



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 5, 1891.

NUMBER 43.

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.

“SPIRITUAL inferences drawn from wrong data cannot be authoritative. No amount of spiritualizing can atone for the perversion or misapprehension of facts. And not only so, but the actual fact, whenever it is ascertained and measured, is always found to have more moral significance than the assumed fact.”

FOR my part, I long ago espoused the cause of religious liberty, not because that cause was popular, but because it was just; and I am not disposed to abandon the principles to which I have been true through my whole life in deference to a passing clamor. The day may come, and may come soon, when those who are now loudest in raising that clamor may again be, as they have formerly been, suppliants for justice. When that day arrives I will try to prevent others from oppressing them, as I now try to prevent them from oppressing others. In the mean time I shall contend against their intolerance with the same spirit with which I may hereafter have to contend for their rights.—*Macaulay.*

IN an editorial on the Sunday question, the *Daily Northwestern* inquires: “Who is to decide for the whole community what each individual’s rest shall consist of? And is it possible to establish one standard and quality of rest for all men engaged in such a multiplicity of avocations? Would it be natural, right or just to insist upon exactly the same kind of rest for everybody regardless of nature’s demands

or different dispositions and situations and week-day employments of individuals?”

The conclusion reached by the *Northwestern* is that “the more the matter is discussed, the more it seems that a single standard can never be adopted or enforced in regard to the one great day of rest which mankind reveres. This is all the more certain when the religious element is taken out of the question. With the religious element in the question, then, according to the principles of our Constitution, the civil code has no jurisdiction in the matter.”

No Religious Basis for Legislation.

OF Sunday observance enforced by law, Judge Hammond remarks:—

The fact that religious belief is one of the foundations of the custom [of Sunday observance] is no objection to it, as long as the individual is not compelled to observe the religious ceremonies others choose to observe in connection with their rest days.

This argument has been made before, by several of the Supreme Courts of the States, but it is as destitute of force as is any other attempt to sustain the Sunday institution. If the argument be legitimate, there is no religious observance known that could not be enforced by law upon all the people, simply by the observers of the institution securing control of legislation. Certain people believe in and practice a certain religious observance, and have sufficient influence to control legislation, enforcing it in their own behalf. Thus the custom is made a part of the law, and as the laws are made presumably for the public good, it is then but a short and easy step to the position that the laws enforcing such observances are for the public good, and not particularly to favor religion; and that, *therefore*, though religious belief be the foundation of the custom, and though the observance be in itself religious, this cannot be suffered to be any objection to it, so long as the individual is not compelled to observe other religious ceremonies that have not yet been fixed in the law.

Yes, this is all very pretty, and it seems always to have been eminently satisfactory to those who make the argument, for it is not by any means new or peculiar to this day or generation. It is as old as is the contest for the right of the free exercise of religious belief. It is the very position occupied by Rome when the disciples of Christ were sent into the world to preach religious freedom to all mankind. Religious observances were enforced by the law. The Christians asserted and maintained the right to dissent from all such observances; in fact, from *every one* of the religious observances of Rome, and to believe religiously for themselves, though, in so doing, they totally disregarded the laws, which, on the part of the Roman State, were held to be beneficial to the population. Then it was held that though religious belief was the foundation of the custom, yet this was no objection to it, because it had become a part of the legal system of the government, and was enforced by the State for its own good. But Christianity *then* refused to recognize any validity in any such argument.

When Paganism was supplanted by the Papacy, in the Roman Empire, the same argument was again brought forth to sustain the Papal observances, which were enforced by imperial laws, and through the whole period of Papal supremacy, Christianity still refused to recognize any validity whatever in the argument.

Under the Calvinistic theocracy of Geneva, the same argument was again used in behalf of religious oppression. In England the same argument was used against the Puritans, and other dissenters, in behalf of religious oppression there. In New England, under the Puritan theocracy, the same argument was used in behalf of religious oppression, and to justify the Congregationalists, who had control of legislation, in compelling the Baptists and the Quakers, under penalty of banishment, and even of death, to conform to the religious observances of the Congregationalists. But through it all, Chris-

tianity always refused to recognize any validity whatever in the argument, and it always will.

The rulers of Massachusetts put the Quakers to death, and banished the Antinomians and "sua-baptists," not because of their religious tenets, but because of their *violations of the civil laws*. This is the justification which they pleaded, and it was the best they could make. Miserable excuse! But just so it is: wherever there is such a union of Church and State, heresy and heretical practices are apt to become violations of the civil code, and are punished no longer as errors in religion, but infractions of the laws of the land. So the defenders of the Inquisition have always spoken and written in justification of that awful and most iniquitous tribunal.—*Baird's "Religion in America," page 94, note.*

The truth of the matter is, that the fact that religious belief is one of the foundations of the custom is the strongest possible objection that could be made to its being recognized and enforced by the civil power. This is demonstrated by several distinct counts.

1. Jesus Christ has commanded, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and to God the things that are God's." In this the Lord has distinctly and positively separated that which pertains to Cæsar from that which pertains to God. Things religious, are due to God only; things civil, are due to Cæsar. When the civil power—Cæsar—exacts that which is due to God, then it puts itself in the place of God, and so far as this exaction is recognized, God is denied; civil and religious things are confounded; the distinction which Christ has made is practically thrown aside; and the things which he separated are joined together. Upon another subject, he declared, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." And upon this subject, it may be declared with equal force,—what God hath separated, let not man join together. When the civil power legally adopts a religious custom, and enforces the observance thereof, it does put itself in the place of God. But no power has any right to put itself in the place of God. Therefore, no civil power can of right ever legally adopt and enforce any religious custom or religious observance. And wherever such a thing is done, he who regards God the most will respect such action the least.

2. The history of more than eighteen centuries demonstrates that the very worst bane of government is for religionists to have control of the civil power. The legal recognition and enforcement of religious customs, or of customs of which religion is the foundation, is to give religionists control of the civil power just to that extent. And the doing of the thing to *any* extent justifies the doing of it to every conceivable extent. It was this that tortured Christians to death under Pagan Rome, and in later centuries under Papal Rome. It was this that burnt John Huss at Constance, and Servetus at Geneva; and that whipped and banished the Baptists, and banished and hanged the Quakers, in New England.

The fathers of the American Republic, having before them the whole of this dreadful history, proposed that the people of this Nation should be profited by the fearful example, and should be forever free from any such thing. They therefore completely separated the national Government from any connection whatever with religion, either in recognition or in legislation. And in this they set to the States the perfect example of human government, which example has been followed in the Constitutions of the States, and by none more thoroughly than by Tennessee.

