



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

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, MARCH 27, 1890.

NUMBER 13.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 48 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

EDITORS,

E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES.

“AMONG all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered except for the violation of what Government denominated the law of God.”

It is not the Roman Catholics alone who are complaining of the religious history that is taught in the public schools. The Presbyterians in Tennessee are at it too. They have petitioned the Legislature protesting against the introduction into the schools of the State, of a State history written by the Hon. James Phelan. They assert that in his chapter on “Churches” he has sadly “misrepresented the Presbyterian Church, and the reasons for the origin of the Cumberland Presbyterians,” and that moreover, he shows too strong Methodist proclivities. We wonder if there would be any protest if he had shown strong Presbyterian proclivities. We hope so.

UPON the subject of progress in the Washington Legislature, the *Spokane Falls Review* of February 20, 1890, says:—

“One would quite naturally imagine, judging from the stew that some people have worked themselves into, over the matter of prayers in the Legislature, that one element within that august body would consider life a burden, a dreary desert unrelieved by a single oasis, unless for a few moments of each legislative day they were insured the pleasing privilege of sitting within the sound of the soothing voice of a court chaplain.”

“The fact that a man is opposed to prayers in the Legislature does not signify

that he is a foe to Christianity. It seems to the *Review* that he might be a prominent member of a church and still consistently object to religious services being blended with law-making, precisely as he might frown upon any attempt to notify a preacher to appear with his Bible and prayer-book on the occasion of a gathering of citizens for the purpose of working a county road!

“If Christianity cannot stand without a State prop it is not the religion we take it to be. As a matter of fact, every effort to give it State support has had a reactionary effect that wrought more injury than benefit.”

The Blair Educational Bill.

WE do not mean by this title the Blair Educational *amendment*, but the Educational *bill*,—though, as will be seen, there is not, in fact, a great deal of difference in the distinction.

The features of this bill are—

1. For eight years from the year of its passage, there shall be appropriated \$77,000,000: the first year \$7,000,000, the second year \$10,000,000, the third year \$15,000,000, the fourth year \$13,000,000, the fifth year \$11,000,000, the sixth year \$9,000,000, the seventh year \$7,000,000, the eighth year \$5,000,000,—to the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, according to the proportion “of persons in each, who, being of the age of ten years and over, cannot write.”

2. In order to be a sharer of the money, each State, through its governor, shall report to the Secretary of the Interior a full account of the common-school system of that State; how much money was spent on schools in the last year preceding the report; how the money was raised; the number of children attending school; the length of the school term; and the average pay of teachers.

3. The Secretary of the Interior shall certify this to the Secretary of the Treasury, with “monthly estimates and requisitions,” of amount due to each, and the

Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the said amount to such persons as shall be designated by the States to receive it. But no amount shall be paid in any one year to any State or Territory greater than the amount of school funds expended from its own revenues. Nor shall any of the \$77,000,000 from the national treasury be used for building or renting school-houses; but \$2,000,000 extra shall be devoted to this purpose in the same proportion as the regular fund.

4. The money “shall be used only for common schools not sectarian in character” in the States, and for common or industrial schools in the Territories.

5. “The Secretary of the Interior is charged with the proper administration of this law, through the Commissioner of Education; and they are authorized and directed, under the approval of the President, to make all needful rules and regulations, not inconsistent with its provisions, to carry this law into effect.” “Copies of all school-books authorized by the School Board or other authorities of the respective States and Territories, and used in the schools of the same, shall be filed with the Secretary of the Interior.”

If any State or Territory misapplies or loses any part of this money, or fails to report as directed, in the act, or fails to comply with any of the conditions of the act, “such State or Territory shall forfeit its right to any subsequent apportionment” “until the full amount so misapplied, lost, or misappropriated, shall have been replaced,” “and until such report shall have been made.” “If it shall appear to the Secretary of the Interior that the funds received under this act for the preceding year by the State or Territory have been faithfully applied to the purposes contemplated by this act, and that the conditions thereof have been observed, then, and not otherwise, the Secretary of the Interior shall distribute the next year’s appropriation as is herein before provided. And it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to promptly investigate all complaints lodged with him of any misappropriation

by or in any State or Territory of any moneys received by such State or Territory under the provisions of this act, or of any discrimination in the use of such moneys; and the said complaints, and all communications received concerning the same, and the evidence taken upon such investigations, shall be preserved by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall be open to public inspection and annually reported to Congress."

Such, briefly stated, are the provisions of the Blair Educational bill. It will be seen at once that it is simply a scheme to make the public-school system a national affair; and that the money involved is only a huge bribe offered to the States to surrender their school systems to the dictation of the national power. The direction of the whole affair is given to the Secretary of the Interior. He is to be the arbiter of all complaints or disputes that may arise about the application of the funds or any of the provisions of the act.

What, then, is the object of making the public-school system a national affair only? Why is it that this shall be taken from the control and management of the several States and merged in a federal head and controlled by national power? There is a purpose in this. This purpose does not appear as distinctly in the bill as in the speech of the author of it, which he made in support of it. *That purpose is to destroy all parochial or denominational schools, and have the national power supplant the family and the Church.* This we shall now prove.

According to Senator Blair's estimate, everybody who believes in the efficacy of the parochial or denominational school is an opponent of the public school and is a "Jesuit." On page 1542 of the *Congressional Record* of the Fifty-first Congress (page 91 of Mr. Blair's published speech), we find these words under the sub-head—

"THE OPPONENTS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS."

I have several times felt the necessity of alluding to the opposition which this bill has encountered from the friends of the antagonistic system of education, known as the parochial or denominational system of schools. That opposition has been of so inveterate and influential a character that it has done more than any other cause, in my judgment, to endanger its enactment into law, and I have felt, very much against my personal inclination, that it was a duty to say here and at this time that the developments of the last few years, more particularly those immediately preceding the present time, have satisfied me that around this measure is concentrated now a great struggle, the result of which will bear strongly upon the fate of the public-school system of our Republic.

I do not complain that those who believe in the opposing system are insincere, that they are not able and upright men, conscientiously believing that the system which they advocate is more for the public good than is the common-school system itself. But that is a question upon which the people of the country must make up their minds; and I feel as as though it was my duty to state what I believe to be the fact, that the issue on this bill in this country at the present time is mainly an issue between the public-school system and the opposing system of education for the children of our people.

