



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 5, 1891.

NUMBER 6.

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.

SENATOR CARLISLE says: "It is the duty of the Government to administer public affairs, and the duty of the people to manage their own private affairs."

ACCORDING to the *Utica Press*, Mr. Crafts says that "the European Sabbath is conceded by the rulers in order to appease the people. They call it personal liberty, but we know it means slavery." A likely story, that the people clamor for slavery!

ALL questions of political economy and of party politics are insignificant compared with the great questions of *personal liberty*, the maintenance of our public schools and the perpetuation of *religious freedom* in these United States.—*Rev. R. S. MacArthur. D. D.*

A JEWISH monarch by grasping the holy censer, lost both his scepter and his freedom. [2 Chron. 26:19.] A destiny as little to be envied may be the lot of the American people who hold the sovereignty of power, if they, in the person of their representatives, shall attempt to unite in the remotest degree, Church and State.—*Col. Richard M. Johnson.*

JEFFERSON'S doctrine was that all men are created free and equal. Of course he did not mean that the Congo negroes, as we find them in Africa, are equal in ability or attainment, to the Anglo-Saxon as he is to-day. Our understanding of Jefferson's declaration has always been, that in political rights and privileges our Creator

had made all men equal, but that human pride and selfishness had made distinctions and privileged classes. Jefferson asserted the essential doctrine of democracy. Stated in other words, it means that every American citizen should have an equal chance as far as our laws affect him.—*Farm, Field, and Stockman.*

Evils of Paternalism.

MRS. SALLY JOY WHITE has written a book, on cookery in the public school, and a Western paper comments upon the fact as follows:—

Much of the misery and unhappiness in woman's life is caused by her ignorance in the most simple things in domestic life. Mrs. White advocates a kitchen in every girls' school, at public expense. Anything in the public school which will give the child an idea, is commendable. Two thousand girls are receiving training in kitchens now, in Boston. A girl cannot know woman's work if not taught, and as boys are being taught in technical schools to do men's work so should the girls be taught to do women's work also. The world is becoming more practical, schooling is in keeping with the age in which we live, and to it we must look for a higher grade of morals among the rising generation of both sexes.

It is true that ignorance of how to prepare healthful and palatable food is deplorable, but it does not follow that the State should undertake to give instruction in cookery. "Boys are being taught in technical schools to do men's work," and very properly so too, but the cases are by no means analogous. Few homes afford the facilities for giving a mechanical and business education, such as is demanded for boys, but every home does, or at least should, afford facilities for giving instruction in common household duties including practical cooking; and it is in the home and by the mother, or at least under the supervision of the mother, and under home influences, that girls should receive this instruction.

There would be nothing radically wrong in the State's giving this instruction, as there would be in its teaching religion. The evil in it is that it is right in line with the mischievous idea, that seems to

be rapidly gaining ground in this country, that the parents owe no duty to their children after they arrive at a school age, except to feed and clothe them. Indeed, it is seriously proposed to practically turn the children over to the State at a still more tender age than formerly. A recent number of the *Catholic Review* notes the fact that "the kindergarten is becoming popular in this country, and a society has been organized in the city of New York to establish independent kindergartens, which may in time become the property of the public school system." "There is," says the *Review*, "more significance in this movement than appears on its surface." And the significance is in the trend which we have indicated. It shows that the tendency of the times is to increase the influence of the State upon the life of the child and to minimize that of the parent; to make the State everything to the child and the parent nothing. Judging from present indications it will not be long until the only duty of parents, as such, will be to beget and bear children for the State; teachers in the employ of the State to do the rest.

The evil is a wide-spread and growing one, and has obtruded itself even upon the attention of Congress. In a speech in the House, January 15, Mr. Clements, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, said:—

People come about our committee rooms full of sentiment. They tell us that it is better to provide school-houses and free school books and everything of that kind than to spend money in maintaining penitentiaries and prisons. That is a very beautiful statement. It sounds very well; and it is all right. But so far as I have been able to observe, it does not necessarily follow that because a man or a woman is educated therefore he does not deserve to go to the penitentiary. As a gentleman near me suggests, something may depend upon whether a child is educated at the public expense; for if he has struggled individually to buy his books and find time to go to school and to take care of himself, he will most probably make a virtuous and industrious man.

In the same line we had before the Committee a proposition to establish about ten kindergartens here in the city of Washington. I do not desire to make any criticism upon the estimable ladies who repre-

sented this enterprise, nor do I criticise the system of kindergartens. They are all right. But the argument was that we should provide means by which the Government may become the father or the mother of the child at the age of three, taking him out of the street and making a good citizen of him; that it is better to support such a system as this rather than to maintain prisons and penitentiaries.

But the statistics not only of this country but other countries fail to sustain the argument that in proportion to the schools and kindergartens which are established the prisons and the penitentiaries are less necessary. This proposition involves all along the idea of taking the child at the age of three years and putting him entirely under the influence of public-school teachers; of others than the parents. In this idea there is a total neglect of what is a very necessary branch of education. The child is taught from the start that he must look to the Government for everything; that is the first principle.

The idea of self-reliance is entirely eradicated; he is taught to look to the Government for clothing, food, and everything. Not only that, but he is taken care of by the public instructor, by the Government through its agents, and to this extent home influences are removed from him, the great lesson of morality and religion, those principles which are necessary in the government of the life of a man or a woman to keep him or her out of the penitentiary or the prison, are almost entirely neglected.

The thing that we call progress in the public schools includes especially looking to the intellectual training of the child; and besides we have a lot of teachers going from school-house to school-house attending to the development of the muscles, giving lessons about physical movements and various forms of muscular exercises. I make no objection whatever to that; I think it is all very well; but I do not believe in governmental control and education of the intellect and the muscles to the entire neglect of the home teaching of the heart, the instruction in morality, fidelity, honesty, industry, self-reliance, religion. These are all wiped out by the paternal system of government.

