



Equal and Exact Justice to all Men, of Whatever State or Persuasion, Religious or Political.—Thomas Jefferson.

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, MARCH 17, 1892.

NUMBER 11.

## 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.

ALL that civil law can properly do toward religion and be just, is to respect every form of religion, and favor none; to be neither hostile nor friendly to any, but simply be silent on the subject, as a matter lying outside of its jurisdiction.

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

DR. BONAR has well said that "a false zeal in religion is always, in some respect or other, misdirected zeal, or a zeal not according to knowledge—a zeal seeking some false end, or, while proposing to itself a good end, seeking its promotion in some unauthorized way." This describes National Reform exactly. "Jehu," continues the same writer, "had a zeal, which he called zeal for the Lord of Hosts. His fault was, not that he was too zealous, but that his zeal was really directed to his own advancement. The Jews, in the days of Christ, had a zeal for God, but it was so misdirected as to fire them with a frenzy to destroy the Son of God and extinguish the Light of the world. There are countless

forms of false zeal now at work; but in all cases they sin not by excess, but by misdirection. Some are planning with zeal to spread some of the corruptions of Christianity, and to carry men away from its great and cardinal truths."

These words were not written of National Reform, but they are just as applicable as though they had been penned with special reference to it.

### Sunday Laws Religious.

In an article in *Our Day* for January, 1891, Rev. W. F. Crafts said:—

It is significant that the American Secular Union, instead of condemning all Sabbath laws, asks only for the "repeal and prevention of all laws enforcing the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, other than an economic one justified by physiological and other secular reasons." As *there are no Sunday laws that enforce its religious observance*, this "plank" "nailed on the fog," is waste timber.

The words, "There are no Sunday laws that enforce its religious observance," which we have italicized, are not in form a denial that there are "laws enforcing Sunday as a religious institution;" but we will not charge Mr. Crafts with making a show of denying a thing, while designedly not doing so. Though not saying it in so many words, he must be understood from the connection as intending to deny that there are in this country "laws enforcing the observance of Sunday as a religious institution." A denial, however, is one thing; and the proof, quite another. And in this case, the proof in support of Mr. Crafts' denial is not only not forthcoming, but the facts prove exactly the contrary.

To enforce "the observance of Sunday as a religious institution," can mean neither more nor less than enforcing the observance of it *because it is a religious institution*; and further, that the observance required must in some degree be in keeping with the supposed character of the day. That all this is true of the Sunday laws now upon the statute books of the several States is the object of this article to show.

That the Sunday laws of the older States are derived largely from English statutes, will not be denied; and that the newer States have modeled their Sunday laws after the Sunday laws of the older States is equally true. It follows, that to learn the real character of Sunday legislation, we must go to the source whence it is derived. We have at hand, however, only a single English case (*Bloxsome vs. Williams*, 5 D. & R. 82), decided in 1824, in which the judge said: "The object of the statute is to prevent persons keeping open shop and disregarding the decency of the *Lord's Day*." In New York in 1811, Judge Kent said of the requirement to keep Sunday, that "the statute has for over a century recognized the *sanctity* of the obligation, and punished its violators." In 1834, another New York judge (*Boynton vs. Page*, 12 Wend. N. Y. 57), referred to "the public order and *solemnity* of the day." In 1859, we are assured (*Campbell vs. International Soc.*, 4 Bos. N. Y. 298) that the statute of New York "explicitly recognizes the first day of the week as *holy time*; and thus it has brought us back to the full, enlarged and absolute rule of interdiction which we find prevailed in the earliest laws of Christian States." Even as recently as 1882 (12 Abb. N. C. 455 N. Y.) we find this significant question: "Is it not obvious that by reason of keeping a store open for business, a temptation is presented to those who have no regard for Sunday, as *holy time*, to violate the law?"

The Pennsylvania Reports furnish numerous similar cases; for instance, we find (*Jandelle's case*, 3 Phil. 509) a judge declaring that "the day is clothed with *peculiar sanctity*;" while another jurist in the same State (*Eyre's case*, 1 S. & R. 347) declares that "Sabbath-breaking is a violation of a *divine* as well as a human law." In still another case (*Johnston's*, 22 Pa. 102) the judge said: "The learned counsel for the plaintiff has entered largely into the question of the origin and sanction of the *Christian Sabbath*. It may not be essential, but it is far from being irrelevant, to

the decision of the present case, to sustain the *divine authority* of its institution." "It is set apart by *divine command* and human legislation as a day of rest." "We have no right to give up this institution. It has come down to us with the most *solemn sanctions*, both of *God* and man, and if we do not appreciate it, we are at least bound to preserve it."

Concerning two Kentucky statutes it is observed (*Moore vs. Hagan*, 2 Duv. 437) that "one applied exclusively to Sunday as *sacred*, and the other to holidays as secular;" while in the same case the object of the Sunday law is declared to be "to aid in securing it [Sunday] against *desecration*."

In Iowa, one of the newer States, it has been held (*Davis vs. Fish*, 1 Green 40) that Sunday is "*sacred*, set apart for rest." In North Carolina it is declared (*Ricketts' case*, 74 N. C. 184) that "all *religious and moral* codes permit works of necessity and mercy on their *sacred* days;" and in Georgia, it is held (*Weldon's case*, 62 Ga. 449) that in that State, "as in England, Sunday is a *holy day*. The code denominates it the *Lord's day*, and as the *Lord's day* all courts and magistrates are to consider it." This list might be greatly extended, but it is not necessary; the proposition under discussion is that "we have no laws enforcing the observance of Sunday as a religious institution." The supreme courts of several of the States themselves being the judges, we have such laws.

But one question remains to be settled, namely, have we laws which require an observance of Sunday in keeping with the supposed sacred character of the day? Again let the courts answer. In Georgia it has been held (44 Ga. 204) that the power to legislate in regard to Sunday "is a very high prerogative, and is supported by the principle involved in the *preservation of morals and duties of the citizens upon the Lord's day*;" while in Ohio it is said (*Wright*, Ohio 754) in the case of a deed executed upon Sunday, that "both parties partook of the *sin of violating the Sabbath*."