I have recently, in another connection, stated my views on this subject, and will incorporate them as part of this address to the Senate.

The Jesuits who have undertaken the overthrow of the public-school system of this country are already far advanced in their work. And I desire to say that by "Jesuits" I do not mean simply and

alone those who may belong to that order, but I refer to them and to those who sympathize with them in their views of public education and of the proper system for the use of the children of the people at large.

I am aware that some who belong in what are known as Protestant denominations share in the belief that the denominational school is the right school, the better school for the education of the rising generation, and to them all, to this aggregate, I have applied this term, which I think is a proper one, not in any sense offensively, because the Jesuit is, as I understand it, the representative order of education in the Catholic Church. To it more than to any other is committed the charge of education in general, and they specially represent and execute the policy of the Vatican in regard to the training of youth and in political affairs.

Having thus made all to be Jesuits who believe in denominational schools, he holds all to be but parts of one grand system of "opposition" to the public school, and further says:—

I do assert that the issue between these two systems of instruction is a national issue, that it is already joined, and that the public-school system is getting the worst of it so far.—Page 1543 (93 of printed speech).

Therefore he proposes to rally the power of the national Government to crush out the parochial and the denominational school. And the right of the national power to do this is thus asserted:—

I do believe that what I said was then true, and is true now, that the Nation has the right and the power of self-defense, and that it may go to any lengths, the State and the parent failing, to secure the education of the children of the country; that it is injudicious to do so unless there be a necessity, but if the necessity was complete and total, then the Nation might assume complete and total charge of the education of the children who are to be the Nation; if the necessity was partial and the remedy does not come, it is the duty of the Nation to find and apply the remainder of it as a matter of self-defense, but to wait long, patiently, and urgently upon the parent and the State, and to aid the parent and the State through their own exertions to accomplish this end to the uttermost before falling back upon its own agencies, its own control. And I believe further that the obligation of the Nation, the constitutional obligation, to guaranty to the States governments republican in form, also imposes the obligation to guaranty needful education, by which alone the guaranty of republican government can be best made good. That affirmative guaranty which the Nation must make good to the State can be best redeemed by insuring to the State the means of educating its children; for a republican form of government can be maintained in no way but as it is based upon universal intelligence.

This bill was first framed and introduced eight years ago. It has passed the Senate three times already, and is now up for the fourth. Eight years ago, therefore, the necessity of national control was partial, and this bill was intended as the remedy for that partial necessity. But, he says, in the issue that "is already joined" between "these two systems of instruction," the public-school system "is getting the worst of it so far." We do not believe a word of this that the public school is getting the worst of it, but it is all the same so far as the intention of this legislation is concerned.

Now the denominational school is established and conducted above everything else to teach religion, a thing which the public school cannot properly teach. As, according to Mr. Blair's idea, the public-school system is getting the worst of the contest; as the necessity for national interference was partial eight years ago, and as the public-school system has continued all this time to get the worst of it,

the necessity, according to the same measure, is fast becoming "complete and total;" and therefore the time has come for the Nation to "assume complete and total charge of the education of the children." But, as it is the specific work of the denominational school to teach religion, and as the Nation must assume complete and total charge of the education of the children, it therefore becomes necessary for the Nation to assume complete and total charge of the teaching of religion. And Mr. Blair is prepared for this, and has proposed that the Nation shall prepare for it in the following amendment to the national Constitution:—

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:—

ARTICLE —.

SECTION 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of learning, in virtue and morality, and in knowledge of the fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, beliefs, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character, nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, beliefs, ceremonials, or observances, be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.

SEC. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve governments republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.

SEC. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary.

That is the object of the Blair Educational bill. And that is why we said at the beginning of this article that between the bill and the proposed amendment there is not a great deal of difference in the distinction. The bill is but a step to the amendment. The bill is but an immense bribe offered to the States to allow the thin edge of the wedge to be entered, to be followed by the whole body of the wedge sent home by the crushing blows of the national power. The bill pretending to be but an expression of tender solicitude for the educational interests of the States, is in reality the expression of a purpose to "assume complete and total charge of the education of the children," usurping the place of the parent and the Church as well as of the individual States.

And the author of that bill, the inventor of such an ulterior and far-reaching scheme, will stand on the floor of the United States Senate, in the presence of the Nation, and denounce as "opponents of the public schools" and as

"Jesuits" the opponents of this infamous scheme!

If ever there was framed a more Jesuitical document than the Blair Educational bill, we should like to see it. And to realize that the United States Senate has passed it three times, is more astonishing still.

In the words of Stanley Matthews upon a like subject we close this article: "I protest against this doctrine. Its application would be a monstrous tyranny. Its idea is pagan, not Christian."

A. T. J.

The National Gods.

THE *Christian Statesman* and the National Reform workers are making a great deal out of the afflictions that have come upon certain members of the national administration.

Secretary Blaine lost a son and a daughter in quick succession, and Secretary Tracy's house was burned, with fearful consequences—the death of his wife and daughter. There is no one in the land who does not sympathize deeply with both of these families in their affliction, and it is not the surest sign of Christian sympathy to turn this into a national thing, and thus charge the afflicted ones with such heaven-daring sins as to exhaust the divine mercy.

This is just what the National Reformers are doing. Dr. McAllister started it with a sermon in Pittsburg, entitled "The Washington Calamity; God's Call to a national repentance." He attacked the present administration with being "un-Christian," and said that the afflictions which had befallen Secretary Blaine and Secretary Tracy are "acts of a displeased and warning Providence." He declared that the first and chiefest reason for these afflictions is that President Harrison, in his Thanksgiving proclamation last year, made no reference to Jesus Christ, and the more fully to prove that this is a great reason, he says:—

The question now arises, where is the reason for the singular train of calamities which has of late attended the course of those who hold the reins of our Government? The question can be answered. It can be answered when the course of the present administration is pointed out; when we observe how its actions correspond with the tone of a Christian people. Take, for the first, the last Thanksgiving proclamation issued by President Harrison. In it thanks were directed to be offered by this Christian Nation, but there was not even a reference to Jesus Christ. Had the omission of this sacred name been accidental, or caused by lack of forethought, the case would not be so glaring.

But President Harrison was waited on by a committee and was earnestly solicited to insert in the proclamation the name of Jesus Christ. In the face of this, Mr. Harrison refused to make the insertion.

