



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

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 15, 1892.

NUMBER 36.

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.

IT has always been the boast of the American citizen that this was the land of the free, and a refuge for the oppressed of all nations. The persecuted and down-trodden of the world have been encouraged to seek a haven here. The United States has made itself the apostle to the whole earth of equality before the law to all men. The people of the world have heard. They believed.

THE gospel of unalienable rights found many believers. The doctrine that the true purpose of government is to secure these rights to men found numerous upholders. The idea that it was from the consent of the governed that governments derived their just powers was like a vision of Paradise regained. It is not to be wondered at, that increasing millions sought to realize for themselves the blessings of this later Eden in the New World.

FOR a hundred years the United States preached these principles, and, in the cases of the immigrants who grasped the outstretched hand of brotherhood extended to them, it practiced the principles which it preached. Colonial ecclesiasticism was but a memory. Neither tolerance nor intolerance ruled, but equity and equality were the watchwords of the State. All were welcome, and equally welcome. The invitation was without reserve to all,—Come! They heard, they answered, they came.

THE invitation has gone out; the multitudes have come from Europe, the East,

the far East. They continue to come. Are they still welcome? If they are not still welcome, why is it that they are not? The Chinese exclusion act, and the extraordinary precautions of the Government for its enforcement, prove conclusively to the Oriental that he is no longer welcome.

The late statutory discriminations against alien labor, and the method of the application of the foreign contract labor law, are more than a hint to the European masses that they are no longer wanted here. What is the occasion of such a complete change in policy as this? This Nation has lately made a judicial profession of Christianity. Is the reason for this coincident change in foreign policy to be found in that?

THE conversion of the Nation to Christianity was accomplished through a decree of the Supreme Court. The decision, in which the Nation made its public profession of religion, also acknowledged the binding force and propriety of an alien labor law of which the purpose was to discriminate against foreign workingmen, and in favor of resident laborers. But the plea was made, that, because this was a Christian Nation, it must necessarily be contrary to its policy to exclude Christian ministerial or missionary laborers. In the very profession itself of our national religion there is found this serious anomaly. It has heretofore been the policy of this country, humane, generous, just, to discriminate against none, but gladly share with all the blessings of a free Government, and the wider opportunities for the pursuit of happiness which this country has afforded. If the religious professions, which this country has made, have been made in perfect candor and good faith, why is there this incongruity?

IN the Gospel of St. Matthew it is related, that, as Christ sat upon the Mount of Olives, his disciples came privately to him and asked what would be the signs of his second coming, and of the end of

the world. When he had given them the evidences of its near approach, and assured them that the day and hour was known, and would be known, to none, not even the angels, only the Father alone,—then he counseled them to be always in readiness for that great event, and spoke to them in beautiful parables, closing his discourse with a terse description of the final examination of the righteous and the unrighteous. He said to them, that, when he should come again in all his glory with the holy angels about him, all nations would be gathered before him, and he should divide the righteous from the unrighteous, and set the one on his right hand and the other on his left. The righteous he would call “blessed of my Father,” and say to them that they should come to their inheritance,—to the kingdom that had been prepared for them since before the foundations of the world were laid. But the unrighteous he would call, “cursed,” and order them from him into the fire prepared for the devil and his angels. To the one,—the second death; to the other,—life eternal! With a directness to be understood by the simplest, he gave his reasons for making this distinction.

TO those to whom he gave the heritage of eternal life, he said that it was theirs because they had given him food when hungry, water to drink when athirst; had clothed him when naked and cold; visited him when sick and in prison; and, when a stranger they had received him gladly. But as for the others, when he had been hungry, they had not fed him; when he had thirsted, they had not given him drink; they had not clothed him when cold and naked; when he was in prison and sick they had not visited and comforted him; when he came a stranger among them, they had shut the door upon him.

When they both alike disclaimed having done, or having failed to do, all this to him personally, he said to them that as they had done this to the least of his

brethren they had done it to him; and as they had not done these kindly charities to his brethren, so they had failed to do them to him.

Those whom he addressed so tenderly, as the blessed of his Father, and to whom he gave the highest possible gift, had entertained an angel unawares. The others had entertained no angels except those who came to them well accredited, having the insignia of their rank, and carrying properly certified letters of credit showing their financial standing, and so introduced that there might be no mistake as to their social position. The one were the righteous and Christlike; the other were the unrighteous and unchristian.

