THE AMERICAN SENTINEL

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

VOLUME 5. NEW YORK, JUNE 26, 1890. NUMBER 26.

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.

"A good Sunday law," says the *Colorado Graphic*, "is one which allows men, women, and children to do as they please, provided they do not interfere with what their neighbors do, or in other words, molest their neighbors."

In commenting upon Senator Stanford's proposition to create a Land Loan Bureau in the Treasury Department, by means of which the Government shall loan money on unincumbered real estate, at a low rate of interest, for a long term of years, the *Christian Union* remarks that it is a much longer step toward Nationalism than it appears to be on its surface, and then pertinently says: "In view of these schemes for making the Government a silent partner in all sorts of industries, we think the time is ripe for some instruction, in popular literature and lectures, on the true functions of government." We think so too: paternalism, or Nationalism, which is only another name for the same thing, will yet be the ruin of this country.

A religious paper of Oakland, California, has the following notice of Miss Lathrop's work in that city:—

The Non-Partisan Woman's Christian Temperance Union is ably represented on this coast at present by the national organizer, Miss Mary F. Lathrop, who is now in Oakland presenting the claims of the new organization. We are assured by Miss Lathrop that the Union is strictly non-partisan and non-sectarian; that it proposes to keep itself clear of all entangling alliances, either religious or political, upon which there is room for wide difference of opinion among members; and that it will work along the single line of Christian temperance. We are sure that this one line affords ample scope for all the energies of the good ladies who join. We believe that the new organization is one with which all ladies can consistently work no matter what their religious convictions; and so long as it adheres to the plan that has been set before us, we wish it a hearty Godspeed.

A Question of Rights.

Although we are opposed to the Bennett Law in Wisconsin and its counterpart in Illinois, or anywhere else; and although we should like very much to see those laws everlastingly killed; yet at the same time we are constrained to say that we believe the opponents of those laws in those States have made a serious mistake in making it the issue in a political campaign. We believe that the opposition to those laws could have made a fight and gained a victory in another way, the effect of which would have been infinitely stronger and more lasting than anything that may be done, or any victory that may be gained in the way they are waging the contest. In the other way we believe victory for the opponents of the laws would have been absolutely certain, while in this way victory is at the very best uncertain.

What we mean is, that the opponents of these laws, instead of entering upon a political campaign to secure the repeal of the laws, should have planted themselves upon the ground of personal, private, parental, and religious *rights;* should have made the plea that those laws are unconstitutional in that they are an unwarranted invasion of such rights; and should have carried their plea to the Supreme Courts of their States. We say that in following this course, we believe victory would have been absolutely certain; because the Supreme Courts of both those States have already decided that it is the right of the parent to direct what subjects and to what extent his child shall study even in the public school; and that this right is above the authority of the public school teacher, or the public School Board. The Supreme Court of Wisconsin said:—

> Ordinarily, it will be conceded, the law gives the parent the exclusive right to govern and control the conduct of his minor children, and he has the right to enforce obedience to his commands by moderate and reasonable chastisement. And furthermore, it is one of the earliest and most sacred duties taught the child, to honor and obey its parents. The situation is truly lamentable, if the condition of the law is that he is liable to be punished by the parent for disobeying his orders in regard to his studies, and the teacher may lawfully chastise him for obeying his parents in that particular.

The Supreme Court of Illinois said:—

> Parents and guardians are under the responsibility of preparing children entrusted to their care and nurture, for the discharge of their duties in after life. Law-givers in all free countries, and, with few exceptions, in despotic governments, have deemed it well to leave the education and nurture of the children of the State to the direction of the parent or guardian. This is and has ever been, the spirit of our free institutions. The State has provided the means and brought them within the reach of all, to acquire the benefits of a common school education, but leaves it to parents and guardians to determine the extent to which they will render it available to the children under their charge.

Of these decisions Judge Prendergast says:—

> It has been decided by the Supreme Courts of Illinois and of Wisconsin that it is for the parents of children attending even the public schools, to determine the extent and the subjects of instruction to be acquired by the child, and that such parental determination *is to control school authorities and teachers.* If this be the law as to public schools, it is *a fortiori* the law as to private schools.

According to these decisions the battle of the opponents of these laws has already been fought and the victory won, and all they had to do was to claim the victory as theirs by carrying their case to the Supreme Courts of their States. For their contest is in defense of the parental rights and authority asserted in these decisions, and of private schools. And as Judge Prendergast says, if the determination of the parent is to control the authorities and teachers of the public school, how

much more must it be so in their own private schools.

In this way the question could have been argued and decided solely upon its merit, in the cool, dispassionate realm of law; all room for political antagonisms and sectarian bitterness would have been avoided; and the victory would have been complete, lasting and beneficial.

As it is, however, entering as they have upon a political campaign to secure the defeat of these laws, the immediate effect will be to multiply party antagonisms; to excite more deeply sectarian bitterness; to involve both the Lutheran and Catholic Churches in direct political action; and even if the campaign prove successful the victory can be but temporary, unless by constant political exertion they shall hold the power they shall have thus gained.