Thus the National Reformers already assume the place and the prerogative of the interpreters of the will of God in the movements of Providence, and make themselves judges both to name the sin and measure the guilt of the national authority.

How do these men know that that was a divine punishment for sins? And even

though they knew that it were such, how do they know what and how many the sins were? The truth is they know not one solitary thing about it. The God of providence *alone* knows the purpose of these afflictions, and why they fell as they did. And it is more human, and much more Christian, tenderly to sympathize with the afflicted—to "weep with them that weep"—than it is to stand off and point the finger, and exclaim, "Ah, ha! that is what you got for your wickedness." It is neither Christian nor wise for men to usurp the throne of Providence, and presume to run the universe according to their narrow views, and in the line of their unsympathetic and wicked ideas.

Balls and festivities at which wine was used are also named as associate sins for which this punishment came; and, taken altogether, Dr. McAllister pronounces the present administration a disappointing one. He says:—

In many other ways the present administration has been a *disappointing one to the Christian people of this land.* It was expected that with so many men in high and responsible positions who were stanch members of the Christian church, many long-looked-for reforms would be made. To-day in this great Christian country we are in many respects behind some of Europe's dynasty-stricken Governments. *The name of God is not mentioned in the Constitution.* Although the land is filled with societies covering every line of moral work and trying to help on the great cause, yet in many instances they fail because they have *not the proper backing.*

So they expected great things of the administration because there was so many men connected with it who were stanch members of the Christian church; and because of this they expected their long-looked-for reforms to be made. But men cannot be reformed by law; and even if they could, these men cannot make law where they are. President Harrison has no law-making power in his hands. He is not the chief legislator, he is the chief *executive*; he is there to execute laws that are made by the law-making power—Congress. But Congress cannot make laws that will reform people. The legislators are only representatives of those who send them to Congress; they can only represent the sentiment of those who send them. Then to the people is the place to look; the people are the ones to be labored with,—they themselves are the ones to be reformed. But even then law is powerless. No man can make a law by which to reform himself. The incentive to reform must come to him from without himself; and when that incentive has been applied by the people, the reform is accomplished without the need of any State or national laws, and without any effort of the administration.

The surest, the most lasting, and the most blessed incentive to reform, is the love of God as manifested to the world in the grace of Jesus Christ. The gospel of Christ, in the true demonstration of the power and spirit of Christ, is the surest, in fact, it is the only, means of real reform. If the churches and the societies

which are endeavoring so persistently to reform the Nation by human statutes, would only take up the blessed work of inculcating the genuine gospel of Jesus Christ, there would readily and easily come such a reform as would do the people good.

It is true those societies fail because "they have not the proper backing;" but the proper backing is the gospel of Christ, and not a law of Congress, or official incorporation of the name of God in national documents. If these societies have not the proper backing, it is because they have not the gospel of Jesus Christ; and if they have not that, it is their own fault and not the fault of the administration. And it is not fair, much less is it Christian, for them to visit guilt and condemnation and supreme punishments upon the national administration for faults which are their own.

A. T. J.

A Movement to Unite Church and State.

IN the SENTINEL of January 16, there appeared the text of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, "respecting establishments of religion and free public schools."

The resolution calls for the instruction of children in the "fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity." Now what are the fundamental principles of Christianity? It is self-evident that Christianity pertains to Christ, and that nothing can be taught in regard to Christianity without teaching about Christ. Where do we learn about Christ? and what shall we teach about him?—We learn of Christ in the Bible, and nowhere else. All we know of Christ is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and therefore that which is taught of Christ, in teaching the fundamental principles of Christianity, must be what the Bible reveals concerning him. So the very first thing in teaching Christianity is the consideration of who Christ is. And what about him? What does he do for us? What is the nature of his work? The simple answer to these points, according to the Bible, would be that Christ is the Son of God; the divine word who was in the beginning with God, by whom all things were created; who was made flesh and dwelt among men; who died and rose again to redeem men and to save them from sin. And this brings up the fact that men have sinned against God; they have broken his law. And so, to teach the fundamental principles of Christianity is to teach the law of God, which points out sin, and to teach Christ as the Saviour from sin; to teach his power and majesty as the one who is able to save from sin; in short, the fundamental principles of Christianity is all there is of it. You cannot teach anything

about Christianity without teaching these very things. For Christianity may be summed up in a word as the way of salvation from sin, through Christ.

Suppose now the State enters upon the work of giving this instruction to all children within its borders. What is it doing?—It is doing the very work for which the Church of Christ exists. Christ instituted a church here upon earth that it might be the light of the world, that it might spread abroad in the earth a knowledge of him and of his truth. This is all the church is for. Now when we have the entire Government doing this work in every school district, we have simply the State organizing itself into a universal church. That would be a State Church, a union of Church and State. Nothing less than this can be made of it.

Again, the bill says "the fundamental and *non-sectarian* principles of Christianity." By that is meant those principles which are not peculiar to any sect, but which all denominations can unite upon. Please consider the fundamental principles of Christianity, as we have referred to them, and see upon which one all denominations are agreed. Christianity means the doctrine of Christ. Who is Christ? Some say he is the divine Son of God, and others deny this. Some say that his work was vicarious, others that he simply lived and died as an example. There has been disagreement upon the very first principles of Christianity ever since the Church existed. So that if the public schools are to teach the principles of Christianity, they must teach principles that are held by some denominations and disbelieved by others.

In his book, "Romanism versus the Public-School System," page 170, Dr. Daniel Dorchester says:—

It is plain that if all classes are to use the public school, there must be no specific religious instruction. It cannot be imparted consistently with the American system of government; if religious instruction is given, it will be almost certain to savor of some particular sect.

The same thing is put more forcibly by the Honorable Stanley Matthews, in a speech in reference to the Bible in the schools of Cincinnati. Said he:—

The gentlemen on the other side say they limit the religious instruction demanded to what they call a "broad Christianity." I have already once or twice adverted to the term. I do not know that I understand it. If I do, it is a "broad" humbug. The Christian religion is not a vain and unmeaning generality. It is a definite and positive thing. It means something, or it means nothing. In my view it is a supernatural scheme of redemption—a revelation from God of his gracious purpose and plan of salvation to a race "dead in trespasses and sins," through the mediation and atonement of Jesus Christ, who, being God from eternity, became incarnate, and by his death upon the cross became a sacrifice for sin, made expiation for it, and, having risen from the grave, ascended into heaven, and there sitteth on the right hand of the Father to make intercession for his people. The whole character and value of such a religion consists altogether in being, as it claims to be, a supernatural plan of salvation from sin. Otherwise it is remedial. Strike out from the Bible the parts which disclose, reveal, and teach that scheme, and the rest is insignificant. And any instruction or education in religion which does not teach the facts which constitute that scheme, and which cannot be stated even, except as conveying dogma, is no instruction in the Christian religion whatever.