Yet, it has ever been the hardest thing to get the courts of the States to recognize the principle, though distinctly declared in the State Constitutions. And here, in the very first instance in which a United States Court has had opportunity to notice it, instead of the principle being recognized, it is revolutionized. And instead of the American doctrine of the nineteenth century, the Roman doctrine of the third century is inculcated.

3. We have proved by the express words of Christ, the divine right of dissent in all religious things; that any man has the divine right to dissent from any and every religious doctrine or observance of any body on earth. So long as civil government keeps its place, and requires of men only those things which pertain to Cæsar, things civil, so long there will be neither dissent nor disagreement, but peace only, between the Government and all Christian sects or subjects. But just as soon as civil government makes itself the partisan of a religious party, and sets itself up as the champion of religious observances, just so soon this right of dissent in religious things is extended to the authority of the Government, *in so far* as that authority is thus exercised. And so far there will be dissent on the part of every Christian in the Government.

Sunday observance is in itself religious, and religious only. The institution is wholly ecclesiastical. The creation of the institution was for religious purposes only. The first law of government enforcing its observance was enacted with religious intent; such has been the character of every Sunday law that ever was made; and such its character is recognized to be in the case at bar in the decision under discussion. The Sunday institution is of ecclesiastical origin only, and its observance is religious only. It is the divine right of every man utterly to ignore the institution; to disregard its observance; and to dissent from the authority which instituted or enjoins it. And when any State or civil government makes itself the partisan of the ecclesiastical body which instituted it, and the champion of the ecclesiastical authority which enjoins it, and enacts laws to compel men to respect it, and observe it, this divine right of dissent is then extended to the authority of the

Government, *so far as it is thus exercised.*

The fact that religious belief is the foundation of the custom, is the one grand objection to its observance by any law of any government on earth. And as for the Government of the United States, or of the several States, so entirely is this true, and so certainly and firmly does the principle hold, that even an act which might otherwise be deemed expedient or valuable as a municipal regulation, would be positively precluded by the Constitution, if it forbade or enjoined any religious observance; that is, if it infringed the free exercise of religion. This point is well stated by the Supreme Court of California, in these words:—

Had the Act been so framed as to show that it was intended by those who voted for it, as simply a municipal regulation; yet, if, in fact, it contravened the provision of the Constitution securing religious freedom to all, we should have been compelled to declare it unconstitutional for *that* reason.—*9 Lee, 515.*

Therefore, the simple truth is, that, that which the Judge pronounces no objection is in itself the strongest possible objection. "The fact that religious belief is one of the foundations of the custom"—this fact is in itself the one supreme objection which sweeps away every excuse, and annihilates every argument that ever can be made in favor of any Sunday law, or in favor of any other law recognizing or enforcing any religious observance, or any custom founded upon any religious observance.

A. T. J.

Paste This in Your Hat.

REFERRING to that part of Judge Hammond's decision in the King case in which it is stated that "malice, religious or otherwise, may dictate a prosecution," and if man has by law set Sunday apart for rest, "it must be obeyed as man's law if not as God's law," the *Michigan Christian Advocate*, of August 22, 1891, says:—

We respectfully advise our Adventist friends in Michigan, especially those who are unusually noisy on Sunday, to paste the above statement in some conspicuous place where they can see it often. The Sabbath law must be obeyed. People are free to proclaim doctrine in opposition to law, and thereby seek to have the law repealed, but while the law stands it must be respected and obeyed. The Michigan law does not compel any one to observe Sunday as the Sabbath, but it does restrain them from interfering with others who wish to observe it. No more disturbance of Sunday worship, if you please.

We would suggest to all who think the spirit of religious bigotry and intolerance dead in this country, that they cut out and paste the above statement of the *Methodist Michigan Christian Advocate* in some conspicuous place. The editor of the *Advocate* knows that it needs no Sunday law to restrain Adventists, or any body else from disturbing worshippers on Sunday, any more than it needs a Thursday night law to restrain the like when prayer-meetings are generally held. And further, this editor knows, if he knows

anything about the matter, that neither Mr. King nor any of his Adventist friends in Michigan have been guilty, knowingly at least, of disturbing any Sunday worship with their noise. They are not noted for being a noisy people, and plowing corn is by no means the noisiest kind of work. We have known of whole neighborhoods being disturbed by "shouting Methodists," and no prosecution being instituted over it either. It is not the noise made by Adventists that is disturbing the editor of the *Michigan Christian Advocate* and his colleagues, but their observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath instead of the first, which Methodists say is the Sabbath. Their attempts at enforcing Sunday laws upon the observers of the seventh day is simply an effort to close the mouths of the latter from saying that which the Lord himself has said, that "the seventh day is the Sabbath." Many a battle has been fought out on this line in the past, but the invariable rule has been that though the persecuted were sawn in sunder, their works followed them, their words echoed round the world, and their persecutors were found in the end to be in error, though in killing them they may have thought they were doing God service. Reader! the rule still holds good.

W. A. COLCORD.

Multiplication by Division.

THE division in the American Sabbath Union has resulted in increasing and distributing the work of the organization and materially aiding its progress. The Sabbath Union, under the leadership of Col. Elliott F. Shepard and Rev. J. H. Knowles, with *The American Sabbath* as its official organ, devotes itself more particularly to the sentiment and theory of Sunday laws and their enforcement, from the point of view rather of an aristocratic estheticism and dilettanteism of religion, while Rev. W. F. Crafts, with his organ, *Sabbath Reform*, is devoting himself to the practical business of organizing Law and Order Leagues; Sabbath Committees; Sabbath Associations, local, State and National; and Rest Day leagues, in which a secret inquisition is instituted by direction of their Constitution, in which the secretary is instructed to "appoint an investigating committee of four or more known only to themselves, some of whom on each Sabbath shall, by personal observation, ascertain what violations of the law of the State and humanity are in progress, and report fully in writing to the secretary, as a basis of reports from him to the board, to guide its work, and to the public by the press and platform, and to civil officers as an urgent incentive to fidelity on their part."

Thus Mr. Crafts is taking active measures to utilize that "sword of the law" which he has boasted is ready sharpened and with hilt turned to his grasp. The evi-

dence of this has already been seen in some southern cities, especially in Atlanta, where Judge Maddox has found it necessary to instruct the Grand Jury that they are the only "Law and Order League" necessary or proper in an organized American municipality. But the organization of these associations which will eventually become religious Ku Klux and White Cappers, goes steadily on and when the time comes they will be ready to be the unseen hand to do the will of the Sabbath Union, which, itself, is too exalted in intellect, wealth and social position, and of too high an order of ideality, to carry out its decrees with its own hand or even look at the logical results of its teachings.