If this is a Christian Nation,—if it can be a Christian Nation,—which must it be, Christlike, or un-Christlike? If a nation can be Christian, when did this Nation show the most Christlikeness? When it opened its doors to the stranger and received him gladly, offering him, with a full hand, all the good things of the earth? Or when it closed its doors to some and strove to make it more difficult to others to enter? Is it consistent to profess both Christianity and un-Christlikeness in the same testimony? Does not such inconsistency savor of hypocrisy? Is there that difference between the Christianity of Christ and "American Christianity?" Is there a new religion, and is the United States its prophet? Has it forsaken the religion of unselfishness, and does it now profess the religion of selfishness, and has it christened this "American Christianity" and established Sunday observance as its sign manual, obligatory upon the American citizen?

All this bewildering maze of intricate inconsistencies which arise about these questions are significant—of what? That this is not a Christian Nation. That there can be no such thing as a Christian Nation. That the whole idea as now taught is but the figment of a deluded imagination. There can be no such thing as corporate religion. Religion, pure and undefiled, can never be anything but an individual experience. In that representative government whose individual citizens have, in the greatest majority, a personal experience of the religion of Jesus Christ, there, civil equity will most abound, and will more and more abound. But in these United States under the hypocritical pretensions of a judicial profession of religion it does, and will, less and less abound.

W. H. M.

Are Sunday Laws a Civil Necessity.

"To substitute a weekly holiday for the Sabbath," says the *Examiner*, of this city, "would be the most cruel wrong that could be done to the man who earns his daily bread by daily labor. The Sabbath is a necessity to him, and whoever attacks it directly, or indirectly undermines it, is the laboring man's enemy, however he disguises himself."

"To substitute a holiday for the Sabbath" would be an impossibility with any man who really keeps a Sabbath; for he would accept no such substitution. But if the individual *desires* a holiday instead of a Sabbath nothing can prevent him from having it. This our contemporary admits when it says:—

There is a constant tendency towards the increase of unnecessary labor. This is due to the growing custom of making Sunday a holiday—a day for junketing and visiting and merry-making.

So far as this concerns the merry-makers alone, the State has no cause to interfere; it is a moral question for each person to settle with his own conscience and with God. But when the Sunday holiday begins to nullify the Sunday rest day, the State may and should interfere. Its interference should be solely to protect all classes of citizens in their right to a day of rest.

The only question, especially in cities, is, whether Sunday, for that is the day that all the agitation is about, shall be a day of devotion and of refreshing rest, or of comparatively innocent pleasure and physical recreation, or one of vicious idleness. If, as our contemporary intimates ought to be the case, excursions to the country, and all other avenues of pleasure requiring the employment of labor should be closed, the day would be, for the most part, one of vicious idleness with all but the comparatively small minority who regard and keep it as a Sabbath. For if people who are confined to the office, the shop, or the factory, six days are compelled to remain in the city on Sunday, and are not inclined to go to church, they will resort to the saloons or to worse places; and if these are closed, as they never all are, people will resort to dissipation in their own homes; for idleness, unless sanctified by the influences of religion, inevitably breeds vice. Continuing, the *Examiner* says:—

Consider what would be the lot of vast classes of working people with fifty-two holidays a year and never a day of rest. That one part of the people may play another must work. To cater to the demands of the merry-makers, thousands must find Sunday the most laborious day of the seven, instead of the most restful. This is true already of employees of horse-car and railway and steamboat companies, of hotel and restaurant keepers, of policemen. How long will it be before Sunday labor becomes general if present legal restraints are ignored or repealed?

As a matter of fact there are comparatively few people who do not, or at least who may not, have regular days of rest if they so desire. Railroad and other employees who work on Sunday, are, with few exceptions, given some other day in the week for rest. And it is a rare thing to find a laboring man broken in health from having insufficient time for rest. Improper living, dissipation, unsanitary surroundings, etc., destroy thousands; and yet on the whole while "holidayism" has been supplanting in a measure, at least, the better form of Sunday observance in this country, the average of human life has increased instead of decreased as one would be led to expect that it would have been by the theories of those who assume that stated weekly rest is a physical necessity.

THE PEOPLE WILL TAKE REST.

The fact is that while real regard for sacred things is on the decrease, and while this naturally leads to holidayism instead of Sabbath keeping, the tendency of the times is toward fewer hours of labor and larger opportunities for rest and recreation than formerly, and Sunday laws are not needed to enable the mass of the people to secure the physical benefits to be derived from this state of affairs. And to force upon people the benefits of religion is both improper and impracticable. The people will take all the physical rest that they need and desire, but it is impossible to force upon them the spiritual rest which alone constitutes Sabbath observance.