But it is not certain that the opponents of the laws will be successful in the campaign. *Reasonably* certain it may be; but absolutely certain it is not. There are thousands of men who care very little about the question considered upon its merits, or who, if it were only a case in court, would be inclined to favor the defeat of the laws; yet when it comes to voting for a Roman Catholic, or a candidate pledged to Roman Catholics, will vote against him for that reason only. It is easy enough to say and we agree that it ought not to be so; but that it *is* so no man can deny.

But suppose the opponents of these laws succeed in electing all their candidates even to the Governor, that in itself does not remedy the evil of the laws. That is a task that still remains to be done by the Legislature; and an important question is, will they be able to secure sufficient power in the Legislature to repeal the laws entirely, or to modify them so as to annul all bad features? or will they be compelled to adopt a compromise in the shape of some ambiguous phrases that will depend altogether upon the party in power for interpretation?

If they should fail in the political campaign and *then* attempt to make a test in law, it will be at an immense disadvantage. And besides it would be but to stultify themselves. For, to submit a question to the decision of a political campaign is to consent that it is a question which may be justly settled by majorities. It is to agree that you will assent to the decision whatever the result may be. But we do not believe that the Lutherans and Catholics in this case intend to assent to the righteousness of the decision, if they fail in the campaign, if the majority proves to be against them. If they do intend to assent, then they are in a most pitiable plight. The truth is that this is not a question of majorities at all, it is a question of *rights only*. And being a question of rights, and not of majorities, it has rightly no place in a political campaign.

But admitting it to be properly a question of majorities, even then a political campaign is the last resort. A successful campaign may secure the repeal of the law, but a successful campaign by the other side may at any time secure the re-enactment of the law. Whereas, if a favorable decision of the Supreme Court be given, that kills the law, and every other like it, forever. If, however, the Court should sustain the law, then a campaign issue would be in order.

We are free to say, that we sincerely hope, that, by whatever means it may be, the Bennett Law and its counterpart in Illinois may be so effectually swept away that in practice they may never be heard of more. Yet at the same time we are also free to say that we think the opponents of these laws have made a serious mistake in the method to be employed. The Lutherans and the Roman Catholics in these two States have started upon a course which they will find to be attended with large possibilities of mischief—possibilities of mischief scarcely less if they succeed, than if they fail in the present campaign.

A. T. J.

An Outrage.

THE Santa Rosa, California, *Republican* has the following editorial notice of the fining of R. M. King, a Seventh-day Adventist, in Tennessee, for working on Sunday:—

> And this occurred in one of the United States of America, in the latter part of the nineteenth century! Let us hear no more about Blue Laws and witch burning.
>
> The Seventh-day Adventists are a deeply religious people. Most faithfully do they observe the day which they believe is ordained of God for rest. On that day they do no work—transact no business. Often the day is kept at great inconvenience. But it is set apart by most members of the church and devoted to public and private worship.
>
> Then, too, the Seventh-day Adventists are generally conscientious and honest people. They are reliable, and can be depended upon. Their code of morals is founded on their construction of Bible declarations. As a class they are true to their convictions of right, and equity, and justice. With them all these things are not a matter of custom, but of profound conviction as to the desire and purpose of the Almighty.
>
> And in this country there are States having laws under which these people, who have religiously observed the day of the week which they believe was divinely set apart for that purpose, are fined for working on another day! It is an outrage to so interfere with the enjoyment of religious liberty.

The *Republican* ought to know whereof it affirms concerning Seventh-day Adventists, for the "Year Book of the California Conference" shows that Santa Rosa has a church of that denomination numbering sixty members. In this Tennessee case the victim of the bigotry of his neighbors, and of an unwise and wicked law, was clearly a man of excellent character; but that has nothing to do with the principle involved; the law would be just as bad if all who suffer under it were blacklegs. A law which makes possible persecution for conscience' sake, ought not to exist in any State for a day. The law has, however, been sustained by the Supreme Court of Tennessee, as appears from a notice in another column of this paper. This does not prove that the law is right; it only shows that the people of that State need to be educated in the correct principles of civil and religious liberty.

Sunday Laws and the Working People.

ONE argument much used in favor of Sunday laws is that such legislation is necessary to give the laboring classes a day of rest. Indeed this is a standard argument and it is urged in favor of both State and national laws for Sunday observance. Senator Blair, the father of the well-known Sunday-rest Bill now on the calendar of the Senate, has himself stated the case thus:—

> The mass of the working people would never get Sunday rest if there had not been a law of the land that gave it to us. There is that practical fact, and we are fighting for the tired, hungry man, woman, and child all over the country who want a chance to lie down and rest for twenty-four hours out of the whole seven days.

The Senator probably believes this to be true; but he is certainly mistaken if he does, for the mass of the people now have, without effective Sunday laws, all the rest that they have a mind to take on Sunday. California has, for about eight years, been without any Sunday law whatever, yet it is the testimony of even the friends of Sunday legislation, that the day is as well observed there as in States having such laws. A residence of six years in one of the largest cities of that State, as well as observation in the largest city in the State, warrants the writer in saying that California has fully as good and as general Sunday observance as States having Sunday laws; very much better than this city. Secular work and business are very generally suspended upon that day, and the great mass of laborers have opportunity to spend the day as they see fit. Of course a few are compelled to choose between losing their positions and working on Sunday, but that is no more true there than it is in States having Sunday laws.