Mr. Clements has clearly pointed out some of the evils of this system of laying upon the State burdens and responsibilities that should be borne by the individual. Parents can do for their children vastly more in the way of aiding them to form right characters than it is possible for the State to do, and they are under the most solemn obligations to do it. They make a fatal mistake when they seek, at the hands of the State, relief from the responsibilities which come to them because they are parents. It is right that schools should be established for the instruction of the youth of both sexes in those things that cannot be better taught at home; but the idea that children of tender age must be taught in public kindergartens and that girls must be taught the culinary art in public schools and at public expense, when the instruction could be given much better in the home, is most mischievous. It shows a dangerous tendency on the part of the parents to shirk duties that should be held sacred and conscientiously discharged, and also an equally dangerous tendency upon the part of the State to undertake work that naturally belongs to the home. The home and home influences should be preserved at all hazards; parental care and parental influences should be preserved and strengthened rather than weakened. Did we for a mo-

ment believe that as a people we were dependent upon public school training for a higher grade of morals in the rising generation of both sexes, we should despair of the future of our country. If good morals and correct habits cannot be taught in the home, and if American home influences are so impotent and depraved that they cannot be trusted to teach moral principles and domestic duties, the evil is indeed great; so great that the State, which cannot possibly be morally superior to the individuals that compose it, cannot correct it, even by such heroic methods as public kindergartens and State-supported kitchens.

C. P. B.

Efficacy of Prayer.

THE *Christian Cynosure*, of Chicago, a religious paper, contends in favor of having all courts of justice, as well as sessions of legislative bodies and political conventions, opened with prayer, and also that on a case being tried in the courts and submitted to a jury, their first act, on retiring to the jury-room, should be to kneel and engage in prayer for divine enlightenment and guidance. If, as would probably sometimes be the case, there is not a single religious man among the twelve, the writer would have a clergyman called in to pray with and for them.

The following almost incredible instance is given in illustration of the efficacy of prayer in the jury-room.

In an important case recently tried at Wichita, Kansas, the jury failed to agree and were kept in their room two whole days. They were unanimously of opinion at the end of this time that agreement on a verdict was impossible, and so declared, but the Judge, a very pious man, refused to discharge them, and called in his pastor, who not only prayed for, but preached to them in the jury-room, with the result that they agreed on the first ballot after these extraordinary services. What the verdict was, and whether it was a just one or not, it is not stated, and was apparently not considered essential to the argument. It was sufficient that some agreement was arrived at. If the decision of the jury in this instance was, as is sometimes the case, in direct opposition to the law, and the facts as brought out at the trial, the result certainly does not tell in favor of the experiment.

Again, if the decision was a just one in this case, no assurance is afforded of a similar result in another case. For aught that appears, the effect of their confinement for the third day, and their being subjected to listen to a perhaps tedious prayer and more tedious sermon, was only to render the jurymen desperate and lead them to agree on something, no matter what, so as to get away from their irksome prison house and the presence of their ghostly tormentor.

However this may have been, the whole proceeding, if it ever took place, which there is great reason to doubt, was an absurd farce and a disgraceful travesty of justice and right. While a jury is in session, no communication with outsiders is rightly allowable. Its seclusion is sacred, and the intrusion of any person, either clerical or lay, with the view of influencing their verdict in any manner, directly or indirectly, is inexcusable. That it should have been done at the suggestion, or by the order rather, of the Court, as stated, is well-nigh incredible. If it was, the Judge should be impeached and divested of his besmirched judicial robes as soon as possible.

The establishment of such a custom might be of some value to impecunious and place-hunting preachers, for in that case each trial court would have to employ a salaried court preacher, as well as a short-hand reporter, but otherwise no one would be benefited, and the entire tendency of the thing would be to bring the court and its decisions into deserved contempt.

Preaching and praying are religious exercises; and under our secular form of government, are as much out of place in our legislative halls and courts of justice as in our public schools. All mixing up of Church and State is an abomination and an offense to the spirit of our free institutions.

It is true, and pity 'tis true that chaplains are still employed in our Legislatures and sometimes, not always, in our political conventions. It is one of those cases where old custom retains its sway in despite of general progress and more sensible views. It used to be the custom in New England, before a general election, for one of the ministers of the Capital City to preach by appointment an "election sermon," as it was called, and in some States the old custom is still observed, but it is little regarded in these days, and is "more honored in the breach than in the observance." Nothing is here said or intimated against prayers or sermons in their proper place, but that place is not our civil courts of justice or the jury-room.—*Oakland (Cal.) Times*.

Good Sense.

ONE of the principles of the Farmers' Alliance, which has of late become a power in politics, is that the Government shall issue a sufficient quantity of treasury notes to enable the business of the country to be transacted on a cash basis, and that these notes should be loaned to the people on any good security at a rate of interest not to exceed two per cent. This is a very taking proposition to people who want money, and do not think enough to know how *real* money only can come. The National Grange has fallen in with the Farmers' Alliance on this point; and the

State Grange of Michigan in its annual meeting, last month, gave its voice upon this question in the following plain statement of sound principles:—

We regret that the National Grange, the Farmers' Alliance, and other organizations of farmers have indorsed the proposition in one form or another to make loans by the Government to the people.

That the issuing of one billion of treasury notes and loaning it to the people, either directly or indirectly, at a low rate of interest, would lead to a wild clamor for credit, every intelligent person must admit.

That no system could be devised or its operation so guarded as to prevent partiality and favoritism in its distribution, first to personal friends of the loaning agent, next to his political associates, every thoughtful man must foresee.

That it would create a feeling of helpless dependence upon Government aid by those whom it is designed to benefit, thereby relaxing their individual effort, destroying their energy and self-reliance and rendering them helpless mendicants of Government charity, every observer of human nature must know.

That it would lead to thriftless improvidence, relying upon Government aid, or Government forbearance, by those whom it seeks to benefit, and prove a curse instead of a blessing, is so plainly evident that we are surprised that the National Grange should allow itself to be carried away by the clamor of those who hope to gain for themselves public preferment by holding out a scheme so enticing to the ignorant or improvident debtor, and scheming speculator.

