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

VOLUME 5. NEW YORK, JUNE 12, 1890. NUMBER 24.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 Bond St., New York.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN, W. H. MCKEE.

"THE Protestants and Catholics of Newburyport, Massachusetts," says the *Converted Catholic*, "are quarrelling over the saloon license. Through the efforts of a secret society all the licenses for that town have been granted to so-called Protestants, and Father Teeling, the Roman Catholic priest, has protested against this unfair discrimination." This item illustrates the impropriety of calling Protestants all who are not Catholics, and of denominating Christian all who are neither Mohammedan nor Pagan. Of course, as the *Converted Catholic* remarks, these people who have received license to sell liquors are not members of any Protestant church, but it is just as proper to call them Protestants as it is to call Christians hundreds of thousands who are so called.

ANOTHER evidence that the workingmen are not crying so loudly for Sunday laws, and that they are not complaining so bitterly of the Egyptian bondage and slavery of being forced to work on Sunday as the Sunday-law advocates claim, is furnished by the Chairman of the Committee of Arbitration in the great Chicago strike which was settled lately. In that, there was no call by the workingmen for the stoppage of Sunday work, there was no complaint about being required to work on Sunday, no demand whatever for any release from Egyptian bondage, nor Sunday labor. There was just this provision in the settlement with regard to Sunday: "Sunday work will be paid for at the rate of double time." That is, wherever men work on Sunday, they are to have double wages over work done on other days. It is probable that pay for Sunday work has not always been at the rate of *double* the pay for work on other days; but nearly always more is paid for work on Sunday than on other days. However, whether that be so or not, it is certain that the workingmen are not nearly as anxious about the question of Sunday labor, as the Sunday-law preachers are.

The Rights of the People.

IT is remarkable how everything in the way of State or legislative action is running more and more to the theory of force. Even now it has reached that stage where it is demanded that the people shall be forced to be religious, forced to be English, forced to be educated, forced to vote, and there is no knowing what next will come, nor where it will end.

By Sunday laws and the Bible in the public school the people are all to be forced to be religious. By such as the Bennett law in Wisconsin the people are all to be forced to be English. By a compulsory voting law Governor Hill of this State, as a leading executive, and David Dudley Field, a leading lawyer, propose that all the people shall be forced to vote.

This theory is subversive of the American principle of government which is the only true principle of civil government. The American principle of government is the principle of *rights* not force. This Government is a government of rights, not a government of force—a government for protection, not compulsion. "Oh," it is said "we fully recognize that. We do not propose for an instant to take away anybody's rights. We simply propose to compel everybody to *exercise* his rights." But, the moment that government assumes the authority to compel a person to exercise his rights, that moment it robs him of all his rights. For who is to compel the minority to exercise their rights?—The majority of course. But if the majority may compel the minority to exercise their rights, then that majority have the equal right to compel the minority to exercise those rights *as the majority say.* Such a proceeding annihilates constitutional government, and substitutes only the government of the mob. The very idea of a constitution is sacredly and safely to guard the rights of the minority against even the slightest encroachment of the majority; whether it be in an attempt to say that any person shall exercise his right, or an attempt to say *how* he shall exercise it.

Any claim of the right to compel a person to exercise his rights necessarily carries with it the right to say how he shall exercise them. All this compulsion that is now advocated is claimed to be for the good of the State; it is claimed to be essential to the peace and safety of the State; that is of the majority. It would be absurd to compel a person to exercise a right and then leave him free to exercise that right to the detriment of the State. It would be suicidal to compel people to exercise their right to vote and then leave them free to exercise it in such a way as to overturn the power that does the compelling. It is destructive, rather than preservative, of the peace and safety of the State to compel people to rest and at the same time leave them free to hatch mischief. Therefore any claim of right to compel anybody to exercise his rights necessarily involves the claim of right to compel him to exercise them in a certain way. And that is only to rob him of his rights and his freedom altogether.

It is true that force is the only power at the command of a civil goverment. But the only proper use that can ever be made of it is for protection. It is not to be used to compel a solitary individual to exercise his own rights; but to compel all to recognize, and not to infringe, the rights of others.

Every person in the United States has the natural right to rest, and to worship, and to be religious, and to speak English; and many of them have the political right to vote. Every person has the right to exercise those rights. And every person has an equal right *not* to exercise those rights.

Another instance of this same spirit of despotic invasion of the rights of the people, is shown in the act of Congress empowering the Census Bureau to carry on such a political inquisition as to compel the people of the United State to answer such questions as the following:—

22. Whether [he or she is] suffering from acute or chronic diseases, with the name of disease and length of time afflicted.

23. Whether defective in mind, sight, hearing, or speech; or whether crippled, maimed, or deformed, and name of defect.

24. Whether a prisoner, convict, homeless child, pauper.

25 and 26. Is the home you live in hired? or is it owned by the head or by a member of the family?

27. If owned by head or member of family, is the house free from mortgage encumbrance?

28. If the head of the family is a farmer, is the farm which he cultivates hired? or is it owned by him or by a member of his family?