Ringgold, author of "Legal Aspects of the First Day of the Week," cites a comparatively recent English case in which it was said "the statute, in express terms, provides that every person shall apply himself to the *observation of the Lord's day publicly and privately*; so that *private*, as well as public conduct, was expressly within its contemplation." Upon this, Mr. Ringgold remarks that "there is no lack of American authorities which recognize the legal consistency of the English view, and adopt the same reasoning. In support of this he cites cases in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and New York. In Massachusetts it has been held that "all arguments drawn from the Jewish law respecting the Sabbath are out of place, *except so far as any provisions of*

*that law may have been recognized and promulgated by our Saviour*, or by legislative authority of our own commonwealth." "We are," says the Court, "far from questioning the *religious obligation* which all Christians are under to separate to *religious* uses the first day of the week, since the legislative power has exacted the observance of it *as such*." In Pennsylvania (*Waf's case*, 3 S. & R. 48), it is declared that "it is of the utmost importance that they [the people] be reminded of their religious duties at stated intervals;" and in Tennessee we have this opinion (2 Yerg. 31): "It is correct, as advanced by the defendant's counsel, that no *worldly* labor or business ought to be carried on on the Sabbath day. It is, at least, unseemly, subversive of *good morals*, and as it appears to me, not in union with the *principles of our holy religion*." And again; "The object of the law . . . was to prevent the *desecration* of the day, which by our law is dedicated to the *duties of religion*." 1 Swan 413.

Have we indeed no laws enforcing the observance of Sunday as a religious institution? What answer must honest men give to the question? C. P. B.

#### Sunday Contracts in Tennessee.

It has been seen that in extending the sphere of indictment to offenses against religion by Sunday labor and profanity, and in importing into the practice of the courts the principle of the exclusion of witnesses for lack of religious belief, the progress of judicial legislation on religious questions in Tennessee has been quite rapid, and apparently without any impediment whatever to its advancement. On the subject of Sunday contracts, however, the courts have hesitated, unwillingly, yet compelled from lack of precedent and definite authority, either ancient or modern. The opinions of the judges in the cases reported show that they have in each case regretted the absence of such shadow of precedent as might have enabled them to have still further strengthened and extended religious law in Tennessee, by adding to it the decree that all contracts made on Sunday are void. It would have required no wider latitude of interpretation than has been indulged in through the desire to make profanity and Sunday labor indictable, but the judges, to whom the cases in reference to Sunday contracts have fallen, have lacked the boldness necessary to establish such an innovation in the law, however desirable it may have seemed to them, and this dishonor is left to some religiously irreligious enthusiast who is yet to come.

The cases reported are of interest as showing the manifest desire to declare Sunday contracts void, and a disappointment amounting almost to chagrin, that a sufficient color of law or precedent could not be found to support such a decision.

The first recorded case appears to be that of *Amis vs. Kyle*, 2 Yerg. 31, May, 1820, which was an action upon a written agreement, under seal, to deliver and pay for a number of horses six months after date, time being an essential element of the contract. It happened that the fixed date of delivery fell on Sunday and tender of the horses was made on the Monday following. The tender was refused and action brought. The plea was made that as Sunday was not a day for the transaction of worldly business, therefore the day next following, or next preceding, must in law be considered proper days for the fulfillment of the contract. Upon this the judge says:—

It is correct, as was advanced by the defendant's counsel, that no worldly labor or business ought to be carried on on the Sabbath day. It is at the least unseemly, subversive of good morals, and as it appears to me, not in union with the principles of our holy religion. But however reprehensible such conduct may be in the general estimation, however injurious to the social state, by inducing a laxity of manners, and thereby lessening the weight of religious obligation, yet the only question in this court can be, could this payment and delivery of horses, from the facts appearing on this record, be legally made on the Sabbath day by the defendant to the plaintiff.

In support of the negative of this proposition, the maxim, *dies dominus non est dies juridica*, was cited and relied upon. And it was inferred that from the spirit of this rule of the common law, the payment and delivery of the horses on Sunday, were within its prohibition. The application of that maxim upon the present occasion, would be giving it too wide a field of operation. It is properly applicable to the ordinary proceedings of courts of justice. Lord Mansfield in the case of *Swann vs. Broome* has given a history of the law on the point. He says that anciently, courts of justice did sit on Sundays; the ancient Christians using all times alike. This was for two reasons, *first in opposition to the Heathens, who were superstitious about the observance of days and times, conceiving some to be lucky, and others to be unlucky; secondly, to prevent Christian suitors from resorting to the Heathen courts*. But these canons were made, one in the year 517, another in 895, and a third in 932, prohibiting the holding pleas and adjudging causes on the Lord's day. These canons were received and adopted by the Saxon kings, were confirmed by William the Conqueror and Henry the Second, and so became part of the common law of England. . . . Lord Mansfield in the case above cited, observes that fairs, markets, sports, and pastimes, were not unlawful to be holden and used on Sunday at common law, and therefore it was requisite to enact particular statutes to prohibit the use and exercise of them upon Sundays, as there was nothing else that could hinder their being continued in use.

The judge then quotes Lord Coke, who, in his comment on the Statute of Westminster, said that the ancient English law prohibiting legal proceedings on Sunday extended also to the making of contracts; but also cites a decision of Lord Coke himself, and a number of other English decisions in which contracts made on Sunday were held good. From these he draws a conclusion that—

These adjudged cases prove, that at the common law, acts not expressly prohibited, might be done on a Sunday; and that contracts made on that day were not, on that account, ever considered by it as illegal.

This brings us to our act of 1741, ch. 14. sec. 2.

It says, "that all and every person and persons whatsoever, shall on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, *carefully apply themselves to the duties of religion and piety*, and that no tradesman, artificer, planter, laborer, or other person whatsoever, shall, upon the land or water, do or exercise any labor, business or work of their ordinary callings (works of necessity and charity only excepted), nor employ themselves in hunting, etc., nor use any game, sport, or play, on the Lord's day, aforesaid, upon pain, etc., . . . to forfeit ten shillings, etc."

The *professed object of this statute, was to further the observance of the Sabbath day, pursuant to the spirit of its original institution. This object is fully and forcibly expressed in its words, "that all persons whatsoever, shall apply themselves to the duties of religion and piety,"* and certainly the actions disclosed upon this record, comport not with its injunction, but are directly contrary to the tenor of conduct contemplated by it. It would therefore seem to have been the intention of the framers of this statute, to have totally interdicted all worldly labor whatsoever. Yet the rules of construction adopted and constantly adhered to by the courts, in the case of penal statutes, will narrow down this intention so far as not to render all acts illegal and void, it having been decided, that to do so, there must be an express prohibitory clause. Now, in our act, the expressed prohibition is against work and labor of one's ordinary calling and extends not to all kinds of labor indiscriminately, under any circumstances.

