



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

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 20, 1890.

NUMBER 46.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN,

W. H. McKEE.

OUR public schools are secular, and must ever remain so if religious freedom is to abide. Let the churches look to the matter of religious education; we Presbyterians will do our part to it, and we ask no subsidy. Let the fathers and mothers do their part; "an ounce of mother is worth a pound of priest." And let the State attend to its own business in the non-sectarian education of the children of the land.—*Rev. Dr. Burrell.*

A CHURCH known to be the slave of the State would not have much influence with the mass of the people in restraining anarchy and making them good citizens, and politicians would ever be tempted to turn aside the Church from its proper spiritual work. The heresy, for it is a heresy, of making the Church subservient to the State, is called Erastianism because inculcated by Erastus, a learned physician in Heidelberg toward the end of the sixteenth century, who claimed for the civil magistrate the power of exercising discipline and of excommunication in the Church.—*James McCosh, D.D., LL.D., Princeton, New Jersey.*

THE Czar of Russia, in the exercise of his paternal sovereignty, has ordered the Protestant missionaries to leave Russia, to cease proselyting. He has also ordered all Jews to leave his dominions, and the order is being carried out with great severity. In the Baltic provinces he is crushing out Lutheranism and the German language. It is evident that the

paternal ruler has taken his cue from the dethroned Pope, who secured uniformity of religion and language by the same tyrannical, oppressive means. By the way, the Czar is head of the Greek Church. This is another fact that illustrates the folly, or, more properly, the crime of uniting Church and State. Politics and religion, when mixed in a ruler, bring misery and poverty to the people.—*Loyal American.*

Is It Unsectarian?

PRESIDENT WESTBROOK'S call for the Congress of the American Secular Union, recently held at Portsmouth, Ohio, contained the following statement, which we wish to examine a little in the light of the Congress itself, and of the official utterances made there:—

The American Secular Union is strictly unsectarian and non-partisan in both religion and politics. It is not, either publicly or privately, committed to the advancement of any system of religious belief or disbelief, but heartily welcomes all persons, of whatever faith, to its membership, on the basis of "no union of Church and State." The word "secular" is here used in the broadest sense, as applied to the State, and not to any system of religious philosophy.

The object of the Union is thus stated, by Mr. Westbrook, in the same call:—

Its object is to secure the total separation of Church and State, in fact and in form, to the end that equal rights in religion, genuine morality in politics, and freedom, virtue, and brotherhood be established, protected, and perpetuated.

With this we have no fault to find. On the contrary we hold that this is a worthy object. We fear, however, that instead of being the object it is only an object, and possibly a secondary object at that. In giving an account of the opening of the Portsmouth Congress, the *Truth Seeker* says:—

The hall was filled to hear J. L. Treuthart welcome his fellow-Freethinkers. The Portsmouth Union, he said, welcomed the Congress as a child receives a visit of a parent. There was also a large public sentiment favoring the objects of the Union. He also welcomed the Union on behalf of the school children who were entitled to know that facts never

contradict truth. For two thousand years the astronomers had been making almanacs, and calculating eclipses and other movements of the heavenly bodies. What would become of astronomy, he asked, if some Joshua could take hold of the spokes of the wheel of time and stop the revolution of the earth?

Now we do not deny Mr. Treuthart's right to say just what he pleases about the story of Joshua; but why he should address a "strictly unsectarian" Congress in that manner does not seem clear. Nor do we understand what it has to do with the separation of Church and State. However, this was unofficial, and we will leave it for something from one of the officers of the Union. In her official address, the Corresponding Secretary, Miss Ida Craddock, said:—

At this time the American Secular Union is confronted with two distinct lines of policy from which to choose. One is the policy which it has steadily maintained during the past year, of strict non-partisanship in religious matters, and open-handed hospitality to all who believe in total separation of Church and State, whether the applicant for membership be Deist or Atheist, Freethinker or Churchman.

The other policy looks further than the mere separation of Church and State. It demands perpetual and unflinching hostility to the Christian religion, and an aggressive warfare whose aim is finally to cripple the Church, if not to kill it off entirely.

This states that there are two lines of policy, but is non-committal as to which one the Union has adopted; nor does it say which one Miss Craddock herself thinks the better one. The following from the same address, however, supplies the lack, and is a declaration of war on religion:—

But my great concern is: How shall we reach the young? How shall we save them from falling into that religious superstition which puts the cross higher than their moral duty as good citizens, and which teaches them to consider what the Church sneeringly calls "mere morality" as of little account in the sight of the Deity whom they worship?

How shall we fit them to take the vacant places in the Liberal ranks—places left vacant almost monthly by the death of our gray-haired veterans?

That is, "How shall we" (the Secular Union, of course) "make infidels of the

children?" And this in the face of the statement of the President that the Union is unsectarian and "not either publicly or privately committed to the advancement of any system of religious belief or *disbelief*."

Nor is this all; Miss Craddock's subject was "Organization," and she not only pointed out work to be done by the Union, but she proposed plans. The following is one of them:—

Personally, I should like to see established throughout the country Freethought Sunday-schools, where children could be saved on Sunday from the allurements of the Church. We may be quite sure that, if we don't look out for our children on that day, the Church will draw them in.

Now we have no fault to find with this plan, nor with Miss Craddock for proposing it. The Secular Union has just the same right to teach infidelity that we have to teach Christianity; but they have no right to do it and at the same time insist that the Union is unsectarian, and that it "is not committed to the advancement of any system of belief or unbelief."

We are surprised at the attitude of the Secular Union, and especially are we surprised at the Corresponding Secretary, who at another stage of the meeting, said:—

The policy of strict non-sectarianism in religion, which we have zealously striven to maintain during the past year, is already bearing good fruit, notwithstanding the gloomy prophecies of some few of our more radical friends throughout the country. By adopting a moderate and persuasive tone, we have succeeded in getting our principles advertised prominently in several of the leading Christian papers of the country, thus bringing our ideas before thousands of Church people who would not otherwise have known how very reasonable are the demands we make; and we have some more work of the same sort in hand now, of which we are not at liberty to speak.