It is a very general custom to give those who work on Sunday some other day off, and there are few indeed, if we except housewives and servant girls, who work seven days in the week. The legislation proposed by the Senator would not do that which he assumes that it would do. Sunday laws would, however, if they were framed as many demand that they shall be, virtually compel thousands to literally "lie down and rest" upon Sunday for it would make it impossible for them to do anything else. Only those who live in large cities can appreciate the privilege of an occasional outing in the country or in some park; but these Sunday-law people

would place all this beyond the reach of the poor by making it impossible for them to reach such places upon the only day that they can spend time to go to them; namely, upon Sunday. The rich can keep carriages and can on Sunday drive to these places or reach them upon other days either by private or public conveyances, but the poor cannot take the necessary time except on Sunday; and then if the hopes of the Sunday-law advocates should be realized, no public conveyances would be permitted on Sunday, and the rich would enjoy a monopoly of the parks and various resorts which now make life tolerable for the toiling masses in our great cities.

Of course Sunday holidayism is not desirable; no more is very much of other holidayism. People are likely on all such occasions to run to excess; but hosts of these people will not go to church and what are they to do? A leading paper in this city says:—

Almost anything is better, for people who are confined by work during the week, than to remain in the heated, noisy, and ill-smelling city on a hot Sunday. Sensible and sophisticated folk start early in the day and thus avoid the rush. They seek an unfrequented rather than a popular resort. They prefer the beach, the woods, the fields, to the best-dressed crowd that ever assembled. And when they find the right spot, they rest in the way which does them most good, whether it be a new and agreeable form of activity or sheer "lazing." It is a great thing to know how to rest and to cultivate a genius for repose.

But this sort of resting is just what the Sunday-law people are determined the people shall not do; they propose to make it impossible for poor people to get into such places on Sunday. This city has, in Central Park, two magnificent museums, one of art, another of natural history, but they are both closed on Sunday in deference to the demands of those who reverence the day. Referring to the last session of the Legislature of this State, the *Mail and Express* says:—

It is important to note that the Legislature did not altogether ignore, as some may be led to suppose, every measure having a moral bearing. It refused, for instance, to pass the bill providing for the opening on Sunday afternoons of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and the Museum of Natural History, in this city, and for this, every true believer in the sanctity of the Sabbath ought to be grateful. A large and powerful influence was brought to bear upon the Legislature in favor of this measure, and it is greatly to its credit that it did not pass.

It will be observed that the only reason urged here for not opening these museums on Sunday is the religious character of the day. A large number of people have a religious regard for Sunday, and for this reason those who do not so regard it, or who so regarding it do not think it wrong to look at paintings and other beautiful and interesting things upon that day, must be deprived of the privilege because of the feelings of those who think it wicked to spend any portion of Sunday in such a way. These people well know that there are thousands who cannot visit the museums upon other days, but they care not for this; they keep Sunday and so everybody else must keep it too; they take snuff and if others don't take snuff also, they must at least sneeze. What they propose is to so hedge them about with law that they will be compelled to choose between staying at home and going to church. It is the duty of the State, they argue, to look after the morals of the people; the people cannot be truly moral without going to church and being religious; so it is the duty of the State to so arrange matters that they will go to church and be religious; and the easiest way to secure this end is by Sunday laws.

There can be no doubt that Sunday laws are essentially religious. The *Christian Statesman* if less wise is more candid than some of its co-workers in the Sunday-law cause, and unhesitatingly declares that the only basis for such legislation is found in the fourth commandment. In support of this proposition the *Statesman* says:—

Judge Flandrau, of the Supreme Court of Minnesota, declared that the Sabbath law of that State "can have no other object than the enforcement of the fourth of God's commandments, which are a recognized and excellent standard of both public and private morals" (Brimhall *vs.* Van Campen, 8 Minnesota Reports, 13). Judge Caldwell, of the Supreme Court of Texas, held that "the object of the Legislature was to forbid all secular employments on the Sabbath, not excepted in the act. The disregard of the Sabbath, the refusal to recognize it as a day sanctified to holy purposes, constitutes the offense" (Elsner *vs.* the State, 30 Texas Reports, 524). The Supreme Court of Alabama said: "We do not think the design of the Legislature in the passage of the act can be doubted. It was evidently to promote morality and advance the interests of religion, by prohibiting all persons from engaging in their common and ordinary vocations" (O'Donnel *vs.* Sweeney, 5 Alabama Reports, 467. See also Wright *vs.* Geer, 1 Root, 474; Fox *vs.* Able, 2 Connecticut Reports, 548; George *vs.* George, 47 New Hampshire Reports, 27).

Of course the fourth commandment says nothing about Sunday, but, inasmuch as it is popularly supposed that it now enjoins the observance of that day, and inasmuch as the design of those demanding Sunday laws is to honor that day for religious reasons, Sunday laws have of necessity a distinctively religious character. They are religious legislation and utterly at variance with the spirit of our free institutions.

C. P. B.

The Precedent Lawyer.