29. If owned by head or member of family, is the farm free from mortgage encumbrance?

30. If the home or farm is not owned by head or member of family and mortgaged, give the post office address of owner.

When Congress, and legislatures, and governors, and lawyers, advocate the compulsory speaking of English, and compulsory education, and compulsory voting, and the compulsory telling of every personal defect and every private disease, it is not so much to be wondered at that preachers should advocate compulsory religion. When Congress voluntarily sets on foot a political inquisition it is not to be greatly wondered at that the political preachers and churches should petition the same body to establish a religious inquisition also.

Every one of these things is an unwarrantable invasion of the rights of the people.

In this Government there are rights of the people, separate from and above both the rights of the States and of the United States. There is such a thing as the rights of the States; there is also such a thing as the rights of the United States; and there is yet further such a thing as the rights of the people. In other words there are State rights, national rights, and personal rights; and each of these is separate from both the others. This is all recognized and expressed in the United States Constitution. The Constitution begins with the words,

"WE THE PEOPLE."

Then the Ninth Amendment says:—

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others *retained by the people.*

Then the Tenth Amendment says:—

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, *are reserved to the States* respectively, *or* TO THE PEOPLE.

The makers of this Nation understood this question thoroughly; but it is now almost entirely forgotten. When will the people learn once more to recognize, and to assert, the rights of the people?

A. T. J.

A Telling Example.

IN *The Independent* of May 22, we find the following announcement:—

A telling example of the evil of intoxicating liquors is that offered by the dismissal of Post-Chaplain John Vaughan Lewis, formerly a popular minister of St. John's Church, the most fashionable church in Washington City, who was appointed to a chaplaincy in the army in 1883. He was compelled to leave his church by his unfortunate, and we must add, criminal habit of drinking. The habit pursued him after he left the church and while a chaplain in the army. A year ago he was confined in an insane asylum for treatment, after having been recommended for retirement by a retiring board. It was hoped that the treatment would result in a partial cure, so that he might be restored to duty; but such has not been the case, and an order has been issued directing his retirement with a year's pay.

That is also a telling example of the evil of State chaplaincies. There was a man dismissed from the church for drunkenness, and then by some "influence" or other hocus-pocus was made a *chaplain* in the army. That is to say, he was not fit any longer to belong to a church, therefore it was proper for the State to take him up and give him charge of the spiritual interests and the moral culture of its soldiers.

Addicted to habitual drinking when he was appointed in 1883, he kept it up all these seven years "while a chaplain in the army;" and a year ago he was confined in an asylum for treatment, with the hope of "a *partial cure, so that he might be restored to duty.*" That is to say, an habitual drinker is worthy to be appointed a chaplain in the army, and so long as he is not entirely gone in besotted inebriety he is capable of performing "duty" as a chaplain. When, however, it is no longer possible to keep him even partially sober then it is proper to retire him "with a year's pay." Eight year's pay, therefore, —not less than ten thousand dollars of public money—has been paid to this chaplain for doing a drunkard's "duty."

Such a misappropriation of public money however is a very small item in comparison with the infamous and standing insult thus imposed upon every enlisted man in the United States Army. For, to assume—as the appointment of such a character as that to the office of chaplain, and as the keeping of him there knowing him to be such, does assume—that the soldiers of the United States army are so low and degraded that a confirmed drunkard is a fit instructor in morals and a proper person to take charge of their spiritual interests, is nothing short of an infamous insult imposed upon every enlisted man in the service.

Considerable has been said lately about bettering the condition of the enlisted men in the army. There is plenty of room for it. And the total abolition of the whole system of State chaplaincies in the army and everywhere else, would be an excellent beginning.

Under the circumstances it is difficult to suppose that this man was not known to be what he was, *when he was appointed.* For President Arthur, who appointed him, was an attendant at the very church of which he was a minister before he was appointed chaplain. It is indeed a telling example.

A. T. J.

Why He Sails Under Cover.

M. A. GAULT, in *Christian Nation*, April 30, says:—

Brother Crafts is now making a tour of the West, but does not announce his meetings definitely, I presume in order that these organizers of the opposition may not get on his track.

Yes; that is what we presumed some time ago. But why does he not wish these opponents to get on his track? Is he fearful of the results of an open conflict when overtaken by them? or doesn't he want such large crowds, anyway? Evidently he is not advocating doctrines which admit of such profound reasoning and unanswerable arguments that those who have attacked him once dare not ask him any questions after that. On the contrary, he seems anxious to avoid having to answer the questions a second time. But a lack of definiteness in making appointments may not only keep the opposition off his track, but his friends and abettors also. To such inconvenience is error put when pursued by truth. Why does not Mr. Crafts stand his ground?—*W. A. Colcord.*

Some Statesmanship.

IN the course of the discussion in regard to the admission of Idaho into the Union, in the House of Representatives, April 2, Hon. Joseph E. Washington, of Tennessee, as reported in the *Congressional Record* of April 6, said:—

Mr. Speaker: The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. DuBois) in defending the clause in the Constitution of Idaho which disqualifies Mormons from voting and holding office, says:—

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Washington) signs this report. Let us see what the Constitution of Tennessee says on the subject of franchise. By article 9, "Ministers of the gospel are forbidden to hold office, also persons who deny God, or fight duels."