Some members of the National Reform Association feel that this organization, also, should be doubled in its activity and effectiveness by the same process of division which has taken place in the Sabbath Union. Interesting testimony to this fact may be found in the following article to the *United Presbyterian* from a Pittsburgh correspondent:—

"A number of the subscribers of the *United Presbyterian* have been for years members of and contributors to the National Reform Association. In not a few homes can be seen, neatly framed, hanging on the wall, certificates of life membership. For a long time some have felt that the movement was conducted on too narrow a scale. The whole management was entrusted to a few persons, and these, with a few exceptions, members of the Covenant Church. The recent troubles in the Reformed Presbyterian Church have completely alienated some of the best friends of the reform. The New York *Independent*, in a late issue, called attention to the fact that the managers of it, those who control its policy and expend its funds, were the leaders in the prosecution of the ministers in the trials last spring in this city, and also that National Reform as at present conducted was simply a disguised effort to carry out the views of the Covenanters. Outside of that body, not many persons are willing to accept the latter or to be led in any reform by Messrs. McAllister, Wilson, and George.

"Now it is a pity that what is commendable in the National Reform platform should be overlooked. A prominent Methodist brother remarked a short time ago that he was absolutely sure that any movement wisely inaugurated and conducted, based upon the fact that this is a Christian Nation, and intended to preserve its Christian features and give clearer expression wherever needed, would receive the hearty indorsement of that church. There is scarcely a doubt it would meet with the approval of four-fifths of the Christian people of this land. Why cannot this be done? Who will take the initiative? Cannot a few of our influential citizens, representing different denominations, be called together and inaugurate

such a movement? Now is the time to act.

"National Reform as conducted now is something very different. It is based upon the theory that this is a Christless and Godless Nation. The conclusion is, Do not recognize it, testify against it, stand aloof from it, till this feature is removed. No wonder that only Covenanters can engage in it. Conducted on a broader platform all could unite in its advocacy, and untold good would result."

America's First Opposition to Sunday Laws.

HARDLY had the liberty-loving Anglo-Saxons stepped their feet on the American shores and made a home in the wilds of New England, before the irrepressible spirit of liberty which has ever been a characteristic of these peoples, was destined to raise its voice in opposition to the Church-and-State Sunday laws which have descended to us from the Dark Ages. The pilgrim fathers landed in 1620; and before a score of years had passed the rightfulness of Sunday laws was one of the leading questions of debate in America. Roger Williams, who has justly been styled "the first American," was the champion against Sunday laws, and the Puritan clergy and Government were their defenders. "Roger Williams," says Bancroft, "was the first person in modern Christendom to assert in its plenitude the doctrine of the liberty of conscience, the equality of opinions before the law."

"A few weeks after his arrival" (February 5, 1631), says his biographer, "Mr. Williams was invited by the church at Salem to become assistant to their pastor, the Reverend Mr. Skelton; but the magistrates of the Colony had heard of his opinions, and immediately interposed their remonstrances with the people of Salem to prevent his settlement." One reason of this interference on the part of the authorities, as alleged in the letter, which they addressed to the church at Salem, was that he "had declared his opinion that *the magistrate might not punish a breach of the Sabbath*, nor any other offense that was a breach of the first table." (See Winthrop, 1, 52, where he makes such record in his journal of April 12, 1631.)

This charge, it will be seen, relates to his declaration of the great doctrine, to the vindication and elucidation of which he was to devote his life. "His doctrine," continues his biographer, "was in direct conflict with both the opinions and the practices of the Colony of Massachusetts whose counselors and elders considered themselves the appointed guardians of the orthodoxy of the people; and in that age they could conceive of no other mode of executing their trust, than by inflicting civil penalties upon every one who ventured to dissent even in the most unim-

portant particulars from the prevailing faith.

"The opinion of Roger Williams, which was then urged in proof of his unsuitableness to become a minister of the gospel, has long since become the common sentiment of the American people."—*William Gammell, in Sparks's Library of American Biography.*

Four years later (summoned to appear before the General Court May 10, 1635) in the charges which were the groundwork of his final trial and banishment, the charge of 1631 was repeated, and given first place in order, being thus recorded by Governor Winthrop:—

It was laid to his [Williams's] charge that, being under question before the magistracy and churches for divers dangerous opinions, viz: (1) That the magistrate ought not to punish the breach of the first table, otherwise than in such cases as did disturb the civil peace. . . . Much debate was about these things. The said opinions were adjudged by all, magistrates and ministers (who were desired to be present), to be erroneous and very dangerous, and the calling of him to office at that time [while under general condemnation for these alleged errors] was adjudged a great contempt for authority."—*Winthrop, vol. 1, page 162.*

Williams thus exhibited his persistence, and showed how deep-rooted were his "sublime principles," as Bancroft designates them.

It was fortunate for the anti-Sunday-law cause—the cause of liberty—that it had such a man as Roger Williams to lead out in the agitation for religious freedom. He was a noble man; a minister "lovely in his carriage," "godly and zealous, having precious gifts"—expressions of Winslow and Winthrop; gentle, temperate, and forbearing; beloved by all—even by those with whom he was in constant antagonism, who could but admire his patience and magnanimity; he was logical and scholarly; an intense lover of liberty; a student of law, tutored by Coke, that "strenuous asserter of liberty on the principles of ancient laws;"—on the whole, being a man wonderfully qualified for the work before him.

Although written in no especially friendly spirit, Mr. Ellis in the "Puritan Age," thus describes the character of Williams:—

Alike for the noble qualities and for the petty infirmities singularly blended with them, he is to us an admirable and a picturesquely engaging person. He was wholly free of guile, open, sincere, and of a most generous disposition, with traits of a childlike simplicity and tenderness. The resolute front which he presented to those who opposed him in his opinions or his actions had in it nothing of ugliness or perversity. He was forbearing and magnanimous. . . . Though all the powers of State and Church were engaged against him in Massachusetts, with many fretting altercations and the final infliction—yet not without forbearance on the part of the authorities—*Williams never had there a single personal enemy.*"—*Ellis's Puritan Age and Rule in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay. Page 263.*

The intensity of Williams's feelings, the clearness of his views, the boldness of his actions, and the logicalness of his

theories are thus set forth by Scott, in the "Development of Constitutional Liberty in the English Colonies of America":

Roger Williams's whole being was possessed by the one great principle that the soul should be free, and he was wont to express his heart's aspiration by the term "soul-liberty." He boldly threw down the gauntlet to the world, by announcing that soul-liberty was of God, that conscience was by nature free, and that it was the duty of human society to preserve intact that freedom, whereof the least violation was invariably but the first step to soul bondage. The conscience, the soul of man, being free, no limits bounded that freedom but those set by the Creator. Of a consequence, any limitation imposed on the conscience of one man by another, was an interference between the Creator and the created: it was intolerance, a thing altogether abhorred by God and unjust to man. Religion being a relation that existed solely between the Creator and the created, God was the only judge of the latter. No religious organization, then, had a shadow of right to dictate what one should think or what one should do in matters religious. As a necessary deduction from this conclusion, no such right existing, there was no need of agents to enforce the observance of faith, nor any right to use them. Consequently, the use of the civil jurisdiction by the ecclesiastical, and the subordination of the former to the latter, had no justification, and was, in fact, a monstrous perversion of truth, which called for immediate reformation.