In his address before the National Reform Convention in Washington, last April, Judge Hagans, of Cincinnati, said:—

Very early the *dies dominicus* was set apart and the people were not to be employed in secular business on that day. Legislation in England began in the reign of Henry VI., but a little more than a hundred years ago. During the reign of Charles II., a statute was passed, which is the origin or foundation of the various and somewhat dissimilar acts of the legislatures of the several States of the United States on this subject. . . . In every State in this Union, Sunday laws have been passed by our various legislatures containing provisions of more or less stringency, and construed and enforced by the highest courts, until a Sabbath of cessation from secular pursuits is firmly intrenched in American law, there to abide forever. . . . This legislation has come to stay in this land.

Here speaks the precedent lawyer. Because the legislatures and the courts have mistakenly perpetuated a Church and State Statute of Charles II., therefore, the error is "firmly intrenched in American law," and "there to abide forever," although in conflict with the spirit of American institutions and the letter of the injunction which the general Government lays upon itself in the First Amendment to the Constitution.

The Supreme Court and the Bible.

In the *Northern Wisconsin News* of May 8, we find the report of a sermon delivered by Rev. T. De Witt Peake, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at Merrill, Wisconsin, Sunday evening, April 27. It sounds much more like genuine Methodist doctrine than does the report of the New York Methodist Episcopal Conference rebuking the action of the Wisconsin Supreme Court in the case referred to. We wish the men of Mr. Peake's stamp were much more numerous, not only in the Methodist Church, but in all the other churches. We reprint the following extract from this sermon:—

It is known to all well-informed people in our State, that the Supreme Court of Wisconsin rendered a decision, March 18, which holds that the reading of the Bible in the public schools of the State is unconstitutional. The case was an unusual one, as well as a most important one. Doubtless, feeling the gravity of the situation, three of the Justices rendered separate opinions on different phases of the subject, the whole Court concurring in the decision on the main point at issue. The particular case at issue is known as the "Edgerton Bible Case," it having been the habit of some teachers in the Edgerton schools to read the Bible at the opening of the morning session each day, using the King James version of the Bible. Some of the Catholic parents of the little city, whose children attended the public schools, protested against this exercise, and appealed to the Circuit Court for a writ of *mandamus*, compelling the School Board to have the practice stopped or show cause for not doing so. An alternative writ was granted, to which the School Board responded, and the relators demurred thereto. The demurrer was overruled, and on this, appeal was taken to the Supreme Court, which decided that the order of the Circuit Court overruling the demurrer of the relators must be reversed, and the cause remanded with directions to that Court to give judgment

for the relators on the demurrer, awarding a peremptory writ of *mandamus* as prayed for in the petition.

Since this decision was given, many adverse opinions have been issued from the pulpit and the press, showing that the ligaments which bind the State and Church together, in other countries, are not entirely severed in this country, in the minds of many good and loyal citizens. Indeed, many of my own brethren, in my own church, which is the most thoroughly American church in the world, have been foremost in denouncing the decision as antichristian and un-American. Now, as much as I dislike to do so, I must dissent from their opinion, and affirm that I can see nothing antichristian, nothing antiprotestant, nothing un-American in the decision of the Court. At first I thought there was; being influenced by garbled extracts from the opinion of the Court, and by the adverse criticism thereon by men in high places. But having secured the full text of the opinion and having studied it closely with the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, I cannot see how the Court could have decided otherwise, and been American at all. And further, I think the decision will serve better the cause of truth and the Christian religion, as it is, than did it seek to re-knit the broken ligaments of Church and State, which it has taken centuries of bitter conflict and bloody struggle to sunder.

The American State, as I see it, is completely secular. It has no religion, as such, and is entirely indifferent to sects as such. Because this is the case, she gives each citizen religious liberty in the fullest sense, as a fundamental right. This means more than the toleration by law of differences of religious belief and of different modes of worship. The ideal American State is not to inquire into any man's belief, as affecting his qualifications for office nor to concern itself either for the support or hindrance of any form of religion.

Toleration denotes neither the freedom of religion from the State control, nor the equality of all religions before the law. On the contrary, it implies either a preference by the State of some one form of faith or worship, though other forms are permitted; or the right of the State to regulate the administration of ecclesiastical affairs by the civil law. In the etymological sense, toleration is the permitting of that which is not fully approved. In the ecclesiastical sense, it means definitely, the allowance of religious opinions, and modes of worship, in a State when contrary to or different from those of the established church or belief. Toleration is a concession, in part, of that control over religion which the State assumes to exercise, but which it so far permits to fall into abeyance.

Now, you can see that this is not the condition of things in the ideal American State. The religious liberty, guaranteed by the ideal American State, is absolute freedom of religious opinion and worship, a vested right of conscience, not derived through any grant of the civil power. All that the ideal American State can do is to protect her citizens in the enjoyment of these vested rights. Liberty of opinion, liberty of worship, liberty in all matters pertaining to religion, is not a privilege created, or conceded, by the State, but is a right inherent in the personality of the individual conscience; and the ideal American State is pledged, not only, not to interfere with that right, but to protect it.

Now, the Supreme Court only protected the Catholic conscience, at Edgerton, and their liberty to worship according to its dictates. The Court, in my judgment, could not have done less than this. We may deplore the case, we may think the Catholic conscience is wrong, that it is miseducated and narrow, but the Court had nothing to do with anything but the facts, that the conscience is there, and that its rights are being trampled upon. The Court had no right to inquire into the fact whether the Catholic Church is friendly to the common-school system or not, for the question was whether the individual conscience of the people of Edgerton, was abused by the religious exercises, held each morning in the public schools of the city? The Court had no business to ask whether it was a Catholic, or a Methodist, or a Baptist conscience, that had been or was being abused.

