



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 8, 1891.

NUMBER 2.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 48 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.

It was with a kiss that Judas betrayed his divine Master: and we should all be admonished no matter what our faith may be, that the rights of conscience cannot be so successfully assailed as under the pretext of holiness.—Col. Richard M. Johnson.

ON the 19th ult., there was introduced, simultaneously in the Senate, and House of Representatives, a bill providing that no exhibition or exposition, for which an appropriation is made by Congress, shall be opened on Sunday. Senator Dawes, of Massachusetts, introduced the bill in the Senate, and Representative Morse, of the same State, was its champion in the House. The penalty attached to the bill is a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000.

APROPOS to our statement made last week, that it is self-evident that every man has, so far as his fellow-men are concerned, an inalienable right to perfect liberty of conscience, is the following from Col. Richard M. Johnson, which came to our notice after our article was written. In his report to the House of Representatives, March 4, 1830, Mr. Johnson said:—

“The framers of the Constitution recognized the eternal principle that man’s relation with his God is above human legislation, and his rights of conscience inalienable. Reasoning was not necessary to establish this truth; we are conscious of it in our bosoms. It is this consciousness,

which in defiance of human laws, has sustained so many martyrs in torture and in flames. They felt that their duty to God was superior to human enactments, and that man could exercise no authority over their consciences. It is an inborn principle which nothing can eradicate. The bigot in the pride of his authority, may lose sight of it, but, strip him of his power, prescribe a faith to him which his conscience rejects, threaten him in turn with the dungeon and the fagot, and this spirit which God has implanted in him rises up in rebellion and defies you.”

Sunday Laws Invade the Realm of Conscience.

MR. CRAFTS’S second article is entitled “Is the Sabbath Imperilled?” Of course he means to ask whether the Sunday is imperilled; and to this inquiry he answers, “Yes.” And he declares that “Sunday’s worst foes are of its own household.” We here present quite a lengthy extract on this point, as it gives an excellent view of the Sunday-law question; and coming, as it does, officially, is of particular value. He says:—

But I believe the chief difficulty is that in the Christian descendants of the Puritans on both sides of the sea conscience is no longer regnant, but indulgence reigns in its stead. Christians break the Sabbath chiefly because it seems pleasanter or more profitable to do so than to do right. Even church committees receive men into church membership who are doing needless work on the Sabbath, and intend to continue so doing, sanctioning the excuse that otherwise a salary will have to be sacrificed. That is, a man ought to do right except when it will cost him something. With such a fountain the subsequent Christian life cannot be expected to rise above the idea that the Sabbath is to be kept only when it is perfectly convenient to do so. [The preachers ought not to blame the people for that, for it is the preachers who have taught the people so.—Ed.] Thus convenience has displaced conscience in thousands of Christians.

“What shall we do with our Presbyterian elders?” said a pastor to me recently. “One of my elders owns the motor line, and another the electric cars that carry the people to Sunday picnics and baseball.” Half the railroads of the country, I believe, after abundant opportunity to inquire, are owned

by men who are devoutly singing, “O day of rest and gladness,” in the churches, while their employes are toiling and cursing on their Sunday trains. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church is itself a stockholder in a liquor-selling, Sabbath-breaking, railroad. Some commissioner should raise the question whether it ought not to follow the example of its illustrious adherent, Hon. Wm. E. Dodge, and refuse to share the “wages of unrighteousness.” Sunday camp-meetings, which the New England Conference calls “the scandal of Methodism,” are not yet wholly abolished, nor that other scandal, the use of Sunday trains by some presiding elders.

In one of our great cities a leading officer of a Congregationalist Church devoutly worships every Sabbath morning, while his employes indevoutly work, driving all over the city to furnish the people that necessity of life, ice-cream. One Easter Sabbath I looked into a post-office and saw those who had been learning of the spiritual resurrection in flowers and songs and sermons, with prayer-books and hymn-books in hand, and one in a Quaker bonnet, getting their letters and bills and newspapers, as to bury the risen Lord again.

Taking a swift run from city to city, let us see who are the owners or controllers of the Sunday papers. In this first city a Baptist trustee, in this next a Methodist steward, in this next a Presbyterian elder, in this next the editors of both Sunday papers are Methodists, and so following.

Who owns that little store that sells candies and cigarettes and fire-crackers to little embezzlers on their way to Sabbath-school? A Covenanter, who is very particular that no one should call the Sabbath Sunday, but allows it to be heathenized in her own buildings rather than risk the rent.

“Judgment must indeed begin at the house of God,” which means discipline. Candidates for the ministry and for membership should be examined as to their Sabbath observance, that they may start right, and then be admonished at the first open violation of their vows in this line. “I commanded the Levites,” said Nehemiah, “that they should purify themselves, and that they should come and keep the gates to sanctify the Sabbath day.”

From this it appears that the churches are filled with people who have little respect for the rules or discipline of the churches to which they belong, and less respect for Sunday. And this extract fully justifies the statement which we have often made, that the main object of Sunday-laws is the enforcement of church discipline not only upon the church members but upon the people who do not belong to the church at all. That is the secret of all the Sunday laws that ever have been. It was the ob-

ject of the first Sunday-law that ever was made. This lengthy extract from the chief worker for Sunday-laws, shows that the logic of Sunday-laws is that there are hosts of people in the church who profess to be what they are not, and therefore these laws are demanded in order that they may compel everybody else to be just what they are.