This is the truth clearly and forcibly stated. If the principles of Christianity are to be taught at all, the whole must be taught. Christianity is a unit, and the whole of it is contained in the fundamental principles. If the State is going into the business of teaching this, then we ask, How will the work of the school-teacher differ from that of the Sunday-school teacher and the minister of the gospel? And the only answer is that their work will be a little more comprehensive. They will be doing the work of the minister and the Sunday-school teacher, and, together with that, will be giving instruction in the sciences. So that, as we said before, for the public schools of the United States to teach the fundamental principles of Christianity would be to establish a State Church, to effect a union of Church and State in the most complete manner possible.

We have already shown that non-sectarian instruction in religion cannot be given. Such instruction will necessarily savor of some particular sect, as Dr. Dorchester says. And this, it is admitted, would be to effect a union of Church and State. Thus, in the book before referred to, on page 65, Dr. Dorchester, in referring to an appropriation by the State of New York to certain Catholic schools, says:—

The people thus found themselves taxed for the support of sectarian education, the Roman Catholic faith being taught in the schools thus supported. The State and the Church were then virtually united.

It is plainly evident that whatever way we consider this proposed amendment, it is really an amendment to effect a union of Church and State. We have not in this article touched upon some of the pernicious results that would necessarily grow out of the adoption of the amendment, except as the readers may infer for themselves some of the evils that would result from a Church and State union. In another article we shall show some of the wickedness that would follow its adoption.

E. J. W.

Recreation and Religion.

A SCOTCH parish minister has been discussing the rival claims of football and religious worship. He finds that some of the athletic youth in his congregation have been so wearied by their exertions at the football matches on the Saturday, that they could not come out to church on Sunday morning. The remedy he proposes for this state of matters sounds very like revolution in Scotch religious ideas. He proposes that the football match should be postponed till the Sunday afternoon, and that his young people should have their worship first and their enjoyment afterwards. He defends his proposal by the observation that, etymologically, religion and recreation mean the same thing. We are not so sure about that, but the fact that such a suggestion

is made by a minister in Scotland proves that Scotland is moving forward perhaps, fast enough. Twenty-five years ago another Scotch minister was the subject of universal reprobation in Scotland because he suggested that a quiet walk on Sunday might be a good thing. Now we have football on Sunday recommended. Scotland is advancing.—*London Daily Graphic.*

Logic and Law.

(Concluded.)

CONGRESSMEN are here to crystallize into law the highest expression of the will of the people. The expression of the civilian will, must result in civil law. You are here to make civil law then, are you not? Not moral law. Why can you not make moral law for the people?—Because you cannot exceed the powers which the people had to give you, who constituted you legislators. And as they had no power to make a rule of moral action, one for the other, or for themselves, therefore they had no authority to delegate such power to you.

If, then, you cannot, in your own minds, and in the minds of the people, both in theory and in fact, divorce completely—as utterly as though it had never existed—the religious idea from the concept Sunday, you have no right to legislate upon the use of that day, as distinguished from any other day.

Those who are asking for the passage of this bill, are urging the members to commit themselves to an unconstitutional act.

Sunday laws, and the whole line of religious legislation which goes in the same category, are alien to the letter of American fundamental law, and to the spirit of American institutions. They are a survival of the English Church Establishment, and should have existed, after the Declaration of Independence and the adoption of the Constitution, no more than the laws governing the control of livings, and the maintenance of the Church of England. They have rightly no more place in our statutes, than law for the regulation of the royal succession.

But the legal and judicial indolence of bar and bench has permitted this alien brood an entrance into our statute books, through *precedent* and not principle. And the precedent can be relied upon, in every case, to prove its principle wrong.

A clause of Article Fourteen, of the amendments to the Constitution, says, that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States;" but, when "legislating for the District of Columbia, Congress is bound by the prohibitions of the Constitution," and as otherwise expressed, it is the purpose of this Government to defend the personal rights and privileges of all its citizens, that, as the preamble states, the blessings of liberty may be secured to ourselves and to

our posterity. Yet, suppose for a moment that you are able to divest yourselves of the religious heredity acquired since your ancestors first heard Sunday preached, and you proceed upon a civil basis entirely; how far may you, as legislators, proceed in this special legislation, without trenching upon individual and absolute rights? To determine that, let us go back again to the source from which legislative authority is derived,—the people.

A citizen holds the right and title to his life in fee simple. Of what is a man's life composed?—Three score years and ten, or more, if by reason of strength he may attain to it. In other words, it is *time*,—that is the stuff of which the web of his life is woven. That time is his, possessed by him in indefeasible right. May he take, civilly, one-seventh of his neighbor's time, ten years of his life; may his neighbor take one-seventh of his life, ten years of his time, and devote it to any purpose whatever? If not, then have they the right to delegate to you the power to take away one-seventh of the lifetime of all the people? For, if it be true that they have that right, and may therefore give it to you, then the representative of the Knights of Labor, who spoke at the late Sunday Convention at Washington, was on the right track, when he said, "We go farther than you, and demand two days in the week, Saturday for play and Sunday for rest," and it may properly be made a penal offense to labor on Saturday *and* Sunday, and if for two days, then for three, four, five, six, seven; and the State may properly dictate what shall be the works of necessity and mercy permissible for any and all days of the week. Then a man's *lifetime* is not *his*; but has been absorbed into the being of a vampire of his own creation. If this can be so, what then becomes of the "inalienable rights" of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," which the Declaration of Independence asserts?

It is therefore by the inexorable logic of their position, that those who are promoting the passage of Sunday laws, are compelled to deny the soundness of the foundation principles of our Government, "All men are created equal," and "Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed," declaring them to be untrue and dangerous doctrines. At a joint Convention of the Sabbath Union and National Reform Association, held at Sedalia, Missouri, last summer, Rev. W. D. Gray said, in open convention, "I do not believe that Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and so, the object of this movement is an effort to change that feature of our fundamental law." The assent of the convention to these views was shown by the election of Mr. Gray to the secretaryship of the permanent State organization. Colonel Elliott F. Shepard, Presi-

dent of the American Sabbath Union, in a speech made at Chautauqua last summer, said, "Governments do *not* derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. God is the only law-giver. His laws are made clear and plain in his word, so that all nations may know what are the laws which God ordained to be kept."