I think the attempt of any body of Christians to introduce their discriminating doctrines and practices into schools that are the common property of all citizens, should be set aside as a monstrous usurpation. Only by doing this can we have any harmony in the schools of the State at all, and without harmony but little good can be accomplished by them.

Religion and the State.—No. 2.

THE first form of government given to man, was committed to him by the Author of his existence, and was of a paternal nature. Under this, each head of a tribe became the absolute ruler of his family interests. He not only interested himself in the temporal welfare of his subjects, but was considered by them, their spiritual leader as well. This continued to be the criterion in the patriarchal age, but, as family circles enlarged, and connecting ties became more slender, individual interests became more and more antagonized, until it was necessary to institute another form of government, which would provide for the exigencies arising from the ever multiplying and divergent interests, and yet not encroaching upon purely personal rights enjoyed under the previously existing polity.

One of the God-given rights of every man, is to exercise parental authority in his family. It has been from the first, and is still, the privilege of parents to decide what rules shall govern in their respective households, without regard to how others govern in their families. It is also their privilege to instill just such principles, and to teach just such behavior toward themselves and all others, as they may think proper and right. This authority has the sanction of both the Old and New Testaments in the following expressions: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it" (Prov. 22: 6,); and, "Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Eph. 6: 4.

By these injunctions parents are alone made responsible for the moral well-being of their children, consequently, are given absolute control of their moral training. The civil government has no such credentials, and therefore has not the least right to interfere with the direction of any household, unless, perchance, its inmates are jeopardized in life or limb, by the despotic sway of unnatural parents. In this case, the civil power may step in, and protect the child from physical injury.

The Church, like the family, is paternal or instructive in its government. It, too, decides its own tenets of faith, and rules of discipline. The Church holds a commission from Heaven to preach the gospel, and administer the ordinances thereof. By virtue of that commission, it rightfully extends its occupation to become the guardian of family morals. But while the Church is thus permitted to give religious instruction to as many families as wish it, there are certain limits, beyond which it has no right to go. The Church may counsel parents how to train their children for heaven, but it has no commission to usurp authority over the children, because that has been reserved to parents alone.

Civil government is essentially different from that of both the Church and the family, in that its functions are wholly of a civil nature. In other words, it is that form of government which guards the social privileges, and prescribes the civil duties of all under its jurisdiction, without regard to their religious beliefs. Civil government has to do with the people, only as citizens, without regard to Christianity. The Church, on the other hand, deals with its members simply as Christians, without authority to inflict civil penalties. The State formulates civil law for all alike, within its precincts, whether Christian or unbeliever. The Church has but spiritual authority, and that only over those who profess faith in the tenets of the Church, and have formally connected themselves with it.

But the test of citizenship is not based on any religious creed. So long as one duly regards the rights of others, as human beings, and readily meets his part of the obligations which rest alike on all;

so long as he promptly discharges all the demands of the government upon him, the State must recognize him as a good citizen, even though he may be an atheist. The State, as such, can know no difference between a Christian and an unbeliever. This must necessarily be so, from the fact that Christianity relates wholly to another world, to things spiritual and eternal, while civil governments have to do entirely with the affairs of this world—with the temporal only.

A State cannot properly enter the realm of religion, to direct its methods, or restrain its operations when properly conducted, that is, so long as it does not trespass upon the domain of the civil, for the reason that true religion is from a higher source than human authority, and its subjects are responsible to a higher than an earthly tribunal. Christianity is founded on the unchangeable word of Jehovah, while earthly governments are ever being modified to meet the rapidly changing conditions of society. These varying phases are produced by majorities, which are often created through political cabal or personal magnetism. To subject religion to the control of such influences, is to delegate it to the domain of human strife, and the corruptions of party power.

Again, religion being a matter between the individual soul and its God, no one person has a right to make his conscience the rule by which to guide another, in things spiritual. The same principles obtain, in relation to majorities. The greater part of a community may be agreed concerning some matter of conscience; but, if only one among them holds a different opinion, his rights of conscience are just as sacred as those of all the others, and should be respected. Then, for the majority of a community to dominate the minority in matters of conscience, is to assume infallibility in spiritual affairs; and so, to make the consciences of the larger part, the rule of conscience for all others. That would be unjust; for while it would permit the majority to exercise spiritual discretion, it would forbid that privilege to all who happened to be in the minority. Moreover, such a state of things would subject the minority to others who would make their religious creeds, regulate their mode of worship, and tax them for the support of a religion which the majority might think to be true, but which they themselves may believe to be false.

But when a religious majority are engaged in such work, they are not exercising their own rights of conscience, but are trampling on the rights of others, instead. It is safe to say that any Christian would come to this conclusion if the proper test were brought to bear in his case. Suppose, for instance, that in the turn of human affairs, a pagan majority should prevail in a country composed largely of Christians, and should compel all Christians to support paganism: Would Christians who then happened to be in the minority, consider themselves justly treated, when compelled to support a religion in which they had no faith? Certainly not. But would it be any less wrong for a majority of Christians to compel a person dissenting from the faith of Christianity, to support that religion?