So long as the Secular Union remained purely a secular affair, there was no reason why Christian journals should not advertise its principles, for "secularism" means, "The state or quality of being secular;" and "secular" means, "Pertaining to this present world, or to things not spiritual or holy." "Secularism" is not, therefore, a synonym for infidelity, and very many Christians and some Christian papers are secularists, that is, they believe in keeping Church and State entirely separate; and to this end they can co-operate with all who are laboring for the same object; but every Christian and every Christian paper must defend the Christian religion when it is attacked, or else cease to be Christian. It follows that when as an organization, the Secular Union proposes to strike down Christianity, it cuts off the co-operation of all Christians.

And not only so, but by assuming such an attitude as this, the Secular Union is strengthening the hands of the National Reformers, for they virtually say that did they believe in Christianity they too would be National Reformers. That is, opposing

State recognition of religion *because they do not believe in religion* is only to say that did they believe in religion they would favor such recognition. They thus abandon the broad principle of religious liberty, the common ground upon which the purest Christians and the most pronounced infidels have in the past fought side by side for their God-given rights, and assent that the question instead of being one of inalienable human rights is one of fact. But to this we can never agree. We maintain that the truth or falsity of the Christian religion has nothing whatever to do with this question. This we believe to be the only consistent position, and to take any other is to abandon the principle of religious liberty and concede that the whole matter is only a question of majorities.

We hope to say more upon this subject next week; at which time we shall examine some of President Westbrook's reasons for opposing the reading of the Bible in schools supported by the State. We shall likewise have something to say about the proposed manual for the teaching of morality in the public schools. C. P. B.

Why We Oppose Sunday Laws.

WE object to Sunday laws not because they require the observance of that particular day but because of the principle involved. Sunday laws are wrong, they work hardship and injustice, they tend to destroy free heart service to God, thus making hypocrites. For these and similar reasons we oppose and would oppose all such measures. Disguise their motive as they may by pleas for a rest day for the laboring man, the fact remains that the great majority of those who desire such laws make the demand *because they regard Sunday as a sacred day*. Therefore the passage of a Sunday law is State interference in religious matters and involves the judicial decision of religious questions. It follows that by enacting such laws the State usurps a prerogative of God. And not only so, but Sunday laws are unjust to man. There are in every State, and indeed in almost every neighborhood, three classes, namely, (1) Christians who regard Sunday religiously, (2) Christians who do not regard Sunday, but who do regard the seventh day, and (3) non-religious persons who regard all days alike. Sunday laws necessarily discriminate between these classes. If, as is sometimes the case, the seventh-day Christians are exempted from the provisions of the law, then it is a fact that they are favored above others simply because they are Christians. They are granted certain privileges on account of their religion, and that is contrary to the spirit of American institutions. If they are not exempted and are required to obey the law and refrain from Sunday work, they are deprived of one-sixth of

their God-given time for conscience' sake. But in any event the non-religious are forced to observe, to some extent, a religious institution in which they have no faith. C. P. B.

Memorials of 1829-30. No. 1.

A MEMORIAL FROM SENATOR BLAIR'S STATE.

IN the interesting Sunday agitation of 1829-30, petitions, both for and against the discontinuance of Sunday mails, were sent to Congress from all parts of the country. Considerable interest was aroused, and even in Congress politicians were found to champion both causes. Several reports were written; but the most influential, and the ones receiving the approbation of Congress, were those written by Colonel Johnson, of Kentucky, afterwards Vice-President of the United States.

As the same question has been again introduced in our National Assembly by Senator Blair, of New Hampshire, whose Sunday Bill is now in the committee rooms of Congress, perhaps some of the old documents which aided so materially in the defeat of Sunday legislation sixty years ago, will be of interest to the readers of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL. The first I shall send you is a memorial from Senator Blair's own State. It reads as follows:—

To the Honorable, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

The subscribers, citizens of the United States, and inhabitants of Portsmouth, in the county of Rockingham, and State of New Hampshire, having been informed that petitions have been, and are about to be presented to Congress by many of our fellow-citizens, in various sections of the country, praying that the transportation of the mail upon the first day of the week may be discontinued, we beg leave respectfully to remonstrate against granting the prayer of said petitioners, for the following, among other reasons:

We believe that the measure proposed by said petitioners, if carried into effect, would operate unfavorably upon the interests of the Post-office Department, and would occasion much inconvenience to our citizens generally; that it would wholly fail of effecting its avowed object, and would, in the end, *injure rather than promote the cause of true religion*; that, however pure and patriotic may have been the motives in which it originated, the measure has found its support among a majority of its friends more in their zeal than in their knowledge: yet we cannot but regard the steps they are taking as movements hostile to the liberties of the people, and we are persuaded that the *original movers* of the measure designed it as a stepping-stone to more sensible inroads upon our religious privileges. By establishing the principle it involves, *they hope to silence remonstrance against their future enterprises*, and contend successfully *with weapons furnished them by Congress*.

The supporters of the measure are sufficiently protected in their worship, and in the enjoyment of their religious privileges, by the laws of their respective States, and this is all they have a right to demand; while others are not permitted to disturb them, they should not, as we humbly conceive, be permitted to disturb others; they have not, to our knowledge, been appointed by the Almighty the defenders of his honor, or the avengers of his injuries. The experience of all ages fully testifies the deplorable consequences of arming religion with the power of the laws. Church and State were never united,

but the articles of their union were subsequently sealed with blood.

In an enlightened community, blessed with free and liberal institutions, *religious despotism can only be established insensibly, and by degrees. Every approach to it should be vigilantly guarded against by the Government.* Knowing that in all ages, down to the present time, the clergy have been enterprising and ambitious, seizing eagerly upon power, and exercising it without reason and without mercy, it would be arrogance in those of the present age to claim an exemption from similar propensities; and, even were they to claim it, their claim would not be credited by careful observers of their conduct. When we consider the number, talents, and influence of this body of men, their zeal and activity, the intimate union that exists among them, and the concert with which all their movements are accomplished; the astonishing credulity of many of their adherents; the support they derive from numerous religious corporations and societies, rapidly increasing in numbers and in wealth; the almost unlimited control which they exercise over our colleges and other literary institutions, with no power but the laws, which they are ambitious to control, to watch or check them—we see reason to dread even their unassisted efforts to deprive us of our liberties; but especially should we deprecate arming them with powers which properly belong only to the people and the rulers of their choice—powers, like in other days, to tread on the necks of kings, dictate laws to nations, and murder millions with impunity. *We cannot shut our eyes to the visible fact that the clergy are the prime movers, the life and soul of the measure prayed for by the petitioners.*

With these views and feelings, we deem it our sacred duty respectfully but solemnly, to remonstrate against the measure prayed for by said petitioners, and we feel conscious that *in so doing we shall best subserve the cause of true religion and the interests of our beloved country.**

These reasons, urged so forcibly and so successfully against Sunday legislation sixty years ago, are equally applicable today. What was the "life and soul" of that movement, is the "life and soul" of the present movement—and now, as then, the move is simply a stepping-stone to further legislation in the same line.

