



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 17, 1891.

NUMBER 37.

## 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.

In the New York *Christian Advocate*, Rev. D. W. Huntingdon, D.D., says:—

Public vices present fearful opposition to the work of the Church, and in civil laws and their execution; in the character of public officers and in the good order of society generally the Church has much of her success at stake.

How about the Church in the days of the apostles when both the civil laws and those who administered them were bitterly hostile to Christianity? Is there not some mistake about the Church being in any measure dependent for success upon civil laws?

CHRISTIANITY is vastly more than a code of morals; it is a divine scheme for the moral elevation of men who have sinned. It not only teaches men how to live, but it teaches them how to become free from past transgression; it promises pardon for sins that are past, and gives assurance of power to overcome temptation and avoid sin in the future. Both the pardon for the past and the power for the future come through Christ. It is manifest, therefore, that Christianity is beyond the jurisdiction of all human governments.

THE *World* suggests that if the Fair must be closed one day in each week, let it be on Monday, as in the case of "the Louvre and the Luxembourg, for cleansing, and for the recreation of the attendants." "Monday," says the *World*, "is always the day when visitors to a great exhibition are fewest in number. Sunday is the day when they are always most numerous. To

close the Fair on Monday would be a rational proceeding; to close it on Sunday would be to defeat its best usefulness. If a day of rest for the employes cannot be provided without closing the Fair for one day each week, in the name of right and reason let the great American wash-day be the one selected for that purpose."

What can the "civil Sabbath" advocates say to this proposition? Why would not Monday rest meet all physical necessities just as well as Sunday rest?

### In the "Interest of the Laboring Man."

It is very popular nowadays to try to have the laboring man shoulder the responsibility of all the pet schemes and theories that various so-called reformers are trying to get through various legislatures. Just at present the American Sabbath Union is attempting to bribe the workingmen of America into an advocacy of the Sunday-closing of the World's Fair by offering them cheap rates of admission upon certain other days. All kinds of socialistic and paternalistic bills are introduced, trying to regulate our rest, religion, recreation, and various other things. Some can never seem to learn that people will get along just about as well when you give them a chance to use their own brains as when you try to make the Legislature do the brain work for the whole Nation.

Recently, Parliament was about to pass a bill prohibiting women from using a heavy forging implement known as the "oliver;" whereupon a deputation of these laboring women went to London to protest against the passage of the act.

At London they were questioned at length upon the manner of their employment, by the Home Secretary—an officer whose position in the British Government is much the same as that of the Secretary of the Interior in this country. Between Mr. Matthews, the Secretary, and a chain-woman the following dialogue took place;—

*Mr. Matthews:* And what is the precise nature of the employment in which you are engaged—

*Chain-woman (breaking in):* I don't want to have my work taken away from me!

*Mr. Matthews (blandly):* Pardon me, that is not quite the point on which I desire information. If you will please explain to me the nature of the operation in which—

*Chain-woman (firm, though flustered, and determined to get out what she had come all the way to London to say):* It never done me no harm, sir!

*Mr. Matthews:* But, my good woman, if you will suspend your observations long enough to communicate some idea—

*Chain-woman:* I likes the 'eavy work, sir; an' I says, Let each one do what they can!

Not long ago in our own capital the Sunday-law advocates were trying to obtain a law "in the interests of the laboring man," prohibiting Sunday work (although in the foregoing anecdote the "laboring man" were women), and very plausibly laid their case before the Congressional Committee; but unfortunately for the Sunday-law advocates who were so solicitous for the "laboring man," the master workman of the whole federation of the Knights of Labor was present, Mr. Millard F. Hobbs, and by a few words blew their nicely concocted schemes into atoms. He said:—

Mr. Crafts came before the Federation of Labor, and argued this bill, and that body refused to indorse the bill. He came before the District Assembly of the Knights of Labor (which is made up of all the Knights of Labor of the Assemblies of the District of Columbia), and that body has refused to indorse it. There are parties in that body who believe in the bill as it is; others believe in a certain portion of it, and others are wholly opposed to it; and the Knights of Labor, as a whole, have thought best not to have anything to do with it. Some of them do not believe in working on Sunday, but as for the other [the religious] feature of the bill, they think it best not to appear here in favor of it; and I believe there is quite a lot of the members of the order who believe that if they want rest on Sunday, or any other day, they can get it through their labor organizations, and that it is best not to try to get it through Congress by a sort of Church movement.

There are over thirty unions of Knights of Labor, and there has been only one petition sent here. They have remained silent upon this subject, and I think they want to remain silent upon it.

One of the gentlemen present, speaking of the effect of the speech said:—

This speech, coming as it did, was more or less of a surprise to all; but to Mr. Crafts and his party it was a "stunner." It instantly crushed to atoms the whole pet theory which they had so nicely framed, and so pathetically presented in behalf of "the poor workingmen who are so cruelly oppressed by being forced to labor on Sunday;" and of the Church's gallant effort to liberate them from "the Egyptian bondage of Sunday slavery." Nothing could have happened that would more clearly expose the perfect hollowness of the plea that is made by the American Sabbath Union, that this Sunday movement is in the interests of the workingmen, than did this unpremeditated and wholly unsolicited speech.

This was worse for the theory of the American Sunday-law agitator than was the chain-woman's strictures on the British bill. The New York *Independent* truly says of the workingman "that a great deal is asked for in his behalf for which he is not responsible." This is true, as THE SENTINEL has before remarked; and of nothing is it more true than of the demand for Sunday laws made in the name of the workingmen.