California has no Sunday law, and for this reason is an excellent illustration of the ability and willingness of the people to regulate for themselves the matter of

Sunday rest. The facts as stated by the friends of Sunday themselves show that Sunday observance has actually improved in that State since the repeal of the Sunday law.

In 1885 Rev. W. F. Crafts published his book, "The Sabbath for Man," in which he relates that in order to obtain a world-wide view of Sabbath observance he corresponded with more than two hundred persons residing in nearly every nation of the world. One of the questions which he asked was:—

Where have you seen the best Sabbath observance?

To this, a San Francisco pastor responded:—

Among the Christian people of California.

Mr. Crafts' question and the San Francisco pastor's answer to it are found on page 95 of his book before referred to. On the preceding page occur these words:—

Both laymen and ministers say that even in California the Sabbath is, on the whole, better observed and Christian services better attended than five years ago.

"Five years ago," from the standpoint of 1885, was three years before the repeal of the California Sunday law. Therefore, taking into consideration all that Mr. Crafts said upon this subject, we conclude that according to testimony published in his own book, California had in 1885, when the State had been without a Sunday law for two years, better and more general Sunday observance than it had under a Sunday law.

And that Mr. Crafts meant to convey the idea that there had been a general improvement in California, in the matter of Sunday keeping, is further evident from the fact that the quotations which we have made from his book, are prefaced with the following, set in italics:—

Another element of hope in the United States is that the West has improved in Sabbath observance (except in the largest cities), as the communities have changed from frontier Territories into settled States.

Then, after only four and one-half lines relative to Dakota and Wyoming, follows the statement quoted, that "both laymen and ministers say that even in California the Sabbath is, on the whole, better observed, and Christian services better attended, than five years ago." This Mr. Crafts gives in his book as an encouraging fact. A residence of seven years in California, six years of which were spent in one of the largest cities of the State, justifies the writer in saying that the facts are about as "both laymen and ministers" have stated them. And with this agrees also "Holloway," a correspondent of the *New York Observer*, who, in a letter in that paper, dated October 2, 1890, said of Sunday in San Francisco:—

True, there are some drawbacks here as there are in all the cities of our land. Attractive as the city is, and in its main features very desirable as a place of residence, yet the good people who have come from the East regret the absence of some things with which they have always been familiar. There are no Sabbath laws in California and no recognition of it on the statute books of the State. Labor of all kinds can be carried on without hindrance, stores may remain open for the transaction of business as on any other day of the week, places of amusement may be open without interference from the authorities, while noisy demonstrations can go on as usual. But while there is the absence of all Sunday laws we must not draw the conclusion that there is no respect paid to the Lord's day. Truth compels us to state the fact that San Francisco is a Sabbath keeping city. The drift is plainly in that direction. The moral sentiment of the people is largely in its favor, and with very rare exceptions you will find as much order and quiet in the streets as in some of

our most favored Eastern cities. Those who knew California twenty years ago, now witness a far different order of things. The mass of the people respect and keep the Lord's day. No merchant of any respectability keeps his store open on the Sabbath. The wharves are deserted. The Italian fruit dealers in many localities close up their places of business, and even in the Chinese quarter of the city there is some recognition of the fact that this one day calls for a regard to decency and order, if not for religious reverence.

CIVIL LAW NOT NECESSARY.

"Holloway" has stated the facts just as we know them to exist in California. Truth, he says, compels him to say that "San Francisco is a Sabbath-keeping city." Sunday work and Sunday business instead of being on the increase in that State are on the decrease even in the cities. The drift is in the direction of more general rest upon that day. We do not say that this is due to a growing regard for the day; indeed we incline to the opinion that it is right in line with the general tendency of the times, which is toward shorter hours and more holidays; but that does not alter the case.

The facts show that civil law is not necessary to secure to the working people a weekly rest day. And that this conclusion is correct even the *Examiner* inadvertently admitted something over two years ago, when of the Saturday half holiday in this city it said:—

For several years, by a concerted action, some few large firms in the same lines of business adopted a system of early closing during the summer, but the practice was by no means general, and it had no sure basis until a statute made Saturday afternoon a legal holiday. When all banks and public offices closed at noon on Saturday, it was found not only practicable to close private offices and shops, but of little use to keep them open, and so the half-holiday became assured as a summer institution, and is more and more generally observed with every year.