These open statements show that the Sabbath Union and National Reform Association are, by the utterances of their representative men, traitors at heart. They unblushingly declare their disrespect for the principles of the Declaration of Independence, as a preliminary to the request to Congress, for the passage of laws in violation of the Constitution. They are at enmity with the Declaration and Constitution, because they desire to ignore rights which the one specifies, and the other secures to the people.

In this nation every individual is subject to the Government, and this Government derives its authority from no foreign power. The just powers of this Government then, if not from the governed, must be derived directly from God. We can understand how that the people express their highest civil conceptions in voicing human law; but if there be no human law, and all law is the expression of the perfection of God, what medium shall give voice to it? Upon this point, hear Rev. W. F. Crafts, Secretary of the Sabbath Union, in the convention lately held in the city of Washington. The following is *verbatim*:—

Mr. Hamlin: Is it proposed that an end should be put to the running of the street cars on Sunday?

Mr. Crafts: Well, whatever the law may be, I suppose the consciences of the people, and the officers, will carry out the law; otherwise, I suppose the citizens will form a *law-and-order league*, to aid in the enforcement of the law; for, even independent of police, local influence, a law-and-order league is useful in connection with the officers. As to newspapers and street-cars, these would come either under "secular work" or "works of necessity and mercy," and that is a matter of interpretation by the courts. . . . But the question of horse-cars and newspapers will undoubtedly be discussed by the courts, and something will either be put into the law, or decided by the courts shortly after the law is passed.

See also "Notes of Hearing," before the Senate Committee (of the Fiftieth Congress) on Education and Labor, on the joint resolution (S. R. 86) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, respecting establishments of religion and free public schools, p. 90.

Senator Payne: Let me inquire whether Unitarianism is within the principles of the Christian religion? . . . Is not Unitarianism a direct denial of the Divinity of Christ, and the Christian Church, and is that to be prohibited, or is it to be allowed?

The Chairman: The Court would have to settle that wherever the question was raised.

There is, then, no controversy but what these questions raised by this line of legislation, must come before the courts for adjudication. If this is to be "The American Sabbath," and these the necessary measures for its "preservation," who will be the "American god?"—Jehovah? the courts? or the theological instructors behind the bench?

This is not a new subject in the com-

mittee-rooms of Congress. The Twentieth Congress was largely petitioned for the stoppage of Sunday mails, and it was then said that "these petitions did in fact call upon Congress to settle what was the law of God." The measure was reported upon adversely, the Senate concurring. See Register of Debates in Congress, Vol. 5, p. 43; and abridgments of Debates of Congress, Vol. 10, p. 232. The report of Mr. Johnson, of Kentucky, from the Senate Committee on post-offices and post-roads, to whom these petitions had been referred, is germane to the present issue. It is submitted that the Committee of the District of Columbia would, in this instance, be justified in presenting a similar report on H. R. 3,854, on similar ground.

As to the point that the District of Columbia already has Sunday laws in force, and enforceable, see laws of the District of Columbia, 1868, p. 137, Sections 10 and 11 (re-adopted in 1874). Section 92, p. 9 of the Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia, says: "The laws of the State of Maryland, not inconsistent with this title, as the same existed on the twenty-seventh day of February, 1801, except as since modified or repealed, continue in force within the District." The authority so to legislate, is shown in laws of Maryland, 1791, 1. Dorsey, p. 269, chapter 45, section 2, in connection with the clause in section 8, Article 1, of the Constitution of the United States, where, in citing the powers of Congress, it says, "To exercise exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States," etc.

The District being thus under the jurisdiction of Congress, and the Maryland law adopted the Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia (section 1049, p. 122) determines what court has jurisdiction of cases coming under this law. It is there found to be the Police Court, and section 1,054 same page, provides that "The court may enforce any of its judgments or sentences, by fine or imprisonment, or both." Therefore, although the penalty affixed to the Maryland law may have become obsolete or difficult of determination, authority is lodged in the court having jurisdiction to affix its penalty by "fine or imprisonment, or both;" and in evidence of the fact that the law survives, although the penalty may become obsolete, see *United States vs. Royall*, 3 Cranch, Circuit Court Reports, pp. 620-25.

If Congress ever had the power to adopt such a law, the Maryland Sunday law of 1723 is still in force, and enforceable in the District of Columbia, and to adopt another would be simply cumulative legislation.

But, on the other hand, if it be true that, when "legislating for the District of Columbia, Congress is bound by the

prohibitions of the Constitution," see *United States vs. More*, 3 Cranch 160, and Congress never rightfully adopted this law into the statutes of the District, then Congress would be guilty of cumulative unconstitutionality, in passing the law contemplated in House Resolution 3,854.

Respectfully submitted,

W. H. MCKEE,

For the Nat'l Religious Liberty Ass'n.

Paganism and Christianity.

BISHOP ANDREWS, who has recently returned from a tour of inspection of the Methodist missions in Asia, reports that he found evidences in Japan of what he regards as a drift toward Christianity. The whole nation, he says is permeated with the fundamental principles of Christian civilization.

The same tendency has been discerned by other observers, and the advisability of formally adopting Christianity has every been discussed seriously by some of the Japanese statesmen and philosophers on the ground that the nation would profit by establishing the religion of the West. But this disposition toward Christianity is rather an indication of the absence of religious ideas and convictions than of the kindling of any new and genuine faith among the Japanese. The whole number of actual Christian converts there is put by Bishop Andrews at 25,000 only, while the population of the islands is about 35,000,000; and the educated people are described by him and other travelers as doubting or utterly rejecting all supernatural religion whatsoever. Such vital religious faith as there is remains among the common people; but the skeptical philosophers argue that so long as they have a religion of some sort it would not make much difference whether it were Christianity or Buddhism. The change, as the philosophers would make it, would be in name only.