Although thus constantly making these claims that the laboring people are so anxious for these laws, still the contrary state of affairs has been frequently a matter of complaint on the part of the leaders in the movement. Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, who for the past few years has been the leading worker for Sunday legislation, after setting forth in his recent work what he deems conclusive evidence of the benefit of compulsory Sunday observance, says:—

Blind to these great facts, a Shoe Lasters' Union in Brooklyn, at the publication of the new Penal Code of New York in 1882, adopted a paper which thus describes the Sabbath laws: "We learn with regret that the churches are joining hands with tyranny and capital for the purpose of suppressing liberty and oppressing the laborer"—sentiments representative of many labor organizations, which show that holiday Sundays prevent those who follow them from learning the a-b-c of political science, and keep them in such ignorance of the true meaning of liberty that they mistake its champions for oppressors.

Even educated men sometimes make the same blunder from infidel prejudices. John Stuart Mill characterizes "Sabbatarian legislation as an illegitimate interference with the rightful liberty of the individual," and with strange intellectual perversity affirms that "the only ground on which restrictions on Sunday amusements can be defended must be that they are religiously wrong."—*The Sabbath for Man*, page 226.

For the last millenium the world has slowly been learning the lesson that it is better to let individuals manage their private affairs, rather than have the government do it for them. Will the lesson ever be learned?

THE Emperor of China has published a decree requiring his subjects to permit their brethren who have embraced Christianity to live in peace, and forbidding all persecution for conscience' sake. The American Sabbath Union, the National Reform Association, the State of Tennessee, and the Illinois Justice who fined David Longnecker, recently, should make a note of this and go and do likewise.

### The Chicago Fair on Sunday.

THE question whether the World's Fair at Chicago shall be opened on Sunday is making serious trouble for the managers of the enterprise. They are asked to decide it as a question of moral and religious duty only, and not with reference to the pecuniary profits, of which the Exhibition will be in sore need.

The prevailing sentiment of the Protestant churches, as expressed in the deliverances of their assemblies, conventions, and conferences, is undoubtedly opposed to the Sunday opening. Delegations have been appointed to proceed to Chicago to protest against it as a violation of the commandment of God, which would outrage Christians convictions and tend to increase the popular disregard for the sanctity of the Lord's day. Religious papers are exhorting the managers to seek the approval of the Almighty rather than the favor of men, and to show to the whole world the depth and sincerity of their own piety and the piety of this country. When the *Independent* sought the views of bishops and leading clergymen on the subject, the Protestants were almost unanimous in condemning the policy of Sunday opening, and some of the Roman Catholics also opposed it as a dangerous innovation. This feeling too, seems to be growing under the stimulus of apparently concerted efforts for its cultivation, and from this time forward the managers of the Exhibition will feel its pressure steadily.

Meantime, we do not hear of any organized movement on the other side. The only loud appeals which they hear come from those who would shut the gates on the first day of the week without regard to pecuniary loss and without reference to the public convenience. It is God's will, cry the religious enemies of opening, and God must be obeyed. The spiritual gain of obedience, they declare, will far transcend in importance any material profit which disobedience might bring in.

The addition to their expected functions which is thus imposed on the Fair managers is of enormous weight. Besides looking after the secular interests of the Exhibition they are required to settle a controverted question as to the proper observance of Sunday. They must mix up business and religion, theology and finance, when they are at their wits' end to provide ways and means for carrying on the enterprise. Sunday opening would increase their receipts, and yet, much as they will need the money, they are called upon to give it up as a tribute to the religious sentiment of the Union, and as exemplars of Christian conduct and champions of a theory of Sunday observance which is rejected by the great majority of the people of Christendom, and of this country also. If the question as to the Sunday opening of the Fair were put to

popular vote, undoubtedly it would be decided in the affirmative, in a very emphatic way. If the gates are opened on Sunday more visitors will enter than on any other day of the week. Yet the managers are urged to shut them as a religious duty overriding every consideration of profit or public convenience. The responsibility of honoring or dishonoring the commandment of God rests on their shoulders, according to the united declaration of Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian conventions.

The managers of the Chicago Fair are, therefore, in a situation full of difficulty and embarrassment. They are made the arbiters between two great parties in the religious world, and between the majority of the public who want to enjoy Sunday as a day of leisure, and the minority who would treat it as a fast-day, on which all amusement is forbidden by divine command. When the same question came up here in the discussion as to the Sunday opening of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, it was decided contrary to the views of the Sabbatarians, and probably at Chicago they will be no more successful, for in principle the two cases are precisely alike. If it is allowable to visit a picture gallery on Sunday, it is proper to look at the collections of a World's Fair.—*The (N. Y.) Sun*, September 10.

### Christianity Can Stand Competition.

THIS may seem a queer heading for an article. And if it were not for the fact that statements are seriously being urged which justify it, it would be quite in place to offer an apology for writing on such a subject; yea, it would be quite improper to write on such a topic at all.

We hear of great corporations trying to cut off competition so that their business will have no obstacles, and that they may the more readily heap up massive fortunes. The world has just been startled at the statement that the Standard Oil Company has about gained the control of the petroleum output of the whole world. If this be true, it will have no *competition*, and can regulate the price of oil at will. It is always the aim of worldly enterprises to put down competition so that they may have things largely their own way.

But Christianity asks no such favors. The true Christian realizes that his power is not dependent upon men or the favors of human agencies. When his Master commissioned him to represent Heaven, and to stand as a light in the world, he told him that "in the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." "Beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues; and ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles," "And ye shall be hated of all men

for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved." "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you; and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake." "They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."

In contrast with these statements of Scripture read the following from No. 2 of the *Sabbath Reform*, a quarterly, edited by Rev. W. F. Crafts, and published by the Authors' Publishing Company:—

To officers and owners of railroads: We urge upon all Christian and humane owners and managers of railroads, separately and jointly, to ask Congress and State legislatures to eliminate the only real obstacle to the complete suspension of Sunday trains, namely, competition, by enacting laws forbidding all Sunday trains, except in cases of mercy and necessity.