W. A. BLAKELY.

University of Michigan.

Is the State Supreme?

A CORRESPONDENT sends us a long defense of Sunday laws, from which we take the following extract:—

The question involves nothing more nor less than the conscience of the individual in conflict with the will of the State, and the decision heretofore by eminent jurists, has been, that "the State must not waver." Why? Because "the State is supreme." If the will of the State is to be bandied about "by every wind of doctrine," then it will be plain to every reasoning mind, the State can never proceed upon any well-regulated system of law, and "without system there can be no rule of action," which will not do for a State. Well, but, you will now say, the State has nothing to do with conscience. Indeed! I have just shown that where the will of the State is opposed by the conscience of the individual "the State must not waver."

Certainly "the question is nothing more nor less than the conscience of the individual in conflict with the will of the State;" it does not follow, however, that "the State must not waver." In its legitimate sphere "the State is supreme and must not waver;" but the domain of con-

science is a domain that the State has no right to invade. By "conscience," we mean, as defined by Webster, "the faculty, power, or principle which decides on the lawfulness or unlawfulness of our actions [the divine law being the standard], and approves or condemns them."

This domain, we say, the State has no right to invade; and it needs no extended argument to prove this proposition. It has been truly said of civil government, that "the domain which it invades it dominates; the jurisdiction which it takes it keeps." This fact alone should forever exclude it from the sacred precincts of the soul, for no man can ever surrender his conscience to the keeping of another and maintain his own self-respect, to say nothing of his loyalty to his God.

Governments have in past ages assumed to dominate the realm of conscience; the sequel is the history of the Inquisition. The thumbscrew, the rack, and the fagot are inseparable from the theory advocated by our correspondent. He may affirm that he would not carry it so far as that, but it is impossible for him to stop short of it without abandoning his theory. It is for this reason that we oppose all Sunday laws; they are the beginnings of intolerance; they necessarily trench upon the most sacred right of man, namely, the right to worship (which carries with it the right not to worship) just as seemeth him good.

Sunday is, and always was, a religious festival. It was originally sacred to the worship of the sun god, and is now very generally regarded as commemorating the resurrection of Christ, and is by many held to be the Sabbath. If it were not regarded as sacred there would be no demand for laws enforcing its observance. It is therefore a matter that the State has no right to touch.

It is true that the friends of Sunday legislation have learned wisdom by past experience, and endeavor as much as possible to keep in the background the fact that their motive is religious, but they can never get away from the facts. They demand a "civil Sabbath;" but what they mean is a religious Sabbath enforced by civil law. Mr. Crafts himself says: "Take the religion out and you take the rest out;" and right in harmony with this utterance is the following "plank" from the platform of the Pennsylvania Prohibitionists:—

The Sabbath must be preserved by the due enforcement of existing laws and the speedy enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary to insure its due observance.

The words "Sabbath" and "due observance" are not civil, or secular, but religious terms, and the thought back of them was a religious thought. It is not physical rest but spiritual worship that is the object of Sunday laws. The plea that "all must rest or none can," is negated by the fact that thousands do rest

upon days when the majority are at work. All told, our country contains probably fifty thousand seventh-day Christians, who conscientiously and habitually rest upon the seventh day, the busiest day of all the week, and they find no difficulty in doing so, and desire no law compelling others to rest at the same time.

Again, this is a question with which majorities and minorities have nothing to do. The rights of a single individual are just as sacred, and should be just as carefully guarded as the rights of a multitude. The State properly protects from interruption religious meetings upon every day; and it very properly does the same for other meetings. Such laws are right, they apply to all people and to all days, but laws setting apart certain days for religious purposes and stopping on those days all the ordinary avocations of life, are opposed to the spirit of our institutions, and to the spirit of true Christianity; and should be opposed alike by the patriot and by the Christian.

This is the principle upon which we stand; we could not, with our understanding of the word of God, do otherwise and maintain our Christian integrity.

C. P. B.

Is It Personal Rights or Selfishness?

THE *Young Men's Era*, of Chicago, in an article relative to the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday, says:—

Much of the outcry against the enforcement of laws pertaining to Sabbath observance, the Bible in the public schools, etc., is based on the claim of interference with personal rights and religious convictions. Is it not about time the rights and religious convictions of the other side shall be taken into consideration? Shall there not be some assertion that the rights of the Christian people in this country, rights and privileges which we have inherited from our forefathers, and that are vouchsafed to us by the laws of the land, shall be respected?

This is another instance of the prevailing ignorance of what constitutes personal rights. The idea seems to obtain quite generally that the rights of different people always clash, and that for one class of people to have their rights, another class must yield theirs. This is a great mistake. Human rights are equal. If no man grasps more than he has a right to, every man will have all that he has a right to. Take the case of Sunday rest. It is stated that every man has a right to it. That is true, if he wants it; and it is just as true that every man has a right not to rest if he does not want to. The right of choice implies the right of refusal. If a man has not the right to refuse to do a certain thing, then he has no right to choose to do it; it is then no longer a matter of right, but of compulsion, and in that case the rights of some are certain to be trampled upon.