Thus the state of mind among the educated Japanese is analogous to what it now is among many educated Europeans and Americans. They reject the old religious faith for themselves, but they regard its acceptance by the mass of the people as valuable for the preservation of the social order and system. The colleges and universities of Japan propagate religious doubt and scientific and philosophic theories subversive of all theology; and yet the temples are kept up to stimulate the faith of the humble faithful. Is not the same very much the case here? Our chief colleges exert an influence hostile to theological dogma and theory, but the churches continue to preach and uphold as much of the old belief as ministers will consent to inculcate and the attendants to receive. [The *Sun* might justly have added, and it ought to, that they are also seeking to have the State formally adopt it here as is proposed in Japan.—EDITOR SENTINEL.] This

substantial agreement with their own sentiment and practice leads the Japanese philosophers to question whether they might not adopt Christianity as they see it manifested in the West, without any violent shock to popular prejudices and with material gain in their relations with the western civilization. That seems to be the explanation of such drift toward Christianity as there really is in Japan.

Nor can it be denied that they have some reason for so thinking, and that it has been strengthened by recent theological discussions in this country. The best of the candidates offering themselves as missionaries for the American Board are young men who have acquired in the theological seminaries of the Congregationalists, views whose logical tendency is toward the Japanese position. They doubt, or absolutely reject, the old and fundamental doctrine of everlasting punishment, and would govern God by rules and under limitations which satisfy the requirements of human reason. In other words, reason has become their God. So, also, the Presbyterians are demanding that their standard of faith shall be made consistent with reason, though in order to accomplish the change the whole system of theology, as held by all orthodox churches, must be destroyed. They would make man's reason and sentiment rather than God's will to rule in the world. They are on the road to an agnosticism as complete as that of the Japanese. The Presbyterian minister who asserted in the New York Presbytery that his church was taking Colonel Ingersoll as its guide and leader, was not far wrong. The movement for a revision of the Westminster Confession is a movement in that direction.

It seems to us, therefore, that instead of attempting to encourage a tendency toward indifferent Christianity in Japan, Bishop Andrews and all Christian Bishops and ministers should rather bind themselves together to revive genuine Christianity at home. New York to-day is a pagan city. The majority of the people, and more especially the educated people, are as much pagans as the inhabitants of Tokio.—*New York Sun*, February 25, 1890.

In the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, March 15, the Rev. P. H. Whisner asked for the appointment of a committee of five on Sabbath observance, saying that "there is a great struggle going on between those who wish to see the Christian Sabbath kept sacred and those who wish to do as they please on that day." Well, if a man is not a Christian, has he not the right to do as he pleases on the Christian Sabbath? Why is it that those who profess to be Christians, persist in the effort to compel those who are not Christians to act as though they were? Such a proceeding is a reproach and only causes reproach to Christianity.

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.



DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ.
We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.

We believe in supporting the civil government, and submitting to its authority.

We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.

We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.

We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation by the civil government; that we and our fellow-citizens may enjoy the inestimable blessings of both religious and civil liberty.

OFFICES.

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY;
225 A ST., N. E. WASHINGTON; 28 COLLEGE PLACE, CHICAGO..

C. ELDRIDGE, President.
W. H. MCKEE, Secretary.

Religious Intolerance.

As a representative of the National Religious Liberty Association, the writer attended the March term of the Circuit Court, at Troy, Tennessee, to witness the trial of one R. M. King, indicted for working on Sunday. Mr. King is a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, a sect which, like the Seventh-day Baptists, observes the seventh day (Saturday) as the Sabbath, instead of Sunday, believing the seventh, and not the first day of the week, to be the day of divine appointment.

The indictment against Mr. King reads as follows:—

Indictment vs. R. M. KING.

State of Tennessee, } July Term, A. D. 1889.
Obion County. }

The Grand Jurors of the State of Tennessee, elected, empanelled, sworn and charged to inquire in and for the body of the County of Obion, in the State aforesaid, upon their oath present that R. M. King, late of said County, laborer, heretofore, to wit: on the 23rd day of June, A. D. 1889, and on divers other Sundays before and after that date, and up to the taking of this requisition, in the County of Obion aforesaid, then and there did unlawfully and unnecessarily engage in his secular business, and performed his common avocation of life, to wit: plowing on Sunday, and did various other kinds of work on that day and on Sundays before that day, without regard to said Sabbath days. Said work was not necessary, nor done as a matter of charity; and the doing of said work on said day was and is a disturbance to the community in which done, was offensive to the moral sense of the public, and was and is a common nuisance. So the Grand Jurors aforesaid present and say that said R. M. King was in manner and form aforesaid guilty of a public nuisance by such work on Sunday in a public place, prejudicial to public morals, contrary to the statute, and against the peace and dignity of the State.

J. R. BOND,
Att'y-Gen.

Five witnesses were called for the State, and one for the defense. The first witness examined was J. L. Cole, who was also the prosecutor in the case. He testified that he had seen Mr. King plowing in his field on Sunday on one occasion. There was a public neighborhood road on two sides of the field in which the plowing was done, but the field was not in sight of any place of public worship. He did not see the defendant plowing for more than five minutes. On cross-examination the following questions were put to the witness by

Colonel Richardson, the defendant's counsel, and drew from the witness the answers as given:—

Col. R.—Did you see the defendant, Mr. King, working on Sunday?

Mr. Cole.—Yes, sir; I saw him plowing in his field on Sunday, the twenty-third day of June last.

Col. R.—Did it disturb you in any way?

Mr. Cole.—Yes, sir, of course it did; it was very annoying to my feelings.

Col. R.—On what grounds?

Mr. Cole.—On the ground that it was a violation of laws both sacred and civil.

Col. R.—Then it was an excitement of your religious feelings, and repulsive to your views of Christianity?

Mr. Cole.—Yes, sir.

Col. R.—How long have you known Mr. King?

Mr. Cole.—For about twenty or twenty-five years.

Col. R.—What was the general character of the defendant as a peaceable, quiet, law-abiding citizen, up to the time of this indictment?

Mr. Cole.—It was good.

Col. R.—Is he a pious, Christian gentleman?