The case of *Drury vs. Defontaine*, in Taunton's Reports, shows the construction of the English judges upon their statute of 29 Ch. II ch. 7; an act similar to ours, *having substantially the same enactment and in nearly the same words.*

An English case is then cited which is almost parallel in all its attendant facts, wherein the court held that as the sale of horses was not the ordinary calling of either party to the case, therefore, the case did not fall within the statute and the contract was consequently good. Upon this, the judge in the Tennessee case concludes his opinion:—

So in the case before the court, there is nothing to show that the work and labor and business stated in the record was of the ordinary calling of either of the parties, but in the nature of the transaction, quite the reverse—a private matter. *However much, therefore, it is to be regretted, yet the act covenanted to be done on Sunday, might have been lawfully performed on that day, and not being done, the plea is no answer to excuse the non-performance.*

The next case which appears in the reports is that of *Berry vs. the Planters' Bank*, brought in 1875; in this it is held that where a contract on Sunday is executed, each party is in equal fault, and relief cannot be granted on the plea that the contract was made by one of the parties in exercise of his ordinary calling. The petitioner in this case had deposits, of the issue of the Planters' Bank, in the Bank of Tennessee at Nashville, held at par, and when, on February 16, 1862, the news of the fall of Fort Donelson reached him, it being Sunday, he went immediately to the bank to withdraw his deposits. In the language of the report,—

He went to the bank to make inquiry about his deposit, and arrived there in the afternoon, and found—Sunday as it was—all the bank officers at their post, attending to their usual avocations, with the bank doors open, and paying off the depositors in Confederate treasury notes.

The Confederate notes he accepted under protest and afterward brought suit for indemnity. The position was taken by the petitioner that the transaction took place on Sunday and was void. Of this, the judge says, in considering the grounds relied on for relief—

One of these grounds is that the payment to the petitioner of his deposit was made to him on Sunday, in the exercise, by the bank, of its "common avocation," and therefore void. Code sec. 1723. . . . But the contract was clearly executed, and each party *in pari delicto*, and no relief can on this ground be granted to either.

The plea is consequently good in itself, but the parties in this case were not in a position to take advantage of it, not being able to come before the court with "clean hands."

Again at December term 1880 occurred the case of *Mosely vs. Vanhooser*, 6 Lea 286, where it was attempted to break a contract because it was made, as claimed, on Sunday. But it was shown that the agreement was not fully complete on Sunday, only negotiations entered into, and the judge said:—

If a contract is to be held void because made on Sunday, it certainly should be technically complete on that day. If it had been technically complete on that day, a question of great gravity would have been presented to the court. That is not, however, pretended, and we think it not proper, upon a hypothetical case, to decide a matter of so much importance.

In these cases the gradual progress of judicial sentiment towards a decision that all contracts entered into on Sunday are void, is manifest. In the first case the judge, although he deplored the necessity of such a decision, was still very certain that Sunday contracts were valid, while in the last the judicial feeling is that it is a question of "great gravity" and of "much importance," not yet satisfactorily decided. The inference from this is that in Tennessee the judicial mind is still open to conviction that all Sunday contracts are invalid.

It has proved upon other similar questions that the wish has brought forth the desired decision, and the evident teaching of the spirit of the reported cases is that the same thing is not impossible in the matter of Sunday contracts whenever another case shall come up for adjudication.

W. H. M.

### The Charter of Religious Liberty,

AS ASSURED BY HER MAJESTY'S ROYAL  
PROCLAMATION OF 1858.

PROCLAMATION.—Firmly relying ourselves on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of religion, we disclaim alike the right and the desire to impose our convictions on any of our subjects. We declare it to be our Royal will and pleasure that none be in anywise favored, none molested or disquieted, by reason of their religious faith or observance, but that all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the law; and we do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under us, that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of our subjects, on pain of our highest displeasure.

How often in the history of nations

have the peace and good order of society been disturbed by some real or fancied injustice or oppression, until the agitation that followed has led to armed resistance, open revolt, and bloodshed; while the governing power has been called upon first to quell the rebellion, and then to investigate the cause that led to it. Thus it was in the older provinces of Canada a little over half a century ago, under the inequitable rule of Church and State, until Lord Durham's report brought to light such an array of facts as led to the removal of the grievance, and the supposed guarantee of equal rights to her Majesty's subjects in the provinces. And thus it was again in India about twenty years later, when the Sepoy soldiers remonstrated in vain against the military requirement respecting the cartridges greased with pork. As believers in the Koran, how could they submit, at every loading of their rifles, to bring in contact with their lips, tongues and teeth, that which their Prophet had so solemnly forbidden? Hence their revolt was only the result of that inward revolt of their consciences against an act which their religion taught them was an abomination and a sin against God. And when the investigation which followed the suppression of the rebellion, showed in its true light how their religious convictions had been trampled upon,—how seasonable and appropriate was Her Majesty's Royal Proclamation of Religious Liberty, which has since won from their hearts a right loyal allegiance to the "Empress of India."

And we, her Canadian subjects, have an equal claim to all that is assured in that proclamation. In declaring her "Royal will and pleasure that *none* be in anywise favored, *none* molested or disquieted . . . but that *all* shall alike enjoy the . . . protection of the law," it is obvious that the gracious assurance is to *all* within the limits of her jurisdiction, and to the exclusion of *none* within those limits. Here is the necessary limitation and extent of the terms used in the proclamation.

The opening of the proclamation assures us that her Majesty professes to be a Christian sovereign, and yet she freely disclaims the *desire* to impose her convictions on any of her subjects. This was surely good news to her Mohammedan subjects whose religious convictions had been disregarded. But the jubilee trump of emancipation has the clear ring in the words: "We disclaim the *right* . . . thus to treat . . . any of our subjects." And if Queen Victoria has no such *right* over any of her subjects, and is thus free to declare it, by what inherent or derived *right* are those actuated who seek to oppress the loyal subjects of their sovereign in their conscientious convictions, even those who profess the same religious faith as her Majesty?

Who then are they, whether ecclesiastics or laity, who are rushing to the front on the platform and through the press, and seeking to enlist the higher powers of Parliament, that they may be specially "favored . . . by reason of their religious faith and observance," which her Majesty has expressly declared to be contrary to her "royal will and pleasure?" And against the same declaration a systematic combination has been going on, especially for the last two years, to secure such power to the aspiring majority through parliamentary enactments, that others, who are only a small minority, "by reason of their religious faith and

observance," might not only be "disquieted or molested," but even fined and imprisoned, for the same reason. What RIGHTS—which her Majesty emphatically disclaims—have those individuals or combinations to the exercise of power over the consciences or religious convictions of any, to whom the above proclamation pledges "the equal and impartial protection of the law?"