Moreover, the right of one man to refuse to do a certain thing does not interfere with the right of another to do it. The

*Published by authority of Congress in 1834.

fact that one man does not observe Sunday, does not interfere in the least with the right of another man to keep it. The fact that one man objects to hearing the Bible read, or to having his children hear it read, does not in the least interfere with the right of another man to read it for himself, and to his children. So the opening of the Fair on Sunday will not in the least degree interfere with the personal rights and religious convictions of those who regard Sunday as the Sabbath, since none will be compelled to visit it on that day. On the other hand, to refuse to have it opened on that day would seriously interfere with the right of thousands who have no conscientious scruples in regard to the day, and who cannot see the Exposition on any other day, yet who have as much right to see it as others have; and while these are being deprived of a right, those who regard Sunday religiously will not be having anything added to their rights and privileges, since the closing of the Fair will not enable them to rest or go to church any better than if it were open.

In these days professed Christians have need to beware lest they confuse personal rights and selfishness, and while they deprive others of what is their right, add nothing to themselves.—*Signs of the Times.*

Danger to Our Civil Institutions.

THE common sense of the people sees very plainly that if religious instruction is introduced, the school system as it is cannot remain. It will be broken up and church schools substituted. There will be Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and infidel schools, and each division will have to support its own. The proposition has been made that the school fund be distributed among Catholics and Protestants according to their numbers; but the State can make no such religious discrimination. A great part of the population, also, are of no religious belief and convictions, and the number of Jewish children in the schools is large, much larger proportionately than the number of Jews in town. Neither is there any agreement among Protestants as to what is the true religion to teach. Schools that would suit Episcopalians would not suit Baptists and Methodists. If there is to be any religious instruction, each party will demand that it be after its own tenets. Each wants to hold its own children in its own fold, for on them chiefly depends the perpetuation of its strength.

The only way to escape discord is to keep the instruction purely secular, and it is the only course consistent with our theory of Government. Otherwise we should have to give up the public school system altogether, and turn over education to private enterprise wholly. If there were as much dissatisfaction with this divorce of religion among parents generally as there is among theologians, such a

result would be unavoidable. The people would not support the public schools. But the census every autumn shows that there is no such popular discontent. In spite of many Catholic and Protestant parish schools, the public school-houses are not large enough and numerous enough to hold the children who are sent to them. The great mass of the people seem to take no interest in the discussion which is so active in many religious quarters. They are not disturbed because religion is out of the schools.—*New York Sun.*

Christian Morality.

IN reply to our advice to "read the twelfth chapter of Paul's 'Epistle to the Romans,' to learn what practical Bible Christianity is," the *Truth Seeker* devotes nearly a page to an attempt to discredit the Scriptures, and after quoting a number of texts which infidels generally regard as objectionable, says:—

We trust that our religious contemporary will be kind enough to say whether it approves of the practical Bible Christianity outlined in the passages we have quoted; and if it does not to say why.

Space forbids any extended answer to the *Truth Seeker's* effort. It is not the mission of this paper to discuss Bible truth, further than it bears directly upon the proper relations of Church and State. Nevertheless, believing that a courteous question demands a candid reply, we will say that THE SENTINEL is a Christian paper, and that its editors heartily accept the Scriptures as the revealed will of God. We do not, however, accept the interpretation put by infidels upon the texts quoted by our Lafayette Place contemporary. For instance, the *Truth Seeker* says:—

In chapter twelve of the 'Epistle to the Romans,' Paul recommends honesty (ver. 17); but in the third chapter he says:—

For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto his glory, why yet am I also judged as a sinner?

Perhaps Paul was trying to make the truth of God abound when he recommended the providing of honest things, for he admits to the Corinthians that he caught them with guile (2 Cor. 12:16). That, we suppose, is "practical Bible Christianity," as the vote buying, slandering of opponents, and deception of the people nowadays by Christian statesmen is "practical politics."

We dislike to impute to anybody wrong motives, but in this case we can scarcely think that the editor of the *Truth Seeker* does not know that Paul was arguing against the very thing of which infidels accuse him, namely, of doing evil that good might come. The apostle says that this was "slandrously reported" of him then; and it seems that some are still circulating the same old slander.

Of guile, Webster says: "Craft; cunning; artifice; duplicity; deceit;—usually in a bad sense." But the apostle does not use it in a bad sense; indeed, he did not use the word "guile" at all, but a word meaning "artifice." The Diaglott renders it: "I did not burden you; but being cunning, I took you by artifice." Paul

simply used good judgment in dealing with men; he combined the wisdom of the serpent with the harmlessness of the dove. This is well illustrated by his sermon on Mars Hill (Acts 17:22-31); instead of preaching to them from the Jewish Scriptures, he took for his text an inscription on one of their own altars and quoted to them their own poets; it was thus that Paul used guile.

The difficulties which the *Truth Seeker* finds in the other texts cited are only imaginary, as we have shown them to be in Rom. 3:7 and 2 Cor. 12:16, and we must still insist that it is unjust for that paper to charge upon Christianity all the faults of much of that which to-day is called Christianity. Men professing to be Christians are guilty of "vote buying, slandering of opponents, and deception of the people," but they are not Bible Christians, and we want the *Truth Seeker* to recognize the fact. The Bible standard of morals is infinitely higher than is the practice of many who call themselves Christians. The *Truth Seeker* may deny this, but fortunately its *ipse dixit* does not make true that which it asserts. The idea that Christianity is immoral is negated not only by the facts, but by the admission of infidels themselves; and it is too late in the history of the world for unbelievers to oppose the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ because it is immoral. The world knows better; and we think that the *Truth Seeker* must certainly know better too.

C. P. B.

The Public Schools.

It is not the business of the public schools to give a complete education, or even an approximation thereto. The principles upon which they are founded is simply to go so far as within reasonable limitations, may be deemed necessary for the protection and safety of the State. Beyond this we have no business to go. Religion is an individual want or realization, which pertains to the individual alone, or, distinct from his rights and duties, as represented in the State—a part of which he is, and in all of which he bears a responsible share, over and above any allegiance which he owes to his own spiritual nature or the religious powers which represent this element in the ecclesiastical organism which gives form and force to the outward acts of man.