Yet, the gentleman from Tennessee signs a report which says:—

"We insist that in Idaho disqualifications for holding office shall result only from a conviction of crime."

The people of Idaho say bigamists and polygamists shall not hold office in Idaho, the people of Tennessee say ministers of the gospel shall not hold office in Tennessee.

Now, sir, let me read you in full the parts of the Constitution of Tennessee referred to. (Art. 9. Sec. 1-3.) They are as follows:—

Whereas ministers of the gospel are, by their profession, dedicated to God and the care of souls, and ought not to be diverted from the great duties of their functions; therefore no minister of the gospel or priest of any denomination whatever shall be eligible to a seat in either house of the Legislature.

No person who denies the being of God or a future state of rewards and punishments shall hold any office in the civil departments of this State.

Any person who shall after the adoption of this Constitution, fight a duel, etc. . . .

Sir, these disqualifications are very different from what the statement of the gentleman from Idaho would lead one to suppose. . . . Surely the gentleman cannot object to that clause of our Constitution which excludes from civil office the infidel who denies the existence of a God! How, forsooth, could such a person take an oath to support the Constitution? Upon whom would or could he call to witness the solemnity of his obligation? He could not swear by the earth, for it is God's footstool. He could not swear by any created thing, for it is less than the Creator, whose very existence he denies. . . .

But, sir, Tennessee does not stand alone among the States in excluding certain persons from the right to vote and hold office. On the contrary, she has fewer restrictions of this sort than almost any other State.

As the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. Stewart) alluded to my State, let me read from the Vermont Constitution, chapter 2, section 12, which says each member of the Legislature before taking his seat shall make and subscribe to the following declaration:—

"You do believe in one God, the Creator and Governor of the universe, the rewarder of the good, the punisher of the wicked; and you do acknowledge the scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration, and own and profess the Protestant religion."

This prohibits, if enforced, a Roman Catholic from becoming a member of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, and certainly excludes every infidel. I will not consume time by reading from the constitutions of all the States. . . .

I have cited these cases to show that Tennessee has done nothing cruel, unjust, unusual, or contrary to the spirit of a free and enlightened government when she placed a few restrictions around the right to vote and hold office, but on the contrary she has not gone to any such length as have the States which those who criticise her represent.

The congressman from Tennessee is in error as regards his quotation from the Vermont Constitution, for the clause which he quotes is to be found in the Constitution of 1786, but is omitted in the Constitution of 1793 now in force. However there are other provisions remaining which are, in almost equal measure, out of harmony with the true principles of civil government.

But the remarkable fact remains that after a century has elapsed for the development of the principles enunciated by Thomas Jefferson and his compatriots in the establishment of this Government, such views should be expressed unchallenged in the Congress of the United States; and the fundamental law of all the States be called to witness to their propriety and soundness.

Such incidents as this would argue it not amiss for our legislators to withdraw occasionally from the consideration of naval and military appropriations and tariff making, to the study of the primary principles of civil government, as found in the act for establishing religious freedom adopted by the Legislature of Virginia in 1785.

The following portion of that act would be of special value in such an exercise:—

That our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions, any more than on our opinions in physic and geometry; that therefore the proscribing any citizen as unworthy of the public confidence, by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emolument unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow-citizens, he has a natural right, etc.

This act also provides that opinions and professions in matters of religion shall in nowise diminish, enlarge or affect civil capacities.

When in the discussion of a question of disfranchisement for a civil crime, such opinion as to what falls within the proper sphere of legislative cognizance are expressed, and things civil and things religious so inextricably commingled, there is, evidently, a wider field for civil service reform than has yet been dreamed of.

W. H. M.

The Contest in Wisconsin and Illinois.

As Judge Prendergast had something to do in assisting the Board of Education of Chicago to frame educational bills to be presented to the Illinois Legislature in 1889; and as the Illinois educational law and the Wisconsin law are both now the subject of great discussion, the Chicago *Herald* requested the Judge to prepare a review of the whole subject, embracing both laws. He did so, and the review was printed in the *Herald* of May 27. For the benefit of the readers of THE SENTINEL, we shall reprint the material part of the article. It will make two installments, the second of which will be a history of both the Illinois law and the Bennett law. We think the propositions set forth in the part here printed will bear the test of all fair criticism. Judge Prendergast says:—

A brief review of recent statutes of the States of Illinois and Wisconsin concerning education is undertaken at the request of the Chicago *Herald*, and from a belief that by reason of grave misunderstanding as to the provisions and effects of both these laws, good citizens, who have in common the laudable purpose of educating youth and forming individual character, are moving, if they have not already moved, into opposing lines.

The rights of parents and of the State are already so well defined by decisions of the highest judicial tribunals of both States, that it ought not to be difficult to compose the present dispute without drawing into the arena of politics, questions so fundamental and yet so easy of misrepresentation. It is wholly foreign to this statement to discuss the relative merits of the public and of the private, or denominational, school methods of instruction. To precipitate such a topic into the discussion of the relation from the general legal standpoint of the parent and the State to the education of children, would be to introduce a factor not at all relevant.