Thus at one blow, Williams would have cloven Church and State asunder, and sponged from the statute-roll the very mention of conformity or non-conformity. Heresy, with him, had no existence, and, carrying his doctrine to its conclusion, he fearlessly asserted that compulsory worship of God was an abomination; that, where the spirit was not a willing one, worship compelled was an offense to the Deity; that if one would not worship, he should not be made to do so, that no man should be compelled to support any religion whatever, least of all one in which he had no faith.

This doctrine overturned the intolerance whereby the civil power is made the agent of the ecclesiastical in the prescription of faith and the extirpation of heresy, and left error at the mercy of the only power that can combat it—truth. It was the sentence of divorce between Church and State, and it ordained that neither should have anything to do with the other, further than extending the protection under which the latter is bound to shelter every element of society; yet this protection was to be given, not so much to the institution, as to the worshippers, in whom lay the natural right to freedom of conscience, and, consequently, the inherent right to freedom of worship.

No man ever had a clearer view of the true relations existing between the civil and the ecclesiastical powers. The civil magistrate, he says, may not intermeddle even to stop a church from apostasy and heresy.

The following from Bancroft shows how advanced he was in his views, and the light in which a man who stands up for principle, even though in opposition to all the ministers of the land, will be regarded by posterity, who can look with an unprejudiced eye and view actions in their real—not in their apparent—aspects:

At a time when Germany was the battle field for all Europe in the implacable wars of religion; when even Holland was bleeding with the anger of vengeful factions; when France was still to go through the fearful struggle with bigotry; when England was gasping under the despotism of intolerance; almost half a century before William Penn became an American proprietor; and two years before Descartes founded philosophy on the method of free reflection—Roger Williams as-

serted the great doctrine of intellectual liberty. It became his glory to found a State upon that principle, and to stamp himself upon its rising institutions, in characters so deep that the impress has remained to the present day, and, can never be evaded without the total destruction of the work.

Would that we had in our land to-day more ministers like Roger Williams.

W. A. BLAKELY.

The Sunday Sham.

NOT content with the privilege they enjoy of attending church on Sunday, representatives of the American Sabbath Union have appeared before the World's Fair Commissioners with vehement appeals for Sunday closing of the Fair. Since there is no agitation going on favoring the compulsory attendance of anybody at the World's Fair on a Sunday, or on a Monday, or on any other day, why their solicitude? Can they not feel easy-minded if some one else is following his own conscience in the matter, whether religious or otherwise? The very men who profess a pathetic interest in the hard work some men may have to do at the Fair on a Sunday have no tears to shed over their equally exhausting labors on a Saturday or on a Monday. Indeed, shorn of the sham of pretense, it looks as if their motives could be summed up as a writer in the *Open Court* expresses it, that "as we, the members of the Sabbath Union do not care to go, therefore we demand that nobody else shall go."—*Western Herald.*

A Prototype.

THERE seems to be almost an exact agreement between the theocratical laws of colonial Massachusetts, and the demands of National Reformers.

To prove such a statement correct, a few historical extracts will be sufficient when coupled with the demands of the "reformers."

Ridpath says:—"At a session of the General Court of the Colony held in 1631, a law was passed restricting the right of suffrage. It was enacted that none but members of the church should be permitted to vote at the colonial elections. . . . Nearly three-fourths of the people were excluded from their rights as freemen."

National Reformers admit if their idea of government is carried out it will disfranchise dissenters. Rev. W. J. Coleman says:—"The classes who would object to the amendment are,—Jews, infidels, atheists, *et al.* These classes are perfectly satisfied with the Constitution as it is. How would they stand toward it if it recognized the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ? . . . To be perfectly plain, I believe that the existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel."

The "*et al.*" [and others] can but mean all dissenters aside from the three classes,

"Jews, infidels and atheists." Thus they, according to the statement of Mr. Coleman, are working to secure an amendment to the Constitution that will in effect disfranchise all who may "logically or consistently" differ with them.

Ridpath further adds:—"Taxes were levied for the support of the gospel."

A Baptist writer, speaking of the town of Ashfield, Mass., in 1763, says:—

The General Court passed a law granting the pedo-baptists the privilege of taxing all the land in town to pay their ministers and build their meeting-houses, and if they refused, power was granted to sell their lands to cancel the debt.

We sent a petition to the General Court for relief but were refused. We immediately agreed not to pay the tax, and in the month of April, 1770, they presented a tax of £507 which had been raised for the support of their minister, and erection of their meeting house.

They commenced selling our land and in all sold about four hundred acres.—*Religious Denominations in the United States.*—Belcher.

What do National Reformers say? District Secretary Rev. J. M. Foster in defining the duties of nations according to their views, mentions the following:—"By providing her (the church) funds out of the public treasury for carrying on her aggressive work at home and in the foreign field."

Six years ago, a citizen of Washington County, Pennsylvania,—a stronghold of National Reformism—told me that a few months before he fell in company with some ministers that were on their way to attend a convention, and one of their number stated that he was looking forward to the time when they would "draw their salaries from the treasury, the same as Government officials."

When their desires are fulfilled, when they have influenced the Government to legislate in their behalf, if any one should refuse to pay tax to support the national religion they would have their property sold by the Government to meet the demands of the law, requiring taxation to support the church.

Ridpath further says:—"None but church members were eligible to office."

Rev. J. M. Foster says the reigning Mediator requires of the nations:—"A constitutional provision of moral and religious qualifications for their officers."

To require a "religious qualification" for an official would tend to corrupt both the Church and the State. Scheming politicians would be wonderfully pious about election time, and men actuated by selfish motives would join the Church, and thus the Church would be heavily laden with hypocrisy, and nothing can be more effectual in corrupting a State than a corrupt Church wedded to the State.

Dr. Adam Clarke says:—"When political matters are brought into the Church both are ruined. The Church has more than once ruined the State, the State has often corrupted the Church."