Yet as sound as these principles are, and though they be so plainly stated as to be easily understood by all who can read, we doubt very much whether either the Farmers' Alliance or the National Grange will accept them.

Shall the State Teach Morals?

Two weeks ago, in answer to a question from the Pastor of the Independent Church at Bloomington, Illinois, we briefly gave our views upon this subject. The matter is again called up by another letter from the same gentleman, who writes as follows:—

Bloomington, Jan. 16, 1891.

To the Editor: I was quite surprised to find in the last issue of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL that my brief note of ten days ago had called for unfavorable comment, or for that matter, any comment at all.

I am free to confess that I certainly did not "understand the position" of THE SENTINEL on the public school question as touching the inculcation of morals in our common schools.

If I now understand you, it is to the effect that *morals should be taught in the family, in the church, in the parochial school, but not in the public or common school.*

If the youth of the State should be taught morals,—if it is desirable they should have any ethical training,—why not give them these advantages in the common school?

THE SENTINEL answers by saying that morals cannot be taught without teaching religion—without the recognition of Christian authority—the Bible—or the God of the Bible. And this cannot be done without connecting religion and State.

Will THE SENTINEL permit me to say that the purest forms of morality—the purest and noblest qualities of it—were among men centuries before the Pentateuch was given by Moses? That five hundred years before Jesus, our Lord, was born, the very highest and safest excellence of moral character existed among the various nations of the earth? That among all men, in all epochs of his-

tory, in all grades of civil and moral culture and religious character, the very essence of morality has existed and has been the safeguard of the people? Morality is authority, because it is best; just as moral and physical purity carry with them—is inherent in them—the very highest qualities of authority. Therefore it is not necessary, in order to moral character, that either Moses, Jesus, Osiris, Brahma, Mohammed, Buddha, Odin, or any other written authority, shall be recognized, for among them all the same moral excellence has been recognized—a moral excellence which is the *common property of mankind*—as the idea of God in many forms is the common property of man.

Again, will THE SENTINEL, which recognizes that morals should be taught the youth, and specifies the church school, the private school, and the family, as the necessary instructors, please tell us where that very large class of children, who have no moral homes, no church, no private tutelage, are to receive the necessary moral instruction, in order that they may be qualified to discharge the duties of citizenship safely? Somebody must teach them, or the State will be endangered by ignorance and immorality.

I did not anticipate that I would be called upon to justify my short note to THE SENTINEL. I am glad, however, that you have been entirely frank in the statement of your views, and trust that THE SENTINEL will come to see that morals can be taught without recognizing the religion or creed of any sect or denomination. Meanwhile, I heartily indorse the aim of THE SENTINEL to oppose all legislation on the Sunday question, or forcible entrance of *religion* in our common schools—that is, as long as religion is held to be indissolubly joined to creed.

H. O. HOFFMAN.

We are afraid that we must disappoint the hopes of our correspondent, for we are not at all likely to "come to see that morals [in any but a restricted sense] can be taught without recognizing religion." *Morals must have a sanction*; therefore, to teach morals is not only to teach rules governing actions but to teach also *the reasons for those rules*; and our position is that the only adequate reasons for the most fundamental moral principles are found in the law of God. That this conclusion is justified by usage is easily shown.

Webster defines "morality" thus:—

The relation of conformity or non-conformity to the *true moral standard or rule*; the quality of an intention, a character, an action, a principle or a sentiment, when tried by *the standard of right*; the quality of an action which renders it good; the conformity of an act to *the divine law*, or to the principle of morals.

"Moral," used as an adjective, is defined by the same authority, as follows:—

1. Relating to duty or obligation; pertaining to those intentions and actions of which right and wrong, virtue and vice, are predicated, or to the rules by which such actions and intentions ought to be directed; relating to the practice, manners, or conduct of men as social beings in relation to each other, as respects right and wrong, so far as they are properly subject to rules.

2. Conformed to rules of right, or to *the divine law respecting social duties*; virtuous; just.

The definition of "right," as applied to morals, is:—

Conformed to the constitution of man and the *will of God*; never deviating from the true and just; according with truth and duty; unswerving; just; true.

In answering the question, "What is the difference between religion and morality?" the *Christian Union* says:—

Religion is defined by Max Muller as being such a manifestation of the Infinite as produces an influence upon the moral character of man. In a less generic but more practical sense, religion is the maintenance of such relations between the soul and God as promote life and character that are righteous. Accepting either of these definitions, there is evidently no true religion which does not promote morality, and, in our judgment, there is no permanent, enduring morality which is not rooted in and dependent upon religion.

We are well aware that the word "moral" is used to signify no more than outwardly correct deportment, civility, a recognition of natural rights, and the like, but as we have seen, it means much more than this; it means "conformed to the divine law." It follows that that which Mr. Hoffman wants to have taught in the public schools is not morality but utilitarianism—"the doctrine that virtue is defined and enforced by its tendency to promote the highest happiness of the universe." The nearest approach that it is possible to make to genuine morality without reference to the law of God, which, according to Webster, is "the true moral standard," would be to teach civility and civil justice upon the basis of the self-evident truth that all men are by nature endowed with certain inalienable rights; but this should not be taught as the *sum* of morals, neither should it be taught that this truth, though self-evident, is the ultimate basis of all moral obligation.

To teach utilitarianism is to establish in the mind of the pupil a purely human standard of action, and to teach him not only that it is a standard, but that it is *the* standard. This would at once place the State in antagonism to Christianity. The effect on the pupil would be, as we remarked in a former article, to place him in a position where it would be impossible for the teaching of the gospel to reach and elevate him at any subsequent time, because he would be unable to comprehend the existence of anything higher or more desirable than his own conceptions of right, to recognize any obligations higher than what might appear to *him* to be his self-evident obligations to his fellow-men.

Because it is desirable that moral instruction should be given to all children it does not follow that the State should give it. A failure on the part of the State to teach morals would neither lessen the quantity nor injure the quality of the moral instruction given to the youth of the land. Indeed, the effect of the State's tampering with such things is to paralyze spontaneous home Christian missionary effort. The less the State professes to give of moral and religious instruction, the more will be given by Christian benevolent institutions of all kinds—given as it should be given, and by those who should give it. The State is the poorest possible dependence in such a matter.