The statutes mentioned are laws, and undertake to treat of and enforce rights which, in the legislative judgment, reside in different subjects, *i. e.*, the parent and the State, and shall be considered with reference to their bearings upon legal rights. I venture to say that the opposition to the so-called Bennett law of Wisconsin is directed against what that law is believed to be rather than against what it is, and further, that those who approve unqualifiedly the Illinois statute do so without accurate knowledge of the real ground of complaint against it. Denunciation of those who oppose both these statutes proceeds on the assumption that they are enemies of popular education and of the public school, and that they deny to the State its just share of authority in the field of education. This view would seem not to be grounded on fact.

The Bennett law has been generally published and understood to be a copy of the Illinois law. Beyond the fact that both treat of education, there is but little similarity between them. The Bennett law, while open to some objections, is yet replete with provisions recognizing and guarding parental rights, and at the same time it accords to the State recognition of its proper function. [From a careful study of the Bennett law, we are sure the Judge need not be so tender of it as he here seems to be. It is scarcely less violative of rights than is the Illinois statute. —EDITOR SENTINEL.] And in these respects it differs essentially from the Illinois act, which, as to some of its provisions, is violative of rights heretofore considered inviolable.

Before examining these acts and the history of them, it may be well to consider a few general principles, so as to find, if possible, a common ground upon which fair-minded men may stand, and which are conformable to law. Cannot agreement be had to the following propositions?

1. To determine and direct the education of the child is a natural right of the parent.

2. There arises out of this parental right the duty to provide education.

3. When one who, by natural or human law, owes a duty to another, fails to perform that duty, the State can (a) enjoin or compel performance, (b) punish for non-performance, (c) supply the lack where, to the injury of society, non-performance is wrongfully persisted in.

4. The citizen is a partner in the sovereign power and a partaker in its activities, hence the aggregate of citizens may require that those who are to exercise functions of citizenship be fitted to their proper discharge.

5. Compulsory education, in the sense

that parents who violate or neglect their parental duty may be compelled to its performance, or punished for non-performance, is licit.

6. Compulsory education, in the sense of controlling, or seeking to control, or dislodging from their rightful place those parents who are discharging their parental duty commensurately with the state of life of parent and child, is not allowable, even to the State.

7. For the education of his children one parent may select the public school; another may select the private or denominational school; still another may furnish proper education without the aid of any school, and each of the three in so doing exercises a right protected by the law of the land as well as by the law of nature, and for doing which, he need offer neither excuse nor apology.

8. The public and private or denominational schools are in law neither related nor are they subordinate one to the other, nor need they be antagonistic.

. . . . . .

There lies within the bare proposition that "the State may compel all parents subject to its jurisdiction to give to their children instruction in the English language" much more difficulty than would at first appear. I will illustrate by the statement of a case within my own knowledge. I know a citizen, not a German, who for some years has educated several of his children in Germany, and instruction has there been given them altogether in the German language. In the Illinois act, as at present framed, if valid, this parent could be punished, for he does not send his children to a school within a district where they reside; nor are they given instruction in the English language. Another instance within my knowledge is that of a parent, not a German, who is about to remove from a comfortably and conveniently located home to another place where he can send his children to a school in which German is—to a considerable extent—the medium of instruction and of conversation among the pupils. He does this so that his children, in youth, may become proficient in that language.

It may be said that these are extreme cases, but what of that? They are facts, and what is the right of these parents is the right of every other parent. Is it competent for the State to punish either or both of these parents for such exercise of their parental rights? It is doubtful. He was a wise man who said, "It is good also not to try experiments in States, except the necessity be urgent and the utility evident." In such cases and in the case of German parents who send their children to German parochial schools, is it not to be presumed that the parents are sensible of the manifest advantage to their children of a knowledge of the English language, and that to parental interest and affection, rather than to penal statutes, should be committed the task of providing instruction?

The right of the State to fix, by penal law, a given language as the language of instruction in schools has seldom been exercised. The only instances in mind are where drastic measures have been imposed on conquered or overborne peoples, as in Poland, Ireland, Alsace-Lorraine. This requirement for the teaching of certain studies in the English language involves questions of great delicacy. To enforce every right would often lead to offending against judiciousness. What danger sufficient to arrest legislative attention dwells in the fact that in a few rural communities the language brought by foreign-born citizens from the place of origin may obtain supremacy in a schoolroom. Will not this wear away? . . .

Is it not fair to presume that those who in addition to the payment of taxes for the support of the free public schools, voluntarily assume the burdens of private schools, desire that their own children become intelligent, well-informed and useful members of the community, and that they know as well as others what is for the advantage of their children?

Thrilled the Audience.

AT the fiftieth anniversary of the Philadelphia Sunday Association, Mr. John Wanamaker had quite an important place. He made a speech in behalf of Sunday laws, in which he employed the following allegory, which the *Pearl of Days* says "thrilled the vast audience:"—

Just this is on my heart. I have an old friend born in another country years ago. He lived in a garden more beautiful than any other in all the world, where there were no cities and no railroads. I'd like my friend to speak to you. He arrived here last night. Listen to what he says:

"Friend, you are very old?"

"Yes, I have lived a great many years and I have traveled a great deal, first in Palestine, then in Europe, and finally to this country in the Mayflower with the Puritans. I have seen strange things and many changes. I've been to India and to Africa and I go among the Indians of America."