And how solemn is the charge in the closing sentence, to "all those who may be in authority under" her, not to interfere with "the religious belief or worship of any of her subjects!" The dignitaries here addressed must include both Houses of the Imperial Parliament, as well as all Colonial Parliaments and Legislatures throughout her wide dominions,—all of whom have taken the solemn oath of allegiance to Her Majesty,—and the several executive officers of every rank, who are without exception charged and enjoined, "on pain of her highest displeasure," not to violate this solemn interdict! The assertion that any have violated it would be a fearful charge for any subject to make. For thirty-four years, since that proclamation was issued, it is not claimed that the Imperial Parliament has been disloyal to the throne; nor is our Canadian Parliament to this day charged with any such oppressive religious enactment [for which the B. N. A. Act gives no authority], although hosts of misguided zealots have combined to secure such legislation.

May Her Majesty's Royal Proclamation ever remain—second only to the Bible—the charter and bulwark of our religious liberties in Canada!

G. W. MCCREADY,  
President Religious Liberty Association  
of Canada.

### The Throne of David.

It has heretofore been shown in THE SENTINEL that Christ is to possess, at different times, two distinct forms of kingship: one a priestly kingship after the order of Melchisedek; the other a national or civil kingship, after the order of David, or, more properly, as the successor of David on his throne. The radical defect in all the professed arguments of the professed National Reformers is, that they make no distinction between these reigns, either as to time or nature. They liberally quote those prophecies which refer to Christ's reign on the throne of David, and apply them to his present reign on the throne of his Father in Heaven, as priest after the order of Melchisedek.

In the Old Testament Christ was represented by these two kingly personages, Melchisedek and David. Melchisedek was both king and priest. Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews, abundantly proves that Christ is now fulfilling the kingly priesthood in Heaven. *And that is the only kingship he now has.*

Let it be borne in mind that *David had no priesthood.* No one ever acted as priest that sat on his throne. One, Uzziah, essayed to act as priest, but was smitten with leprosy for his presumption. And Christ will not be a priest on the throne of David, for no priesthood belongs to that

throne. The question then arises, Is Christ to occupy two distinct thrones at different times? Yes, that is exactly what the Scriptures teach. The proof is found in his own words, as follows: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me *in my throne*, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father *in his throne.*" Rev. 3:21.

There is no question or difference of opinion as to the present position of Christ; he is acting as priest on the throne of his Father. And if the people were not "slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken;" if they gave ready heed to "all scripture," as they should, there would be no question about Christ yet occupying his own throne—the throne of David to which he was born heir. In regard to this throne, and its occupancy, we will listen to the Scriptures.

The angel, in foretelling to Mary the birth of Jesus, said: "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Luke 1:32, 33. Peter, speaking of the resurrection of Christ, shows that it was in the fulfillment of the promise to David. Of David he said: "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." Acts 2:30, 31

To this throne Christ was born heir. When David died, the throne descended to his son; and each son, in turn, lost his right by death. Jesus also died, and would have lost his right had he remained dead. But the Father "raised up Christ" to sit on David's throne. There is significance in the expression, "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." It was his by birth; it was resigned in death; and it was restored to him in the resurrection. And now, as long as Jesus lives, no other can claim that throne. It is his by heirship, and it is the one upon which the faithful overcomers will sit with him, after he resigns his position on the throne of his Father in Heaven.

In Rev. 11:15 is a declaration often quoted by the National Reformers, and always by them misapplied. We will examine its terms: "The seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in Heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever." Immediately following (verses 17, 18,) are words which the reformers never quote in this connection. They are the words of the four and twenty elders: "We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to

thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldst destroy them which destroy the earth."

1. "The seventh angel sounded." There are seven trumpets in the book of Revelation, bringing to view facts concerning the nations, covering the entire period of the Christian dispensation. The seventh is the last, and closes up the dispensation. This is an undisputed truth. It is confirmed in the following:—

2. "Thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged." Paul at Athens said that God had "appointed a day in the which he will judge the world." The seventh trumpet opens this appointed day. The error of the National Reformers is, their *misapplication* of the prophecies. They press them into the service of their cause without any regard to their connection or relation. This is an error, and the source of error; it is perverting the Scriptures. So Satan quoted Scripture to the Saviour; but all who read Ps. 91 will readily see that he misapplied it. That psalm did not refer to the Saviour, but it does refer to the saints in the coming time of trouble, during the pouring out of the plagues of God's wrath. See Rev. 16. We have no doubt that if the Reformers were asked if they believed the appointed day of judgment has arrived, if the time of the judgment of the dead has come, they would give a negative answer. All these things come under the seventh trumpet, under which dominion over the nations will be given to Christ; but not while he is priest, not during human probation.

3. "And that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets," etc. This can refer to nothing less than the resurrection of the prophets when they, with all the saints, will receive the full blessing of immortality. See 1 Cor. 15:50-54. Jesus said to his disciples, "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke 14:14. And again, "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. 17:27.

"The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ." This declaration needs a more extended examination. It will be observed that the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of *our Lord*, as well as of *his Christ*. The elders praise and thank God because he *has taken to himself his great power and has reigned*. This our model reformers entirely overlook. They see nothing but Christ taking power over the nations, by a popular political vote! But, in the fulfillment of this proph-

ecy, they see no relation to the Father taking his power to himself; no relation to the sounding of the seventh trumpet, to the judgment of the dead, or the time of giving reward to the prophets. It is their reckless method of quoting Scripture that leads them into their grievous errors; and that is the source of most of the religious errors and schisms of the day.

In what sense may it be said that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ takes to himself his power? In what sense do the kingdoms become his under the seventh trumpet? To determine this question we must inquire into the origin and examine the changes of earthly dominion.

It is not a doctrine of the Bible, nor of the Church, that God is directly the Creator of every man. He created man the father of the race, and established the laws of generation, by which the race is multiplied and perpetuated. And, though men become sinners, even desperately wicked, their lives must be respected because life is the highest gift of the Creator. In like manner God established a dominion of man upon the earth in the beginning; and though the dominion has passed into the hands of the wicked, "the powers that be" must be honored, out of respect for their origin—for the ordinance of God. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth." Gen. 1:26. Here is the origin. But where is the succession? We can not imagine that God ever resigned to anybody the right to our proprietorship of the earth. Only a certain extent of power, a limited dominion was conferred upon man. But Adam did not long retain his rule. Beguiled by Satan, he turned away from his Creator and benefactor, took another for his master and threw away his life. All other blessings, all privileges and rights are comprised in this. When Adam lost his life he had no more to lose. His dominion had passed away.