Of course we do not blame anybody for not observing Sunday, nor do we blame anybody for observing it. Any person has a perfect right to observe Sunday if he chooses, as also a person has a right not to observe it at all if he does not wish to. But when men who profess to be observers of the day attach themselves to a church whose rules require its observance, then we do insist that they ought to be honest enough to stand by their professions. But if they are not honest enough to be indeed what they profess to be, then if they obtain laws compelling other people to act as they do, the only possible fruit of the enforcement of such laws can be but to multiply hypocrites.

If all those who profess to observe Sunday were to put their hearts in it, and observe it consistently with their profession, they would do ten thousand times as much toward securing its required observance as all the Sunday laws can do in a thousand years. But if they have not conscience enough nor honesty enough to respect the rules of the church to which they belong, or obey the laws which are already on the statute books of nine-tenths of the States and Territories, then what in the world is the use of multiplying laws? If they will not obey the laws already enacted, how can they be expected to obey others that may be enacted?

From the first sentence of the foregoing extract it appears that Mr. Crafts's object is, by means of Sunday laws, to create in the church members sufficient conscience to lead them to do what their church obligations already require that they shall do. Because, he says, "In the Christian descendants of the Puritans conscience is no longer regnant, but indulgence reigns instead." This, in fact, is the tone of the article all the way through. He complains against the Sunday newspaper because that by it "families are solicited all the week to violate conscience by announcements that the best articles are being held back for Sunday readers."

But whether or not he expects Sunday laws to cultivate conscience where there is little, and create it where there is none, this much is certain: this statement shows as plainly as words can, that the intent of Sunday laws is that they shall have to do with the consciences of men. This is another fact that annihilates every vestige of the authority of the civil Sabbath. Civil statutes have to do only with man's actions as relating to their fellow-men. But there is no such thing as conscience toward man. There is no such thing as conscientious re-

lationship between men. Conscience pertains wholly to man's relationship to God. Conscience has to do with God and with the things of God. Conscience pertains wholly to the realm of religion, and whenever it is admitted that Sunday laws have anything to do with conscience, either directly or indirectly, in that it is admitted and claimed that such laws have to do with religion.

In this statement, therefore, it is formally admitted by Mr. Crafts that Sunday laws do invade, and are intended to invade, the realm of conscience. A. T. J.

The Minority.

FANATIC! the insect hissed, till he taught them to understand
That the highest crimes may be written in the highest law of the land.
"Disturber and dreamer!" the Philistines cried, while he preached an ideal creed,
Till they learned that the men who have changed the world, with the world have disagreed;
That the remnant is right, while the masses are led like sheep to the pen,
And the instinct of equity slumbers, until roused by instinctive men!

—John Boyle O'Reilly.

Still Strong for Evil.

IMMEDIATELY following the Second Annual Session of the American Sabbath Union, held in Philadelphia, December 8 and 9, 1890, we wrote a notice of the said meeting, closing it with these words: "Jealousies and dissensions are weakening it, and unless wiser counsels prevail in the coming year, than appeared in the Philadelphia meeting, their bond of union may prove a rope of sand." Nevertheless, we do not believe, nor would we wish our readers to understand that we expect to see any division in the ranks of the Sunday advocates that will seriously weaken, or even greatly retard their movement. The matter of difference in the Philadelphia meeting was wholly as to methods and management. It was in fact almost a personal matter between Mr. Crafts, the founder of the Union, and Mr. Shepard, its principal financial supporter and its President. Upon the question of the enforcement of Sunday observance by civil law, there was no difference of opinion expressed, and we believe none entertained. The meeting was unanimously in favor, so far as any expression was concerned, of securing and enforcing Sunday laws. True, there might have been, and probably was, some difference of opinion as to the basis of these laws, but that is merely technical. Sunday is a religious institution, and the zeal of these men for its observance, springs wholly from their regard for the day as a religious institution.

The basis of the American Sabbath Union is the fourth commandment, which is wholly religious. It is true that in his work for the Sabbath Union, Mr. Crafts has made a special plea for Sunday laws

on what he calls the "civil basis," that is for sanitary and economic reasons, but he has also declared: "Take the religion out and you take the rest out," and refuses persistently to accept any compromise proposed, which will eliminate religious features from Sunday laws. It is evident, therefore, that his plea for the so-called civil Sabbath, is made simply to enlist in behalf of his movement the co-operation of that class known as the "working-men." His wish is to array upon the side of Sunday laws, the men who carry tin pails, and dinner baskets, and to this end he pleads for what he claims would be a law giving the laboring man a weekly rest day.

We are in favor of everything tending to improve the condition of the toiling masses, but we are not in favor of so hedging every man in by civil law, that he would be compelled to rest, whether he desires to do so or not. Nor do we believe that it is necessary to pass laws compelling a weekly rest. The trend of the age is in the direction of shorter hours of labor, and more frequent holidays. The eight-hour movement is gathering force with each passing year, and is only a question of time, when tradesmen and laborers in many departments of industry, will work only eight hours per day, and as a general thing only six days per week. This will be true whether laws are passed declaring that it must be so or not.

But that which we started to say was that instead of being weakened, the Sunday advocates are constantly growing stronger, because their forces are being augmented, and their numbers increased constantly. The work of organization is being carried rapidly forward. It was stated in the Philadelphia meeting, that more has been done within two years in awakening a sentiment in favor of Sunday laws than in the last quarter of a century. The West especially has been thoroughly organized in the interests of the American Sabbath Union. Almost every Western State has its State association, and many county associations have also been formed. Numerous secretaries have been appointed, and these are pushing the work in every quarter. Papers already established have been enlisted in the movement, and new ones have been started for the express purpose of voicing the sentiments of these organizations. This is briefly the condition of things in the West.