If there are any deficiencies they should be supplied in some other way. If religion could be taught, it should be taught by the church, where each can be represented in its own way, and where each can be cared for without interference from the other. The public school is the creature of the State, and the State, in this country, is inherently and distinctively republican. So that if you want to set aside or modify the school, in this respect, to suit the special religious views of any

sect or church, the first thing will be to break down the principle upon which they rest. That is, republican government. If that is legitimate and right they must stand intact, and perform their duties in perfect harmony therewith. And, in this respect, there can be no distinction. All are equal and all are entitled to receive whatever education may be legitimate with this end in view.

Therefore, it must be common, in which all agree, as far as it goes. And hence all who agree in republican government must be supplied with an education that simply conforms therewith. And so the schools being creatures of the State, which is itself secular, must be of a secular character; and their secular character must not be tampered with or encroached upon by any religious body, Catholic or Protestant.

The public schools are for all creeds, or no creed—Catholic, Protestant, or Agnostic; for all nationalities, native-born and foreign—for the American, the Irishman, the German or Italian. This makes them impartial, secular and comprehensive. No other system can exist in this country so long as it is republican in manner and form.—*The National View.*

Work of the Church.

IN matters of political economy the church is not authorized to expound God's will. Every time she has tried it she has done no end of mischief, and never any good. Our Lord refused to be a judge in the distribution of property, and he never gave to his church an authority he would not assume for himself. What Jesus did was to forbid oppression, but what oppression was in a particular case he did not decide. Solomon might have done that, Caiaphas might do that, but it was not for Him to do it. He asserted principles of love, unselfishness, order, but particular cases under those principles he never decided. He cried out for justice, mercy, and truth, but which brother had the right on his side was for the civil courts to determine. Who made me a judge over you? What right have I to decide these questions?

There is the guiding light for the Church in all ages. It lays down great principles, but it throws upon men the responsibility of deciding what is best and right under those principles. In the old slavery days in this country it was the duty of the Church to speak about the iniquity of human bondage, to speak of the sacredness of man, but it left men to decide how that iniquity was to be abrogated. It had no right to say that its members should go to the polls and vote with one political party as against the other. It is its duty to talk about the evils of intemperance, to urge men to sobriety in every possible way, but it has no right to say because a certain governor is commonly believed to be in

league with the saloons that no man can be a Christian and vote for him, nor has it any right to bind all its members to vote for prohibition or high license. The Lutherans of Illinois, according to recent papers, are making a political issue, fighting out at the polls a certain matter which they think nearly concerns them, and in my view it is a great mistake.—*Rev. John K. Allen, in Christian at Work.*

Let the Verdict Hasten.

IT is well that the case of R. M. King, Seventh-day Adventist, of Obion County, Tenn., is to be carried to the Supreme Court of the United States for adjudication. It will be remembered that he was heavily fined in the lower court for quietly working on his farm on Sunday; and that his defense as a Sabbath-keeper was disregarded. The decision has been sustained by the higher courts in the State, and hence the final appeal to the Supreme Court of the Nation. There have been several similar cases in which Seventh-day Adventists, and Seventh-day Baptists have been thus persecuted. Prejudice and ignorance have thus combined to produce a state of things like that which existed in the Middle Ages. Such cases denote a revival of the bigotry which burned Protestants and Papists in the stormy days of the English Reformation. It seems incredible that such things can be in the last decade of the nineteenth century. They are part and parcel of the new crusade represented by the American Sabbath Union, and the attempt to save the failing fortunes of Sunday by civil law. We are glad that the highest tribunal of the Nation is to pass upon this case. Every Sabbath-keeper is directly involved in the results which are likely to flow from that decision. The whole status of the Sunday laws of the United States is also likely to be much affected, *pro* or *con*, by the verdict of the court. Let that verdict hasten.—*Sabbath (Baptist) Recorder.*

Let the Churches Teach Religion.

THE unsectarianism of our public school system is the secret of its whole power, so that to sectarianize it would be to utterly destroy it. It is an American axiom that the perpetuity of our civil and religious freedom depends on a complete severance of Church and State. No loyal American who is acquainted with the theory and history of our Government will question that postulate for a moment. The First Amendment to our national Constitution is in these words: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." That settles the matter. Our public schools must be carried on consistently with that idea; there must be no sectarianism there; there must be no "establishment of religion" in connection with any of our national institutions;

certainly not in the public schools, where children are being trained for citizenship at the public expense.

I believe in parochial schools. We have hundreds of Presbyterian schools, and the Baptists have hundreds more, but these are not sustained at the public expense. We expect to go on teaching the Westminster Confession of Faith in our denominational schools, but we have not the brazen effrontery to ask the commonwealth to foot the bills. If we choose to have a Presbyterian dance we will pay the piper with Presbyterian money. And that, too, while loyally supporting the non-sectarian public schools. There is room for both. The public schools, however, must always and everywhere be of such a character that parents may send their children to them with a definite assurance that their rights of conscience shall not be violated by the propaganda of any sect. Only so can our religious freedom be protected and secured for coming days.—*Rev. Dr. Burrell.*

German Lutherans and the English Language.

SOME alarm has been felt in some parts of the West lest through the influence of parochial schools the rising generation should be kept in ignorance of the English language. We regard this fear as utterly groundless. How German Lutherans themselves look at the question will be seen from the following article from the *Vindicator*, a Lutheran paper, published in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania:—

The opinion is freely expressed on all hands that the German language in this country will, sooner or later, die out. At the meeting of the Kansas District of the Missouri Synod, in Atchison, Kansas, last September, this opinion was expressed—not by young men and unthinking enthusiasts—but by aged men of wide and varied experience. Everybody seems to become gradually reconciled to the inevitable; so then all that remains to be done is to draw the legitimate conclusions and to act upon the hint.

Well, then, if that comes to pass what the wisest among us predict and concede to be inevitable, what is to become of our German Lutheran Church? Shall it die with the language? Perish the thought! No true Lutheran can bear even to think of such a thing! And yet this must inevitably be the fate of the church unless sufficient provision is made to preach our doctrines in the English language. Or are we waiting for the precise moment when the climax shall have been reached, then all at once make German congregations English? We all know that such a thing is impossible. A change like the one in question must be accomplished gradually. There will be no discharge of artillery to warn us of the necessity of a change. No

angel will appear to tell us; "now is the time, up and change your tactics!" We are bidden to read the signs of the times. Some of the German churches being emptied of young people ought to be sign sufficient that the time has come. Therefore we believe that English Lutheran congregations should be established *wherever an opportunity offers*. If we will not do so now the opportunity may be past by the time we are ready to act. Difficulties? Certainly the work is difficult, but so is all work worthy the effort of an honest man and a Christian. We cannot say that it is impossible, for we have not yet made an earnest and vigorous effort. We ought not to complain of small success, because, being new in the work we naturally make many mistakes. But then the Lord has not promised us brilliant success, nor any certain degree of success; but has said that his word, if preached faithfully shall not remain without fruits, and that ought to be sufficient for us.