This was said in an effort to show that Sunday laws are necessary; but instead of proving the necessity of Sunday laws, it proves conclusively that no such laws are required further than to make Sunday a legal holiday. There is no law forbidding work upon Saturday afternoon; the law simply makes Saturday afternoon a legal holiday, and banks, courts, etc., must of necessity suspend business, because business done at that time would not be legal. But to make Sunday *dies non* would not satisfy Sunday-law advocates. This is exactly the case with Sunday in California. It is a legal holiday, no public business is done and would not be legal if it were done, and yet, Sunday advocates say that California has no Sunday law, and they are demanding that a Sunday law be enacted in that State. The truth is, that that which they want is a statutory recognition of Sunday as a sacred day. And that, they say, would not be religious legislation! C. P. B.

Some Scraps of New England History.*

THE SUFFERINGS OF THE QUAKERS.

NOTWITHSTANDING the laws and penalties, and the spirit to inflict the penalties in the severest way, the Quakers continued to come. In fact, wherever such laws were, that was the very place where the Quakers wished to be, because they were opposed to every kind of soul-oppression and every form of the union of Church and State. Not only in this, but in almost everything else their views made them objects of special hatred to the theo-

crats of Massachusetts. They recognized no such distinction among Christians as clergy and laity, and could neither be coaxed nor forced to pay tithes. They refused to do military service, and would not take an oath. They would not take their hats off either in church or in court. "In doctrine their chief peculiarity was the assertion of an 'inward light,' by which every individual is to be guided in his conduct of life." And "the doctrine of the 'inward light,' or of private inspiration, was something especially hateful to the Puritan." Another thing no less hateful to the Puritan than this, was their refusal to keep Sunday in the Puritan way. They called "in question the propriety of Christians turning the Lord's day into a Jewish Sabbath." They were denounced as infidels, blasphemers, agents of the devil, and were counted as easily guilty of every heresy and every crime in the Puritan theocratical catalogue.

Admission to the confederacy of the New England colonies had been absolutely refused Rhode Island, on account of its principles of liberty of conscience; but hatred of the Quakers led Massachusetts colony in 1657 to ask Rhode Island to join the confederacy in the endeavor to save New England from the Quakers. "They sent a letter to the authorities of that colony, signing themselves their loving friends and neighbors, and beseeching them to preserve the whole body of colonists against 'such a pest,' by banishing and excluding all Quakers, a measure to which 'the rule of charity did oblige them.'"

But Roger Williams was still president of Rhode Island, and, true to his principles, he replied: "We have no law amongst us whereby to punish any for only declaring by words their minds and understandings concerning things and ways of God as to salvation and our eternal condition. As for these Quakers, we find that where they are most of all suffered to declare themselves freely and only opposed by arguments in discourse, there they least of all desire to come. Any breach of the civil law shall be punished, but the freedom of different consciences shall be respected."

This reply enraged the whole confederacy. Massachusetts threatened to cut off the trade of Rhode Island. In this strait Rhode Island, by Roger Williams, appealed for protection to Cromwell, who now ruled England. The appeal presented the case as it was, but that which made it of everlasting importance, as the grandest and most touching appeal in all history, is the piteous plea, "*But whatever fortune may befall, let us not be compelled to exercise any civil power over men's consciences.*"

In this year, October 14, another law was passed against Quakers, in which it was enacted that—

If any person or persons within this jurisdiction shall henceforth entertain and conceal any such Quaker or Quakers, or other blasphemous heretics, knowing them so to be, every such person shall forfeit to the country forty shillings for every such hour's entertainment and concealment of any Quaker or Quakers, etc., as aforesaid, and shall be committed to prison as aforesaid, till forfeiture be fully satisfied and paid; and it is further ordered that if any Quaker or Quakers shall presume, after they have once suffered what the law requires, to come into this jurisdiction, every such male Quaker shall for the first offense have one of his ears cut off, and be kept at work in the house of correction till he can be sent away at his own charge, and for the second offense shall have his other ear cut off; and every woman Quaker that has fulfilled the law here that shall presume to come into this jurisdic-

tion, shall be severely whipped, and kept at the house of correction at work, till she be sent away at her own charge, and so also for her coming again she shall be alike used as aforesaid; and for every Quaker, he or she, that shall presume a third time herein again to offend, they shall have their tongues burned through with a red-hot iron, and be kept at the house of correction close to work, till they be sent away at their own charge. And it is further ordered that all and every Quaker arising from among ourselves, shall be dealt with, and suffer the like punishments, as the law provides against foreign Quakers.