In the South, not so much has been accomplished, but this is owing, not to a lack of sentiment favorable to the object of the American Sabbath Union, but rather to prejudice against the President of the Union because of his intense political partisanship. As Mr. Crafts said to a reporter of a Philadelphia paper, "the South hates Colonel Shepard, and abominates his paper." But this does not weaken, in the least, the feeling of the South favorable to rigid Sunday laws.

Indeed the worst Sunday laws to be found in the United States, are upon the statute books of some of the Southern States, notably, Tennessee; and the South may safely be counted upon as being strongly in favor of the object of the American Sabbath Union, namely: the securing of Sunday observance upon the basis of the fourth commandment, and that by civil law so far as is necessary. The friends of religious liberty and of freedom of action and conscience, have nothing whatever to hope for because of the differences which have sprung up between leading men in the American Sabbath Union. It still remains true, even in this, that "vigilance is the price of liberty." C. P. B.

Our Nation's Danger.

To people generally in this country the thought that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" seldom occurs. Everything is apparently running along smoothly; their business is not interfered with, direct taxes do not burden them, they have no royal family to support, and none are called to account to an Inquisition or a Star Chamber for their religion. But in this very feeling of security, this indifference unless there is some barefaced aggression upon their liberties, there is danger. It is not when a householder is watching and prepared for attack that the thief puts in his appearance. But it is when, after long continued freedom from molestation, a false sense of security from danger is felt that he comes in at the unfastened door or open window. So in the numerous cases of embezzlement throughout our land, it is not the openly dishonest persons who are always regarded with suspicion that do the work; but it is he who is intrusted with funds without due care being taken to see that he faithfully executes his trust.

Likewise in the case of the Nation; if the citizens do not regard their liberties with a jealous care, if they do not vigorously oppose the first indication of despotism, if they do not resist the first steps in unjust taxation, if they do not antagonize the minor violations of the principle of religious equality, the time will come, and it may not be very far distant, when the rights of the people will be trampled in the dust. This is a danger that has been seen and emphasized by the greatest of our American statesmen. It is a trait of human nature too manifest to escape the observing mind. Some of the most important of the writings of our early statesmen utter this warning to the American people, and the truth of their words is so evident to the lover of our free institutions that we cannot disregard them with impunity.

Among these documents is Madison's famous memorial and remonstrance to the Legislature of Virginia; and in that remonstrance he says, "It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment upon our lib-

erties. We hold this prudent jealousy to be the first duty of citizens, and one of the noblest characteristics of the late Revolution. The freemen of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question by precedents. They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much soon to forget it. Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians in exclusion of all other sects?—that the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute three pence only of his property for the support of any one establishment may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?"

Think of these words, and then think of the hundreds of thousands of dollars that are annually appropriated to sectarian institutions out of the treasuries of municipalities, States, and Nation; and then ask yourself if it is not time that the American people were awaking to the dangers which threaten us, and opposing these illegitimate appropriations and further aggressions in the same line proposed by the pending constitutional amendment providing for the teaching of the "unsectarian" principles of Christianity in our public schools. Is it not time for the people to be aroused to these flagrant violations of American principles? It is the repeated transgressions of rights that strengthen the hands of despotism; and in a republic it is only by indifference to the first aggressions upon a people's rights that they can be entirely disregarded.

Another danger against which the American people in the past have been repeatedly warned is our legislation on the Sunday question. If this religious question is decided, why can we not decide other religious questions? "If the principle is once established," says the United States Senate report on Sunday legislation, of 1829, "that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum." And again: "Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are, in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous. This first effort of the kind calls for the establishment of a principle which, in the opinion of the committee, would lay the foundation for dangerous innovations upon the spirit of the Constitution, and upon the religious rights of the citizens. If admitted, it may be justly apprehended that the future measures of the Government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence.

"All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it; and the catas-

trophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequence."

But, says the report, "though the committee would hope that no portion of the citizens of our country would willingly introduce a system of religious coercion in our civil institutions, the example of other nations should admonish us to *watch carefully against its earliest indication.*"

Jefferson also saw clearly how apt the people were to become wholly absorbed in business affairs while laws were being enforced subversive of their rights. In his "Notes on Virginia," query xvii, he says:

Besides, the *spirit of the times may alter, will alter.* Our rulers will become corrupt, our people careless. A single zealot may commence persecution, and better men be his victims. It can never be too often repeated, that the time for fixing every essential right on a legal basis is while our rulers are honest, and ourselves united. From the conclusion of this war we shall be going down hill. It will not then be necessary to resort every moment to the people for support. They will be forgotten, therefore, and *their rights disregarded.* They will forget themselves, but in the sole faculty of making money, and will never think of uniting to effect a due respect for their rights. *The shackles, therefore, which shall not be knocked off at the conclusion of this war, will remain on us long, will be made heavier and heavier, till our rights shall revive or expire in a convulsion.*

To watch our representatives with a jealous eye, and to resist "the first experiment upon our liberties" is, as Madison says, "the first duty of citizens." In harmony with this statement of the "father of the Constitution," Herbert Spencer argues as follows:—

Lastly, the supremacy of this same faculty [the faculty responding to the law of equal freedom—the moral sense] affords the only guarantee for the stability of a democracy. On the part of the people it gives rise to what we call a jealousy of their liberties—a watchful determination to resist anything like encroachment upon their rights: whilst it generates amongst those in power such a respect for these rights as checks any desire they may have to aggress.