Now the question arises, Did Adam, by his sin, by his transfer of allegiance, resign his dominion to Satan? The Scriptures show that he did. God did not take it back to himself, but put it under a curse. Christ calls Satan "the prince of this world;" Paul styles him "The god of this world;" and John said, "The whole world lieth in the evil one." (Rev. Ver.) Most decisive of all is the evidence afforded by the temptation of Christ. When Satan showed him all the kingdoms of the world, he said, "All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them, for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will, I give it. Luke 4:6. Jesus had undertaken to destroy the works of the devil; to redeem man and his inheritance from the curse. Eph. 1:13, 14; Ps. 37:11. To accomplish this object he knew he must lay down his life. But Satan tempts him to take the dominion

which Adam lost, without passing through death. The honor and wealth of this world have been the bait with which he has lured the sons of Adam to destruction. When Christ took "upon him the seed of Abraham"—the nature of Adam,—Satan thought to overthrow him by the same means.

It is generally considered that Satan's words were false; that it was not in his power to bestow the kingdoms and glory of this world. But, if not, how is he the prince and god of this world? how is it that the world lieth in the evil one? and why is it that to love the world, and the things of the world, is to be the enemy of God? But if Satan's words were false; if he had not become possessed of the dominion given to Adam, the Saviour certainly knew it, he then knew it was a false pretense. How, then, was it a temptation? Surely there can be no temptation in a promise which we know is impossible of fulfillment. In this, and in this only, can we find a solution of Rev. 11:17. This is the rule which the Lord God Almighty takes back to himself; this is the power which he rescues from the great usurper, and confers upon "the second Adam." Then Satan is bound, and Christ redeems the inheritance and bestows it upon his faithful ones. But what do the National Reformers propose to do? They propose to take this work into their own hands; to vote the power out of the hands of Satan, and to vote Christ into his kingdom. And anything else? Ah, yes; to vote to themselves all the honor, the power, and the glory of the kingdom, and to disfranchise all who will not acknowledge their right! Never was a greater effort made to turn sacred things into a farce. But, to the minority, the farce will end in a tragedy.

All the Scriptures show that the history of this present world will end in war and carnage. The kingdoms of this world are the enemies which the Father will give to the Son. See again Ps. 2:7-9; 110:1; Heb. 1:13; 10:12, 13. When the kingdoms are given to Christ, the nations are angry, and the wrath of God is upon them. Rev. 11:14, 15, 18. When the God of heaven sets up a kingdom—which setting up consists in conferring the dominion upon his Son, and thus restoring the throne of David—"it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Dan. 2:44. The same is shown in Jer. 25, where "all the kingdoms of the world, which are upon the face of the earth," are caused to drink the wine cup of God's fury. We know that this refers to the consummation, because it is said they shall drink, "and fall, and rise no more." All the kingdoms of this world shall be utterly destroyed, for they are all the enemies of the pure gospel and reign of Christ. And the same is found in Rev. 15 and 16, where the plagues of God's wrath are poured

upon the kings and nations of the earth, which are gathered "to the battle of that great day of God Almighty."

The conclusions of the National Reformers are based upon wrong interpretations and misapplications of the prophecies, which amount to perversion of the Scriptures. But their theories are pleasing to the ambition of bigoted professors, who find it more congenial to their spirits to forcibly compel their neighbors to conform to their opinions, than to conform themselves to the gospel of peace, and use only "the sword of the Spirit which is the word of God."

#### Individual Service to God.

THERE are many who seem to believe that the keeping of the Sabbath is not simply an individual obligation. They seem to think a man is unable to meet the requirements of the fourth commandment of God's law unless his neighbor assists him to keep the Sabbath, by himself refraining from all unnecessary work on that day. The great plea made for the enforcement of Sunday laws is that those who desire to keep that day holy are hindered from so doing by the unnecessary work done by those who do not regard the day as the Sabbath.

But this claim is not true in the least degree; because if it were true, God would be unjust in his requirements; God requires a man to keep the Sabbath holy unto him. The command, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it *holy*," means much more than simply refraining from secular employment on that day. The cessation of labor is only the outward sign of an inward regard for the holy ordinance of the Sabbath day.

Now if the Sabbath can not be kept holy by one man while his neighbor disregards its sacredness, and profanes the holy day by following his ordinary vocation, and at the same time God does require a man to keep it holy; does not God require of a man a thing he can not do unless his neighbor assists him by himself refraining from labor on that day? If God did require such a thing of a man without guaranteeing to him that his neighbor would do his part by refraining from work on that day, the Almighty would be requiring that which is unjust. On the other hand, if God had made provision that he who has no regard for the Sabbath should be compelled to conform to an outward observance of that day that he who does reverence the day might be able to keep it holy, then God would compel an outward conformity to his requirement, without inward reverence for the day. Such a thing God never does, it is not his character to coerce; and those who would circumscribe the freedom of others, do not work the works of God.

The Almighty is not unjust. "Justice and judgment are the habitation of his

throne." He requires nothing of a man that he can not do even though the whole world is opposed to him. It is not true that one man can disturb his neighbor in such a way as to interfere with his acceptance with God in the observance of his holy day.

God requires the best and holiest regard for his day we can give under the circumstances which surround us, and over which we can have no control. The commandment says that a man and all he controls—his animals, his servants, and the stranger that abides with him—shall rest on that day, and when a man conforms to that requirement, sincerely and heartily, his service is acceptable to his Maker, whether his neighbor observes the day or not.

What one man can do and be accepted of God another can do and be accepted; because God is no respecter of persons. I know that I can serve God by resting on his Sabbath even though thousands of busy men are toiling all around me regardless of the sacred claims of God's holy day. My conscience could not be troubled because they are at work. I know this because I have kept the day under just such circumstances, and felt not the slightest compunction of conscience because others did not choose to observe the Sabbath day with me. God accepted my service because I kept the day according to the commandment made to me individually and to every other individual human being on the earth.

A great political lecturer was once addressing a large audience. During his speech he made a very bold statement. A man in the audience arose and stated a little personal experience which completely contradicted the bold statement of the lecturer. "This," says the man, "I know to be a fact by my own personal experience; and how do you harmonize it with your statement." "But," replied the lecturer, "I know nothing of this fact you state, I never heard of it before." The man in the audience then replied, "But my knowledge of this fact, no matter how limited, is not to be offset by your ignorance of it however extensive that may be."