The Quakers, however, not only continued to come, and to come again when imprisoned, whipped, and banished; but their preachings, and much more their persecutions, raised up others in the colonies. This result followed so promptly that May 20, 1658, the following statute was enacted:—

That Quakers and such accursed heretics, arising among ourselves, may be dealt with according to their deserts, and that their pestilent errors and practices may be speedily prevented, it is hereby ordered, as an addition to the former laws against Quakers, that every such person or persons, professing any of their pernicious ways by speaking, writing, or by meeting on the Lord's day, or at any other time, to strengthen themselves, or seduce others to their diabolical doctrines, shall, after due means of conviction, incur the penalty ensuing; that is, every person so meeting, shall pay to the country for every time ten shillings; and every one speaking in such meeting, shall pay five pounds apiece; and in case any such person, after having been punished by scourging or whipping for such, according to the former law, shall be still kept at work in the house of correction, till they put in security with two sufficient men, that they shall not any more vent their hateful errors, nor use their sinful practices, or else shall depart this jurisdiction at their own charges, and if any of them return again, then each such person shall incur the penalty of the law formerly made for strangers.

In 1658 "Rev." John Norton, supported by the rest of the clergy, circulated a petition praying that the penalty of death should be visited upon all Quakers who should return after having been banished. The Board of Commissioners of the United Colonies met in Boston in September. The petition was presented to the Board, which in response advised the general court of each colony to enact such a law. Accordingly, October 16, the general court of Massachusetts enacted the following law:—

Whereas there is a pernicious sect, commonly called Quakers, lately risen up, who by word and writing have published and maintained many dangerous and horrid tenets, and do take upon them to change and alter the received and laudable customs of our nation, not giving civil respects to equals, or reverence to superiors; whose actions tend to undermine civil government, and to destroy the order of the churches, by denying all established forms of worship, and by withdrawing from orderly church fellowship, allowed and proved by all orthodox professors of truth, and instead thereof, and in opposition thereto, frequently meet by themselves, insinuating themselves into the minds of the simple, or such as are least affected to the order and government of the church and commonwealth, whereby diverse particular inhabitants have been infected, notwithstanding all former laws made, have been upon the experience of their arrogant and bold determinations, to disseminate their practice amongst us, prohibiting their coming into this jurisdiction, they have not been deterred from their impious attempts to undermine our peace and hazard our ruin.

For prevention thereof, this court doth order and enact that every person or persons, of the accursed sect of Quakers, who is not an inhabitant of, but is found within, this jurisdiction, shall be apprehended without warrant, where no magistrate is at hand, by any constable, commissioner, or selectman, and conveyed from constable to constable, to the next magistrate, who shall commit the said person to close prison, there to remain (without bail) till the next court of assistants, where they shall have a legal trial; and being convicted [Note:—"For which conviction, it was counted sufficient that they appeared with their hats on and said 'thee' and 'thou'"], to be of the sect of the Quakers, shall be sentenced to be banished upon pain of death; and that every inhabitant of this jurisdiction being convicted to be

* Condensed from "Two Republics."

of the aforesaid sect, either by taking up, publishing, or defending the horrid opinion of the Quakers, or stirring up of mutiny, sedition, or rebellion against the government, or by taking up their abusive and destructive practices, viz., denying civil respect to equals and superiors, and withdrawing from the church assemblies, and instead thereof frequenting meetings of their own in opposition to our church order, or by adhering to, or approving of, any known Quaker, and the tenets practiced, that are opposite to the orthodox received opinions of the godly, and endeavoring to disaffect others to civil government and church order, or condemning the practice and proceedings of this court against the Quakers, manifesting thereby their plotting with those whose design is to overthrow the order established in Church and State, every such person convicted before the said court of assistants, in manner aforesaid, shall be committed to close prison for one month, and then, unless they choose voluntarily to depart this jurisdiction, shall give bond for their good behavior, and appear at the next court, where continuing obstinate, and refusing to retract and reform their aforesaid opinions, they shall be sentenced to banishment upon pain of death; and any one magistrate upon information given him of any such person, shall cause him to be apprehended, and shall commit any such person, according to his discretion, till he comes to trial as aforesaid.