Conversely, let the ruled be deficient in the instinct of freedom, and they will be indifferent to gradual usurpation of their privileges so long as it entails no immediate inconvenience upon them; and the rulers in such case, being deficient in sympathetic regard for these privileges, will be to a like extent unscrupulous in usurping. Let us observe, in detail, the different modes in which men thus contradistinguished comport themselves under a representative form of government.

Amongst a people not yet fitted for such a form, citizens, lacking the impulse to claim equal power with each other, become careless in the exercise of their franchise, doubt whether it is of any use to them, and even pride themselves on not interfering in public affairs.* Provided their liberties are but indirectly affected, they will watch the passing of the most insidious measures with vacant unconcern. It is only barefaced aggressions that they can perceive to be aggressions at all. Placing, as they do, but little value upon their privileges, they are readily bribed. When threatened, instead of assuming that attitude of dogged resistance which the instinct of freedom dictates, they truckle. . . . Meanwhile, in accordance with that law of social homogeneity lately dwelt upon, those in authority are in a like

* As an illustration of this, note the behavior of the Prussian electors following the revolution of 1848; or observe the attitude of the colored population of our own country. Also note the elevating tendency that self-dependence and self-government has upon individuals,—a strong argument for universal emancipation.

ratio ready to encroach. They intimidate, they bribe, they plot, and by degrees establish a comparatively coercive government.

On the other hand, amongst a people sufficiently endowed with the faculty responding to the law of equal freedom, no such retrograde process is possible. The man of genuinely democratic feeling loves liberty as a miser loves gold, for its own sake, and quite irrespective of its advantages. What he thus highly values, he sleeplessly watches; he quickly detects any attempt at diminution of it; and he opposes aggression the moment it commences. Should any one assume undue prerogatives, he straightway steps up to them and demands their authority for so doing. Transactions that seem in the remotest degree underhand awaken his suspicions, which are not to be laid so long as anything remains unexplained. He scents out an abuse with instinctive sagacity, and having found one never rests until it is abolished. If in any proposed arrangement there be a latent danger to the liberties of himself and others—any germ of irresponsible power—he instantly discovers it, and refuses his consent. . . . Thus is he ever on the watch to extirpate incipient oppression; to nip abuses in the bud; or, if such an expression is allowable, to stop encroachment before it begins. And when a community consists of men animated by the spirit thus exemplified, the continuance of liberal institutions is certain.—*Social Statics*, chapter xx., section 10.

Thus plainly is the importance of an enlightened public opinion and a jealous regard for our liberties set forth. Let no one think that legislation in the wrong direction is of little or no importance because the bill in question will entail no hardship. It is well to remember that precedents are sometimes more powerful than the most evident principles; and that legislation once started on the downward course is like a huge boulder rolling down a mountain side—already difficult to check, but which, before we know it, attains such a velocity that it is beyond human power to affect its progress in the least, and it rushes uncontrollably on in its terrible career, crushing all before it, leaving naught but death and desolation in its path. Little do the inaugurators of religious legislation seem to realize the results that must necessarily follow the departure from the American principle of absolute separation of religion from the State. But as little as this danger is generally realized, it was emphatically declared sixty years ago, during the Sunday mail agitation of 1829–30, in the following strong words in a report to the national House of Representatives against any legislation upon the Sunday question by that body:—

If the measure recommended should be adopted, it would be difficult for human sagacity to foresee how rapid would be the succession, or how numerous the train of measures which would follow, involving the dearest rights of all—the rights of conscience.

These words should arouse the American people to a sense of the danger involved in the enactment of Sunday laws, either State or national. Aye, more than this: having seen their injustice and their dangerous tendency, they should never rest till the last vestige of a Sunday law is abolished, and every cent of the people's money is safe from appropriations to sectarian

uses. Maintain the integrity of the Federal Constitution—that noblest and greatest of all political documents—at all hazards, and at whatever cost.

W. A. BLAKELY.

Church Property Exempt from Taxation.

PRESIDENT GRANT, in his message of 1875, said:—

In connection with this important question I would also call your attention to the importance of correcting an evil, that, if permitted to continue, will probably lead to great trouble before the close of the nineteenth century. It is the acquisition of vast amounts of untaxed church property. In 1850, I believe the church property of the United States, which paid no tax, municipal or State, amounted to \$87,000,000. In 1860 the amount had doubled. In 1870 it was \$354,483,587. By 1900, without a check, it is safe to say this property will reach a sum exceeding \$3,000,000,000. So vast a sum, receiving all the protection and benefits of Government, without bearing its proportion of the burdens and expenses of the same, will not be looked upon acquiescently by those who have to pay the taxes. In a country, where real estate values enhance so rapidly with time as in the United States, there is scarcely a limit to the wealth that may be acquired by corporations, religious or otherwise, if allowed to retain real estate without taxation. The accumulation of so vast a property as here alluded to, without taxation, may lead to sequestration without constitutional authority, and through blood. I WOULD SUGGEST THE TAXATION OF ALL PROPERTY EQUALLY.

It would be well if all could realize the truth of these words, and the results that might come from such a course, if continued, in the future; or even realize the imposition on the tax-payers of to-day.