What was in force in Massachusetts in the days when they destroyed witches, hung Quakers, banished Baptists and sold their property, is in part, if not wholly, the demand of National Reformers to-day.

E. T. RUSSELL.

Discussion at the Sunset Club.

THE Sunset Club, of Chicago, an organization of professional, business, and literary men, which dines every Thursday evening at the Grand Pacific Hotel, and regularly serves at its banquets a final course of wit, reason, and eloquence, took as the subject for discussion in its meeting of Thursday, October 22, the question of "Sunday at the World's Fair." The Chicago *Tribune* reports Judge McConnell as presenting substantially the following argument:—

The principal difficulty which has embarrassed me in the consideration of this question has been to divest myself of purely personal views. I thoroughly recognize that because I do certain things on Sunday I should not immediately conclude that everybody else ought to do the same thing. Or that, if I want to attend the Exposition on that day, my desire, in itself, ought not in any manner to influence me in determining what I ought to advocate as the proper policy for the managers of the Exposition to adopt.

I hope I have succeeded in getting rid of the purely personal bias I have in the premises. While engaged in this struggle with myself, the thought has occasionally occurred to me that perhaps the advocates of Sunday closing might also be considering the proposition through minds largely affected by their personal practices and beliefs.

I take it for granted that we must determine this question on much broader grounds than ought to be proposed by a man who is always willing to do anything Sunday not wrong Monday or Tuesday; or that might be urged by another who believed that Sunday he ought to go to church in the morning and remain grave and quiet during the afternoon and evening.

The broad question is: Shall all the citizens of Chicago, and all the visitors within our gates during the six months of the Exposition, no matter what they believe about Sunday, be obliged to submit to what a portion of us think our religious duty that day requires us not to do? In other words, Shall that great enterprise, designed for instruction and delight, be closed one day in seven to the thousands who might that day, perhaps on no other, avail themselves of all the treasures of profit and entertainment afforded by the Exposition, because a good many other people think it wrong to open the gates Sunday?

Is it not the same old fight which has been waged so long in the world—the fight to make one set of men think, or at least do, as another set of men think they ought to think or do? Is there any room in the world for a question of that kind any longer? Have we not grown so much that it seems strange that such a question is even debatable? Is not the controversy in the main a religious one? And might

we not just as well be discussing whether some of us should be made to go to some particular church as to be discussing whether some of us should be prevented from doing Sunday something that some others think they ought not to do Sunday?

It is a religious question, and I think we are beyond using coercive measures in making conversions to our religious beliefs, or even enforcing the observance of matters which are a part of our religious beliefs.

I picked up, however, a few days ago, the resolutions adopted by the Methodist Ecumenical Council, recently in session at Washington, against the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday. In the main these resolutions proceed on the theory that, as the members of this Council believe in Sunday keeping, therefore the Exposition should be closed on Sunday, even as against those who are entirely convinced that they have a right to attend the Exposition that day.

It is true the resolutions go a little further, and charge that the attempt to keep the Fair open Sunday is a mercenary scheme, and would benefit the stockholders only. That part of the resolutions, however, I do not consider as involved in the present discussion.

I think the resolutions fairly confirm what I said—that the question is a religious one, with most of those who advocate Sunday closing; and, as I intimated before, I think the world too wise and too tolerant now to make me and others refrain from doing what the Ecumenical Council of the Methodists think I ought not to do. In brief, I do not think that question debatable in 1891. I do not suppose that any employe will be overworked because of the Sunday opening; and I feel certain that any one of them desiring to devote the day or any part of it to worship will be accorded an opportunity to do so.

If the Fair prove as much of a success as its projectors anticipate, we shall have in Chicago, every Sunday of the six months from May to November, from 100,000 to 300,000 visitors. What will you do with them? The churches will not accommodate or attract them. Will the day be better observed by having them thrown on their own resources, in a strange city, to find such entertainment as they can? I could predict, I believe, with absolute certainty, that there would be less of the worshipful spirit in that crowd, surging through the city, than if it were allowed to find its way to the Exposition grounds.

I believe if the problem were alone confined to the question, What shall we do with our visitors Sunday, so as in the least to disturb the ordinary occupations of that day? the answer would necessarily be that they should be sent to the Fair. There they could innocently spend the day study-

ing and learning the lessons afforded by the exhibits.

I am inclined to look at the whole matter from a practical point of view, and I trust the Exposition managers will consider it in no other way.

I ask that the Exposition be open on Sunday, for the benefit of all; but principally for those tired men who work eight and ten hours of every week-day, and who, with the slender margin of savings that always stands between them and want, can hardly afford to sacrifice any week-day for recreation or instruction. Of all our citizens, they need to see this great exhibition of the results of labor. Many men working in the narrow lines, in the smoke and turmoil and noise of the factories, are seldom enabled to see the achievements of united labor. They work and sweat, and sometimes wonder for what, perhaps feeling that merely to live after so much work, is not much of an achievement. They fail to appreciate their relation and their usefulness to the rest of the world. But here, on this blessed Sunday, for such it shall be, the workman shall come, with his wife and children, and he shall feel great and they proud when they view what he, with other men, can create. Perhaps, too, he can get there, better than from sermons which he does not go to hear, the high philosophy that shall reconcile him to his hard labor and his lowly lot.

I can easily believe that true religion itself will be helped by the lessons of the exhibits, and that the men employed at the Exposition Sunday may truly feel that they are performing a sacred and religious duty.

The Sunday Question.

In questions of public controversy, all sides should be heard. Our republican form of government anticipates the broadest range of individual liberty compatible with the well-being of society.

Honest religious opinions are as widely diversified as the physical, intellectual and moral constitutions of men are different, hence every man and woman, should be guaranteed by law, the full and free enjoyment and practice of his opinions, provided the same do not interfere with the rights of others.

On account of some necessary work recently done on our streets in Atlanta, Georgia, during Sunday, the clergy, in the pulpit, and through the columns of our daily papers, made a bitter and unwarranted attack on those who instigated this Sunday work. This attack revealed the existence in our midst, of a class of narrow-minded beings who speak and act as though governments were instituted, and laws enacted, for their own exclusive benefit. It is about time that this class was authoritatively informed that we live in a Republic, and not a theocracy. They

should also be made to understand that the atrocious code of blue laws and cruel and outrageous *regime* of Cotton Mather, are inapplicable to this age.

Sunday is strictly a religious institution, and cannot be rightfully enforced on persons having no respect for it as a holy day. The Roman Catholic Church has the same legal right to enforce abstinence from meat eating on Friday, as have Protestant Christians to enforce observance of Sunday.—*Ex-Senator Warren Smith.*

Consistency.