"What's your name?"

"My name is Day."

"Large family?"

"No, only seven of us, and I am the oldest. A great many like me best because I am a friend of the poor. I stop the factories and light up the homes."

"Do they treat you well?"

"The boys laugh at me sometimes, and some men sneer at me. Some call me Sunday and others the Sabbath, but the devout people call me Lord's Day. I used to be the last in the family, but after the resurrection of Christ they put me first. I want to go all over, not merely to hospitals, but to all people and make them and their homes brighter."

"Dear old friend, we love you, and we would even kiss your feet. We hope that you may continue to go about the world and fill every land with joy and blessings in the name of Him who sent you."

That is rather a queer sort of personage indeed! First, he was the youngest in the family, and continued to be so for about four thousand years; then, all of a sudden by virtue of the resurrection of Christ, he became the *oldest* in the family: and all this without the loss of a single member of the family! Accordingly he has been the oldest now for about eighteen hundred and sixty years. That the resurrection of the Saviour should cause the youngest member of a family to become the oldest while they all remain alive is an "allegory" indeed, or something worse. No wonder the vast audience was thrilled by the relating of such a phenomenon! But when people can be thrilled with such namby-pamby balderdash as that they must be exceedingly impressible.

A Good Thing Spoiled.

AT the recent anniversary of the Garrett Biblical Institute, in Chicago, Dr. C. W. Bennett, of the Chair of Historical Theology, preached the Baccalaureate sermon from Mark 4: 28; subject: "The Era of Religious Harmony. What Signs of Its Approach? What Can We Do to Hasten It?" Among other things, the Doctor thought this era might be hastened "by recognizing that we cannot produce moral effects by mechanical contrivances, cannot make men moral by statute. Placing the name of God in the Constitution and the Bible in the public schools will not make the Nation righteous."

This is good; but the speaker spoiled it all by saying: "There should be a conference of all the churches to select suitable moral precepts from the Bible for a text-book on which all can agree for use in the public schools." "The Bible," said he, "may be so used by godless teachers as to promote skepticism." Just so; "godless teachers" are incompetent to give religious instruction; and for this reason, if for no other, teaching the Bible, either in whole or in part, should not be attempted by the State, but should be left to the Church and the home.

"God in Government"

A GREAT deal of dignified nonsense has been written on the recognition of God in government, union of religion and the State, and kindred subjects, and we expect much more. Some think it absolutely necessary that religion be connected with the State, and God recognized by the Government, and that no harm will follow in the way of intolerance or persecution, as some anticipate. An article of this kind has appeared in the *Arena* for May, over the signature of Canon W. H. Freemantle. The writer anticipates no trouble from the recognition of God in government, because "this Christianity [of the Bible] can never beget a church which is the foe of progress."

He further says, in speaking of what is vital in Christianity: "In this I trust the two countries are agreed. I see in both

an increasing desire to legislate for the moral good of the people, and I cannot doubt that in the sphere of practical life the two organisms—a church thoroughly nationalized and a nation thoroughly Christianized—will blend together to be the first-fruits of the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."

Now all this sounds very well, but there are some things worthy of consideration in this connection. 1. The Christianity of to-day is no more the Christianity of the Bible, than was the Christianity of the third and fourth century. Yet out of those centuries came the worst system of iniquity which ever cursed the world. Yet this system recognized God in the Government, and was used for the conservation of what was then considered vital to Christianity. Was the union of religion and the State during the Dark Ages a *friend* to progress? 2. Pure Christianity, that of the Bible, will never form a union with the world, nor with worldly powers. 3. "A church thoroughly nationalized" is a spiritual harlot according to the word of God; and a "nation thoroughly Christianized," as far as the ægis of law can make it so, is but a repetition of the Dark Ages. A true Christian nation will be seen only when Christ destroys the national governments of earth and reigns in glory over a people redeemed by grace, not law.—*Signs of the Times.*

The Free Exercise of Religion.

THE following is an extract from a speech delivered by the editor of this paper before the House Committee on the District of Columbia, February 18, 1890:—

There is another consideration in this which shows that the State will be compelled to take official and judicial cognizance of the conscientious beliefs and observances of the people. It is this: When a law is enacted compelling everybody to refrain from all labor or business on Sunday, excepting those who conscientiously believe in and observe another day, then there will be scores of men who know that in their business—saloons, for instance—they can make more money by keeping their places of business open on Sunday than on another day, because more men are idle that day. They will therefore profess to observe another day and run their business on Sunday. This is not simply a theory, it is a fact proved by actual examples. One of the very latest I will mention. I have here a clipping from the *Southern Sentinel*, of Dallas, Texas, February 4, 1890, which I read:—

Right here in Dallas we have an example of how the law can be evaded. Parties have leased the billiard hall of the new McLeod Hotel, and have stipulated in their lease that they are conscientious observers of the seventh day [though to the best of the common knowledge and belief they are not]: that, in consequence, their business house will be closed on Saturday, and will be open on Sunday.

Mr. Froud—If they are known not to be conscientious worshipers, and keepers of the seventh-day Sabbath, what defense would they have?