This is doubtless putting the question in a form in which some have not before considered it. But is it not reasonable to believe that the Golden Rule, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them," has as forcible application in a matter of this kind as in any other? The rights of conscience are individual, and cannot be settled by arraying the larger number against the smaller. Therefore, whatever faith a man's conscience may lead him to adopt, even though he may stand alone in the community, if that conscience is exercised peaceably, and not against the rights of another person, its rights should be recognized and as fully protected, as those of all the others. J. O. CORLISS.

Working for a Sunday Law.

AT the late Sunday Convention at San Jose, California, a resolution was introduced by Dr. Evans, requesting the City Council of San Jose to pass an ordinance forbidding the use of bands of music on Sunday upon any street within one block of a church. The resolution was called out by the fact that some of the churches had recently been disturbed by bands of music during their services. The ministers and church people of San Jose, as in some other cities, seem determined to ignore the State law already in force for the purpose of protecting public worship against disturbance. Section 302 of the Penal Code provides as follows:—

> Every person who willfully disturbs or disquiets any assemblage of people met for religious worship, by noise, profane discourse, rude or indecent behavior, or by any unnecessary noises either within the place where such meeting is held, or so near as to disturb the order and solemnity of the meeting, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

And such misdemeanor, according to section 19, is punishable by "imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding six months, or by a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or both." Why do not the disturbed churches avail themselves of the protection here guaranteed not only for Sunday worship, but for worship on any other day? Do they not fear that the recognition of this comprehensive State law would annul their plea for a special Sunday law? There seems to be no other excuse for such action. To some extent this explains the following resolution, passed by the Convention, which is apparently designed to concentrate all the protection for worship on *one* day, namely, Sunday:—

> The Sabbath was made for man, and God has given it by moral statue. While it is necessary to man as a religious being, yet independent of this, because of the physical, mental, moral, and social benefits resulting from it, it should have a place in the Civil Code of our State, guaranteeing its privileges and benefits to every citizen. Forever opposed to any union of Church and State, denying the right of the State to enforce its religious observance simply because the Sabbath has a religious character, nevertheless we insist that the laws of our State should protect the Sabbath as a day of rest for all, and a day for unmolested religious worship to those who wish to so observe it. Therefore,
>
> *Be it resolved,* That we invite the co-operation of all good citizens in securing a Sabbath law in the State of California which shall protect all our citizens in their right to one rest day in seven.

Of course that *one* rest day must be on Sunday. The Penal Code above quoted protects worship on any and every day; but that appears to be too sweeping, so it is quietly laid on the shelf, and a law is sought for the protection of one day. People who choose to worship on any other day are not worthy of protection.

But the resolution which called out the most discussion, and indeed the only one which received any opposition on its merits, was that regarding Sunday newspapers. It reads as follows:—

> *Resolved,* That it is the sense of this Convention that the taking of mail from the post-office on the Sabbath, the reading or purchasing of Sunday newspapers on the Lord's day, or the publishing of church notices or other matters in such papers, are to be discouraged as violations of the fourth commandment.

Dr. Calhoun said that he had not given a notice to a Sunday paper in ten years; that the Ministers' Union had often resolved not to have their church notices inserted in the Sunday papers, but in a short time afterward "some fellow" would break over, and like a flock of sheep the the others would follow.

Dr. R. H. Mc Donald said he thought we ought to make the best use possible of that which we cannot control; so long as we cannot get rid of the Sunday newspaper, let us use it for all the good purposes possible. He would, as a matter of policy, drop out that resolution from the committee's report.

Rev. T. B. Stewart, of San Francisco, grew quite warm over the subject, and charged the hoodlumism of his city mainly to the account of the Sunday newspaper. He thought that a minister who did not use all his influence against it, should be denounced by his brethren.

This called out remonstrance from Rev. Silcox, of Oakland, who thought this was going too far. He said these papers were regularly issued, giving notice as to all other things that were going on in the city, and he thought it proper that they should also tell where the gospel could be heard. Of course he was opposed to the issuance of papers on Sunday, but as long as they were issued, they might be used to give such information.

Dr. Minton seconded Mr. Silcox' point; said he did not think the publishers of Sunday papers, were worse than other men; that they worked for money. He

was opposed to Sunday papers, however, and did not directly give them any notices, but they copied his notices from the Saturday evening papers as news items.

Even Rev. N. R. Johnston was opposed to the idea of denouncing brother ministers in regard to this matter, but before he got through, he was charged with doing that same thing himself. Said Rev. Stewart, "You are worse than I am, Brother Johnston." The speaker was strong in his utterances against the Sunday paper, and the habit of going to the post-office on that day. He instanced the case of a neighbor of his, a deacon in the Congregationalist Church, who would go to the post-office after his mail on his way home from church.

A Mr. Ross was very emphatically opposed to Sunday papers, and stoutly decried their deleterious influence. He *had two of them coming to his house*, and he seemed to be well posted as to their contents. He urged the necessity of a Sunday law, that these papers might be stopped. We have heard many complaints of the Sunday papers, but never knew that Christian people were obliged to take them if they didn't want to. In fact, one speaker expressed the opinion that if one thousand people would stop the *Sunday Mercury* of San Jose, it would soon cease to be issued.