WHILE the ministers are clamoring for closing the World's Fair on Sunday, it seems they can't agree on Sunday observance between themselves. The Cumberland Presbyterian Synod has been in session in San Antonio, and at a late hour on the night of final adjournment, a resolution was offered, censuring ministers who had gone home on a Sunday train. A bitter debate resulted, the dispatches tell us, one minister suggesting that those who rode on the street cars ought to be included in the censure. The resolution as offered, which reads as follows, was finally adopted:

Resolved, That this body deplores the seeming or real necessity of any of its members violating the sanctity of the Sabbath by returning to their homes by public conveyance on the Sabbath, and that it is the mind of this body that such conduct is dishonoring to God, and should in every way be discouraged.

It is difficult to understand why the resolution should designate "public" conveyance. Where is the distinction, for instance, between hiring a hack and driving your own horse? In one case some one else does the labor and in the other you labor yourself. These regulators of other people have queer ideas of consistency.—*Denison (Texas) Gazetteer.*

REFERRING to the "contract schools" (sectarian schools among the Indians that receive money support from the United States Government), the Canadian *Baptist* says:—

The contract school system of the United States is, like our own, a wrong one, and it is not unlikely that the Government may become convinced of the truth before many years. The course of the United States Government will be followed with interest by the friend of the Indian in Canada, where we have the same unsound system of sectarian schools, supported by Government grants, though our Government has not yet so fully and effectually grappled with the question of providing for the compulsory education and civilization of all Indians, as the United States has at length done, after long years of cruel neglect and maltreatment of the wretched aborigines.

Evidences are not lacking to indicate that the Government of the United States is already convinced that it has made a mistake in paying money to denominational schools; but finds, however, that having once adopted this plan it is exceedingly difficult to make a change. The churches have too strong a "pull."

NATIONAL Religious Liberty Association



DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ.
We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.
We believe in supporting the civil government, and submitting to its authority.
We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.
We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.
We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation by the civil government; that we and our fellow-citizens may enjoy the inestimable blessings of both religious and civil liberty.

OFFICES:

43 BOND ST., NEW YORK CITY.
1225 T ST., N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.
28 COLLEGE PLACE, CHICAGO, ILL.
12TH AND CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.
267 WEST MAIN ST., BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

R. C. PORTER - - - - - PRESIDENT.
A. F. BALLENGER - - - - - SECRETARY.

REV. JAMES P. MILLS says of the American Sabbath Union: "This organization is the child of the churches." In this case, at least, the accuracy of the old saw about ministers' sons cannot be questioned.

SOME slight jealousy arose at the Methodist Ecumenical Conference, in Washington, over the invidious reflection upon the "English Sunday" contained in the term "American Sunday," used in the memorial to the World's Fair Commissioners, presented to the Conference. However, the resolutions were adopted without changing the epithet to "Anglo-American Sunday," as might have seemed courteous. Still, as the biblical day, and the biblical name, and the biblical commandment, and the biblical application of it, are all laid aside, it might just as well be called "American Sunday" as English Sunday, French Sunday, German Sunday, Chinese Sunday, or any other local Sunday.

In discussing the question as to whether the Metropolitan Museum of Art shall be opened on Sundays, after January 1, the *Observer* says, quoting from a previous article in the *Evening Post*, that it is feared that the character of the Sunday attendance has sent the Museum to the level of the dime species, and that "though the attendance has diminished in August and September, it is said to have improved in quality; and yet the evils so flagrant during the first two months still exist, but in greatly diminished extent; probably in proportion to the diminution in attendance." If the Museum exists only for the benefit of persons of a certain "improved quality," and this desirable class of visitors is obtained only "in proportion to the diminution in attendance," then it would be well to subject all applicants for admission to an examination such as will restrict the number admitted to that desirable few of the proper "quality." However the public at large, for whom the Metropolitan Museum was instituted, have had a very different idea of the purposes of this public school of object lessons. It was not established for the sole use of any esthetic and aristocratic few, but for the benefit as well, of the sons and daughters of men whose lives were spent in laying bricks and carrying mortar, every brick and every hod of which is now worth to this city more than the expense of a few days' pleasure and profit in the Museum for the heirs in equity, though not in law, of the wealth of this great city, even if they have not soft white hands or refined manners.

THE following is from Richmond, Texas:—

The jury in the case of Rev. John Todd, Justice of the Peace, charged with selling a bottle of Florida water on Sunday, brought in a verdict of guilty, and assessed his punishment at twenty dollars and costs. The case excited quite a great deal of interest, and the defense had three of our ablest attorneys employed. This decides the fate of the Sunday-law in Richmond, and is the third conviction. Liverwich, a merchant, was fined twenty dollars for selling a five-cent fan. W. B. Parrott was fined twenty dollars for selling a pint of whisky. All convictions under the Sunday law.

It is difficult to understand that such a paragraph as this refers to incidents in the last decade of the nineteenth century; and still more that it narrates occurrences in the United States, where it has long been supposed that it was not the business of the State to enforce religious observances; but being assured that this is not the twelfth century, and Texas is in the United States, the paragraph must be passed to the consideration of those who tell us that the spirit of religious bigotry is dead and that there need be no fear that the church will ever attain a supremacy over the State.

COLONEL SHEPARD made the solemn prophecy before the National Commissioners of the World's Fair that unless that great Exposition is closed on Sunday, Chicago will be visited with tempests, direful earthquakes, great floods, cyclones, and general disaster. It is further reported that he has engaged a suite of rooms, during the Fair, in the Auditorium Hotel, for \$25,000. Putting these two things together, the problem would foot up about like this: the Colonel either does not believe his own prophecy, and is just trying the old-fashioned ecclesiastical scare, so common in the Dark Ages, on the Commissioners; or, if he does believe it, he thinks the Chicago Auditorium storm and earthquake proof when it has him for an occupant; and so he will view the majesty of the awful scene from that standpoint; or, to take another view of the question, something in which he has twenty-five thousand dollars worth of faith gives him the assurance that the World's Fair will actually be closed on Sundays. It is not intended to be discourteous toward this remarkable prophecy, but the human mind will reflect. A. O. TAIT.

SAM JONES and Sam Small have organized a Law and Order League in Rome, Georgia, the purpose of which is to secure the legal and moral renovation of that city. This gratuitous interference by the evangelists and their friends with the regular course of legal procedure has met with a well-merited rebuke from the Circuit Judge. At the next session of the court after the establishment of this extra-judicial organization, Judge Maddox charged the Grand Jury, saying:—

It has been charged by two ministers of the gospel that certain specific crimes were openly committed here; and, as a consequence, a law and order club has been organized. So long as this court exists there is no need of such a club. You, gentlemen of the Grand Jury, are the only law and order club necessary.