Nor were any of these laws in any sense a dead letter. They were enforced in the regular Puritan way.

The Gospel; What It Is, and Its Work As Opposed to the Mystery of Iniquity.*

(Concluded.)

THE National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and this whole ecclesiastical combination has been working for this for these twenty-nine years. Will they stand silent and do nothing? Is there not here to-day an ecclesiastical organization anxious to assert the Government as a kind of sovereignty for itself, just as there was then to raise a like dispute?

Then can any one doubt, or fail to see, that under the circumstances and in the condition of the times, in view of the position the Church occupied at that time, just as certainly as that edict of Constantine in favor of Christianity as the religion of the Roman Empire brought the Papacy, and out of that came all that the Papacy ever was, just so certainly under the like circumstances and the like conditions of church ambition, out of this Supreme Court decision making Christianity the religion of this Nation—just so certainly in this is the image of the beast, and out of it will come everything that the prophecy tells about.

We are not the only ones able to see these things. That was one of the things that was held in mind when this Government was made. Before making the national Constitution, there was a movement in Virginia to establish the Christian religion—not the Catholic nor the Protestant, but “the Christian religion;” that is all. Let me read to you what James Madison saw in that:—

Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease, any particular sect of Christians in exclusion of all other sects?

Constantine favored Christianity at the first, just as a whole—“the whole body of Christians.” And then he established a particular sect, the “Catholic Church of the Christians,” just as easily as he did the first. Just so certainly as the Supreme Court of the United States has established Christianity as the religion of this nation, in

exclusion of all other religions, just so certainly will it, or some other power, have to establish one particular sect in exclusion of all other sects. The Supreme Court hints at Protestantism; but if that is it, somebody will have to decide which sect of Protestantism it is. I do not know who will decide it; whether the Supreme Court, or Congress, or by national election campaign, I can not say; but it will be decided in some way. It is bound to come.

Madison and those of his time knew just as certainly as they knew anything, that if Christianity was established as the State religion of Virginia, there must be a particular sect established, and everybody else be oppressed. Not only that, but he saw this:—

Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution.

Now mark; they held this position; they had experienced this in their day. We have had some of it too in our day. They saw in the mere proposition to make Christianity the established religion of Virginia “a signal of persecution.” Just as certainly as the proposition to make Christianity the established religion of the State of Virginia was the signal of persecution in that State, just so certainly this Supreme Court decision making Christianity the religion of this Nation is a signal of persecution through all the Nation. But I read again from Madison’s remonstrance against that:—

Distant as it may be in its present form from the Inquisition, it differs from it only in degree.

In that proposition to establish “the Christian religion” in Virginia, they saw the Inquisition. What do we see in the actual establishment of the same religion by the Supreme Court of the United States? Again I read:—

The one is the first step, the other is the last, in the career of intolerance.

That is what they saw, the founders of this Republic, when an attempt was made to establish “the Christian religion” as the State religion. What does this people see in this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which establishes “the Christian religion” as the national religion? Just as certainly as that back there was a signal of persecution, and persecution throughout the State, just so certainly is this a signal of persecution, and persecution through all the Nation. Just so certainly as that had in it the Inquisition, just so certainly this has in it the same thing.

And just as certainly as that edict of Constantine back there had in it the Papacy, just so certainly this has in it all that the image of the Papacy is or will be. Controversies arose back there as to what was Christianity, and this brought the establishment of the Catholic Church and persecution of all kinds. Soon the next step was made, compelling them all to become Catholics—heretics to join the Catholic Church and hand over their property to the Catholic Church.

There arose still another difficulty and dispute as to what was the true Catholic doctrine, and this brought the Council of Nice, which established Trinitarianism as the true Catholic doctrine. This was soon followed by an emperor who, by a council, established Arianism as the true Catholic doctrine. This was soon followed by another emperor who, by a council, re-established Trinitarianism as the true Catholic doctrine. Thus one ruler and council decided one way, and another de-

ecided another way, as to what was the true Catholic religion. And thus it went on, controversy after controversy of all kinds, until the bishop of Rome was made the fountain of faith by earthly governments and human power instead of the word of God through the Lord Jesus Christ, the power of God. Thus the mystery of iniquity hid and supplanted for ages the mystery of God.