The Committee of Ways and Means presented propositions, among which were recommendations that ministers present frequently to their congregations the moral statute, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." That prayers around family altars and in prayer-meetings be offered for better Sabbath observance and a righteous Sunday law in California. That tracts on the religious duty and civil requirements of the Sabbath be put into all homes. That the aid of the religious and secular press be invoked in behalf of this cause. That conventions be held in every county in the State, to work up sentiment. That as soon as possible an efficient field secretary be put into the field to hold public meetings and organize local associations in advocacy of a Sunday law for this State. That all churches, societies, and corporations favorable to this movement be requested to take collections of money to further the work. That a State convention in the interest of a Sunday law be held as soon as the State committee shall deem advisable.

Thus are the enemies of religious liberty working in the name of liberty. While they claim to be working under the banner of the Declaration of Independence, which claims that all men are created free and equal, their efforts only comprehend the liberty of a class,—those who *want* to keep Sunday. To compel others to do so, is to take away their liberty. But such is all governmental interference with religion; such is all religious legislation, of whatever character.—*W. N. G., in Signs of the Times.*

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.*

J. O. CORLISS, Field Secretary of the National Religious Liberty Association, is speaking in New Hampshire, in defense of the principles of religious liberty as expressed in the First Amendment to the Constitution, and advocated by the Association. The Concord *Evening Monitor*, of June 2, publishes an excellent report of an address, by Mr. Corliss, which appeals in forcible and unmistakable terms to every citizen and every legislator. The discourse was an able arraignment of the two measures,—the joint resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution, requiring the teaching of the principles of religion in the public schools; and the bill for a national Sunday law.

The closing comment is worthy the attention of every American citizen: "The people should look into this matter and say to those who are sent to Congress, 'Don't put your hand upon our religious liberties.'"

Religious Liberty Involved.

A DISPATCH from Nashville, Tennessee, to the *Sun*, June 15, says:—

The Supreme Court of Tennessee has just rendered a decision affirming the action of the lower court in the case of the State *vs.* R. M. King. This case was appealed from the Circuit Court held in Troy, Obion County, last March, and has attracted much attention on account of the religious question involved in it. Mr. King is a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, a sect which observes the seventh day (Saturday) as the Sabbath, instead of Sunday, the first day of the week. The defense has been made by the National Religious Liberty Association, an organization of recent origin, which admits no one into its membership who does not believe in the Christian religion, but holds that the functions of religion and the State are entirely distinct, and, for the interests of both, should be kept separate. Mr. King is a farmer, and was indicted for quietly working on his own premises, not in sight of any place of public worship. None of the witnesses for the State testified to having been disturbed in any way or to having a knowledge that any one else had been disturbed, except that their moral sense had been shocked by seeing work done on Sunday.

The defendant was first arraigned before a Justice of the Peace, and fined three dollars and costs, amounting in all to about twelve dollars, which he paid. He was afterward indicted for the same offense by the Grand Jury of Obion County, and was fined seventy-five dollars. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court on the plea (1) that the acts complained of and proven did not constitute a nuisance, as charged in the indictment; (2) that the Court erred in not permitting the defendant to prove that he had been once arrested, tried, convicted, and fined for the same offense, and that he had paid the fine and costs; (3) on the ground of the appeal of the Attorney-General to the the religious prejudices of the jury, by his bitter denunciations of the religious views of the defendant, and confounding the sect with which he is connected with the Mormons.

The case will be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States. This will be the first case involving the constitutionality of Sunday laws that has been brought before the United States Supreme Court.

An association has been organized in Tennessee, the members of which pledge themselves to prosecute every violation of the Sunday laws. A number of persons who observe the seventh day as the Sabbath are now under indictment for working on Sunday. They are tenacious of their faith, and claim the right, under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights of the State of Tennessee, to work on Sunday. In view of recent movements in favor of a national Sunday law, and the opposition to this and all other religious legislation by the National Religious Liberty Association, the progress of this case through the Court will be watched with deep interest by many.

AN Iowa paper, of June 14, says:—

The German Lutheran Synod, in session at Dubuque this week, has 300 ministers, 450 congregations, and 50,000 communicants, and is spread over fourteen States. Delegates were present from Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Ohio, Missouri, Michigan, and Washington. The Convention was opened by the President, the Rev. Prof. G. Grosswell, D. D., of Waverly, Iowa. Reports were read denouncing the Bennett Law. The Synod resolved to introduce Barnes' school text-books of the American Book Company in the parochial schools.

And this is the people who, we are told, have to be forced by law to educate their children in English.

NEW YORK, JUNE 26, 1890.

No Paper Next Week.

AS THE SENTINEL volume for this year is to consist of fifty numbers, we will issue no paper next week. Number 27 will therefore bear date of July 10.

THE president of the Young Men's Christian Association of Indianapolis, has been asked to resign because as president of a street railway company he ran extra cars on Sunday to a suburban resort of doubtful character. The demand for his resignation comes from the Presbyterian ministers of that city.

DURANGO, Colorado, has a Sunday law entitled, "An Ordinance Requiring the Observance of the Sabbath." But of course it is a mere "police regulation," a "sanitary measure," to secure to the "tired son of toil a day of rest." It must be so for with the exception of the title it is almost identical with numerous State and municipal acts which we are assured are purely civil.