Some will fear the danger that English Lutheran congregations will swerve from the standard of true Lutheranism. If this hitherto has sometimes happened, it is not to be wondered at. For they were exposed more than the German congregations to the influence of the sects around them, while they had but few truly Lutheran books and papers. But this ought not to discourage us, but rather act as an incentive to vigorous exertions in order that we may make the writings of the fathers of our church accessible to English speaking people. And when that has once been accomplished, doubt not that there will be as good English Lutheranism as there ever was in any other language.

The work may not be exactly such as we would choose were a choice left open. But it is thrust upon us, and seeing that it is, as all admit, either an English Lutheran Church or no Lutheran Church at all in this country, shall we any longer rest content with weak, half-hearted, tentative efforts? Will we continue to allow ourselves to be pushed and forced by dire necessity and by the force of circumstances? In several cases the opportunity was just slipping away from us before we were aroused. Already, in several places we are too late—not too late to do any good, but too late for the greatest measure of good. When the most favorable opportunity had passed then we arrived upon the scene. Too late! May it never be the fate of the Lutheran Church, nor of any section of it, to say of the performance of her duties—too late!

"WHEREVER religion organized in any church has sought or consented to receive any alliance with the civil power, it has corrupted her purity and shorn her of her strength, and it will be so till the end of time."

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.

"Songs of Freedom."

IN the recent call for poems designed for use in "Songs of Freedom," the time was limited to November 10; but as circumstances render the publication of the book impossible before the latter part of January, the time is extended to December 10, before which date all competing poems must be received. J. O. CORLISS.

THE *News-Banner*, of Troy, Tennessee, in its issue of November 6, publishes the following item:—

Robert M. King, the Seventh-day Adventist, who was tried in the circuit court, and sentenced to pay a seventy-five dollar fine for working on Sunday, and who appealed to the State Supreme Court, and had the decision affirmed, is in trouble.

Lawyer Richardson, of Dyersburg, is going to appeal the case to the Supreme Court of the United States, and has telegraphed to get Don. M. Dickinson, Post-master General under the Cleveland administration, to take charge of the case.

The time has come when King must pay the seventy-five dollar fine or go to jail. He says that it is religious persecution, and that he will go to jail before he will pay one cent. King is now in charge of Sheriff Jackson, awaiting the result of Colonel Richardson's efforts towards securing an appeal.

Mr. King writes a very interesting personal letter from the Obion County Jail, at Troy, narrating his experiences in confinement, his opportunities for conversation on Biblical truth, etc. He says of those who have him in charge, "I am treated just as kindly by the jailer as possibly could be expected," and mentions unexpected courtesies shown him by others.

While in jail he has been "interviewed" by a representative of the county paper, and this is his crisp account of the conversation:—

The editor of the *News-Banner* came down yesterday, and I had quite a talk with him. He asked me if the Judge would turn me out would I go home and quit work on Sunday? I told him that I could not promise that. I told him that I thought that I had a God-given right to work six days if I chose to do so. He also asked me if I would leave

the State if the Governor would pardon me? I told him, No, sir!

In the United States of America, during the last decade of the nineteenth century, a man, without known fault as a Christian and a citizen, is fined and imprisoned because in his devout simplicity, he reads in his Bible the commandment of God, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt do no work," etc., and acts accordingly. Is it possible to imagine a more ludicrous travesty on justice, true religion, and common sense? W. H. M.

The National Reform Association.

THERE is no doubt that there is a class of people in America whose aim is to subvert our American institutions. This class are now working in Idaho for the purpose of establishing a theocracy. The green-eyed monster has fastened its covetous eyes upon our infantile commonwealth, and as an entering wedge it proposes to introduce a Sunday bill into our Legislature.

We have just been divorced from one church that demands of its adherents implicit obedience in matters both temporal and spiritual, and thank God and our worthy politicians, that we are free. Let not our Legislature be deceived. The National Reform Association is a foe to our form of Government. Article II of their Constitution reads as follows:—

The object of this society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed reforms in the action of the Government touching the Sabbath, the institution of the family, the religious element in education, the oath, and public morality as affected by the liquor traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian Nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions and usages on an undeniably legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.

Let these principles prevail and our Government becomes a theocracy. There is in reality no such thing as a union of Church and State; both claim to be supreme, and they both should be supreme, but in their own realm. Let the Church dictate in secular matters and the bloody scenes of the Dark Ages will be re-enacted. Men and women would be imprisoned for conscience' sake. The history of Church rule is a history of bloodshed, a history of persecution. Men and women were burned at the stake for their belief. It was the Church that burned John Rogers at the stake, cut out Quaker's tongues, drowned witches, burned Servetus, condemned Joan of Arc, delivered her to the British soldiers to suffer death, then washed its hypocritical hands in innocency. If the Church would follow Christ, let it attend to its spiritual affairs and let the State manage the temporal matters.—*Idaho World*.

DO YOU USE A FOUNTAIN PEN?

Then you need the **COMBINED INK BOTTLE AND PEN FILLER**, consisting of a bottle holding ink sufficient to fill a pen 8 or 10 times, with a Patent Rubber Cork and Filler, all inclosed in a neat wooden case with a screw top, making the safest, most complete, compact, and convenient article for the use of traveling men and others now extant. Weighs when filled with ink less than three ounces.

Imitation Rose-wood case, 25c.
Real Box-wood, " 50c.

Sent post-paid on receipt of price.

Address,
PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,
48 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

THE SENTINEL LIBRARY

A Semi-monthly Publication
Devoted to the defense of
AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS
And the Preservation of the
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
AS IT IS.
TERMS, 75 CENTS PER YEAR.