Mr. Jones—The defense would still be a claim of "conscientious belief in, and observance of, another day." The claim indeed might not be sincere. And if there were any question of it in the community, it would certainly be disputed and the court would be called upon to decide. Thus you see that by this bill the United States courts will be driven to the contemplation of conscientious convictions and compelled to decide upon the sincerity of conscientious beliefs and observances. And thereby it is proved that the introduction and advocacy of this bill is an endeavor to commit Congress and the Government of the United States to the supervision of the conscientious convictions of the people.

Now, gentlemen, to prevent this was the very purpose of the First Amendment to the Constitution. It is well known, as I have stated, that the Colonies which formed the original thirteen States had each one an established religion. When it was proposed to organize a Federal Government, the strongest influence that had to be met and overcome was jealousy of a national power—a fear that a national power would override the powers and interfere with the domestic affairs of the States. It was this that caused the adoption of the First Amendment to the Constitution. Their affairs of religion and the exercise thereof being the dearest of all, are first assured protection. Fearing that the national government might enact laws which would restrict or prohibit the free exercise of the religion of any of the people of the States; or that it might adopt or indorse some one of the religious establishments of the States, and thus form an alliance which might annihilate both political and religious individuality; that the political individuality of the States and the religious individuality of the people might be free; for themselves and their posterity the people declared that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

It is not to be inquired whether there was any danger of that which they feared, they feared it and that is enough. And because they feared it, because they were so jealous—rightly jealous too—of their religious rights and conscientious convictions, they guarded these, as they intended and supposed, *forever*, from any supervision or cognizance whatever on the part of the national Government. And upon this I quote now more fully the words of Bancroft, to which I merely referred a little while ago:—

Vindicating *the right of individuality* even in religion, and in religion above all, the new Nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; *but the American Constitution*, in harmony with the people of the several States, *withheld from the Federal Government* the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and, *not from indifference*, but that the infinite spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom of purity and power. — *History of the Formation of the Constitution, Book V, chapter I.*

Thus says the historian, there is by the Constitution "perfect individuality extended to conscience." This individuality, these rights, are as dear to us and as sacred as they were to the fathers of our Nation, yet no more so to us than to other people. Therefore, gentlemen of the committee and the representatives of the people, by your respect for the Constitution and your oath to support it, and in behalf of the sacred rights of all the people, we implore you to give no heed to any demand for legislation, which in any way, to the least degree, proposes to touch the conscientious beliefs or observances of a solitary individual in all the land; give no heed to this bill, which in its very terms, proposes to commit Congress to the supervision of conscientious beliefs, and proposes to drive the national power into a field where the makers of that power forbade it to go, and to compel it to assume jurisdiction of questions which they have forbidden it even to consider.

Now, as to the petition—their petition I mean (our petition is all right, that needs no defense), the petition which the other side is circulating—that petition shows what this bill means. Both this bill and the Senate bill, "which includes this," were framed and introduced upon this petition. If we know what the petition asks for, we shall know also what the bills are intended to give. Here is the petition—I read the one for the national law, "which includes this."

To the House of Representatives of the United States:—

The undersigned organizations and adult residents (21 years of age or more) of the United States hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding in the United States mail and military service, and in interstate commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, *except works of religion.*

The question then which would inevitably arise upon this is, What religion is it whose works of religion only shall be excepted? That question would have to be answered. It would have to be answered by the United States courts or by Congress. But whenever, or by whichever, it shall be answered, when it is answered, *that moment you have an established religion—a union of Church and State.* You cannot go back if you take the first step. The last step is in the first one, and we beg of you, gentlemen of the committee, and of these men themselves, for their own sakes as well as ours, *do not take the first step.*

We all know that the most wickedly cruel and most mercilessly inconsiderate of all governments is that in which the ecclesi-

astics control the civil power. And how are you going to escape it under such laws as here proposed? Who is to enforce these Sunday laws? Who, indeed, but those who are working for them? Certainly those who are opposed to them, or indifferent about them, will not enforce them. Who then are they who are working for the enactment of these laws? Who organize the conventions and count out the opposite votes? Who appeared here before your committee to argue in favor of it? Who, indeed, but the Church managers? for you saw how summarily the Knights of Labor part of the delegation was squelched.

Well, then, if it is the Church which secures the enactment of the law, it will be the Church that will have to see to the enforcement of the law. In order to do this she will be compelled to have police and courts which will do her bidding. This is her great difficulty now. There is now no lack of Sunday laws, either in the States or the Territories, but the laws are not enforced. In order to get executives and police and courts who will enforce the law to her satisfaction, the Church will have to elect them. Then, as said Mr. Crafts in this city the other day, they will form "law and order leagues to enforce" the Sunday laws. Here then is the system: The Church combines to get the law enacted; the Church secures the election of officers who will do her bidding; the Church forms "law and order leagues" to make sure that the officers do her bidding and enforce the law. Where, then, will the State appear, but in the subordinate position to formulate and execute the will of the Church? Then you have the Church above the State, the ecclesiastical superior to the civil power. This is just what is in this national Sunday-law movement; and this is what will certainly come out of it. It is inherent there.