So with Sabbath observance, if one man knows he can render acceptable service to God by keeping his Sabbath, even though thousands are working on that day, it makes no difference how many may say they know nothing of his experience. There is not only one but there are thousands who can testify to a sense of acceptance with God in resting on his Sabbath, when the world around them was engaged in its usual secular business, bustle, and wickedness.

There is only one way in which a man can disturb his neighbor's conscience by working on the day his neighbor observes as the Sabbath. He can not disturb his conscience in the least if that conscience is first right between himself and his God. If it is not right, it can be very easily dis-

turbed by the course of some one whose conscience is "void of offense toward God and men."

To illustrate: Railroads and steamboats have run, and factories have been operated all over this country on Sunday, and they have been comparatively unmolested, in their disregard of the day. But who has been prosecuted for Sunday work? A typical case is that of a *quiet farmer* in the State of Tennessee, who was arrested for working in his back fields, where he was out of sight or hearing of any religious gathering, and where he could disturb no one by his work. What was there about this man that he should be prosecuted for quietly working where he could disturb no one, while at the same time thousands of busy hands were running railroads, steamboats, telegraph lines, and following almost every vocation under the sun?—Because that man had conscientiously rested on another day, and had performed his duty to his Maker, and felt in his heart not the slightest regard for Sunday as a sacred day. This case and a few similar ones show where the efforts of those who favor Sunday legislation are tending.

It is not so much those who work on Sunday who offend, as it is those who deny the sacredness of the day by resting on some other day, which is sacred to them, and which answers the demands of the conscience. In the Salem witchcraft fanaticism men and women were condemned, not for being witches and wizards but for denying the reality of witchcraft, and if a man confessed himself a wizard or a woman confessed herself a witch, it was almost sure to release them from the death to which they had been condemned. The parallel between the insane fanaticism of that time and the movement in our day which seeks to put a popular belief in the fundamental law of the land on an *undeniable legal basis* is very significant. Persecution has never been directed so much against those who denied God, as against those who departed from the popular forms of worshiping God.

SANFORD O. LANE.

It is not sufficiently emphasized that the Jew is left absolutely free to observe the seventh day. He can close his shop; he can refuse to work.—*W. F. Crafts, 1884.*

The liberty of rest for each demands the law of rest for all. *W. F. Crafts, 1892.*

What has wrought the change? If in 1884 the Jew was "left absolutely free to observe the seventh day" without a law compelling others to observe it also, how is it that in 1892 the Christian is not free to keep Sunday without a "law of rest for all"?

THE greatest praise government can win is, that its citizens know their rights and dare maintain them.—*Wendell Phillips.*

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.

A PRIVATE letter gives information that five Seventh-day Adventists, Brethren Ward, John Dortch, Moon, Lowry, and Stem, of Springville, Tenn., have been indicted for Sunday labor.

ABOUT one hundred and fifty informations have been lodged against newsdealers and others in Pittsburg, for violation of the Sunday law, up to the present time; and in nearly every case a fine of twenty-five dollars has been imposed, with costs added. These cases have all been appealed, and March 11 fixed for their final hearing.

SENATOR PETTIGREW, of South Dakota, chairman of the Select Senate Committee on the quadro-centennial, is quoted in the Washington *Evening Star* as having said to a reporter,—

"I have read about everything that has been published on this matter, and I fail to see why the Fair should be open on Sundays. This is a Christian Nation and so long as it remains so the sanctity of the Sabbath must be preserved; when we legislate in opposition to one of the commandments our title to the possession of Christianity will be difficult of maintenance. . . . If the Fair was opened on Sunday the railroads would bring from surrounding towns immense crowds of people; the day would be a holiday, and we, as a Christian Nation, would be a party to the abandonment of the Sabbath as a day of rest and meditation—reminder of the obligations of man to man.

"The economical point of view must not be overlooked. Since the issue has been raised, and the question debated, I am satisfied that more people—two to one—will stay away from the Fair, if it is opened on Sunday, than the additional people who would attend on Sunday only. A Sunday Fair means decreased gate receipts."

It will be noticed that although the Senator claims to have read about everything on the subject, he has absorbed nothing but National Reform theories. Not much can be said for the depth of thought shown by such a man, whose business is to understand the highest legislative questions that can come before the country, and yet who can see no distinction between "legislating in opposition to one of the commandments" and the pursuance of the proper neutral course of the civil authority in religious questions.

THE question of closing the World's Fair on Sunday has been avoided by the Senate of the New York Legislature. This is the account given by the *Sun*:—

Senator Hunter's resolution to ask Congress to appropriate no money to the World's Fair unless it is closed on Sunday, came up in the Senate and caused one of the religious debates which is a regular thing in one house or the other almost every day. Senator Roesch moved to refer the resolution to the World's Fair Commissioners from New York. He made a speech commenting on the Puritan fathers, and saying that this country should not follow them in their bigotry and narrowness.

The Rev. Senator Edwards said that no one wanted the World's Fair to be open on Sunday, and that there were more than ten millions of Christian people who were strongly opposed to any desecration of Sunday. There was no reason why the World's Fair at Chicago should not follow the example of the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia.

Senator O'Connor said that there are others in this country than the descendants of the Puritan fathers. The Christian religion is no part of the fundamental law of this country, and the Legislature has no right to discriminate in the passage of this resolution against people of other religions, who observe some other day than Sunday for their Sabbath.

"I believe in religion," said Senator Brown, "but I do not think that an observance of the Sabbath day best consists in staying indoors and praying twenty-four hours. Sunday should be a day of rest and not of bondage."

Senator McClelland said that they might as well close up Coney Island as the World's Fair, for Coney Island is much wickeder than the World's Fair would be.

Senator Roesch's motion to refer Senator Hunter's resolution to the World's Fair Commissioners was carried by a vote of sixteen to fourteen.

The *Mail and Express* taunts the Democrats with having "dodged a vote," and of having been afraid to face the question. These daily "religious debates" have taken a political color entirely, and furnish a sure forecast of the national religion of the National Reformers.

THE *Sun* reports the proceedings of the Legislature, in passing the appropriation bill for the Metropolitan Museum of Art, thus:—

"Sunday and religion were discussed in the Senate, and there was one of the most earnest debates of the session. The occasion was the bill to have New York City appropriate seventy thousand a year to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, on condition that the Museum be kept open every day of the week, Sundays included. The bill had passed the Assembly without discussion.

"Senator Hunter moved to strike out the Sunday clause. He said that the bill offered a bribe to the Museum authorities to desecrate the Sabbath day.