To this question the prosecuting attorney, J. R. Bond, objected, and his objection was sustained by Judge Swiggart, on the ground that it was irrelevant. Whereupon Colonel Richardson made the following plea:—

Your Honor, I think it is relevant, and I submit to your Honor that I propose to prove that he is a member of a church which holds that Saturday, the seventh day, is the Sabbath, and that he observes it. I think I have a right to do this for two purposes: first, I think I have a right to do it to show that he did not intentionally violate the law; second, I think I have a right to do it to show the intent and purpose for which he did it, as a matter of mitigation. If this action can be sustained at all, and if this jury can find any verdict at all, it is within the discretion and power of the jury to impose any fine above \$50 that they may see proper. And I think that as a matter of mitigation I have a right to show to the jury that this man belongs to a church that professes certain tenets of religious faith,—amongst which is that the seventh day is the Sabbath; and that he observed that day as the Sabbath. I think I have a right to prove this,—not, I grant you, as a defense to the action, or as a decision of it, but in mitigation of any fine.

The Court.—I do not think his religious belief or religious connection with any church or sect has anything to do with this lawsuit, and sustain all objections tending to prove anything of that sort.

Col. R.—And your Honor declines to allow me to prove it, even as a matter of mitigation?

The Court.—Yes, sir.

Col. R. (to the witness).—Are you prejudiced against the defendant because of his religious views?

Mr. Cole.—I can say this, that I do not favor his religious views.

Here the Court objected to any further questions on this point from the defense.

Further examination drew from this witness and the one which followed, the fact that the witnesses and certain others had bound themselves by a written pledge or agreement to prosecute every violation of the Sunday law. The defendant offered to prove that others who made no pretensions to observe any other day than Sunday cut wheat with a self-binder, rafted logs, and did other work on Sunday, and that no attempt had been made to prosecute them; but the Court would not allow him to do so.

The cross-examination showed that the third witness, Alexander Wright, was going down to his field to examine his crops the first time he saw Mr. King at work; and on another occasion he and the fourth witness, William Oaks, were on their way to another part of the neighbor-

hood after a cow. The fifth witness was looking up harvest-hands when he saw the defendant at work on Sunday.

The defendant also offered to prove that he had been tried before a Justice of the Peace, and fined for the identical work which was made the principal offense in the indictment, viz.: plowing corn on Sunday, the twenty-third day of June last, and that he had paid his fine and the costs; and introduced for the purpose the Justice before whom he was tried; but the Court would not permit him to prove these facts.

The speech of the prosecuting attorney was a tirade against the religious sect of which the defendant was a member, and a reflection upon northern men, although Mr. King is not a northern man, all of which was well calculated to arouse the prejudices of the jury. It was so saturated with blackguardism that it cannot be repeated. The main effort of the speaker was to confound the defendant and those of his religious faith with the Mormons, and he even charged them with offering human sacrifices. I will give a few extracts from the speech, which are very much modified; for no respectable pen could write the words as spoken, and no respectable ear would want to hear them.

There were a lot of fellows in the olden time—some Adventists, or Seventh-day Advents, or Mormons, or Mayflower fellows, I do not care which you call them—that believed in human sacrifices, carrying them to the altar and burning them up as an incense. Suppose they should come from the same section of that country, Colonel Richardson would say, "You have no right to interfere with the rights of conscience of this people; and you can't interfere with them, because the Bill of Rights says that every man in this country has a right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience." Burn children, practice polygamy, and everything else of that sort! No, sir; away with all such foolishness, and everything of that sort! I do not care anything about the Adventists, or Mormons, whether they are right or not. But when they come here they must walk up to the rack and eat the same fodder that our folks eat. Not satisfied with worshipping God! Oh no; but with your shorthand reporters, your Mormons, and your Adventists, you want to corrupt not only the whole morals of the country, but you want to control the courts of the country. I wish to God we had more Methodist Churches, and more Baptist Churches, and more Presbyterian Churches, and more Episcopal Churches, and more Catholic Churches, until every man was brought under the benign influences of these churches; but, in the name of God, I do not want any of these Advent Churches, or Mormon Churches. Guiteau, when he had a revelation from God (and I expect he had a Seventh-day Adventist lawyer to defend him), took a pistol and shot down the ruler of this Nation, and they hung him; and that is what they ought to do with all these fellows. I have no respect for men like that. These fellows never heard from God, and I think they never will. They are not satisfied with working on Sunday and practicing polygamy themselves, they come down here and want to save us, and have us practice polygamy.

The obscene and filthy utterances of the attorney, which we have not quoted, evoked considerable merriment among the visitors in the court-room, the jury, and especially among the leading witnesses for the prosecution, who were devout church members.

The jury was only out about half an hour, when they returned a verdict of guilty, and assessed the fine at \$75. The counsel for the defendant took exception to the charge given to the jury, and moved

a new trial. In refusing to grant a new trial, the Judge said:—

The law is clear. I charged it properly. The fine is a reasonable one, and one well warranted. The laws are made to be obeyed; and Mr. King and all other men should and must obey them, or leave the country. I make these remarks that they may know that I intend to have the laws strictly enforced in the future. Mr. King and his brethren have a right to keep another day if they choose, but as Christian men it is their duty to obey the laws of the State, and they must do it.

An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the State, and will probably be heard at the April term.

The results of this case prove more clearly than ever the danger of removing a single provision that our fathers wisely put in the Constitution to protect the rights of conscience, and to secure to all perfect religious liberty. And it is not enough to have these safeguards in the Constitution; The statute-books must also be kept clear of laws touching matters that are purely religious. The Bill of Rights of Tennessee is clear and strong as to the rights of conscience; but the statutes are enforced regardless of the Bill of Rights. In matters of so much importance we cannot trust to the good will and indulgence of our fellow-citizens. The rights of every citizen in matters of conscience should be recognized fully and distinctly in all constitutions and statute-books, both State and national. Nor can any creed or sect be safe when it is otherwise. No matter how numerous or well protected they may be at the present time, let the precedent once be established of coercing the conscience under the sanction and protection of law, and none can tell what the end will be. In the case above referred to, the witnesses testified that their moral and religious senses and their sense of propriety were shocked. Another citizen of Tennessee, in talking with the writer, said that it would shock his moral sense, and sense of propriety, more to see persons led down into the water and immersed than to see a man quietly plowing in his field on Sunday. Who can say, if the laws would permit it, that there would not be men whose religious senses would be shocked by immersion, by communion in both kinds, or by the opposite of these, till their pent-up religious enthusiasm would seek vent in prosecutions and persecutions. The only tenable ground for a remedy against the evils of religious legislation is to keep the State and the Church forever separate.

DAN. T. JONES.