In another article in the same paper, we read further:—

The only real obstacle to suspending Sunday railroading is *competition*, which Congress can and would remove speedily if such a man as Cornelius Vanderbilt would add his powerful influence to the great petition at Washington.

When an advocate for a Sunday law urges that all competition be taken away from those whom he would have keep Sunday, he is either acknowledging that Sunday lacks divine authority, and, hence, if sustained must have the power of the State, or else he is seeking to evade the path of self-denial that Christ has said all his followers must tread. Where does the great Founder of Christianity commission his ambassadors to labor to have *competition* removed so that men may follow him at no personal sacrifice?

But this is the logic of the whole Sunday-law theory. They want Sunday laws so that men may keep that day without any inconvenience, or loss of position, and thus make it easy for men to be Christians. The promise of Christ is, "Every one that forsaketh houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive a hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life." The man who believes that Sunday is the Sabbath, and yet his convictions are not strong enough to lead him to give up a job of work to follow Christ, would not bear up under the reverses that every Christian must meet in perfecting his character. Christ's promise is, that if we forsake the things of this world that conflict with forming the image of his character, that he will care for us. To believe what he says means to take his promises as he gives them, and render to him the most perfect obedience, without waiting for civil law to so regulate things that he will have no "competition."

There are a good many of our fellow-citizens who believe that ecclesiasticism is making the same advances and apostate

progress in this country that it did in the Roman Empire in the first centuries of the Christian era. And perhaps nothing would be a more fitting conclusion to the foregoing thoughts than the following quotation from the historian Gibbon:—

The Church still continued to increase its outward splendor as it lost its internal purity, and, in the reign of Diocletian, the palace, the courts of justice, and even the army, concealed a multitude of Christians, who endeavored to reconcile the interests of the present with those of a future life.

History records the results; namely, apostasy, and there is no reason to hope that like causes will not produce like fruit now.

A. O. TAIT.

#### What Will Curse It.

COLONEL SHEPARD is reported as saying that if the doors of the World's Fair are opened on Sunday, "the Lord will curse the enterprise." Upon this the *World* remarks that—

This ridiculous person who professes to hold such intimate relations with the Almighty prophesied a descent of the Divine wrath upon the Metropolitan Museum should the Trustees vote to open the doors of that institution on Sunday. The beautiful and refining collection of art has now been open to public inspection for many weeks. Yet none of the pictures have shrivelled in their frames; the mummies have not burst their cerements and walked forth; the noble marbles and casts have not been hurled from their pedestals by an earthquake. The Museum has simply more nearly fulfilled its mission as an educator of the people and has had more orderly and interested visitors on Sunday than on all the rest of the week.

The fact that no evil has as yet befallen the Museum proves nothing; but the disposition shown by Colonel Shepard and his co-laborers in their so-called "Sabbath reform," does prove that they are utterly unworthy to be trusted with any power whatever over their fellow-men. Men who are so ready to invoke the wrath of God against those who do not please them, are just as ready to supplement that wrath with civil penalties in case it seems to them to be too long delayed. It is the threatened Christian (?) boycott that is to curse the Fair in case its gates are opened on Sunday.

#### The Political "Atheist."

It has ever been the custom of persons who have been fighting to maintain the crumbling theories of Church and State, to call their opponents "atheists." It is done to-day (especially by Sunday-law advocates) and it was done by the enemies of American institutions a century ago. Our good old "fathers,"—Washington and his co-laborers—had to receive the appellation over and over again.

Madison, in one of his essays, gives an illustration of the common anti-constitutional style of argument then, which sounds very like that of the religio-political reformer of to-day:—

"You are destitute, I perceive," says the anti-republican, "of every quality of a good citizen, or

rather, a good subject. You have neither the light of faith nor the spirit of obedience. I denounce you to the Government, as an accomplice of atheism and anarchy."

And so saying he (the anti-republican) let the argument drop, presumably because he thought that calling American principles "atheism and anarchy" was at once both the strongest argument and severest chastisement that he could give them.

#### Devoid of Reason.

COMMENTING upon certain arguments in favor of the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, the *Chicago Journal*, of the 4th inst., says:—

Dr. Henson simply trifled with the subject. This city is to entertain in July and August, 1893, thousands and thousands, perhaps millions, of visitors. Every hotel and private hostelry will be filled to repletion, and the weather may be very warm. Yet Mr. Henson proposes that on Sundays the multitude be invited to "take a rest"! That is, he would have them sit all day in their narrow and overcrowded lodgings and fan themselves instead of seeking recreation and refreshment in Jackson Park. The idea is totally void of reason or good sense, and savors of religious bigotry.

Even the proposed religious and educational gatherings do not meet the case at all. There will be countless people here who take no more pleasure in such meetings, especially in warm weather, than Dr. Henson takes in a game of euchre; and there is no more justice nor propriety in excluding them from their chosen form of recreation than there would be in excluding Dr. Henson from the pulpit. The coolness with which the Sabbatarians profess to make everybody a Christian in 1893 by force of law is injurious to the cause of religion, and is beginning to excite some indignation.

Still, it should be understood that the *Journal* is conservative on this subject. There may be due something of respect to ultra-religious sentiment. But a different line of argument, if there is one, should be adopted by the Sabbatarians, in their efforts to enforce their views. Thus far they have presented little but fallacies.