We are well aware that much—we think too much—has been claimed for the morality of the ancient pagans. True, the world has always had some knowledge of

correct moral principles, but this has been because it has never been utterly devoid of the moral law. History shows that as any people have lost sight of the principles of that law they have retrograded morally. We do not entertain the idea that God left the world without witness till the time of Christ, nor even till the giving of the law at Sinai. And as far as correct morals were ever practiced among the heathen, their existence was, we hold, due to the fact that the people still retained some knowledge of the moral law. Of the heathen who had not the written law, the Apostle Paul said: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." Rom. 2:14, 15.

The boasted morality of even the most enlightened heathen philosophers did not approach the morality of the divine law, and is not to be compared with it. It is well known that the Spartans taught their children to lie and steal. According to Professor Stuart, "both the Epicureans and the Stoics allowed and defended sodomy and incest, numbering these horrid crimes among the things indifferent." Horne says: "Pride, and the love of popular applause were esteemed the best and greatest incentives to virtue and noble actions; suicide was regarded as the strongest mark of heroism." "Acts of the soul—the adultery of the eye and the murder of the heart—were little regarded.* On the contrary, the philosophers countenanced, both by arguments and example, the most flagitious practices. Thus theft, as is well known, was permitted in Egypt and Sparta; Plato taught the expediency and lawfulness of exposing children in particular cases; and Aristotle, also, of abortion. The exposure of infants, and the putting to death of children who were weak and imperfect in form, was allowed at Sparta, by Lycurgus." "Customary swearing was commended, if not by the precepts, yet by the example of the best moralists among the heathen philosophers, particularly Socrates, Plato, Seneca, and the Emperor Julian." "The unlimited gratification of their sensual appetites, and the commission of unnatural crimes, was common among the most distinguished teachers of philosophy, and was practiced even by Socrates himself." Gibbon testifies that "the devotion of the pagans was not incompatible with the most licentious skepticism."

That these things are true of even the best heathens is not strange, when we con-

* Many advocates of "natural morality" in our own day attach but little importance to thoughts and intents of the heart. Only a few days since a prominent Freethought editor said to the writer: "Covetousness is not immoral; it is the spring of all progress." And yet covetousness is the root of theft, as lust is of social vice.

sider that their morality and religion were alike utilitarian. Their gods were of like passions with themselves, and their highest incentives to virtue were "pride and love of applause." And now it is seriously proposed, not only by Freethinkers but by not a few Christians, to teach morality in our public schools in a way that will make pride and love of applause the highest incentive to virtue, in the minds of the rising generation. The children are to be taught to be good that they may be happy and highly esteemed, to be honest, because, forsooth, it is "the best policy," to be truthful that they may be respected, to be virtuous that they may be admitted into good society! God forbid that such morality should be taught in our public schools!

"Virtue will surely be rewarded, but one who seeks virtue for the sake of reward can never find it, because the end at which he aims is not virtue but the reward. He makes virtue a secondary consideration, and no one can obtain it who does not make it first." C. P. B.

National Reform Criticism Answered.

SOME weeks since, the *Daily Times* of Oakland, California, contained an article criticising the National Reform movement and Rev. N. R. Johnston one of its chief promoters in the Golden State. Mr. Johnston did not see the article until he read it in THE AMERICAN SENTINEL. He at once replied to it sending his communication to the *Times*, in which it was published together with the following editorial comment:—

To all these criticisms we reply: The Israelites, to whom the original law of Sabbath-keeping was given by Moses, were under a theocratic form of government. Our form of government is democratic. Many of the laws which Moses gave as divine, Mr. Johnston, himself does not pretend to observe. While Sunday is called the "Christian Sabbath," and Christians generally recognize it as a holy day, it must be remembered that Americans are not all Christians in their belief, and that there are several denominations of Protestant Christians who observe the seventh day of the week, instead of the first, as the Sabbath. What justice in the Government taking sides with the Sunday-keepers against the Sabbath-keepers—the Jews, the Seventh-day Baptists, and Seventh-day Adventists? Then Mr. Johnston is wrong, we think, in his declaration that all classes of people, and especially laboring men, would be benefited by a law enforcing Sunday rest. As a rule, and without any law, laboring men rest on Sunday as they do at night, of their own free will and because they feel their need of it; but how would Mr. Johnston look upon a law forbidding all labor from six o'clock at night until six o'clock in the morning? Would laboring men be benefited by such an arbitrary law?

Notwithstanding Mr. Johnston's demurrer, we repeat our proposition that the United States Constitution does not favor penal Sunday laws, and is in spirit against them. If not, why are Mr. Johnston and his fellow-members of the National Reform Association laboring so hard to get the Constitution amended? Rev. Dr. McIlvaine, a member of the same Association, states expressly that they want this amendment to afford a basis which they have not now in the fundamental law of the land for Sunday laws and Sunday law enforcement. Finally,

while we do not go to THE AMERICAN SENTINEL for instruction on this point, we fully agree with it in its contention that the American Sabbath Union and the National Reform Association are virtually striving to overturn the religious liberty of the Nation, and establish a virtual union of Church and State, and we heartily commend it for the loud note of warning it has raised.

And the *Times* is right; the success of the National Reform movement would certainly destroy religious liberty in this country, and, at the very best, substitute for it religious toleration.

That Insignificant Minority.

