospel of Christ. Christ came not into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved.

LET none be deceived by the plausible cry of "a civil Sabbath." There is no such thing as a "civil Sabbath," and nobody wants such a thing. A "civil Sabbath" could be nothing else than a weekly holiday, when public business would be suspended and the people be left free to do as they please so long as they are civil, just as they are upon any other holiday. But that would be the "Continental Sunday" with a vengeance; and that the Sunday-law advocates do not want. "Take the religion out and you take the rest out," says Mr. Crafts, thus showing that, in his opinion, a Sabbath to be of any value must have a religious basis; and that is the truth. But when that is admitted where is the "civil Sabbath"? The fact is, as before stated, that there is, and in the very nature of the case, can be no such thing as a civil Sabbath. It is simply chaff used to catch sparrows.

THE field secretary of the American Sabbath Union should take the president of that association aside and instruct him in regard to the real object which they have in view. Mr. Crafts has been "swinging around the circle" explaining to the people that the Sunday movement is in the interest of the working men, a sort of sanitary measure as it were. But Mr. Shepard is continually saying something which, to say the least, excites a suspicion that the field secretary has been keeping something back; in short, that the real object of the movement is something else than that which he has represented it to be. One of these unfortunate "breaks" on Mr. Shepard's part was made in the recent meeting of the so-called Union in this city, when that gentleman offered some resolutions to the effect that the day of the inauguration of the president of the United States should be upon the first Wednesday of March, instead of upon the fourth day of that month. The reason for the change, as set forth in the resolutions, is that it would do away with the desecration of Sunday by enabling persons, east of the Mississippi, and those living even farther away, to leave their homes on Monday, attend the inauguration ceremonies, and return home by Saturday of the same week. This, says the resolutions, would prevent their "dishonoring the Lord's day for the purpose of honoring the president of the country."

Now the question naturally arises what possible connection this proposed change in the day of the inauguration has with

a movement in the interests of the working men? It certainly looks very much as though Mr. Shepard's object is to honor Sunday, and to promote its observance as a sacred day. And inasmuch as the American Sabbath Union adopted the resolutions without a dissenting vote, it would seem that the Union is in perfect accord with its president. And thus it appears that unless Mr. Crafts is mistaken as to his real motive, he stands alone in his efforts to preserve the health of that large and respectable class which he professes to serve.

THE object of the American Sabbath Union is declared by article 3 of its constitution to be, "To preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship." This object the Union proposes to effect by legislation. It makes no other effort than by law to do this. And granting just here, for the argument's sake, their claim that they do not propose to compel anybody to worship, they do propose to compel everybody to rest, on what they themselves call "the Christian Sabbath." Now Christian institutions and Christian ordinances belong only to Christians. The Christian church is for Christians only; Christian baptism is for Christians only; the Lord's supper is for Christians only. If Sunday be the Christian Sabbath, it likewise is for Christians only; and they not only have no right to compel those who are not Christians to observe it but those who are not Christians have no right voluntarily to observe it.

THE fathers of our Constitution builded wisely when they inserted the provision that liberty of conscience must remain inviolate. To maintain that bulwark of liberty there must be a continuous and absolute separation of State and church and public schools from all religion. To guide the public-school system to its destiny it is absolutely essential that religious influence be far removed from the schools, and that sectarian doctrines be forever eliminated. The blending of popular education with religion has been fully illustrated by the present condition of Germany, where the fatal effects are now shown. Atheism and infidelity exist there to a larger extent than in any other civilized country.—*Merced (Cal.) Express*.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending towards a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

SINGLE COPY, PER YEAR, POST-PAYD, \$1.00.

In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, 75c.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, 58c.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL.

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.