This is the first time that these Law and Order Leagues which are being organized, not only throughout the United States, but throughout the world, as active aids to the Sunday Union Societies, have met with the slightest criticism. There will be an awakening before long to the fact that there is throughout the world, in the International Law and Order League, a strong and systematic organization, ready to be the right hand and swing the sword for the International Federation of Lord's Day Societies.

THE Superintendent of the Sabbath Observance Department of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pennsylvania, reported at the State Convention of the Union, lately held at Bradford, Pa., that thirty-nine counties of the State were organized for "Sabbath observance," with County Superintendents; that 96,933 pages of literature had been

distributed; 200 sermons had been preached by request, on the subject; 26 special prayer-meetings had been held; 38 public meetings; 7 Bible readings given; 11 articles furnished by Superintendents for local papers; 8,549 signatures obtained to petition for closing the World's Fair,—by the indorsement, through formal vote, of fifteen churches and the assistance of twenty-five churches in the circulation of the petition for signature; and at the request of the Department thirty business men had written letters to the World's Fair Commissioners protesting against the opening of the Exposition on Sunday.

A Bible reading in support of the Sunday closing of the World's Fair or teaching the legal enforcement of the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, or in favor of civil laws compelling obedience to the commandment "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," would be an anomaly indeed. It is not at all surprising that no more than seven of them were given.

Sunday in Foreign Countries.

THE *American Sabbath* thus summarizes the progress of "National Reform" in foreign countries during the last five years:—

Austria.—A Labor Law protects women and minors from Sunday work, and makes the fiat of a Minister of the Government necessary for any manufacturing operations on the day of rest. Postal deliveries are now limited to one. Sunday evening and Monday morning newspapers are prohibited, because of the Sunday work necessary for their production. Many shops are now closed.

Belgium.—A Labor Law has been passed to diminish Sunday work in factories. Work on the State railways has been very greatly reduced. The influence of the Protestant congregations has secured Sunday rest largely in iron, coal, and glass industries.

Denmark.—A Sunday-rest Law has been passed. Shops are closed at 9 A.M. for the day. Factories and workshops may not work between 9 A.M. and midnight. All employes have at least alternate Sundays off. Postal work is limited to one delivery. Tramcar work is considerably lessened.

France.—The work of the French League for Sunday rest, which was founded at the International Paris Congress of 1889, has spread with great rapidity in many parts of the country. The closing of shops becomes more and more common. Railway, goods, and parcels offices have been closed at 10 A.M. or at noon, instead of at later hours. In the annual meeting of six railway companies further installments of rest have been demanded, and in some cases secured. A Labor Law has passed, securing one day's rest in seven, but the Lord's day is not necessarily the day for rest.

Germany.—A Labor Law protecting the Lord's day has been passed. The second delivery of letters has been suppressed throughout the whole Empire. Goods traffic is limited. Shops are now closed largely in Berlin and other cities and towns, and none may remain open more than five hours. Work is prohibited in mines, quarries, salt-pits, collieries, foundries, timber-yards, tile-yards, and factories of all kinds. Sunday race-meetings have incurred the displeasure of the Emperor, and are dying out.

Holland.—One of the most influential newspapers has closed its offices on Sunday, in agreement with the general movement for Sunday rest. Goods trains do not run, and parcels and goods are delivered only early in the morning. A law has been passed securing rest for women and minors in factories and workshops.

Hungary.—A law has been passed, generally the same as for Austria, both making the rest longer, i.e., from 6 P.M. on Saturday till midnight on Sunday.

Norway.—The hitherto unbroken toil on tramways has been reduced, and a larger proportion of men rest. Labor in factories and workshops is greatly diminished, and women and children are protected.

Russia.—Here no marked progress has been made, but from all parts of the Empire petitions have been addressed to the Holy Synod, asking for the closing of all shops and factories on Sunday.

Sweden.—Movements here are of the same kind as in Norway and Denmark. Count A. Moltke, from Copenhagen, makes the same hopeful reports for the three countries.

Switzerland. comes last only alphabetically, for in actual progress this country is well to the front, as indeed it should be, for it is the headquarters of the Lord's Day Federation, has enjoyed the services

and support of the great-hearted Alexander Lombard, and is now served by noble Christians such as Pastor Roehrich, Pastor Ehm, Count St. Georges, and the steadfast and faithful Monsieur Deluz. By a law which came into force Dec. 1st, 1890, "Every servant of railway, steamer, tramway, and other locomotive companies, and the employes of the post-office, will have fifty-two days of rest in the year, of which seventeen must be Sundays. The day's work cannot be lengthened merely by the will of the employer, and in no case may exceed twelve hours, and at least one hour's rest must divide the work. No wage is to be deducted for the rest-day. Any breach of the law is to be visited with a penalty of from fr. 500 to fr. 1000."

This law is supplementary to others which secure to the workmen in factories, mills, and workshops, their complete liberty on the Lord's day, except in certain cases, for which the authorization of the Federal Council is needed, and even then one Sunday in two must be free.

A railway is in course of construction, which connects Yverdon and St. Croix, in the Canton Vaud, which by its Constitution is to be free from all Sunday traffic for at least twenty-five years. To obtain this privilege the promoters have cheerfully sacrificed all the money subventions to which they had a claim from the various parishes, the Canton, and the State.

SPEAKING of the observers of the first and seventh days of the week, Mr. W. F. Crafts says:—

The fourth commandment can be observed by keeping either day, but society cannot wisely encourage or protect but one of them.—*Watertown (S. D.) Public Opinion, July 25, 1890.*

Observations: 1. Let it not be forgotten that this apostle of Sunday laws admits that those who keep the seventh day obey the fourth commandment. He can never consistently charge them with violating God's law in this respect.

2. Society can afford to encourage and protect the inalienable rights of the people composing it, one of which is the right of the individual to observe any day as the Sabbath he may choose, and to labor on every other day. It cannot afford to trample upon one such right in one of its members. As is stated in the Bill of Rights in Kentucky, "absolute, arbitrary power over the lives, liberty, and property of free men exists nowhere in a republic, not even in the largest majority."

3. It is not some day, or other religious rite or ceremony, that needs the encouragement and protection of the Government, but the people. Civil governments were not instituted to protect religious rites and ceremonies, but to guard men and women in the exercise of their rights, and to protect them from the wicked and ambitious designs of those who in their thirst for position, or craving for power, would lord it over the souls and bodies of men. W. A. COLCORD.