THESE Sabbatarians are "only seven-tenths of one per cent.," exultingly asserts the Sunday advocate, and thinks that on account of their being in such an insignificant minority the contemplated Sunday laws might just as well be pushed through and enforced, as not. "What difference does it make if such a few as that are imprisoned?" he continues, "for if they can't think and interpret the Bible the same as the dominant church, they ought to go to jail." This is the kind of a spirit that we meet to-day after a century of unexampled prosperity under our incomparable Constitution—under the Constitution that was framed especially to protect these insignificant minorities. In a letter to Dr. De La Motta, a Jewish rabbi, Madison made the following declaration with special reference to the Jews, and that, too, when they were in a much more insignificant minority than they are now:—

Among the features peculiar to the political system of the United States, is the perfect equality of rights which it secures to every religious sect, and it is particularly pleasing to observe in the good citizenship of such as have been most distrusted and oppressed elsewhere a happy illustration of the safety and success of this experiment of a just and benignant policy. Equal laws, protecting equal rights, are found, as they ought to be presumed, the best guarantee of loyalty and love of country; as well as best calculated to cherish that mutual respect and good-will among citizens of every religious denomination which are necessary to social harmony, and most favorable to the advancement of truth. The account you give of the Jews of your congregation brings them fully within the scope of these observations.—*Writings of James Madison, vol. iii, pages 178, 179.*

It is only he who would act the tyrant that would oppress or make it hard for a certain class of citizens because they are only "seven-tenths of one per cent." John Stuart Mill presents this in its true light, and in the light that every American should regard it. "Let us suppose," says he, "that the government is entirely at one with the people, and never thinks of exerting any power of coercion unless in agreement with what it conceives to be their voice. But I deny the right of the people to exercise such coercion, either by themselves or by their government. *The power itself is illegitimate.* The best government has no more title to it than the worst. It is as noxious, or more noxious, when exerted in accordance with public opinion, than when in opposition to it.

If all mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and *only one person* were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind."—*On Liberty, chapter 2, paragraph 1.*

The truth of the matter is this: The person who parades the "seventh-tenths of one per cent." argument virtually says: "We must have Sunday laws anyhow. If the opposition is too large, we must modify our demands; but as the Sabbatarians are only seven-tenths of one per cent., we will ignore them entirely,—no matter how much it interferes with their rights."

Every independent thinker knows that an appeal to reason is the only way to arrive at the truth; and the fact that the seventh-day observers are in the minority gives the majority no right to interfere with their working six days and then resting one, which right they have just as truly as does the majority. This principle is set forth as follows, in a note in "American State Papers bearing on Sunday Legislation," pages 189, 190:—

This important principle [that the right guaranteed by our Constitution to acquire property is just as sacred as the right to protect and possess it; and that the right to acquire must include the right to use the proper means to attain that end, which includes the right to our time] is not infrequently overlooked when the question of the constitutionality of Sunday laws is under consideration.

"All men are created equal." All men have a right to use their time to acquire property. The Legislature can no more deprive a person of the free use of part of his time, than it can deprive him of the use of his time altogether. And because the Sabbatarian has enough independence of thought and enough strength of character to differ from the majority in Sabbath observance, it is manifestly unjust to deprive him for that reason of one seventh of his time, to which he has an inalienable right. The innate sense of every man asserts that he has the same right to his opinion that others have to their opinion; that he has the same right to work on such day as he wills, that others have to work on such days as they will. The question is one of individual rights, not a question of whether you do or whether you do not agree with the dominant religious party. Any laws interfering with the right to acquire property, like the laws interfering with the rights to life and personal liberty, are a flagrant violation of the individual's natural rights.

The principle is as follows: An individual's rights cannot be infringed because he belongs to the minority. If I have a right to work six days, and then rest one, all others have the same right; and if I choose the first day on which to rest, no one has a right to molest me; and if my friend chooses the seventh day on which to rest, no one has a right to molest him. If I work on the day on which he rests without molesting him, no one has a right to stop or hinder me in my work; and, likewise, no one has a right to stop or hinder him if he works on the day on which I rest. This is justice and equality. But it is neither justice nor equality to deprive my friend of one day (Sunday) for work in every week because he chooses the seventh day on which to rest—thus giving him only five days in which to work for a livelihood.

"But," argues the advocate of Sunday laws, "the minority are not compelled to work on their Sabbath, but simply to refrain from working on our Sabbath." But if the Legislature may compel the minority to "refrain from working" one day in the

week, why not two? and if two, why not three? and if three, why not six? Thus there is no time to which the minority has a right; and the Legislature (the servant of the people) is empowered to entirely deprive the people of the use of their time, and thus of the very means of sustaining life itself. To this absurd conclusion do the positions of Sunday-law advocates lead us.

In order to understand the relation of majorities and minorities, we must inquire into the nature and object of government. For it is true, as Madison says, that "the sovereignty of the society, as vested in and exercisable by the majority, may do anything that could be rightfully done by the unanimous concurrence of the members; the reserved rights of individuals (conscience, for example) in becoming parties to the original compact being beyond the legitimate reach of sovereignty, wherever vested or however viewed." It is not the size of the majority that entitles them to act; but the fact that in the very nature of government the majority must rule;—but only in those things that come within the sphere of government. Madison mentions this point. And among the things that are outside the sphere of government is to dictate whom, when, or how we shall worship, what we shall eat, drink, or wear, when we shall rest or go to bed (as was originally regulated by ringing the curfew bell) and such like. In an essay on "Railway Morals and Railway Policy," published in the *Edinburgh Review* for October, 1854, Herbert Spencer had occasion to deal with the question of a majority's power as exemplified in the conduct of public companies. The same principle is true of governments, or of any other organizations. Mr. Spencer says:—