Now, then, old controversies will be revived. Some of these controversies will rise right up again as to what is the real true Christianity, Catholicism or Protestantism, Trinitarianism or Unitarianism, Calvinism or Arianism. These old controversies will be revived, which have apparently been hushed for a long time. These disputes will arise over hair-splitting theories that have no truth in them. They will dispute over these things. Atoms will be worlds, and worlds will be atoms; and these atoms that they will turn into worlds will be simply senseless disputes by which they can obtain control of the civil power, to force those who oppose them, and do not believe as they do, to act as they think or believe. “Old controversies will spring up,” and here are new controversies: revelations of false science, evolution, probation after death, etc. “New and old will commingle, and THIS WILL TAKE PLACE RIGHT EARLY.” Do you not believe it? Do you believe it? Is it not time to believe it? Is it not time to believe it, brethren? Well, then, I hope you will.

The Sabbath a Memorial.

APROPOS of our notes in last week’s paper upon the nature and design of the Sabbath, are the following paragraphs from “The Abiding Sabbath,” published by the American Tract Society:—

Not to a single race, but to man; not to man alone, but to the whole creation; not to the created things alone, but to the Creator himself, came the benediction of the first Sabbath. Its significance extends beyond the narrow limits of Judaism, to all races, and perhaps to all worlds. It is a law spoken not simply through the lawgiver of a chosen people, but declared in the presence of a finished heaven and earth. The declaration in Genesis furnishes the best commentary on the saying of Jesus: “The Sabbath was made for man.” For man, universal humanity, it was given with its benediction.

The reason of the institution of the Sabbath is one which possesses an unchanging interest and importance to all mankind. The theme of the creation is not peculiar to Israel, nor is worship of the Creator confined to the children of Abraham. The primary article of every religious creed, and the foundation of all true religion is faith in one God as the Maker of all things. Against atheism, which denies the existence of a personal God; against materialism, which denies that this visible universe has its roots in the unseen; and against secularism, which denies the need of worship, the Sabbath is therefore an eternal witness. It symbolically commemorates that creative power which spoke all things into being, the wisdom which ordered their adaptations and harmony, and the love which made, as well as pronounced, all “very good.” It is set as the perpetual guardian of man against that spiritual infirmity which has everywhere led him to a denial of the God who made him, or to the degradation of that God into a creature made with his own hands.

The words which we have italicized express truth which, if rightly understood and accepted in its fullness, would forever put an end to the “civil Sabbath” plea for Sunday laws. The Sabbath was primarily made for man, not that he might rest but that he might worship his Creator in the beauty of holiness. It was to be to man a memorial of God’s finished work, a monument erected at the end of each week to remind man of the time

*From a sermon delivered by A. T. Jones, at Battle Creek, Mich., July 9, 1892, as reported and published in the *Review and Herald*.

"when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy," because "God saw everything that he had made and, behold, it was very good." Physical rest is an incident, not the object, of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

Ought it to Close on Sunday?

THOSE who have been watching the trend of religious thought during the last decade, and have noted the advances which the Church has been making toward the civil power, will perhaps be interested to know how the supreme religio-civil question now before the public, namely, the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, is regarded by the leading journals and ministers of California. The *Examiner*, of San Francisco, in its issue of July 17 contained the following special despatch from Washington:—

Matters of national import in Congress which have divided the parties appear to be thoroughly overshadowed by the World's Fair Sunday closing combat waged between the Senate and the House. The conflict was launched last Wednesday when Senator Quay, the eminent Pennsylvania moralist, sprang an amendment to the Sundry Civil bill (in which the World's Fair appropriation is incorporated), providing that the Fair be closed tighter than wax on Sunday in all its departments.

The opposition rallied, but the Sabbatharians carried their point by the heavy majority of 45 to 11. Not even the art galleries were exempt from the rigorous operation of the new proviso.

The question of closing the World's Fair on Sunday was submitted to the leading pastors of San Francisco, and elicited from them opinions as follows:—

Rev. C. L. Miel, editor of the *Pacific Churchman*, said:—

When the discussion on the Sunday opening or closing of the World's Fair began, I wrote as follows: "Shall the World's Fair be opened on Sunday or shall it not? The arguments on both sides will readily suggest themselves. The main one for the opening of the Fair is that Sunday is the only holiday of the workingmen; per contra, it is urged that Sunday has, in America, taken upon it the distinct character of a holy day, and that the proposed departure would amount to desecration. It is time the press, pulpit, and people should realize, as concerns Sunday, that recreation and desecration are distinctly different. There is a recreation which consecrates, and there is a recreation that desecrates. So far as the World's Fair is concerned, there seems to be a middle course that should recommend itself to all but the extremists of both parties, those who favor and those who do not favor the opening of the Fair on Sunday. This is simply to open the Fair on Sunday afternoon at one half the price of the usual admission. Sunday could thus be preserved as a holy day first, and a holiday as a recreation of the physical man, uniting peacefully and harmoniously the religious and civil character of the day."