"Senator O'Connor said that milk wagons ran on Sunday, and that it was as good for the people to see pictures on Sunday as to get milk and newspapers.

"This is a bid for money at the expense of morality," said Senator Smith. "It's bad enough in Central Park now without making it worse by passing this bill. People now on Sunday look at the animals, eat sandwiches, drink beer, and see snakes. It's not right for the State to put a premium on breaking the Sabbath day."

"The Rev. Senator Edwards made the principal speech in opposition to the bill. 'Why break the Sabbath,' he said, 'and why make an appropriation of seventy thousand dollars for breaking down the American Sabbath? Degradation in morals will surely follow. Stand by the old faith. Those who go to the Museum on Sundays are not the poor people and the working people who could not go on some other day, but loungers who might go as well on a week day.'

"The bill passed by a vote of seventeen to eight. The negative votes were cast by moral Republicans and the Rev. Senator Edwards."

THE following from the *Pittsburg Dispatch* is a telling commentary on the value and propriety of Government chaplaincies:—

"Mr. Milburn, the blind chaplain of the House, has made quite a reputation for the originality of his prayers. Few clergymen are more confidential and intimate in the language with which they hold what is here called an executive session with the Deity; and few are more liberal with advice to man, and claiming to have their inspiration direct from Heaven. Mr. Milburn has often incensed members by his criticism of the conduct of the House and even of individual members, in the guise of a prayer; and many of them have seriously canvassed the propriety of abolishing what is, at best, in both House and Senate, a hypocritical, hollow, and contemptible show of piety. There is no greater bur-

lesque of religion, and the solemnity which should attend its public practice, than these prayers and their surroundings.

"I have often listened to the very eloquent prayer of the Senate Chaplain when there were but two or three senators present, and once when only one bowed his head in mock reverence to the performance. I use the adjective advisedly, for the senator is well known to be an agnostic.

"In the House, though, of course, the number present at prayer is larger, the burlesque is even more evident. The sum and purpose of the employment of a chaplain is to have the fact go to the religious element of the country to show how pious and reverent the congressmen are, in that they can not proceed to business without a prayer. Of course, the religious element is not expected to discover that both senators and representatives carefully remain away from prayers, unless it is more convenient to be present. But if they must have prayers for the effect upon the religious element they don't want to be scolded by the chaplain. He is not employed for that. He is not paid to give congressmen any moral or other advice whatever, but merely to play the part of a pious lay figure in the show windows of the capitol, to suggest the splendid character of the goods within, the Simon Pure religious stuff, and no shoddy or fustian. They can stand a little scolding as a sort of novelty, a bit of prayerful comedy, but that sort of thing every morning, following upon the liberal congressional breakfast, becomes irritating and conducive to dyspepsia. Therefore, Mr. Milburn has been quietly informed that if he does not want to start a movement for the abolition of his office it would be well for him to confine himself simply to an invocation of divine Providence to give as much of his favor as is fair and deserving to the American House of Representatives, and there let the matter rest.

"On the other hand, Hon. Joseph J. Little, of the Twelfth New York district, elected to fill out the unexpired term of Hon. Roswell P. Flower, comes in with a joint resolution providing that the prayers of the chaplains shall be printed in the *Record* as a part of the congressional proceedings. This is an innovation that will hardly obtain while Chaplain Milburn continues his moral lectures to the House in his voluminous prayers."

THE real meaning of the general alliance to close the World's Fair on Sunday is understood by some, as is shown by this note from the *Eye*, Snohomish, Wash.:

It is seldom that the so-called representatives of God and the devil shake hands over the smoking chasm, so to speak, and co-operate in the interests of a few selfish bigots who want special legislation from Congress to drive "trade" to their doors; but such a picture is presented in Chicago, where the saloon keepers and the breweries, under instruction from their associations, are co-operating with the different church denominations in an attempt to have the World's Fair closed on Sunday. "It is calculated that from one hundred thousand to two hundred thousand people will visit the exhibition on Sundays, and that would take away the saloon patronage on that day," is the reason given by liquor manufacturing and selling organizations for their action. With the saloons, as it seems to be with the churches, the closing of the Fair on Sunday is a strictly business proposition; in each case it will drive patronage to their doors because there would be no other resorts open. If the church organizations desire to work in the real interests of morality, let them concentrate their efforts in securing the closing of the Chicago saloons on Sunday and stop their opposition to the opening of the Fair on that day!

This is twitting on facts, but the last sentence embodies an error. To attempt to close the saloons on Sunday, or any one day, and thus legalize them for the remainder of the week, is not working in the real interests of morality. The church which concentrates its efforts on the closing of saloons, and the stoppage of the liquor traffic on Sunday is striving to serve both God and Bacchus. God will not have his Church serve him but one seventh of the time. The principles of righteousness are the same for all days of the week so far as concerns the questions of temperate living.

THE February issue of *The Quarterly Register of Current History* (Detroit, Mich., \$1.00 a year), is a model one. Without beating about the bush, it strikes right at the very heart of its subject-matter. From a clear and interesting treatment of international affairs, it proceeds to a series of splendid articles on "Affairs in Europe," "Affairs in Africa," "Affairs in Asia," and, last but not least, "Affairs in America." Under this last heading is included, the presidential discussion, the proceedings of Congress and the Legislatures, the state of trade, finance, and general politics. An elaborate treatise on the latest developments in Canada is an interesting feature of the number.

THE undersigned, being a regularly appointed transportation agent, will take pleasure in giving information concerning ships and arranging for a voyage for any one desiring such services. Berths on steamers should be secured as far in advance of date of sailing as possible in order to get the best available position. Write for list of proposed sailings, rates of passage, etc.

T. A. KILGORE,  
43 Bond st.,  
New York.

## ANALYTICAL CONCORDANCE

TO THE BIBLE.

On an Entirely New Plan.

Containing every word in alphabetical order, arranged under its Hebrew or Greek original, with the literal meaning of each and its pronunciation. Exhibiting about 811,000 references, marking 30,000 VARIOUS READINGS in the NEW TESTAMENT. Designed for the simplest reader of the English Bible. By Robert Young, LL.D. Fourth revised authorized edition, printed on heavy paper. One large volume, 4to, cloth, \$5.00; sheep, \$6.00.

## CHURCH AND STATE

IN THE UNITED STATES.

OR THE AMERICAN IDEA OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND ITS PRACTICAL EFFECTS, WITH OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D.