Under whatever circumstances, or for whatever ends, a number of men co-operate, it is held that if difference of opinion arises among them, justice requires that the will of the greater number shall be executed, rather than that of the smaller number; and this rule is supposed to be uniformly applicable, be the question at issue what it may. So confirmed is the conviction, and so little have the ethics of the matter been considered, that to most this mere suggestion of a doubt will cause some astonishment. Yet it needs but a brief analysis to show that the opinion is little better than a political superstition. Instances may readily be selected, which prove by *reductio ad absurdum*, that the right of a majority is a purely conditional right, *valid only within specific limits*. Let us take a few. Suppose that at the general meeting of some philanthropic association, it was resolved that in addition to relieving distress, the association should employ home missionaries to preach down Popery. Might the subscriptions of Catholics, who had joined the body with charitable views, be rightfully used for this end? Suppose that of the members of a book club, the greater number, thinking that under existing circumstances rifle practice was more important than reading, should decide to change the purpose of their union, and to apply the funds in hand for the purchase of powder, ball, and targets? Would the rest be bound by this decision? Suppose that under the excitement of news from Australia, the majority of a Freehold Land Society should determine, not simply to start in a body for the gold-diggings, but to use their accumulated capital to provide outfits. Would this appropriation of property be just to the minority? and must these join the expedition? Scarcely any one would venture an affirmative answer even to the first of these

questions: much less to the others. And why? Because every one must perceive that by uniting himself with others, no man can equitably be betrayed into acts utterly foreign to the purpose for which he joined them. Each of these supposed minorities would properly reply to those seeking to coerce them: "We combined with you for a defined object; we gave money and time for the furtherance of that object; on all questions thence arising, we tacitly agreed to conform to the will of the greater number; but we did not agree to conform on any other questions. If you induce us to join you by professing a certain end, and then undertake some other end of which we were not apprised, you obtain our support under false pretenses: *you exceed the expressed or understood compact to which we committed ourselves; and we are no longer bound by your decisions.*" Clearly this is the only rational interpretation of the matter. The general principle underlying the right government of every incorporated body, is that its members contract with each other severally to submit to the will of the majority *in all matters concerning the fulfillments of the object for which they were incorporated; but in no others.* To this extent only can the contract hold. For as it is employed in the very nature of a contract, that those entering into it must know what they contract to do; and as those who unite with others for a specified object, cannot contemplate all the unspecified objects, which it is hypothetically possible for the union to undertake; it follows that the contract entered into cannot extend to such unspecified objects. And if there exists no expressed or understood contract between the union and its members respecting unspecified objects, *then for the majority to coerce the minority into undertaking them, is nothing less than gross tyranny.*

And, subsequently in another essay, he added:—

Naturally, if such a confusion of ideas exist in respect of the powers of a majority where the deed of corporation tacitly limits those powers, still more must there exist such a confusion where there has been no deed of incorporation. Nevertheless the same principle holds. I again emphasize the proposition that the members of an incorporated body are bound "severally to submit to the will of the majority *in all matters concerning the fulfillment of the objects for which they are incorporated; but in no others.*" And I contend that this holds of an incorporated nation as much as of an incorporated company.

Mr. Spencer also in his "Social Statics" refutes the idea that majorities have the omnipotence so generally conceded to them. On pages 232, 233, he says:—

Of the political superstitions, lately alluded to, none is so universally diffused as the notion that majorities are omnipotent. Under the impression that the preservation of order will ever require power to be wielded by some party, the moral sense of our time feels that such power cannot rightly be conferred on any but the largest part of society. It interprets literally the saying that "the voice of the people is the voice of God," and transferring to the one the sacredness attached to the other, it concludes that from the will of the people, that is of the majority, there can be no appeal. Yet is this belief entirely erroneous.

Suppose, for the sake of argument, that, struck by some Malthusian panic, a Legislature duly representing public opinion were to enact that all children born during the next ten years should be drowned. Does any one think such an enactment would be warrantable? If not, there is evidently a limit to the power of a majority. Suppose again, that of two races living together—Celts and Saxons for example [or in America the Saxons and the Negro] the most numerous determined to make the others their slaves. Would the authority of the greatest be in such case valid? If not, there is something to which its authority must be subordinate. Suppose

once more, that all men having incomes under fifty pounds a year were to resolve upon reducing every income above that amount, to their own standard, and appropriating the excess for the public purposes. Could their resolution be justified? If not, it must be a third time confessed that there is a law to which the popular voice must defer. What then, is that law, if not the law of pure equity—the law of equal freedom? These restraints, which all would put to the will of the majority, are exactly the restraints set up by that law. We deny the right of a majority to murder, to enslave, or to rob, simply because murder, enslaving, and robbery are violations of that law—violations too gross to be overlooked. But if great violation of it are wrong, so also are smaller ones. If the will of the many cannot supersede the first principle of morality in these cases, neither can it in any. So that, *however insignificant the minority*, and however trifling the proposed trespass against their rights, no such trespass is permissible.

Professor Francis Lieber touches upon the same point in his work "On Civil Liberty and Self Government" (London, 1853), page 15:—

Liberty has not infrequently been defined as consisting in the rule of the majority; or, it has been said, where the people rule, there is liberty. The rule of the majority, of itself, indicates the power of a certain body; but power is not liberty. Suppose the majority bid you drink hemlock, is there liberty for you? Or, suppose the majority give away liberty, and establish a despot. We might say with great truth, *that where the minority is protected*, although the majority rule, then, probably, liberty exists. But in this latter case it is the *protection*, or in other words, *rights beyond the reach of the majority*, which constitute liberty,—not the power of the majority. There can be no doubt that the majority ruled in the French massacres of the Protestants; was there liberty in France on that account? All despotism, without a standing army, must be supported or acquiesced in, by the majority. It could not stand otherwise.

Hence, we must remember that if we would maintain our free institutions, we must protect the rights of minorities, and insure to them every privilege and immunity that is accorded the majority, and that every man's rights must be protected whether he stands alone or with the Nation. We must remember, too, the tendency of mankind to enforce upon others *their opinions and their customs*.

"Apart from the peculiar tenets of individual thinkers," says John Stuart Mill, "there is also in the world at large an *increasing inclination to stretch unduly the powers of society over the individual*, both by the force of opinion and even by that of legislation; and as the tendency of all the changes taking place in the world is to strengthen society, and diminish the power of the individual, this encroachment is not one of the evils which tend spontaneously to disappear, but, on the contrary, to grow *more and more formidable*. The disposition of mankind, whether as rulers or as fellow-citizens; to impose their own opinions and inclinations as a rule of conduct on others, is so energetically supported by some of the best and by some of the worst feelings incident to human nature, that it is hardly ever kept under constraint by anything but want of power; and as the power is not declining, but growing, unless a strong

barrier of moral conviction can be raised against the mischief, *we must expect, in the present circumstances of the world, to see it increase.*"—*On Liberty, chapter 1.*

If, then, we would guard against the evil, rather than suppress Sabbatarianism, whose advocates form only "seven tenths of one per cent." of our population, it would be better to act in accordance with the principles established in the Declaration of Independence and American Constitution, and which was written out as it bears upon the question of Sunday legislation in Colonel Johnson's celebrated Sunday Mail Report, in the House of Representatives, in 1830:—

The principles of our Government do not recognize in the majority any authority over the minority, except in matters which regard the conduct of man to his fellow-man.