The Church has the protection of the State from the onslaught of her enemies; the protection, by the civil law, in her worship from disturbance by disbelievers or fanatics without a cent of remuneration; and just the same benefit as the individual, business corporation, society, or order that pays taxes for the support of the State and national Governments under which we live.

I am a believer in the religion of Jesus Christ, and would not say or do anything to bring it into disrepute or cast it down. But I do think, nevertheless, and it is true, that any society, religious or otherwise, having the benefits derived from the Government, should be equally taxed.

And further, when any individuals or corporations are exempt from taxation it falls upon the remaining individuals and corporations to make up the required amount of tax.

Therefore there is not only a class receiving the benefits derived from the Government without paying their share for such benefit, but, on the other hand, the masses are compelled to pay indirectly not alone for the protection, but also for the support and upbuilding of religious sects, and thereby religions which they cannot espouse. As an example, I will mention the Catholic Church, as it is the greatest in numbers in the United States. Just see the millions of dollars worth of property owned by her, not taxed. The same with

other churches, but to a less extent. Is this justice? I say, No. WE OUGHT ALL to say, with James A. Garfield, in his words to Congress, June 22 1874, as follows:—

The divorce between Church and State ought to be absolute. It ought to be so absolute that no Church property anywhere, in any State, or in the Nation, should be exempt from equal taxation; for if you exempt the property of any Church organization, to that extent you impose a tax upon the whole community.

S. H. CARNAHAN.

The Sabbath as a Civil Institution.

UNDER the above heading, the official organ of the American Sabbath Union published some time since an article written by the Hon. E. S. Fancher, of New York. He begins by saying:—

The Christian Sabbath is observed and well established in the United States of America as a day of rest and religious worship; and both by the common law and by statutory legislation it is protected as a civil institution.

What right has the Government to protect as a *civil institution* that which is not a civil institution? The writer calls it "The Christian Sabbath," and yet he says "it is protected as a civil institution." Christian institutions are not civil institutions, and no one has any moral right to treat them as such. Yet this is what the American Sabbath Union is organized to do. The writer continues:—

In all the States of the Union the principles of the common law prevail, and in nearly all of them the Sabbath of Christianity is regulated by laws passed to secure the peace and good order of the community.

Notice that it is the "Sabbath of Christianity" which is "regulated by laws." This is what the American Sabbath Union upholds. But what right has the civil Government to regulate Christianity by law? When the Roman Empire regulated Christianity by law, they had a union of Church and State; and wherever Christianity is established or regulated by law in this country, we have a union of Church and State. But when this is so, and every person is compelled to conform to such regulations, how can any man worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience?

It has always been the plea of those who regulated religion by law that it was absolutely necessary "to secure the peace and good order of the community." That is the old story. But no Sunday laws are needed to secure the peace and good order of the community. There are laws to secure peace and good order on every day, Sunday included; and if these laws can be enforced on all of the days, there is no need of Sunday laws for that purpose. When, therefore, the American Sabbath Union asks for Sunday legislation, it must be for some other purpose than the one here given. Again, the writer says:—

Sabbath observance was enjoined and regulated by colonial laws before any organization of the Gov-

ernment of the States. The Sabbath is, therefore, a civil institution older than the States.

All the writer gives, throughout his entire article, to prove that the Sabbath is a civil institution, is the fact that Legislatures have regulated and enforced its observance by law. On this principle, all the institutions of Christianity could be turned into civil institutions simply by passing laws for their enforcement. Enjoin and regulate Christian baptism and the Lord's supper by law, and they would at once become civil institutions according to the principle of the American Sabbath Union. When Charlemagne compelled the Saxons to receive "Christian baptism," then by the same token, Christian baptism became a "civil institution," just as the "Christian Sabbath" is now.

How nicely this principle was applied in the Dark Ages by the men who condemned the martyrs to death. When they burned men at the stake for ignoring the laws they had passed to regulate and enforce what they called the institutions of Christianity, all they had to do was to say, "This is not religious persecution, because we are not trying to force people to be religious; we punish them merely for refusing to recognize the civil institutions of the State. To be sure, these are the institutions of Christianity, but the Holy Roman Empire has passed laws to regulate and enforce them, and this has made them civil institutions. Of course it is the duty of the State to protect its own institutions, consequently it is right to burn these men who refuse to submit; and it cannot be called religious persecution, for certainly nobody's conscience is interfered with." Thus the Church never persecuted nor punished anybody, and never put anybody to death. The Church merely excommunicated them, and the State punished them for violating State laws.

Further, the writer says:—

Judicial decisions have held that it is not a violation of the rights of conscience of any, that the Sabbath of the people, the day set apart by common consent and usage, from the first settlement of the land, as a day of rest, and recognized by the common law of the State as such, and expressly recognized in the Constitution as an existing institution, should be respected by the law-making power, and provision made to prevent its desecration.

To desecrate a thing is to treat it as though it was not sanctified or sacred, hence to prevent its desecration is to prevent people from treating it in that way. But if they are not allowed to treat it as though it was not sanctified, they will be obliged to treat it as though it were sanctified. The object, therefore, of Sunday legislation is to force people to recognize the sanctity of Sunday. Civil institutions are not sanctified. Only religious institutions are sanctified, and only such can be desecrated. The Sabbath, being sanctified, is a religious and not a civil institution. To treat a religious institution as God directs is to observe its sanctity; to treat it in any different way is to desecrate it. Further, to regard the sanctity of anything

is religious worship; and since the object of Sunday legislation is to compel people to observe the sanctity of Sunday, it is therefore proved that the object of Sunday laws is to secure religious worship.