This is a companion volume to "Religious Freedom," and discusses that part of the Constitution which protects us against the despotism of a State Church, and guarantees to us the free exercise and enjoyment of religion, as an inherent, inviolable, and inalienable right of every man. A most excellent treatise. Price, \$1.50.

## THE PROGRESS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM,

AS SHOWN IN THE HISTORY OF TOLERATION ACTS,

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D.

This most excellent treatise traces the progress of Christianity in its relation to the State from persecution to toleration, and from toleration to freedom. It is a companion to the treatise on "CHURCH AND STATE IN THE UNITED STATES," and properly precedes it, and ends where the other begins. Both together form a brief history of

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN EUROPE AND AMERICA.

This history can best be written from an American standpoint, because America reaps the benefit of all the preceding toleration acts, and has successfully tested, by the experience of a century, the system of religious freedom on the basis of legal equality and a peaceful separation of Church and State. Price, \$1.50.

## OUR COUNTRY, ITS POSSIBLE FUTURE, AND PRESENT CRISIS—

By Rev. Josiah Strong. 228 pages, cloth, 60 cents.

CRUDEN'S CONCORDANCE—A dictionary, and alphabetical index to the Bible. Cloth, \$1.25. Sheep, \$2.50.

The above named books will be sent post-paid on receipt of price.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.  
Or Oakland, Cal. 43 Bond St., New York City.



NEW YORK, MARCH 11, 1892.

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 *Catholic Review* says: "There is but one United States, and that means there is but one spot on the face of the earth where a man can hold up his head and say, 'I am allowed to practice the religion I think is the right one.' Let us pray that this grand religious liberty will last forever." And that would in effect be to pray that Romanism may never become dominant here.

At first thought it seems strange that people reared in a land of comparative freedom should have no just appreciation of individual liberty; and yet such is certainly the case. The principle is illustrated by the fact, that generally speaking, only those who labor properly appreciate the fruits of toil. The fortune carefully hoarded by the father, by whose industry and self-denial it was accumulated, is frequently squandered by the son, reared in ease and luxury. It is indeed true, as Wendell Phillips has said, "The manna of popular liberty must be gathered each day or it is rotten."

THE utter lack of any proper sense of the meaning or value of the sacred rights of the individual, is well illustrated by a recent article in the *Boston Traveler*, by one Charles Eaton, of Memphis, Tennessee. In the outset of his article Mr. Eaton says:—

The supreme law of the land (Article 6, paragraph 2, United States Constitution) is that made by the people, whether in their Federal or State organizations; or, the supreme law may be that which is expressed by the people through the press, the platform, and the pulpit—called public sentiment. This fact is stated in a variety of forms in the several State Constitutions. In Pennsylvania's Constitution of 1838 this language is used: "That the general, great, and essential principles of liberty and free government may be recognized and unalterably established, we declare: . . . That all power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their peace, safety, and happiness."

THIS paragraph contains a great truth, and a fatal error. The truth is that "the Constitution is the supreme law of the land;" the fallacy, that the will of the people, aside from the Constitution, is supreme; or that it ought to be supreme. That which should be supreme in civil government, and that which political Con-

stitutions should guarantee, is inalienable human rights. But that Mr. Eaton does not at all appreciate these facts is evident from these propositions which he lays down in the course of his article:—

The people, the State, are sovereign in all things whatsoever, as between man and man.

The people and the people alone decide where my rights end and yours begin.

BUT the people have of right no such powers as those claimed for them by Mr. Eaton. Nothing whatever can justify the majority in meddling with the inalienable rights of the individual. John Stuart Mill never wrote a truer thing than when he said that such—

power itself is illegitimate. The best government has no more title to it than the worst. It is as noxious, or more noxious, when exerted in accordance with public opinion, than when in opposition to it.

The idea that whatever the majority decrees is right is no more true now than it was when the majority demanded the crucifixion of Christ, or when the majority demanded the hanging of witches in Massachusetts, or when, as in our own day, the commune of a Russian village decrees the exiling of innocent men and women to Siberia. It is possible for majority rule to be just as tyrannical and just as wicked as the rule of a single man.

THE Declaration of Independence sets forth this: "That all men are created equal, that they are by their Creator endowed with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men." The difference between this declaration and the propositions laid down by Mr. Eaton, is as great as the difference between night and day.

GOVERNMENTS are not instituted to define rights, "to decide where my rights end and yours begin." My rights begin where yours begin, and end only where yours end; and no majority, however large, can of right make it otherwise. Governments are instituted, not to create, but to defend rights; to guarantee to the individual the untrammelled exercise of his rights; and when "public sentiment" forbids this, the will of the people becomes as tyrannical as the will of a single man. And it is for this very reason that Constitutions are made—to restrict or hold in check the majority from trampling upon the rights of the minority, no less than to protect the majority against the usurpations of the few, or of one.

CONSTITUTIONS are usually the fruit of agitation, and are framed by men jealous for their rights. They are designed to be the conservators of the inalienable rights of the individual citizen; the citadel of defense alike against the usurpations of one, of the few, or of the many. Constitutions

are supposed to be, and should be stable; the will of the majority is fickle, and liable to sudden and unreasonable changes; hence, Constitutions are just as essential in popular governments like our own as in any other.

AND not only are Constitutions necessary, but the people must be constantly reminded of their rights as individuals. As Wendell Phillips has so aptly said: "Some men suppose that in order to the people's governing themselves, it is only necessary that the rights of men be printed, and that every citizen have a copy; as the Epicureans two thousand years ago imagined God a being who arranged this marvelous machinery, set it going, and then sunk to sleep. Republics exist only by being constantly agitated. . . . Never to our latest posterity, can we do without prophets . . . to trouble the waters, that there may be health in their flow." Mr. Eaton's article proves the truth of these words, for it demonstrates the present need of such prophets.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *Examiner*, writing from Jackson, Mississippi, says:

Our State Legislature is now in session at the capital, and is said to be an unusually fine body of men, many of them Christians and in favor of reform measures. The Baptists have a liberal representation in the body.

How a denomination comes to have representatives in a State Legislature is not easy to see. Even in Mississippi the members of the Legislature are supposed to be chosen to represent the citizens of the districts in which they severally reside. Possibly some prove recreant to their trust and represent not the people but certain religious organizations among the people. Baptists most of all should blush to confess that this is true of members of that communion. But if "many" of the members of the Legislature of Mississippi are in favor of reform, they should at once sweep from the statute book of that State the religious laws which at present disfigure it. Christian men and reformers ought to be just. However, if the statement is correct that they represent not their districts, but their churches, nothing in the line of real reform can be expected of them.

## 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 City.