Congress acts under a Constitution of delegated and limited powers. The committee look in vain to that instrument for a delegation of power authorizing this body to inquire and determine what part of time, or whether any, has been set apart by the Almighty for religious exercises. On the contrary, among the few prohibitions which it contains, is one that prohibits a religious test, and another which declares that "Congress shall pass no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The Constitution regards the conscience of the Jew as sacred as that of the Christian, and gives no more authority to adopt a measure affecting the conscience of a solitary individual than that of a whole community. That representative who would violate this principle would lose his delegated character, and forfeit the confidence of his constituents.

W. A. BLAKELY.

Religious Liberty Work.

BELIEVING that our readers will be interested to learn of the progress of the religious liberty work in California, we give the following report..

That all may be apprised of the situation, we would state that a movement was set on foot in the fall, by the American Sabbath Union, and strenuous efforts have been made to secure the passage of a Sunday law in the State Legislature (now in session). Petitions were circulated throughout the State, asking that such a law be enacted.

Early in November, a Council met at Oakland, and after carefully weighing the matter, decided that the State Society should prepare literature especially adapted to meet the demand, and that this matter be placed in the hands of the branch societies throughout the State, and they be requested to give it a wide circulation by sending it through the mails to localities in their district that could not be reached by other means. It was also recommended that a call be made by the State Society for funds to defray the expense of printing this literature.

When the matter was presented to the societies by letter, we received the most hearty responses, in which we were assured that they would co-operate with us, and that they stood ready to circulate the literature as soon as it should arrive.

An eight-page tract, entitled, "Shall California have a Sunday Law?" was first prepared, and 40,000 copies printed. These were apportioned to the different societies, according to their working force and the population of the city or town in which they were located. The societies were given the privilege of ordering more in case a sufficient number had not been sent to meet the demand. We soon found it necessary to print 25,000 more. About this time a second tract of four pages, entitled, "Religion Enforced by State Law," was written, and 40,000 printed. We are constantly receiving orders for more of the tracts, and the reports from the societies relative to the work are most encouraging. Up to the present date \$369.26 has been received on the fund, and other societies are yet to remit.

When the copy was put in the hands of the printers, they were so driven with work that it was impossible to get the tracts as early as we felt we must have them; so it was arranged that the Tract Society should assist in the folding. Our Tract Society rooms presented a very busy scene during these days. Some of our friends left their work at home and came in to help in this emergency, and many thousands of the tracts were soon ready for the mails.

The Oakland Tract Society also rendered valuable assistance. For two successive weeks, at the close of the regular programme and during the time of the workers' meeting, all the members that could be well accommodated at the tables, worked on the tracts, some staying until a late hour. We felt that we in Oakland were doubly privileged, as we not only had the opportunity to distribute the reading but also to help prepare it to send to others to circulate.

Our State Society has mailed to all of the Senators and Assemblymen of California as well as to the executive officers, a copy of the pamphlet, entitled, "The Breckinridge Sunday-rest Bill," accompanying each with a letter expressing the hope that they would find it convenient to peruse the arguments it contained before sanctioning a Sunday law for this State. We have received several good responses to these letters, in which we are assured that they will be glad to examine the documents. The State Society has also sent to the above named officials and to the county officers, as far as their names were obtained, copies of the tracts.—*Anna L. Ingels, in Missionary Echo, Oakland, Cal.*

It is unjust to compel those who set aside Saturday for rest and worship, to lose another day also. This is to subject people of a certain religious belief to a penalty for that belief, which is nothing else than religious persecution, however it may be disguised.—*Baptist Examiner.*



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.

**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.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OR OAKLAND, 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	" " " " " "	15c.
No. 3	" " metal back, 2 pens,	15c.
No. 4	" " " " " "	20c.
No. 5	Sealskin, for 2 pens,	15c.
No. 6	" " " " " "	25c.
No. 7	Russia Leather, for 4 pens	25c.
No. 8	Sealskin, " " " "	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.

**FATHERS
OF THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH**

BY ELDER E. J. WAGGONER.

History repeats itself, because human nature is the same in all ages of the world. Hence, he who would know

HOW TO AVOID ERROR IN THE FUTURE

must know how errors have developed in the past. The "Fathers of the Catholic Church" shows the condition of the heathen world at the time of Christ, briefly states the principles of ancient heathen philosophy, and shows how the adoption of these principles by prominent men in the church, and

**The Incautious Lowering of the Standard of Pure Christianity,
Developed the PAPACY,**

which was simply a new phase of paganism. It shows that by the time of Constantine every phase of the Papacy was fully developed, and was only waiting for supreme power. The chapter on

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY

is alone worth the price of the book. Fine English cloth, substantially bound, contains about 400 pages, and will be sent post-paid at the nominal price of \$1.00.

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

OR, OAKLAND, CAL.

**The Nonesuch Professor,
IN HIS MERIDIAN SPLendor.**

By WILLIAM SECKER (Puritan).

With an introduction by THEO. L. CUYLER, D. D. Price, post-paid, \$1.00.

TESTIMONIALS.

"It is a mine of sparkling gems."—*Presbyterian Observer.*
"A sheaf of golden grain, ripened by grace, and sweet with the flavor of rare simplicity and holy wisdom."—*New York Observer.*
"It is a searching book."—*Christian Intelligencer.*
"This is a wonderful book. At whatever page you open it, your eye lights upon pithy aphorisms that combine the sententiousness of Benjamin Franklin, with the sweet, holy savor of Samuel Rutherford. It contains hundreds of bright seed thoughts."—*Rev. T. L. Cuyler, D. D.*

Address, **PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,**
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

**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.

Address, **PACIFIC PRESS, 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.