But when George III. undertook to make the military superior to the civil power, our liberty-loving fathers declared it tyranny and avowed such things should not be in this land. And now when a movement reaches the national Capitol which bears in itself an attempt to make the *ecclesiastical* superior to the civil power, it is time for the American people to declare that this is tyranny also, and resolve that no such thing shall be in this land. That attempt one hundred and fourteen years ago grew out of the "divine right of kings" to govern, and the doctrine that governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. This attempt now grows out of the divine right of *the ecclesiastics* to govern, and likewise that governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. The President of the American Sabbath Union, which is the originator of this national Sunday-law scheme, has definitely declared in so many words that "governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed;" and one of the secretaries of an auxiliary Union has as definitely stated that "this movement is an effort to change that feature of our fundamental law."

Gentlemen, when such doctrines as these are openly avowed, and when such an attempt as this is made by those who avow them, to embody them in national law, it is time for all the people to declare as we decidedly do, that this Nation *is, and of right ought to be*, FREE AND INDEPENDENT OF ALL ECCLESIASTICAL OR RELIGIOUS CONNECTION, INTERFERENCE, OR CONTROL.

Selfish and Tyrannical.

THE proposed religious legislation as embodied in the Blair-Crafts-Breckinridge Sunday bigotry, is "not dead but sleeping," and will no doubt bob up serenely at the beginning of every new session of Congress. It is really an indirect confession on the part of its advocates that they are losing faith in the invincible power of love in the conquest of the world.

But it is not "religion, pure and undefiled before the Father," but ecclesiasticism which is foremost and uppermost in this Sunday-law crusade. The former is always tolerant—"not puffed up"—and is ever ready to fulfill the golden rule, while the latter is always selfish and tyrannical, according to power and opportunity, and disposed to control the human conscience by force.

It is strange that professed followers of Christ should forget the lines defined and ordered by the Founder of our religion, and appeal to the State to aid them with its fines and prisons in the spread of religious truths, when the facts are ever before us to prove that in this country, where Church and State have thus far been divorced, Christianity is on a better and more promising footing than it is in any other country on the globe.—*J. G. Clark, in Oregonian.*

A Modern Inquisitor.

WHAT a perfectly inquisitorial disposition Census Superintendent Porter must have! First, he commissions the enumerator to inquire into the financial difficulties, the private defects, and secret diseases of all the people, with the idea of compelling answers under penalty of one hundred dollars. When he found this could not be made to work, he then undertook to get the physicians all over the country to violate their professional oaths and betray professional confidences, by revealing the private diseases and secret maladies of all their patients. Since he found that the physicians of the country were men too honorable to stoop to such shameful dealing, he now directs that where the persons themselves refuse to answer these wickedly hatched questions, the enumerator "should obtain the information *by inquiry from neighbors*, and enter it upon his schedule the same as if obtained from the head or some member of the family." No doubt Mr. Porter, by this last effort, will obtain a host of information. In many instances "neighbors" know more about other people than those people know about themselves, and are ready to tell it. But anybody who would trust such "information" would have to be of as remarkable disposition as is the author of this inquisition himself. We doubt whether the records of the Papacy contain the names of a person more perfectly qualified for the office of Inquisitor-General than *this* record shows Census Superintendent Robert P. Porter to be.

How Do They Use It?

THE lessening of the hours of labor may seem to be a very good thing for mechanics, but it is not impossible that in the long run it may be found to work against their interests. A great many persons who are not mechanics, but toil as arduously as any mechanics ever do or did, do not find that they can make a fair living unless they work more than eight hours a day. If the whole wide world can get along upon eight hours a day for toil, and is ready to devote the rest of its time to proper rest and recreation, and to such pursuits as will help to relieve those who engage in them, we wish the eight-hour rule might be established the world over. But the question arises, whether, apart from possible financial difficulties, the reduction of the hours of labor and consequent increase of hours of idleness may not prove in a moral point of view more hurtful than helpful to the laboring classes? Do they use well such leisure as they now have? Or do they use it in a way that suggests that increase of leisure would prove only a curse, and not a blessing?—*New York Observer.*

A RELIGIOUS paper of Oakland, California, has the following item which contains a thought worth repeating. It says:—

There is published in Santa Cruz, California, a monthly journal called the *Buddhist Ray*, which boasts of being the first paper of its kind published in a Christian city. It is being circulated in Japan. What is a *Christian* city? And if a city were Christian, would it publish a Buddhist journal? The doctrine of Christ is, "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." The paper has naught of which to boast. Christ would not recognize Santa Cruz as his, any more than he would Yeddo, Oakland, London, or any other city.

THE defeat of what is known as the Bennett law, on a direct issue in Milwaukee, shows the danger of carrying unnecessary proscription into the public schools.—*Christian at Work.*

NEW YORK, JUNE 12, 1890.

SOME men are bound to get to the front no matter what it costs; notoriety they will have in one way or another, as is just now strikingly exemplified in the case of Senator Blair, whose picture and name figure prominently in a patent medicine advertisement in several papers. In years to come when it shall be asked, Who was H. W. Blair? the answer will be, He is the man who was cured by Dr. Blank's Wild Cherry and Sarsaparilla Troches.