The following numbers are now ready, and will be sent to any address post-paid on receipt of price:—

- No. 1 *The National Reformed Constitution.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 2 *Religious Liberty.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 3 *Evils of Religious Legislation.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 4 *The Blair Sunday Rest Bill.* Price, 7 cents.
- No. 5 *The Blair Educational Amendment.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 6 *Purity of National Religion.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 7 *National Reform and Rights of Conscience.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 8 *The American Papacy.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 9 *The Salem Witchcraft.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 10 *National Reform is Church and State.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 11 *What Think Ye of Christ?* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 12 *Bold and Base Avoval.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 13 *The National Reform Movement an Absurdity.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 14 *The Republic of Israel.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 15 *National Reformed Presbyterianism.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 16 *A Lutheran View of the National Reform Movement.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 17 *Religion and the Public Schools.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 18 *The National Sunday Law.* Price, 25 cents.
- No. 19 *Rev. W. F. Crafts Against the Editors of The American Sentinel.* Price, 10 cents.
- No. 20 *Romanism and Civil Liberty.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 21 *Why We Oppose Religious Legislation.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 22 *The American Sabbath Union and Human Rights.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 23 *A Civil Sunday Holiday.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 24 *Blair's Sunday Rest Bill and Joint Resolution, introduced December 9, 1889. (Exact copies, with notes).* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 25 *Civil Government and the Decalogue.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 26 *National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 28 *A Religious Political Movement.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 29 *Arguments on the Breckinridge Sunday Bill. The Object and Price of Exemption Clauses.* Price, 10 cents.
- No. 30 *A Civil Sabbath. What It Amounts to.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 31 *Union of Church and State. What Constitutes Such a Union?* Price, 1c.

Address:
Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
OAKLAND, CAL.

Or, **Atlantic Tract Society,**
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

SIBERIA AND THE NIHILISTS

WHY KENNAN WENT TO SIBERIA,

By **William Jackson Armstrong,**

(Late Inspector General of United States Consulates.)

This is one of the most intensely interesting and thoroughly reliable contributions to literature on Russia and the Nihilists ever published. It comprises Mr. Armstrong's famous lecture on "Siberia and the Nihilists" (delivered first in Cooper Union, New York, and afterwards by special request of many eminent men in Lincoln Hall, Washington), together with some exceedingly interesting letters and newspaper criticisms from the pens of the author and George Kennan, the Siberian traveller.

EVERYBODY SHOULD READ THIS BOOK,

because no one can be intelligent upon the subject of which it treats without familiarity with its contents. Besides, the book is a powerful stimulus to that love of liberty so essential to the maintenance of free Government.

It contains some pointed and caustic criticisms upon Mr. Kennan's defense of the Russian Government after his first visit to that country, and explains

WHY KENNAN WENT TO SIBERIA

the second time. The *Century* articles which were the result of that visit fully justify the position taken, and the statements made by Mr. Armstrong in 1883.

160 PAGES, PAPER COVERS, PRICE 25 cents.

PACIFIC PRESS, NEW YORK, N. Y., and OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.

GOOD FOR ALL TIME!

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW

THIS PAMPHLET CONTAINS THE ARGUMENTS IN BEHALF OF THE RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS, AND IN OPPOSITION TO THE BLAIR SUNDAY-REST BILL, WHICH MR. JONES PRESENTED BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, DECEMBER 13, 1888.

Mr. Crafts has pronounced the report as published

"MIGHTY INTERESTING READING."

And Mr. Jones' comments make it more so. His argument is enlarged to what it would have been without Senator Blair's interruptions, objections, and counter-arguments, and is accompanied with answers to all of his objections and counter-arguments. As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially Legislators, lawyers, judges, and other public men. The argument is based on Scripture and history, constitution and law, showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday bill, an analysis of the Sunday laws and other religious legislation of the different States, the

Sunday-Law Movement of the Fourth Century,

AND THE

Sunday-Law Movement of the Nineteenth Century.

The Methods Used in Securing Indorsements to the Petition for the Blair Bill, and the Workings of Such Sunday Laws as are Proposed for the United States.

The Work Contains 192 Pages and will be Sent Post-paid on Receipt of 25c.

Send for it! Read it! Send it to Your Friends!

Address all Orders to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

TEN LECTURES

ON

NASAL CATARRH

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

CHOICE PRESCRIPTIONS

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

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

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

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

HEALTH FOOD CRACKERS

HEALTH produces wealth; and good health can not be made of poor material. The agitation of this health question for some years in the past has created a demand for

HEALTHFUL FOODS,

in the manufacture of which we have for the past ten years been engaged. The demand having constantly increased, we have found it necessary to greatly increase our facilities by the addition of new and the latest improved machinery, etc. We are now well equipped, and prepared to fill all orders, and to extend our business into new fields.

Our Foods and Crackers are made from the choicest grains and are strictly pure, justly entitling them to the name above given.

SAMPLE PACKAGES

Of assorted Health Food Crackers sent post-paid on receipt of fifty cents. Write for descriptive circular and price list to

Battle Creek Bakery Co.,

163 WEST MAIN ST.,
Battle Creek, Mich.

IS THE PAPACY IN PROPHECY?

BY THE

Rev. Thomas W. Haskins, M. A.,

Rector Christ Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

The above is the title of a treatise written by the author at the request of the Ministerial Union of Los Angeles, California. It grew out of a discussion upon the present aspect and aims of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, the author taking the ground that the rise, progress, present and future condition of the temporal power known as the Papacy, or Vaticanism, is outlined in the prophecies of Holy Scriptures with sufficient accuracy to determine what the "Papacy" is, and what is to be its future development and ultimate end.

PAPER COVERS, 25 CENTS.
CLOTH COVERS, 60 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Address,
Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK;
12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.,
Or, LOS ANGELES CHURCHMAN, 35 California Bank Building, Los Angeles, Cal.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET

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

PRICES.

- No. 1 Russia leather, for 2 pens 10c.
- No. 2 " " " 3 " 15c.
- No. 3 " " metal back, 2 pens, 15c.
- No. 4 " " " 3 " 20c.
- No. 5 Sealskin, for 2 pens, 15c.
- No. 6 " " " 3 " 25c.
- No. 7 Russia Leather, for 4 pens 25c.
- No. 8 Sealskin, " 4 " 40c.