THE following letter, received at this office, will be of interest to the person who is sending THE SENTINEL to the address given. Such a letter is so rare that it is inserted in full, as a curiosity, but out of consideration for the correspondent his name is suppressed.

406 PIONEER PRESS BLDG.,
ST. PAUL, MINN., Oct. 17, 1891.

Editor AMERICAN SENTINEL.—*Sir*: Some one is at the expense of sending me your paper, for which I do not thank them.

I have n't time to waste in reading it; and, comparing it with the teaching of Jesus, the less it is read the better.

Your energies might better be given to something that will tend to lift up humanity from evil, than in tilting against windmills.

Very truly yours,

It is evident that as our friend has not had time to read THE SENTINEL, neither has he taken time to study the "teaching of Jesus" upon the questions of which THE SENTINEL treats; nor the Revelation of God, sufficiently to know who is the Don Quixote of the age "tilting against windmills."

To make criminal upon one day in the week that which is perfectly legal at all other times, is simply to place a premium upon official corruption; to make possible persecution, as in Tennessee; and to educate people to disregard and despise the law,



NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 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 *Christian Statesman* quotes a saying of Confucius,—“He who persecutes a good man makes war against himself and all mankind.” The decisions against R. M. King in the Justice Court, Circuit Court, and Supreme Court, of Tennessee, and the Circuit Court of the United States, in each of which he was remanded back to jail, is probably what the *Statesman* had in mind in publishing the quotation.

ALEXANDER BACON, of Brooklyn, President of the King's County Sunday Association, has stated the missionary problem of the world as it now presents itself to the American Sabbath Union and all its adherents. At the hearing before the Commissioners of the Columbian Exposition at Chicago, he said:—

I have a classmate in Japan, a missionary, who tells me that the conflict is no longer between Christianity and idolatry,—that it is between the continental Sunday and the American Sunday.

There is a far-reaching truth in this statement, beyond anything that Mr. Bacon thought. In these days, the contest between the traditions of men obscures the truth as to the Sabbath of God and the gospel of eternal salvation. This is according to the plan of the great enemy of mankind, which is now progressing to its fulfillment, as foretold in the word of God.

THE New York Presbytery of the Reformed Presbyterian Church met on October 28, to consider the charges brought against Rev. J. C. K. Milligan and Rev. J. F. Carson, that they had violated the canons of the church in advocating the right of suffrage, and in publishing what has become known as the “East End Platform.” The Presbytery refused to put the reverend gentlemen on trial for heresy, and passed a resolution which really amounted to a declaration of “no cause of action.” The end is not yet, however, for notice was given that the case would be taken to the Synod on other counts.

The whole difficulty in the minds of the Presbytery seemed to be in the question, “What is Political Dissent?”—and the absence of definite interpretation of that doctrine by any supreme church authority. To an unprejudiced observer the uncer-

tainty seemed to lie in a commendable hesitation on the part of many present, and of the Covenanter Church at large, to declare themselves political aliens, unreservedly, and accept all the necessary results of that declaration.

The meeting was, however, a Covenanter school of political dissent, and no doubt strengthened the Presbyterians present in the theory, if not in the practical application, of that doctrine, which one of the ministers present declared to be “the heart and soul of their denominational life.”

THERE is great dissatisfaction in the minds of those who have charge of the petitioning for the Sunday closing of the World's Fair at the failure to roll up a monster petition in that behalf, and they do not hesitate to openly express their chagrin.

Of the Sunday Leagues and other Sunday societies, which Mr. Crafts has recently fathered, not more than one in twenty-five have sent in their petitions,—and the Sabbath Union officers are saying, “there has been a wonderful failure to send in petitions. Where lies the difficulty?”

The difficulty is not far to see. There is no sound principle expressed in the demands of the Sabbath Union and their kindred, and self-interest and prejudice have not yet been sufficiently appealed to, and aroused, to obtain any overwhelming expression in their favor.

THE leading “civil Sabbath law” advocate of the country says:—

A republic cannot endure without morality, nor morality without religion, nor religion without the Sabbath, nor the Sabbath without law.

It follows that religion cannot endure without law! That the assertion is utterly false is proved by all history. The true religion has existed not only without law but in opposition to law. So true is this that the saying “the blood of martyrs is the seed of the church,” has become a proverb. No greater slander could be uttered against Christianity than the statement that it cannot exist without civil law. A minister engaged in such work

Is like a villain with a smiling cheek;
A goodly apple rotten at the heart;
O, what a goodly outside falsehood hath.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *United Presbyterian* complained to that paper some weeks ago that—

the National Guard of the State of Missouri was ordered into encampment, near St. Joseph, and in nearly every case the various regiments left their homes or traveled on the Sabbath [Sunday]. These are the men to whom we are to look for protection in time of sudden danger; and yet, on this occasion, without the least necessity, they defiantly trample under foot the law of God, and the law of the State which they themselves have sworn to uphold. Many of these are Christian young men,

members of our churches, and are thus forced to violate their conscientious convictions by their superior officers. It is said the colonel of this regiment is a member in good standing in a prominent church. I heard of but a single member of the regiment with sufficient conscience and courage to disobey his commanding officer, rather than prove disobedient to his Lord and Master Jesus Christ.

In this the National Guard of the State of Missouri only followed the example of very many ministers. Not long since a considerable number of ministers did a very similar thing in Texas; and less than a year ago, if we mistake not, many of the delegates to a religious gathering in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, returned to their homes on Sunday. These physicians ought to heal themselves and their fellow doctors before attempting to reform others.

THE *Christian Union* deplors the recent decision of the Supreme Court of Virginia, that the law of that State forbidding the running of railroad trains on Sunday is unconstitutional because it interferes with interstate commerce. It says:—

If the Federal Supreme Court sustains this decision, then those States which are most advanced in the matter of restricting Sunday labor on railroads have their hands tied, not only until a majority of the States are bent upon like restrictions, but until public sentiment in them is so great that a majority of both houses of Congress shall be compelled to act in accordance with that sentiment, instead of in accordance with the interests of the railroad corporations.

It is thus that a question, which only a few years ago was purely local, has now become one of the very foremost national questions.

THE Chicago correspondent of the *New York Observer* finishes a column article descriptive of the hearing lately accorded the representatives of the American Sabbath Union, National Reform Association, etc., before the Commissioners of the World's Fair, with the sentence—“and so closed a memorable convention on Sabbath observance; the most significant that has ever been held in this country.”

It is a fact that there is a significance in the attempt to close the World's Fair on Sunday by law which is lacking even in the breadth of purpose of the National Sunday law, and that is the desire to thus forcibly evangelize representative exhibitors from all the world.

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,

48 Bond Street, New York.