AMONG the many petitions for a national Sunday law presented to Congress during the present session, is one from "one hundred and two citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the better observance of the Sabbath." The query naturally arises, If these petitioners really desire better Sabbath observance why do they not observe it better? There is no law in this country against any man's observing any day just as well as he wishes to. It would be just as appropriate to petition Congress for better attendance at church, or for more regularity in family worship, or for less formality in giving thanks when sitting down to dinner. There is really no difference between petitions to Congress asking for a national Sunday law, and petitions "praying for the better observance of the Sabbath;" the latter, however, show more plainly the wish of the petitioners, namely, the legal enforcement of a religious institution.

THE Boston Committee of One Hundred, taking their cue from the United States Supreme Court decision upon the Mormon test oath, are now urging that the Roman Catholics shall be disfranchised. They declare:—

> We do not hesitate to say, as a measure for the Nation's self-preservation, that no man who confesses allegiance to the Pontiff should be allowed to participate, as a citizen, in either holding office, or casting a ballot. The United States Supreme Court has decided that the law of one of our States disfranchising Mormons is constitutional, on the theory that the man who takes the oath the Mormons were required to take cannot be a good citizen. Why should not this principle be applied to those who confess allegiance to the Papal hierarchy? No ballot for the man who takes his politics from the Vatican.

The Committee of One Hundred are not alone in this; there are several papers in different parts of the country that advocate the same measure, and for the same reason. Others advocate the same measure for other reasons. But whether it be this reason or others, the truth is that those who advocate such a proceeding, hold a despotic theory and proceed upon a despotic principle. And if they had the power to execute their wish, the despotism that would thereby be established, would be no less cruel than that which they assert characterizes that which they wish to abolish. That Committee of One Hundred should be annihilated.

MISS MARY F. LATHROP, of the Non-Partisan Woman's Christian Temperance Union, is now on a visit to the Pacific Coast, in the interest of Christian temperance. She met a rather hot reception from some of the partisans of the partisan Woman's Christian Temperance Union. In an address in the First Congregational Church, Oakland, Sunday evening, May 25, she referred to this, and read a letter which she had received from a preacher, before she started for the Coast. In the letter the preacher said to her:—

> Don't you dare to come to California, you scarlet woman of Babylon, you hand-painted Jezebel!

When she had read this, Miss Lathrop lowered her voice and quietly remarked:—

> You laugh, my friends, but it is no laughing matter. If connection with political parties inculcates such feelings as this, where Christian love, forbearance and peace and good will should exist, isn't it high time we got away from politics?

So say we. All honor to the womanly women, who have cut loose from a leadership that is characterized by mannishness in women, and womanishness in men.

SOME of our exchanges are still repeating the story that the Nun of Kenmare had received subscriptions for a forthcoming book and then "disappeared," leaving said subscribers with neither their money nor the book. There never was a particle of truth in the story. There was no disappearance of the Nun. She was filling a lecture engagement in Baltimore, in midwinter, when she took a severe cold, which settled in her throat, affecting it so that she was compelled to break off her engagement, and by the positive direction of physicans go to Florida for her health. But at no time did she disappear, for her publishers as well as her friends knew all the time where she was. Yet her enemies seized upon this circumstance, and, being virtually in control of the press of the country, made it tell for all they could against her. Besides this, when she found that her book would be delayed, she wrote personally from Florida to each subscriber, offering to return the money if he did not want to wait longer than was at first expected for the book. Her enemies however, knowing well that a sensational story stands a much better chance of wide circulation through the daily press than the truth can possibly secure, made the fullest use of their opportunity.

We have the honor to be personally acquainted with the Nun of Kenmare—Miss M. F. Cusack;—we have had an hour's conversation with her, within a week before this writing; and we know that there never was a particle of truth in the story of her disappearance. It was wholly an invention, and the wish that it might be so was the mother of the invention. She is working diligently at the book referred to—"Why I Left the Church of Rome"—and hopes to have it in the press soon. If all the people knew what steady persecutions follow her, and what repeated difficulties meet her, so far from wondering why the book is delayed, they would the rather wonder at the splendid courage that sustains her in undertaking to print the book at all, and in carrying on the noble fight that she is making. From our acquaintance with this lady, we believe her to be a genuine Christian woman, and well worthy of the sympathy and support of everybody who loves Christianity or admires courage.

THE *Christian Statesman* of April 24, copies from the illustrated *Christian Weekly*, an article by the Rev. Robert F. Sample, D. D., in which he says that "patriotism is a Christian virtue." We have read the New Testament through several times, and we never yet discovered this amongst the Christian virtues. One list of these virtues is as follows: "The fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Another list gives these: "Faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, charity." Patriotism is not amongst these, nor is it anywhere mentioned in the New Testament amongst the Christian virtues. How Mr. Sample found it out therefore, when it is not written, we should like to know. Will Mr. Sample give his authority? or, will the *Christian Statesman* give the authority for the statement?

WE have on hand a few volumes of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL for 1889, neatly and substantially bound in half roan, which we will send to any address, post paid, for two dollars per volume. These volumes are very cheap at the price. Order at once if you want one, for we have only a very limited number.

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,
43 Bond Street, New York.