#### "The Flag and the Cross."

THE sentiments quoted in THE SENTINEL of September 3, from the *Youth's Companion*, and the *Christian Advocate*, that "the flag represents religion," call to mind a lecture given years ago by a popular clergyman in Concord, New Hampshire, to a "full and delighted audience," who manifested their approbation by "frequent applause." Said he:—

The flag and the cross is my theme to-night. The cross is the symbol of our religion. It reminds us of the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the sacrifice of Christ, the redemp-

tion of the world. The flag is the emblem of our nationality, the symbol of liberty and order. They should be associated, intertwined about our altars. There is no desecration in the act. There is little danger of too intimate union between Church and State. If our religion be not brought into contact with politics and business, and all the every-day concerns of life, it is not a blessing, but a curse. The assumption that Christian ministers should not intermeddle with affairs of State, is a great and dangerous heresy. . . . We have undertaken, as a Nation, to divorce the flag and the cross. . . . Would we have our Nation prosper, we must solemnize anew the union between the cross and the flag.

The lecturer complained that as a Nation we had undertaken to divorce the flag and cross—the State and the Church. Of course the bill of divorce is our national Constitution. To solemnize anew the union, would be to subvert that noble charter of our liberties, under which we have enjoyed unparalleled prosperity for the past century. He speaks his mind quite plainly. He had not learned to dissemble and prevaricate like later advocates of "National Reform," disclaiming all desire for a union of Church and State, and only pleading for "civil" law to enforce a religious institution. It would be more manly, not to say more like Christians, to state plainly what they want, and not use deception and fraud to attain a professedly holy end.

R. F. COTTRELL.

#### The Incongruity of Religious Legislation Illustrated.

"JOHN," said Mr. Smith, a manufacturer of glassware, to his employe, whose work was to pack the goods for shipment, "you must pack these articles so and so (prescribing the exact manner in which the work should be done), and whatever is broken in transit will be charged to your account."

After some reflection, John, who had had considerable experience in packing glassware, remonstrated thus: "Mr. Smith, I think I know of a safer way to pack these goods, and if I am to be held responsible for the breakage, I think I should be permitted to use my own judgment as to how the work should be done."

But Mr. Smith was inflexible, and informed John that he was capable of running his own business, and intended to do so.

All can see at once that the requirements of Mr. Smith were unjust and unreasonable, yet many respectable and conscientious citizens of our country are acting upon the self-same principle in using their influence to induce law-making bodies to legislate upon religious subjects, to pass laws regulating the conduct of individuals in things pertaining only to God.

Many fail to realize that each and every person has a private account to settle with "the Judge of all the earth," a personal responsibility which cannot be re-

moved by legislation. And in view of this solemn fact it is evident that every man should be left free to act according to the promptings of his own conscience, and to bring his actions into harmony with what he understands to be the will of God concerning him, as long as his course of action does not interfere with the rights of his fellow-men.

If it were possible for the civil government to assume the responsibility and to bear the consequences of the wrong actions of the individual toward God when such actions were compelled by its laws, then, and then only, could it with any degree of reason and justice define the duties and pass laws regulating the conduct of individuals in religious affairs.

The National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and all others who are seeking for the enactment, or favoring the enforcement of Sunday laws, are working in accordance with the foregoing principles.

There are people who believe that the seventh day should be kept holy in accordance with the commandment found in Exodus, chapter 20, and that "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work," is a God-given privilege (yea, duty) with which no person, organization or government has a right to interfere; and that God will hold each and every one responsible for the course he pursues in this, as well as in other matters.

And while the seventh-day keeper must stand the breakage, the Sunday-law advocates insist that the glassware shall be packed according to their own ideas. National Reformers and others who are trying to coerce people in religious matters, a method wholly foreign to the scriptural way, will probably find as much responsibility connected with their own cases in the "day of judgment," as they will care to bear, without being entangled in the misdeeds of others.

G. M. POWELL.

Geneva, South Dakota.

#### Logic and Results of Evangelization by Law.

God destroyed the antediluvian world because the wickedness of man was great in the earth. Gen. 6:5-7. He rained fire and brimstone on Sodom and Gomorrah because there were not ten righteous persons in them. Gen. 18, 19. Christ said, "As it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. . . . Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot, . . . even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." Luke 17:26-30. And Paul adds, "But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." 2 Tim. 3:13.

Mr. Moody evidently believes these statements, and accepts the situation. He says:—

It is no use attempting to work for this world.

The old ark is going to sink, and the only thing to do is to get as many of the crew and passengers out of her as possible, and let her go down.

But many professed Christians appear to be laboring under the impression that the ship can be saved. They seem to be ignorant of the fact that the heavens and the earth which are now, are, by the same word which created them, and destroyed the world once by a flood, kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. 2 Peter 3:5-7. Seeing that wickedness abounds on every hand, they think that something must be done to check the powerful tide of evil. But instead of working upon the principle that the gospel is the only remedy for sin; that men can receive forgiveness of sin, be made righteous, and finally be saved only by repentance, conversion, and faith in Christ, they proceed upon the theory that these may be accomplished, to a large degree, at least, in a sort of wholesale manner, by civil legislation. Hence they propose as a remedy for the numerous evils and increasing wickedness of the times, that the name of God be put in the Constitution; that Jesus Christ be declared the Ruler of nations; that rigid Sunday laws be enacted; that religion be taught in the public schools; that the Bible be recognized as the supreme authority in civil affairs; and, lastly, that all Christian laws, institutions, and usages be placed upon an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.

This movement involves two fundamental errors; first, that the great masses of men by some means are going to become better and better, while the great Author of Christianity and its greatest apostle declare that they are going to grow worse and worse, and be worst of all at last; and secondly, that the means of extending the work of the gospel and making men better, is by forcing certain religious rites and customs on them by law, which is contrary to the very nature of free moral agency and the spirit of the gospel, which appeals to the heart, the conscience, and the understanding, and says, "Whosoever will."