THE act of those riotous women at Lathrop, Missouri, the *Union Signal* approves as "a temperance crusade with practical features and speedy results." We do not believe in intemperance nor in rioting. Riotous "temperance" is intemperance none the less dangerous than saloon intemperance. These women ought to have been more both womanly and more temperate. They should not have allowed their zeal to get the better of their judgment.

NEW YORK, MARCH 27, 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 Supreme Court of Wisconsin has decided that the reading of the Bible in the public schools is sectarian teaching, and therefore unconstitutional. Judge Bennett's "representative" decision is therefore reversed.

THE Blair Educational bill was defeated in the Senate March 20, by a vote of thirty-one to thirty-seven. Senator Blair changed his affirmative vote to no and gave notice of a motion to reconsider.

The article in this paper on the bill was in type and "made up" before the bill was defeated; and it will help more to show how richly the bill deserved the everlasting death which we hope has been dealt to it by this vote.

OUR readers will remember that two weeks ago we published a letter from our California correspondent criticising a sermon on Sunday work in one of the California prisons. Referring to this same sermon the San Francisco *Alta* says:—

A good many interior journals are commenting admiringly on the energetic and righteous indignation with which Rev. Dr. F. A. Horton, of Oakland, recently denounced the practice of working the San Quentin convicts on Sunday. Only one fault can be found with Dr. Horton's denunciation. The convicts in San Quentin are not worked on Sunday.

This is indeed a serious fault, but we think that our correspondent showed very plainly that it was not the only fault in that sermon.

WE learn from the *Territory Enterprise* that a large and enthusiastic meeting of the citizens of Virginia City, Nevada, was held in the Opera House at that place on the 10th inst., to protest against the passage of the Blair Sunday-rest bill, the Breckinridge Sunday bill, and the proposed Educational amendment to the Constitution of the United States. A part of the resolutions were as follows:—

Resolved, That . . . it is not and never should be within the province of the national Congress, or the Legislature of any State in the Union to prescribe for the free public schools what are and what are not the "fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity."

Resolved, That religion is beyond the purview of human government, and from it is essentially distinct and exempt from its cognizance. That any connection between them is not only injurious to both, but is destructive of personal liberty, freedom of conscience, and the public welfare; and with the patriot soldier, Grant, we affirm that all religions should, for all time, be left to the family altar, the church, and

the private school, supported entirely by private contribution, and that the State and the Church should remain forever separate.

The senators and representatives from that State were requested to oppose the adoption of the Blair and Breckinridge measures. The work of the National Religious Liberty Association was heartily approved.

DR. GOSSLER, Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs and Public Instruction of the German Empire, has, it is said, expressed his approval of the views of Dr. Windhorst, the Catholic leader, that the Church, school, and State ought to work together. Radical changes, he declares, are impending in the field of education. In view of the fact that the late elections in Germany have given the Papists a strong hold upon the Government, enabling them to dictate their own terms to the emperor, the world need be surprised at nothing which may happen in Germany in the way of a return to the methods of the middle ages.

REV. JOSEPH COOK is quoted by the *Christian Statesman* of Feb. 27, as criticising Edward Bellamy's Nationalism, in his first Boston lecture for 1890, and saying: "It has elements in it that are very Christian; but the Christianity is in the voluntary co-operation, and not in the compulsory Nationalism." Very true Mr. Cook! The principle of voluntary co-operation, and not of national compulsion, is at the root of all Christianity. In that expression, you have stated a truth of universal application, and one which bears just as hard upon the methods and purposes of the National Reform Association, and Sabbath Union, as upon the doctrines of Mr. Bellamy. Why, then, do you affiliate with these advocates of nationalism in religion?

THE *Christian Statesman*, of March 6, contains the following: "We regret to note that Sabbath, the 23d inst., was openly devoted to lobbying among the members of Congress in favor of the rival cities. The amended Fair bill, imperilled by a shameful struggle for political advantage, passed the New York Legislature on Wednesday, the 19th. Until this was done, New York's representatives at Washington could do nothing. The Sabbath was one of the four days left before the vote was to be taken. Chauncy M. Depew, Ex-Senator Warner Miller, Elliott F. Shepard and others, hastened to Washington. We cannot say to what extent the Christian men in this delegation were responsible for the fact, or were implicated in it, but the newspapers of Monday bore evidence that no other day of the four was more diligently employed in pushing the claims of New York, than was the Sabbath. On the evening of that day, a dinner was given by Representative Flower, where the plans for the week were carefully looked over again, and close calculations made, as to the result of the vote."

Already it seems the religious press has begun its censorship, and among those who fall under its displeasure, is the unfortunate president of the Sabbath Union itself. Elliott F. Shepard has been in bad company, and the *Christian Statesman* throws the first stone. He has soiled the immaculate dignity of his office by coming to Washington on the same train with Chauncy Depew and others, who, according to the newspapers, must have talked about the World's Fair on Sunday. A New York Representative gave a dinner too, and these bad men all ate together on Sunday, and planned how to get the World's Fair. If only the Breckinridge-Sunday bill had been a law, the *Statesman* might have had legal redress for the "disturbance" of its Sunday rest in Philadelphia, by these New York Sunday-breakers in Washington.

A GENTLEMAN in Florence, Ontario, sends us a postal card, from which we make the following extract:—

You seem to think that God requires some help from some of his creatures to maintain his kingdom upon earth. I pray that the United States may be so fortunate as to get a civil statute to protect the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath.

We cannot see why the gentleman should imagine that we think that God needs some help "to maintain his kingdom upon earth." That is the position occupied by those who are endeavoring to give him the help of the civil law. The Sabbath is a divine institution, and it belongs to God. If Sunday is the Sabbath, it certainly needs no other law than the law of God to maintain it. God needs no aid from the civil power to maintain the dignity of his government. But the National Reformers are insisting that he does, and that this Government shall give it to him.

THE member of Congress who presented the local Sunday bill for the District of Columbia, in the House of Representatives, said, in an address in New York, as quoted in "Sabbath Reform Document" of January 9:—

The State owes it to itself and to its present citizens, and to the generations that are yet to come, to protect this day, on precisely the same grounds that they protect the martial relation.

This member proposes to protect the day, by a law "to prevent persons from being forced to labor on Sunday." At the next session of Congress, then, we may expect him to introduce a bill "to prevent persons from being forced to violate the marital relation."

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 toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, \$1.00

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

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid . . . 5s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
48 Bond Street, New York.