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

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

THE BEST DUPLICATING INKS

FOR USE WITH

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

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

Celebrated "Redding Inks."

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

A SUPERIOR ARTICLE.

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

REDDING INK CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.



NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 20, 1890.

NOTE.—Any one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

"A REST day is justified," says Dr. McDonald, a prominent Sunday-law advocate, "upon the principle that the privilege of rest for each citizen depends upon the observance of one day of rest in seven, by everybody." But the assumption is false. Mr. Crafts himself says that "the Jew is left absolutely free to observe the seventh day." True enough; and so is every one else left absolutely free to keep the first day.

ACCORDING to the *Morning Journal*, Colonel Ingersoll says that "if we should finally invent some means of traveling by which we could go a thousand miles a day, a man could escape Sunday all his life by traveling west. He could start Monday, and stay in Monday all the time." The Colonel will have to invent some better argument than that against Sunday laws or they will, we fear, remain on the statute books of the several States. We don't wonder that Ingersoll said this, but we are surprised that any paper would think it worth printing. To escape Sunday all his life one would have to travel about twenty-five thousand miles a day.

THE standard argument used to win the masses to Sunday closing for the Columbian Exposition, is "that Sunday opening is not a boon to the working people, for it means unremittent toil for thousands of them—seven day's work for six day's pay." These words are from the *Union Signal*, but the *Observer* of this city, comes nearer the truth when it says: "Sunday opening is opposed solely in the interests of the Christian Sabbath, of rest from toil, and of holy occupation." And that is just what we have said all the time, namely, that were it not for their religious regard for the day not one of the champions of so-called civil Sunday laws would lift his voice, or wield his pen, in advocacy of a day of rest for the working man. "Take the religion out and you take the rest out," says Mr. Crafts, and it is equally true that take the religion out and you take out all the interest that the ministers and churches have in the matter. The Sunday movement is not a movement for the amelioration of labor, but for the bolstering up of emasculated Christianity by civil law.

"Isn't it strange," says a Western paper, "that the laboring men, who are represented by the Sunday-law lecturers as consuming with desire for a Sunday law, are in mortal dread of saying anything about it, lest they should lose their places, and yet they will strike for an advance of twenty-five cents a day in wages, or even when they have no personal grievance, if a fellow-workman is discharged?" Well, yes, it would be strange if the representations of the Sunday-law advocates were all true; but inasmuch as they are not true the only strange thing about it is that men professing godliness will resort to duplicity to accomplish what they imagine to be a great moral reform. The Jesuits should be awarded a monopoly of "doing evil that good may come."

WE learn from the *China Mail* that a law forbidding Sunday labor in the harbor of Hong-Kong is among the probabilities of the near future. At a recent meeting of the Mercantile Marine Officers' Association held at Marine Hotel on Saturday evening, Captain S. Ashton, the President, addressed the members on the Sunday labor question. After alluding to "the good work" done by Rev. A. G. Goldsmith, with a view to bringing about a cessation of Sunday labor in the harbor, President Ashton said that he was a firm believer in the fourth commandment, and he thought those who obeyed it would "be healthier, wealthier, and wiser in the end." As in this country, the great plea for this Sunday law is that the laboring man may have opportunity to rest, and, as here, it appears that the real motive of the prime movers is their religious regard for the day. Were Sunday not religious the plea for a rest day for the "poor working man" would never be made.

A MEMBER of the Shaker Order, at Mount Lebanon, New York, writes to us saying:—

I wish that you could see, as I do, that the God of Israel was only a created being—a tutelary deity.

Well we can't see it; and furthermore it has nothing to do with the question of governmental regulation of religion and religious observances. We are Christians and believe most sincerely that Jehovah, the God of the Jews, is a self-existent being, that he created all things by Jesus Christ, and that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are his revealed will; but with Paine, the infidel, we would say to all who assume to dictate to their fellows in matters of religion: "Who art thou, vain dust and ashes! by whatsoever name thou art called, whether a king, a bishop, a Church, or a State, a parliament or anything else, that obtrudest thine insignificance between the soul of man and his Maker? Mind thine own concerns. If he believest not as thou believest, it is a proof that thou believest not as he be-

lievest, and there is no earthly power that can determine between you." Nevertheless we hold that it is the duty of all men to "fear God and keep his commandments;" "for God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Eccl. 12:13, 14.

THE Sunday question seems to be just as perplexing in Hong-Kong as in America. The advocates there of enforced Sunday rest get just as badly tangled in its intricacies as they do here, and in a very similar manner, as is witnessed by the following extracts from an article in the *China Mail* in advocacy of a Sunday law for the harbor of Hong-Kong:—

I do not think there is one man in the Colony who would support compulsory Sunday observance throughout the Colony. Even if it were possible to enforce such a law, it would be a curse instead of a blessing.

Thus readeth extract No. 1. Number 2 is as follows:—

It would no doubt be well if this rest could be secured by voluntary co-operation, but that I fear is impracticable. Compulsory measures—always objectionable in themselves—have been sanctioned at home, and will I fear have to be resorted to in Hong-Kong.

Just so! It has been so; therefore, it must be so. This is the logic of Sunday laws the world over.

REFERRING to the Sunday closing of the Columbian Exposition, the *Union Signal* editorially says:—

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, acting in conjunction with the Sabbath Observance Associations, has a great educational work to do along this line, and now is none too soon to begin. Educate by petitions, by mass-meetings, through the press; educate and agitate, till the Sunday-closing victory is won. Then plan and work for the best possible utilization of the Sabbath time during the Exposition; it will be the opportunity of the century for preaching Christ to those who know him not. So broadly should we plan and work that at the close of 1893 we can truthfully say, "Not one soul in the Columbian Exposition did not have salvation offered; no tried, tempted one need go away in chains to drink because a way out of temptation has not been shown him."

Thus again, it appears that the real object of the Sunday-closing movement is religious. It is right that the women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union should plan to do all the good they can upon the occasion of the Exposition; but they have no right to invoke the aid of the civil power in the matter of offering salvation.

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.