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 Avowal.* 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.



NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 5, 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 *Loyal American* thinks that "the men who are too cowardly to stand up for civil and religious liberty because it might injure their business, or interfere with political advancement, are not built like the men who signed the Declaration of Independence."

COLONEL SHEPARD'S donation to the American Sabbath Union during the last fiscal year, of that Association, amounted to \$7,500. The total receipts for the year were \$10,649.45. Perhaps it is not surprising that the Colonel was chosen to be his own successor in office.

THE *Catholic Review* criticises the *Independent* for advocating the taxation of church property, but admits that the exemption of such property "certainly smacks of the union of Church and State." And it certainly does, for by it the State indirectly contributes to the support of the Church.

COMMENTING upon the action of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, in taking steps to try five young ministers, because they insist that it is not a sin to vote, the *Catholic Review* very justly remarks that "The genius of our Constitution, as evinced through the past century has not been agnostic; it has simply made provision for every sort of persuasion. The narrow spirit that restricts the rights of citizenship of any one who wishes to use them is certainly most un-American."

THE *Times*, of Dyersburg, Tennessee, has the following to say about Sunday laws:—

All Sunday laws are oppressive, unjust, tyrannical, unconstitutional and contrary to the principles of our Government.

It is fundamental with us, that there can be no union or association between Church and State. The State has no religion. The same is true of the Federal Government. In no sense can either be said to be a Christian Government. By the Constitution of each, no preference can be given to any religion, or mode of worship; the State was founded for civil affairs, for worldly business; the Church was organized for spiritual affairs. To the State all religions are equally sacred, and entitled to equal protection. All Sunday laws that have been passed for religious purposes, have in them the religious idea; they are intended to favor a day because it is claimed as sacred by Christians, they are intended

to give preference to the "Christian mode of worship." No candid or fair-minded man can say that Sunday laws, and especially those of this State and of the town of Dyersburg, were not so intended; or that the ordinance lately passed, was not in response to what was believed to be, the religious sentiment of the church members of the town.

This is significant, coming as it does from a county adjoining that in which Mr. King has been so persistently persecuted by means of an iniquitous Sunday law.

WE are thankful to our friends who have sent us newspaper clippings, etc., giving items of interest more or less closely connected with our special work. We are not always able to use these things directly, but they are generally suggestive, and so helpful to us. Papers when sent should be marked; the clippings should be accompanied by the name and date of the paper from which they are taken.

THE lower branch of the Wyoming Legislature recently passed the following as part of the school law of that State:—"All religious exercises, such as reading the Bible, praying, etc., are hereby prohibited in the public schools or any educational institution in the State of Wyoming, which is supported by and is under control of the State, during the sessions of such school or educational institution. The teacher or principal of any school or educational institution violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from his or her position, by the Board of school trustees."

At the late Sabbath Union meeting in Philadelphia, Colonel Shepard bewailed the fact that by the workingmen of New York, and other cities, Sunday is very generally utilized as a day for meetings of labor organizations of various kinds. He thought that such things ought not to be. Of course just now such friends and patrons of labor as the valiant Colonel have not the power to prohibit orderly assemblies of laboring men on Sunday, but that is just what they want, and what they will have ere long, unless the workingmen refuse to be charmed by the siren song of the American Sabbath Union. Colonel Shepard and his co-workers promise the workingmen liberty; they would give them slavery.

THE "Pearl of Days," of January 16, says:—

The Board of Managers of the American Sabbath Union, held an important meeting, in New York, January 12. The following managers were present: Bishop John F. Hurst, of Washington, D. C., the Rev. Joachim Elmendorf, D. D., the Rev. George S. Mott, D. D., the Rev. R. M. Sommerville, the Rev. Leighton Williams, the Rev. James H. Darlington, Ph. D., Col. Elliott F. Shepard, Col. Alexander S. Bacon and Secretaries Knowles and Taylor.

The utmost harmony prevailed throughout the meeting, and the decisions so unanimously reached by the Board will tend to broaden and strengthen

the society's operations for the defense of our civil and Christian Sabbath.

The nature of the plans is not stated, but the "Pearl of Days" promises to outline them in the future. That "the utmost harmony prevailed" is not to be wondered at when we remember that the element disposed to make trouble was effectually silenced in Philadelphia.

THE pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, of Chicago, is quoted as follows, by the *Independent*, upon the question of the Bible in the public schools: "We would express our earnest hope that all distinctive teaching of religion might be forbidden in the free schools. That the reading of the Bible is of the nature of distinctive religious teaching no one can deny. And because there are tax-paying Jews and infidels, who object to the Bible, I would urge, on the ground of fair play, that it be not read, but that all religious teaching be intrusted to the home, the Church, and the Sunday-school."

ONE of the best numbers of the "Young People's Library" yet issued, is "Jottings from the Pacific No. 2, the Tonga Islands and Other Groups." This book, though one of a series, is like its companions, complete in itself, and is a most readable and instructive book. Parents will do well to cultivate in their children a taste for such reading. A year's subscription to the "Young People's Library" costs only \$2.75, or \$5.50, according to binding, for twelve numbers of one hundred and sixty pages each. Those who desire to secure not only unobjectionable but really instructive books for their children, cannot do better than to order this library for a year. Address, Pacific Press, 43 Bond St., New York, or, Oakland, California.

FIRST Philadelphian: "Well, a number of the neighbors have combined and sent to Wiggins a polite note asking him to leave town."

Second Philadelphian: "What's the trouble? Is Wiggins a Sabbath breaker?"

First Philadelphian: "No; but he is understood to have a barrel of cider in his cellar, and we are informed that the said cider worked on Sunday."—*America*.

THE sooner we divorce Church and State, the better for both.—*Loyal American*.

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,