If all the world were to become converted to Christianity, this is not the way it would or could be accomplished. To convert a man is to change his heart, and not merely his actions. His actions will naturally change after his heart has been changed. But only by the preaching of gospel truth accompanied by the power of the Spirit of God, can this miraculous change be wrought (Rom. 10:10-14; John 3:1-8), and not by civil requirements enforced by the sword. Free moral agency and the development of character require freedom of action, an opportunity to choose, a chance to exercise the will. If God had desired that man should be simply a machine, governed only by external forces, he would have made him that way in the first place. But as he did not, but

gave him the power to will and to do good or evil, it is manifest that any theory which, in reference to moral and spiritual things, deals with man as a mere machine, is not of God or in harmony with God.

As in theory this movement is wrong, its results can only be bad. It involves the establishment of a national religion: this is to be enforced according to the interpretation of certain religionists, the class to depend solely upon which ones are dominant. All conflicting views and practices will of necessity, as of old, be branded "heresy." The timorous will yield, the stubborn be bent, and the incorrigible be summarily dealt with. This is the logic of the case, and these the inevitable results,—a trampling upon the rights of conscience of many, and the conversion of no one.—*Religious Liberty Tract.*

#### The Sunday Press and the Preachers.

THE *Herald*, of Elizabeth, New Jersey, has the following, which illustrates the controversy between the Sunday press and the Sunday preachers:—

The Rev. Dr. Merrill, a gentleman belonging to the Methodist body, and calling himself a bishop, has added his quota to the mass of puritanical absurdity and inconsistency that has, during the past week, rendered Asbury Park and Ocean Grove the targets for the scoffs of the irreligious, and the contempt of all common-sense Christians.

He was enlarging on the subject of keeping holy the "Sabbath day," and in the course of his somewhat perfervid address, he turned his guns on the press and fired a raking shot at the members of the "fourth estate." Facing the reporters' table, he gave utterance to the following very foolish sentiments:—

The man who sits on this platform and reports a sermon for a religious or secular newspaper is as big a sinner as the man who plows his field on Sunday. One man plies his vocation as well as the other.

We hardly venture to imagine what would have been the feelings of this divine had he not seen his sermon in print on the Monday morning following. His indignation would have known no bounds, and would have vented itself in a tirade of abuse against the want of enterprise displayed by the local papers and the press correspondents. That is to say, his mortified vanity would have reproached these very men whom he had so fiercely attacked the day before for not being guilty of the very act which it had pleased him to call sinful—reporting his sermon—which, by the way, could not have been set up in type without a further violation of what he improperly styled the Sabbath. We suppose, however, that Dr. Merrill would have the divine law suspended in his case, and in his only.

But the inconsistency did not end there. The preacher branded the reporter as a "sinner," because he was "plying his vocation"! The reporter was doing no more than the preacher. The only difference was that the slave of the quill probably earned about three dollars by "plying his vocation" in reporting the sermon, while Dr. Merrill would put as money in his purse some fifty or one hundred dollars for the delivery of it. Had the man been preaching for nothing, for the pure love of saving souls, we should be the last to blame him. But when he was not only absent from his legitimate sphere of duty in Kansas, when he was not only enjoying what the reporter so seldom gets, a vacation without any stoppage of his salary, but was also making money as a "star preacher," his utterances certainly savored naught of the divinely

commissioned messenger of salvation. They were redolent simply of Pharisaism and hypocrisy.

Of the two men, the reporter and not the preacher was best observing the Sunday by doing his duty faithfully.

It is evident that the Sunday press and the Sunday preachers are at one in practice—that is, they both work for money on Sunday—they are, at least, a thousand miles apart in opinion.

#### A Well-Deserved Rebuke.

THE following editorial under heading, "Uncharitable Sabbatarians," appeared in the Chicago *Evening Post*, of August 31, 1891:—

The Rev. L. McLean has been mentioned before in these columns in connection with the work of the so-called American Sabbath Union, of which he is secretary. Mr. McLean attracted the attention of the *Evening Post* by the zeal rather than the discretion of his advocacy of his peculiar views on Sunday observance and the violence of his aspersions upon those who do not assent to those views. It was intimated, in all charity, that such advocacy injured rather than assisted the cause of rational Sunday observance—in which cause, be it remarked, the *Evening Post* is as much interested as the Rev. L. McLean or any other of that ilk.

At the Wabash Avenue Methodist Church last night, Mr. McLean preached, lectured, declaimed or scolded once more on his favorite theme. The following sentences are extracted from the newspaper reports of his address:—

The papers assure us that we have a mayor. They say he claims to be able to manage the affairs of this great city while enjoying himself hundreds of miles away. Some say this apology for a mayor will stay away, and for my part, I think it would be as well if he did. We don't want that kind of a municipal head. . . . Our German mayor. It's an imposition and a disgrace to have such a mayor, and I pray to God that he will stay where he is!

We join the great majority of Chicago's citizens in the hope that this impious prayer may not be granted. Mr. Washburne, besides having been lawfully elected mayor of this city, has attended pretty closely to his business ever since his election. Having fulfilled these requirements, it is not exacted of him that he should satisfy in all particulars an inconsiderable body of fanatics. True, the mayor has spent the summer out of the city; but in so doing he not only has warrant of law, but has followed the example of many gentlemen of Mr. McLean's cloth, though with this difference: While the mayor has kept up constant communication with his office for the transaction of necessary business, the vacation preachers lock their doors and give the key to the devil. There has been no considerable complaint of Mayor Washburne's absence from those who have the most right and interest to complain.