The fact that civil judges have decided that Sabbath laws are no infringement upon the rights of conscience does not prove that this is so. The fact is, civil judges are usurping the prerogative of God when they assume jurisdiction over any such question, and hence their decisions amount to nothing. Christ said, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." This shows that Cæsar has no jurisdiction over the things which belong to God, and the Sabbath is one of those things. "It is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." It is Christ, and not Cæsar, who is Lord of the Sabbath, and we deny the right of any civil power to undertake to regulate that which belongs to Christ, and thus constitute itself lord of the Sabbath in Christ's stead.

This writer next says:—

The existence of the Sabbath as a civil institution being conceded, the right of the Legislature to control and regulate it is a necessary sequence.

This would be true provided it was "conceded" by the proper authority. But as Christ is Lord of the Sabbath, he is the only one that has any authority to make such a concession. Christ, however, has never conceded any such thing; hence the conclusion does not follow.

Again, the article says:—

If precedents were necessary to establish the right to legislate upon the subject, they could be cited from the statutes and ordinances of every government really or nominally Christian, and from the earliest period.

This statement is certainly true; but it is just as true that, if precedents can establish the right of things, there is hardly an abomination on the face of the earth that cannot be established as right. Liquor drinking, polygamy, slavery, and religious persecution have for ages been defended by law; but this does not prove them to be right. Of course there are precedents for Sunday laws. The new States point to the older ones for their example, the older States point to the Colonies, the Colonies point to Protestant England, she in turn to Catholic England, with the other European countries, while all these point to Papal Rome, the original fountain of all Sunday laws. But Rome had a union of Church and State, and Sunday laws were a part of that system. Hence, wherever such laws are enacted, it is a step, not toward, but *in* a union of Church and State. It establishes a precedent for religious legislation, and that is what the National Reformers and the American Sabbath Union are trying to do. They may call it a "civil Sabbath," and tell us they do not intend to enforce any part of the Christian religion, but they cannot conduct an argument of any length without proving the contrary

before they get through. In further illustration of this fact, we will offer one more quotation from the article under criticism. Mark this well:—

Christianity has surely done enough toward the elevation of humanity to be entitled to claim that the laws which protect its sacred day shall be maintained.

This shows the purpose of the whole movement. It is not to protect the workmen, or anybody else, but to protect a "sacred day" for the benefit of Christianity. And yet they tell us that Sunday laws are only for the enforcement of a "civil Sabbath." Remember this is in the "Pearl of Days," the official organ of the American Sabbath Union.

But the fact that Christianity has elevated humanity shows that in vitality and power it is superior to humanity, and consequently needs no protection from that source. Christianity can stand alone; it does not have to depend on the civil power. And whatever it may be entitled to, one thing is certain, it never has claimed that any protection was expected or desired by the civil law.

A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

"Reasons for the Sunday Laws."

THIS is the title of an article in the monthly document of the Pacific Coast Department of the American Sabbath Union. As a matter of fact, there are no *reasons* for a Sunday law, but it is proper to notice some of the *pretexts* for such legislation. In the article referred to, it is asserted that "the Legislature has the right to establish a day of compulsory rest, and it has the right to select the day. This is a sort of common-law right and the precedents are manifold."

That assertion is true only on the principle that the power to do any act makes it right. The Declaration of Independence, which contains the foundation principles of our Government, says that all men are "endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." Although not directly specified, it is universally conceded that the specifications—"life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—include the right to honest toil. If the Creator has endowed men with the inalienable right to labor, what Legislature has the right to deprive them of their God-given privilege? If men abuse this privilege by laboring for themselves during the time which God's law has declared to be holy, then they are amenable to God, and not to any human Legislature.

It is conceded on all hands that the Legislature has no right to compel men to labor, only as a punishment for crime; then, on the same principle where does it get the right to compel them to rest, except as a punishment for crime? If the Legislature has the right to compel men to refrain from working one day in the week, it may do so on any or all days. Would

the American Sabbath Union admit the extension of its principle over all days of the week, and stop work altogether? Concede to the Legislature the power to stop men from honest toil, and who will limit the power?

But the Union's organ cites the fact that the "precedents are manifold." I submit that "precedents are manifold" for all manner of usurpations and tyrannies by legislative bodies. Precedents do not make right. There are precedents for every crime in the calendar of crime. There are precedents for the rack, and the thumb-screws, and the dungeon, and the stake, and the Inquisition, to make men religious according to the law, but that does not make such methods right, nor does it make right a principle which, persistently followed up, would necessarily lead to such methods.

The Union further asserts that, "The Legislature in most every State prescribes the hours of work, declaring that eight, nine, or ten hours shall be a legal day's work. This has never been questioned in law, yet it is upon the same principle that the Sunday law is enacted."

There is no parallel whatever between Sunday laws and the laws specifying how many hours shall constitute a day's work. There is not a law in any State which prescribes what particular hours of the day shall constitute a day's work. There is no law that prohibits adult persons from working more hours than are prescribed as a legal day's work. If the legal day's work be eight hours, there is no law which prevents an adult person from working two such days every twenty-four hours, if the proprietor of the work be willing. Even where the laws prescribe a certain number of hours in the twenty-four for children to labor, they do not specify what particular hours they shall labor.

Another so-called reason is: "The object is to afford rest to those who need it, and who otherwise could not obtain it."