THE *Western Herald* published at Burlington, Iowa, comes to us filled with hard arguments against Sunday laws and kindred religious legislation. Referring to the efforts of the Sunday-law advocates the *Herald* says: "It has taken centuries to evolve separation of Church and State, and now we are asked to surrender our vantage ground, and relapse once more into the darkness of the mediæval ages."

JUNE 11 and 12, there was held in this city a Temperance Congress representing every shade of temperance sentiment in the country, the only condition required of delegates, being opposition to the saloon. The Congress was large and enthusiastic, and while it adopted no platform and passed no resolutions, there was no room to doubt that an overwhelming majority present were third party Prohibitionists. The readers of THE SENTINEL need not be told that it is opposed to the liquor traffic, yet we could not help feeling that there was a spirit manifested in the Congress which bodes no good to the country; it was the spirit of intolerance, and of government by clamor. Speaking of the Supreme Court decision in the original package cases, one speaker said that if the Constitution upheld the liquor traffic, he was in favor of spitting on the Constitution and stepping on it. If the Constitution as it is upholds the liquor traffic, we say let us respect it and abide by it until such time as public sentiment shall be educated up to the point of amending the Constitution. The country can get along very well without the patriotism that proposes to spit on the Constitution.

WHEN Mr. Crafts started west across the Continent on his Sunday-law tour, we announced his appointments, which, it will be remembered, were invariably at one of two or three places each particular date. As he returns, he finds it necessary to make his appointment each date to be at any one of a series of from one to seven different places. They are as follows:—

June 27, Watertown, South Dakota, or St. Peter, Minnesota, or Mankato or Fergus Falls; June 29, Minneapolis; June 30, Winona or Faribault or Northfield or Owatonna or Hastings or Red Wing; July 1, Madison, Wisconsin, or La Crosse or Green Bay; July 2, Madison or Prairie du Chien or Freeport or Galesburg or Dubuque or Davenport or Burlington; July 3, Des Moines or Cedar Rapids or Iowa City or Indianola or Keokuk.

This form of appointment, says Secretary Gault, is "in order that the organizers of the opposition may not get on his track." It is well for the American Sabbath Union thus to advertise his fear of the opposition. Why does n't he rally his seven million two hundred thousand Roman Catholic petitioners for a national Sunday law, and at one stroke overwhelm the opposition?

A READER has sent us a report of the Gloucester County (N. J.) Temperance Alliance clipped from the *Gloucester Constitution*, which is of interest because of one bit of information which it contains. Referring to an effort which had been made in the name of the Alliance to prevent the issuance of a liquor license to Lincoln Park Company, the chairman of the committee having the matter in charge said:—

In conversation with the judges your chairman told them *our principal objection to Lincoln Park was the fear of Sunday selling and the consequent disgrace to our county.*

Some further history of the case then follows, and the report concludes thus:—

Our attorney stated plainly our objections. Then Mr. McGowen, the President [of the Park company] and Mr. Patterson, the applicant, personally stated that no liquor would be sold on Sunday; that all the laws would be obeyed. . . . Upon receiving these assurances, on the advice of counsel, your chairman consented to withdraw the remonstrance. Our counsel made the announcement to the court, the judges nodded their approval, and in a few minutes publicly announced that the license to keep an inn and tavern at Lincoln Park was granted.

This shows the drift of much of the so-called temperance sentiment, and is right in line with something which appeared some months since in the *California Prohibitionist:* a correspondent of that paper remarked that if the saloons would only close on Sunday, he thought it was about all that could be reasonably asked of them.

"MORAL forces," said Mrs. Mary T. Lathrap at the recent Temperance Congress in this city, "are the imperial forces, and the nation is safe only when its moral forces are on the throne. I believe that in some of our great cities, and in some eastern commonwealths, we are reaching a moral deadlock, when the moral forces are beaten down, and beaten back by the forces of evil around them. Now I believe that the Church is the party, and ought to be the organized expression of moral forces in government just as I believe that the saloon is the organized form of the devil's kingdom on earth."

Let us examine this a little. "The moral forces are the imperial forces."

"The nation is safe only when its moral forces are on the throne."

"The Church is the organized expression of moral forces in government."

The inevitable conclusion is that the Church should be upon the throne. And yet, in common with other National Reformers, Mrs. Lathrap would no doubt indignantly deny any desire to unite Church and State in this country or to subject the State to the Church.

A JUDGE in Pennsylvania, lately rendered a decision on "works of necessity and mercy" on Sunday, in which he declared that Sunday could not be surrendered to the fierce rivalry to get gain, and that "it has come down to us with the most solemn sanctions, both of God and man, and if we do not appreciate it as we ought, we are, at least, bound to preserve it."

Upon which, the *Pearl of Days* remarks:—

Above all else, the supreme will of God as to what the Sabbath day was given to man for should enable us to decide questions of supposed necessity.

Exactly! That is the real reason in all the arguments for Sunday laws that are made, and it shows the hollow pretenses to virtue in the arguments of those who plead for the "civil" Sunday.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,

DEVOTED TO

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

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

SINGLE COPY, PER YEAR, POST-PAID, ... $1.00.
In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, ... 75c.
To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, 5s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.