It is possible that Mr. McLean has been misquoted in the papers. If he has, he is relieved from the unpleasant imputation of having abused a well-intending mayor, and insulted from the pulpit the 300,000 German-Americans in Chicago, who yield nothing to him in point of good citizenship, and most of whom might give him valuable instruction in that charity which lays at the base of all Christian conduct. As we have remarked before, Sunday observance loses much and gains nothing by such ill-considered and uncharitable diatribes of abuse.

"STRANGELY enough," says a correspondent of the *Independent*, "the very year that witnesses the Sunday opening of the Metropolitan Museum in New York, witnesses also the passing of a bill by the Danish Rigsdag providing for a more reverent observance of the Sabbath in this little land. The law of April 7, 1876, placed many restrictions upon the transaction of business on Sunday. These restrictions have now been extended, and the application of the law has been clearly defined. As in our own city, the law does not apply to restaurants or confectioners, or to manufactories in which uninterrupted work is necessary. It is provided, however, that in such cases the employes shall have, at least, every other Sunday free. Barber shops, furthermore, may be kept open until noon. Under the head of manufactories that require uninterrupted labor are included gas works, electric light stations, sugar refineries, etc. Any violation of the law is punishable by a fine of from ten to two hundred kroner (\$2.75 to \$55). The law entered into effect June 3."

As for the "civil Sabbath," there can be no such thing. Sabbath observance is a duty we owe to God, and not to man; it is a subjective matter entirely; while things civil have to do only with the State, and our relations man to man. In God's law it finds a place where the duties toward him are defined, and in no other relation can it be placed, while things which we call civil are in that part of the law where man's relations to man, society, and the State, are defined. The laws of our land rightly may have to do with stealing, adultery, murder, false witness, etc., as these are civil matters; but I deny, sir, that they can have anything to do with idolatry, blasphemy, or Sabbath observance, as these are not civil matters, and have to do only with the relations between man and his Maker.—*Rev. H. B. Maurer, Baptist.*

How about this agitation in favor of a Sunday law? We are watching the fight closely, anxious to learn if the American people are ready to unite Church and State.—*The Radical.*

## NATIONAL Religious Liberty Association.

Sunday at Racine, Wisconsin.

THE Sunday-closing movement at Racine, Wisconsin, has taken on a new phase. The Law and Order League has been arresting some saloon-keepers for opening their places of business on Sunday. The saloon-keepers have taken it upon themselves to refuse to sell any kind of drink on that day, with a view to creating a sentiment that will compel the authorities to allow the saloons to be opened. It is reported that fabulous sums were offered them for beer and whisky on Sunday, August 23, all to no effect. Even the drug stores had fallen into line and refused to sell any kind of strong drink. It has stirred the old toppers up, and they are threatening that there may be another Haddock tragedy, unless they are allowed their beer on Sunday. The ministers have been getting their lives insured so as to be prepared for anything that may happen to them.

If it were to secure prohibition that they were thus risking their lives, it would certainly be commendable, and they should have the prayers, sympathy, and help of every philanthropist. But if they die to secure the closing of saloons on Sunday only, what is gained? Those who are laboring to secure Sunday laws tell us that if all Sunday traffic were stopped just as much business would be done in the other six days of the week as is now done in seven. Why would it not hold just as good in the case of the saloon? If it be a correct statement that any merchant—provided all would close on Sunday—would get as much trade in the other six days as he does in the whole seven, the conclusion in regard to the saloon would have to be the same. Then closing the saloon on Sunday will not help the temperance cause a particle, and men who are ready to die in such a cause are taking useless risks. Stand on the solid foundation of prohibition seven days in the week, and in carrying this measure into effect take whatever consequences may come. And in such a warfare God will be a greater safeguard than the insurance companies or anything of the kind.

A. O. TAIT.

### Lorenzo Dow on Natural Rights.

UNDER the heading of "Natural Rights," the *Clarion*, of Richland, Iowa, has an article in its issue of August 23, which contains some principles that it would be well for those who are working for Sunday laws and kindred religious legislation to study and practice. The *Clarion* says:—

Lorenzo Dow, in a very plain, quaint way, gives his views on these natural rights, which all of us might profit by carefully considering.

In reading the life of this teacher of the better way, we find this: "Moral rights are the personal privileges to think, and judge, and act for one's self in point of moral duty. This is the more plain and clear, as no one is concerned but God, the Judge, and the individual man as the responsible agent. For what right hath any man to meddle with that which does not concern him?"

"Moral duties are the result of moral law, which is the divine prerogative alone; and man hath no right to invade the moral duty of another, for his is the right of the divine government. No man, therefore, nor set of men, has a right to infringe upon, or bind, the conscience of another. Man, therefore, a rational creature, must be convinced before he can be converted, in order to act consistently as an agent accountable to the supreme Governor of the universe. Consequently, submission of will to a compulsory power, in matters of religion, in repugnance to the dictates of tender conscience, is nothing but an empty show, a piece of hypocrisy, without any mixture of moral goodness or genuine virtue. All churches established by law have been a curse to mankind and a pest to society. Law religion will cause people to be hypocrites, but can not cure them of error.

"Suppose that one man believes in one God, another believes in ten; what is that to the first? It neither picks his pocket nor breaks his leg, why should he persecute him? Persecution is contrary

to natural justice, inasmuch as it assumes a power which no mortal can claim, it being the divine right only to judge in such cases. Universal right of conscience is given by the Author of nature, who is the moral Governor of the human family; and such liberty of conscience ought to be established in every land.

"Intolerance assumes to itself the right of withholding liberty of conscience; toleration assumes the right of granting it. Both are despotisms in their nature. Toleration places itself not between man and man, nor between church and church, nor between denomination and denomination, but between God and man—between the being who worships and the Being who is worshiped; and by the same act of assumed authority by which it tolerates man to pay his worship, it presumptuously and blasphemously sets itself up to tolerate the Almighty to receive it."