Then why not confine it to those who need to rest and who cannot otherwise obtain it? There are plenty of men who rest half of the time or more. They do not need a law to compel them to rest. There are thousands of others who need to work on that day; they do not have regular work on other days, and are glad to get work at any time to support themselves and families. Why compel them to rest when they have a much greater need for work?

The Union says, "To protect labor is one of the highest offices of the law." But the Sunday law is especially and entirely directed to *prevent* labor—to compel men to be idle. The Union says, "The Sunday law treats of business matters—not religious duties." But if we get such a law as is proposed by the American Sabbath Union for California, it will treat of religious duties; for it makes an exemption for such as religiously observe another day

as a day of rest. It does not propose to make Sunday observers religious, but it does propose that those who observe any other day shall be religious. Why? Because, it says, they are the minority, and must do as the majority says. The man who is in the majority may make his rest-day a day of divine worship "if he chooses." The man in the minority must be religious on his rest-day whether he chooses or not.

Such are a few of the many incongruities connected with the Sunday-law proposition.—*Signs of the Times.*

Untaxed Church Property.

BUT few of our citizens realize what a marked distinction exists between this and most of the other States of the Union in the matter of exempting church property from taxation.

In California real estate held by a religious society is assessed and taxed the same as other real estate, no difference being made between that and private property, which is as it should be—exemption from taxation being an indirect subsidy and so far a support of the Church by the State. Now, take the State of Illinois and contrast the condition of things there in this respect. In the city of Chicago alone nearly two thousand lots (1,991) are held by Catholic and Protestant churches. A moderate estimate of the value of which is over \$2,000,000. All of this property is entirely exempt from taxation by the laws of Illinois, though much of it is not used for church purposes, but is either unimproved or occupied by tenants who pay a rental. Although the Protestants are in the majority, the Catholics have one thousand one hundred and eight lots to the Protestants eight hundred and sixty-six. St. Columbkil Sisters of Charity have sixty-eight lots, and the Jesuit Church of the Holy Family eighty. When it is remembered that the value of these mostly unoccupied lots is increasing rapidly, and that the "unearned increment" will make the societies that own them enormously wealthy in process of time, the gross injustice of the whole thing can be properly estimated.

It is a matter of satisfaction to observe that the public press in Chicago, which is the conservator of religious liberty and equal rights, is waking up to the importance of the matter, and calling for such a change as has taken place in California. That the repeal of the law in this State exempting church property from taxation has not worked to the injury of the churches is evident, as their prosperity has been far greater since, than before.—*Oakland (Cal.), Daily Times.*

If a man is faithful to truth, truth will be faithful to him. He need have no fears. His success is a question of time.—*Professor Phelps.*

Who Gets Chased?

In his late meetings in Rome, New York, Mr. Crafts made three statements as follows, that I would like the readers of THE SENTINEL to compare:—

1. He said that brave, God-fearing men, who stand for the right regardless of consequences, are a power. One such man would chase a thousand of cringing slaves.

2. Again, he said that there are twenty-six thousand Adventists, and twenty-six millions of his party. This would make one to a thousand.

3. Again, he said his people could not stand before the Seventh-day Adventists in an argument on the Sunday question; that the Adventists could, and usually did, completely rout them in less than five minutes.

Now let us condense the three statements.

1. A brave, God-fearing man will chase a thousand.

2. There is one Adventist to one thousand Sunday Union men.

3. The Adventists completely rout the Crafts party in less than five minutes.

QUESTION.—Who are the "God-fearing men"?

JOHN R. CALKINS.

REV. W. F. CRAFTS urges the friends of Sunday laws all over the Nation to write to their respective Congressmen urging immediate action upon the Sunday bills now pending. He says:—

Let writing to Congressmen about pending legislation become the people's habit. That is the way to make "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people" something more than a pretty saying. Legislators tell me that they seldom get any letters that are not selfish—if not applications for office, at least for seeds. A letter that urges attention to a great moral question from philanthropic motives is "as rare as a day in June," that is, there are only about thirty such in a Congressman's big mail in a year. They are, therefore, influential, though badly written. Such letters have been quoted in the Senate as evidence of the workingmen's interest in pending bills. The Sunday-rest bills for the Capital and for all under the jurisdiction of Congress, would doubtless become a law during this Congress, and the pending temperance bills also, if every one who believes in them would at once write to his two Senators and his Congressman, the stockholders in the national corporation, thus informing the directors of their wishes.

This shows that no stone is to be left unturned to secure the legislation demanded in the interests of Sunday sacredness.

It is stated that a number of prominent Germans refuse to pay their subscriptions to the World's Fair fund until such time as they are given positive information as to whether the Exposition is to be closed on Sunday or not. It is not strange that the Germans take such action, but in view of the anti-foreign feeling which is developing so rapidly in this country, it is very likely to give impetus to the Sunday-closing movement rather than the contrary.



NEW YORK, JANUARY 8, 1891.

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

THE *Sun* has the following sensible words on the school question: "The introduction of religion into the schools means the overthrow of the whole public school system. They cannot be State schools unless they are purely secular; and they cannot be religious schools without becoming purely church schools."

SOME months since the *Orleans Herald* took issue with us upon the question of teaching morals in the public schools. Now it indorses the position taken by the Baptists of this State, which is substantially the same as our own. We are glad to note this evidence that the *Herald* has become a convert to the faith which it once opposed. Such papers are a good deal nearer the people than the great city dailies, and have in their sphere much influence in molding public opinion.