If these views were held by all professing Christians at the present time, there would be no petitions sent to Congress, requesting it to enact laws establishing certain religious institutions.

### Closing of the World's Fair on Sunday.

THE *Chautauqua Assembly Herald*, of August 18, 1891, devotes its second page to a report of the meeting held in the Amphitheatre, August 10, conducted by Dr. J. M. Buckley, editor of the *Christian Advocate*, of New York City. This meeting was devoted entirely to answering questions which had been written and placed in the "question drawer." Among others we find the following:—

**Question.**—Since the churches in Chicago will be insufficient to accommodate the crowds that will be present at the World's Fair, will not the day be less desecrated if the gates of the Exposition be opened on the Sabbath to the public, rather than closed on that day?

**Answer.**—The person who wrote that question may be as good a Christian as I am; but the keynote of that question may be found in the words of a certain person which are recorded in the book of Job, and whose utterances were originally heard in the Garden of Eden. You seem to think that a man, who has not repented, is worse at one time than another. A man who utters an oath in the morning and swears every five minutes during the day, is no worse at sundown than the man who has taken the name of God in vain in the morning, and not once after that during the day, and has not repented of his sin. The man who goes out in the morning looking for a fight and does not find one, is as bad as if he had found one every five minutes during the day. We are opposed to the opening of the gates during the day, because, in that event, the day would be desecrated under the sanction of the Government.

But suppose the gates of the Fair should be open on Sunday and nobody should go in on that day; how, we ask Dr. Buckley, would the day be desecrated in that event? And suppose again that the gates were closed Sunday, but everybody wanted to go in then; how far from desecrating the day would they come in this case? Is not the man who goes out Sunday morning looking for an open Fair gate and does not find one, as bad as if he had found one open every five minutes during the day? So how much better are the people going to be if the Fair is closed on Sunday?

### Inconsistency of National Reform.

THE inconsistency of the National Reform theory is well summarized in the following pungent paragraphs from the *New York Independent*, of January, 1875:—

This being a Christian Nation, we have a right to acknowledge God in the Constitution; because, as things are now, this is not a Christian Nation, and needs such recognition to make it one.

This having always been a Christian Nation, we have a right to keep it such; and therefore we need this amendment, since hitherto, without it, we have only been a heathen Nation.

In other words, we need to make this a Christian Nation, because we are already such, on the ground that if we do not make it such, we are not a Christian Nation.

Because the people are substantially all Christians, we have a right, and have need, to make the Constitution Christian, to check our powerful element of unbelievers.

We mean to interfere with no man's rights, but only to get certain rights, now belonging to all, restricted to Christians.

This religious amendment is to have no practical effect, its object being to check infidelity.

It is to interfere with no man's rights, but only to make the unbeliever concede to Christians the right to rule in their interest, and to give up like claims for himself.

It is meant to have no practical effect, and therefore will be of great use to us.

We want to recognize God, and Christianity as our national duty to Deity, but intend to give no effect to such recognition, pleasing God by judicially voting ourselves pious, and doing nothing more.

We shall leave all religions in equality before the law, and make Christianity the adopted religion of the Nation.

Christianity, being justice, requires us to put down infidelity by taking advantage of our numbers to secure rights which we do not allow to others.

Justice to Christians is one thing, and to infidels another.

We being a Christian people, the Jewish and unbelieving portion of our people are not, of right, part of the people.

And so, having no rights which we, as Christians, are bound to respect, we must adopt this amendment to our interest.

Passing this act will not make any to be Christians who are not Christians; but it is needed to make this a more Christian Nation.

The people are not to be made more Christian by it; but, since the Nation can not be Christian unless the people are, it is meant to make the Nation Christian without affecting the people.

That is, the object of this amendment is to make the Nation Christian without making the people Christians.

By putting God in the Constitution, he will be recognized by nobody else than those who already recognize him; and therefore we need this amendment for a fuller recognition of Him.

If we say we believe in God and Christ in the Constitution, it is true of those believing in him and a lie as to the rest; and as the first class already recognize him, we want this amendment as a recognition by the latter class, so that our whole people shall recognize him.

Whether we have an acknowledgment of God in the Constitution or not, we are a Christian Nation; and, therefore, it is this recognition of God that is to make us a Christian Nation.

AN officer of the American Sabbath Union, recently stated before a Chicago audience that, "It would be better, a thousand times better, for us to have the Puritan Sabbath again, with all its rigor, than the continental Sabbath."

The continental Sabbath is a day in which those who so desire, attend church, and those who prefer worldly pleasures (and this class is usually in the majority), spend the day accordingly.

The Puritan Sabbath "with all its rigor" compelled attendance at church, fines and imprisonment being the penalty for disobedience.

The American Sabbath Union, if correctly represented by this officer, "would prefer, a thousand times" that men should be forced to attend church by threatened fines and imprisonment than permit them to spend the day in pleasure seeking.

THE rights of a single individual are just as sacred, and should be just as carefully guarded as the rights of a multitude. The State properly protects from interruption religious meetings upon every day; and it very properly does the same for other meetings. Such laws are right, they apply to all people and to all days, but laws setting apart certain days for religious purposes and stopping on those days all the ordinary avocations of life, are opposed to the spirit of our institutions, and to the spirit of true Christianity; and should be opposed alike by the patriot and by the Christian.

THE *Radical*, of Janesville, Wisconsin, has this to say of the King case:—

An American citizen, named R. M. King, was arrested recently in Obion County, Tennessee, for the horrible crime of plowing quietly on Sunday, after having worshiped God on Saturday. Tennessee has a Sunday law, and in that State a man has no right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, which right the Constitution of the United States guarantees to every one. This is union of Church and State, and we hope to see Tennessee beaten in the game.





NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 17, 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.

ON the 7th inst. the Board of Lady Managers of the World's Fair voted fifty-six to thirty-six in favor of closing the Fair on Sunday.

THE idea that men and women would better be cooped up all day in their miserable tenement quarters than "desecrating Sunday in the parks," is entirely worthy of the Sunday-law cause. It would not have been unworthy of the Spanish priests in the days of the Inquisition.

A SAN FRANCISCO paper tells of a captain in the British navy who, not long since, found two tribes on the Polynesian Islands carrying on a fierce war; one tribe, having become converted to Christianity, was trying to force the other to contribute to the purchase of an organ for public worship. The whole tribe must be National Reformers.

MISS FRANCES WILLARD is credited with the assertion that the corset has filled more graves than whisky. Here, then, is a grand opportunity for those philanthropists (?) who are so profoundly concerned for the *physical* good of their fellow human beings that they demand laws requiring everybody to rest, for their health. It will hardly be denied even by the civil Sunday-law advocates that intemperance is a greater *civil* evil than disregard of Sunday; and we have Miss Willard's word for it that wearing corsets is a greater evil still. Should they not then assail the greatest evil of the three rather than the smallest one?

If it is proper for the State to legislate upon the subject of rest, requiring men to abstain from labor one day in seven, for their physical good, why would it not be equally proper to require everybody to dress healthfully?

Nor can it be truthfully urged that the evil effects of Sunday-breaking are any greater in the community than are the ill consequences of corset wearing. The home and the family are the hope of our civilization. Corset wearing tends to destroy both. What is home with a peevish, sickly wife, and weak, rickety children? Nothing but a perpetual incentive to frequent the gin-mill and the gambling den. Then why should we not have a purely

civil law regulating dress, and especially forbidding corsets as the very sum of all offending in the matter of attire, the arch-enemy of the home, the ally of the saloon and of the undertaker.

In view of these facts, should not Mr. Crafts instead of traveling and lecturing in behalf of Sunday rest from a "civil" standpoint, in the interest of lengthened life and increased happiness for mankind, devote himself to a crusade against corsets?

THE *Catholic Review* notes a report "that the Pope is preparing an encyclical on the different forms of government, with the intention of showing how much the nations are indebted to the Church for conciliatory settlement of differences arising from the change of government form;" and then adds: "If this be true he has a noble subject." Just so; but a subject that would require less manipulating and falsifying of history would be: "What the Pope has learned from republican America, and what the Pope and all his imitators, from Mr. Crafts to the National Reform Association, have still to learn of natural, God-given human rights.

It is stated that a Sunday-closing decree has been promulgated recently at Panama, "the once gay and godless Babylon of the Isthmus." The new law provides that all places of business, with a few exceptions, shall be closed on Sundays. The exceptions are the railroad and steamship offices, for urgent business only; hotels, drug stores, restaurants, cook shops, bakeries, and the ice houses. But the exempted places that sell spirits are required to post a big placard notifying that no drinks will be sold before 4 P. M., when the prohibition ceases. The market, grocery stores, and barber shops may be open until 11 A. M. "The newspapers," remarks the *Sun*, "continue to announce the winning numbers in the Sunday drawings of the Panama Lottery, so presumably the lottery is exempted as a necessary business."

REV. J. P. MILLS, District Secretary of the American Sabbath Union, is credited with the following statement concerning the National Religious Liberty Association, and THE SENTINEL:—

This Association publishes a paper called THE AMERICAN SENTINEL. They started it in California, but soon wanted to take it to New York. They found it would cost \$30,000 to move it, and made a call for that sum, and the money just came rolling in; and now it is right in the heart of New York City. It started with only a few thousand subscribers, but soon bounded up to half a million, then to a million, two million, and now it has two and a half million subscribers.

We are sorry to say that the statement is somewhat exaggerated in regard both to the cost of removing THE SENTINEL to this city, and to the circulation of the paper. We will say frankly that our

subscription list falls considerably below the figure given by Mr. Mills. We would not, however, impeach his veracity in the least. His estimate was doubtless based upon the influence of THE SENTINEL.

It is stated that Dr. Brockman, who has been compiling statistics in Germany relative to mine accidents, has brought to light the fact that of the eight hundred and eighty fire-damp explosions which have occurred during twenty years in the Dartmund district, more than twice as many occurred on Monday as on any other day. If the advocates of a "civil" Sunday for the benefit of the "poor working-man" are sincere, they ought certainly now to demand a law requiring all mines to be worked continuously seven days in the week, as it is manifest that fire-damp gathers more rapidly when the mine is not worked for a day.

A FEW days ago an Ohio woman testified in suit for divorce that her husband had once knocked her down for playing croquet on Sunday, although he himself frequently indulged in old sledge, euchre, and poker on that day. At first thought this man's actions seem a little inconsistent, but they are no more so than are Sunday regulations generally. The line must be drawn somewhere; and this man drew it at croquet. The authorities at some of the resorts near this city, and on some of the excursion steamers, draw it at dancing. There is just as good reason for the one as for the other. Nor is the analogy any less striking when we come to consider the right of the man to inflict summary punishment on his wife for the forbidden amusement; he had the right of physical power to enforce his arbitrary rule; the State has the same power, but no more. There is no more moral right in the one case than in the other.

THE principle of persecution, to the extent of burning heretics, is inseparable from the union of Church and State, which makes a crime against the Church, also a crime against the State, to be punished according to human law. If Americans hate anything it is the principle and practice of religious persecution, and if they love anything it is civil and religious liberty.—*Philip Schaff*.

## 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.