WILLIAM ALLEN BUTLER says that because Blackstone declares "Christianity to be part of the law of the land," therefore it is a part of the law of the United States. The next position for William Allen Butler to take is, that the President of the United States never dies, and can do no wrong. When the Papal Monopoly League has elected its candidate for the Presidency of the United States, Mr. Butler will doubtless be called upon to advocate this theory to the people at large.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *New York Observer* writing from California says:—

In and about our city are several institutions in which are gathered the poor, the lame, the halt, the wicked. Being under municipal control, of course nothing is done for these men and women in the line of spiritual work. Hence if they are reached at all, it must be by interested parties without. Something, I am glad to say, has from time to time been done. Private individuals have visited them, carrying religious literature, singing and praying with the inmates, and, as opportunity offered, preaching the Word. But this was felt to be inadequate; and so there has recently been formed the Prison and Hospital Religious Association."

It is unsectarian and inter-denominational. Its president is a Presbyterian elder—a thoroughgoing business man, its vice-president is a Methodist clergyman, while a Congregational minister is its efficient secretary. Associated with these is a Board of Directors, composed of five ladies and five gentlemen. Already a missionary has been employed, and efforts are now making to bring the whole matter to the notice of the Christian and other charitable disposed people of the city. With such co-

operation, with the assistance which good Christian workers from the various churches will give, and the faithful and indefatigable labors of our missionary, it is expected that not a little good will result. May God grant it.

And this is just the sort of work that ought to be done by Christians everywhere in public charitable and penal institutions. Can any one doubt that such effort put forth, with the honest desire to do good, would be infinitely better than any number of State-paid chaplains?

THE *Christian Register* publishes the following incident:—

Mrs. A. and her five-year old daughter recently had a Jewish neighbor die, leaving a pretty boy-baby orphan dependent on public sympathy. His condition appealed very strongly to little Miss A., and she tried to convince her mother of the advantages it would be to the baby to have them for mother and sister. Mrs. A., with the idea of settling the matter, said, "But, Mabel, he is a Jew, and you wouldn't have a Jew for a brother would you?" Mabel thought for a moment and then said, "No, mamma; but couldn't you spank him and make him believe in Christ?"

"This little girl," says the *Register*, "was simply putting into childish phrase the spirit and method of coercion illustrated again and again in the history of the Christian Church."

A PHYSICIAN in West Virginia writes as follows:—

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL: I am receiving your paper regularly, by the kindness of some friend unknown to me, to whom I am very grateful for it. What you and the National Religious Liberty Association advocate is certainly vital to true American patriotism. Were I financially able, I would like to show you my sympathy in cash; but a poor country practice and a large family prevent me. I have had warm friends in Dakota, who belonged to the Seventh-day Baptists, who worshiped with me in a regular Baptist Church. I learned from them that that denomination sincerely love the Bible. I see, too, that you love the dear book, and am glad of it.

THE *Christian Advocate* deplors the fact that certain New York papers are enabled to advertise beforehand in the interests of their Sunday editions, articles from more or less eminent clergymen of different denominations, each setting forth the reasons for his particular faith. "Such conduct," says the *Advocate*, "on the part of ministers encourages the buying of Sunday papers, and is so designed by those who procure and advertise them." "Most inroads upon the Sabbath," it remarks, "are promoted as much by professed Christians as by antagonists of the gospel and irreligious men." In the light of this statement, which is certainly true, it looks very much as though the demand for more rigid Sunday laws, springs, in part at least, from a desire to compel the ministers to live up to their professions.

A WINNIPEG dispatch says that one of the chief contentions of the Catholics' attorney in the school case there, was, that they should be free from the necessity of supporting schools other than their parochial institutions. The judge held that the law does not abridge their right to have separate schools, but as the public schools are non-sectarian there is no reason why the Legislature cannot compel everybody to contribute to their support. If that is the case of the Catholics, they have a poor one.

AT the annual Sabbath Reform Convention of the Western Pennsylvania Sabbath Association, held in the Eighth Street Reformed Presbyterian Church, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, November 18, Mr. Crafts said:—

New England ought to be near the head of the class in Sunday observance, but it is nearer the other end. The Puritanical spirit has left it and is now springing up in the West. The Rocky mountain Sabbath is improving, while the New England Sabbath is retrograding. Through the Sabbath Association we have secured good observance of the law in Boston and other cities. But there they run Sunday trains to carry milk to the babies and newspaper trains to carry scandals to the men. We have reason for encouragement in the enforcement of law in New York, Brooklyn, Baltimore and all the large cities of the country. Pennsylvania observes Sunday the best of any State, and Pittsburg and Philadelphia the best of any cities, but there is room for improvement. Only three States are now without Sunday laws, and they are California, Idaho, and Wyoming. In these States we are making war and will force the issue. We want to enlist the solid men in every community. We advocate no violence, but want to repress the base sort of foreigners who would pervert our American Sabbath.

In reading this statement the question naturally arises, if Sunday laws are so potent for good as Mr Crafts teaches that they are, how comes it that New England, having on its statute book such laws, is retrograding, not only in Sunday observance but in morals generally?

THE *Scientific American*, referred to in another column, under the heading of "Patents," is the very best publication in this country for those interested in science, engineering, mechanics, inventions, etc. A father can give his young son no better present than a year's reading of this valuable paper.

It is stated that "there are now ninety-eight associations working in behalf of Sunday," in California.

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 2 to 100 copies, per year, each, - - - 90c.

In clubs of 100 or more copies, per year, each, - - - 75c.

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

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,

43 Bond Street, New York.