The foregoing was written in July, 1890, and during the interval I have written in the same strain. I have come in for my full share of criticism—favorable, adverse, good, and ill-natured. I have followed carefully the views of men whose opinions are worthy of consideration, but as yet have seen no sufficient reason for changing my own. The question, after all, is one of Sunday observance. It is well to remember that Sunday in the United States has a civil as well as a religious character. A large class of our citizens observe the day solely from a religious standpoint. Holding rigidly to the letter of the fourth commandment, they apply every jot and tittle of it to the Christian Sunday. Their observance of Sunday is strictly and solely ecclesiastical. They have a perfect right to hold their opinions and practice them. They have, however, no moral right to compel others who do not share those opinions to act as if they did. Another and a larger class of citizens do not mark their Sundays by any religious observance. They regard and observe Sunday as a civil holiday. They, like the former class, have perfect right to do so, provided their observance is within the law. They have, however, no moral right to compel the former to close their churches, and spend their Sunday as a civil holiday. But there is a third, and by far the larger, class of citizens who observe Sunday in both characters, religious and civil, as a holy day and as

a holiday. They believe that the day is one of recreation of soul and body. They recreate the soul by public observance of prescribed religious duties. They recreate the body in whatever decent, healthful, agreeable way, they may choose. They, like the others, have a perfect right to do so. They, like the others, have no moral right to enforce their practices upon those who differ from them. This is a free country, and in nothing more free than this liberty of religious opinions and practices. To open the World's Fair on Sunday is not to compel those who do not believe in Sunday opening to enter its gates and perambulate its grounds. But to close the World's Fair on Sunday is, in no slight sense, to compel an observance of the day which a majority of our citizens do not believe in. As no one is under compulsion to go to the Fair on Sunday, so, also, no one should be under compulsion not to go. The question of attendance or non-attendance is purely a question of individual conscience. As to the question of opening or closing, I do not believe in denying to two large classes of people the privilege of attending the Fair on Sunday, because a minority, however respectable and well-intentioned, desires the gates closed on that day. Beyond this there remains the fact that to many Sunday is the only day when they can attend the Fair without a loss in wages, which they can ill afford, or not afford at all. I am now, as I have been from the first, in favor of opening the Fair on Sunday. It was in deference to a sentiment which I appreciate and do not think it just to ignore that I suggested, as a compromise, the opening of the Fair on Sunday afternoons.

Rev. John E. Cottle, rector of St. Bridget's, said:—

The keeping of the Exposition open on Sunday may become the occasion of the neglect of religious duties on the part of a great many. After all, six days in each week seem quite sufficient to enable people who wish to see the Exhibition to see all that they need to see. The Sabbath is a day set apart for religious reflection, and to bring the thoughts of man back to a consideration of the welfare of his soul; and God, who gives us six days of each week for business and pleasure, should have at least a seventh of the time reserved to his own special use, especially since he has ordained that Sunday belongs to us only in so far as we make a proper use of it.

Rev. John Kimball, of *The Pacific*, the organ of Congregationalism west of the Rocky Mountains, said:—

The universal opinion, both of those who are Christians and those who are merely good citizens and Americans, is that the best health and interest of the country are conserved by the observance of a rest-day, upon which all ordinary employment shall cease, and a time be given to repose and reflection, if not to religious observances.

Rev. J. A. Cruzan, Pastor of the Congregational Church:—

My principal objection to the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday is that the grandest thing that we have to show to the nations of the Old World is the American Sunday, with its worship and its rest from labor, for the workingman especially, as in contrast with the continental Sunday.

Rev. W. W. Case, of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church:—

Of course the clergy is a unit on this proposition. I do not see how any member of the profession can logically oppose the closing of the Exposition on Sunday. We are a Christian Nation, and should recognize a Christian Sabbath.

Rev. J. Q. A. Henry, one of the leaders in the Baptist denomination:—

The decision to close the World's Fair on Sunday is a move in the right direction, and a grand victory in the cause of good morals and religion.

Rev. D. Hanson Irwin, Pastor of the Howard Street Presbyterian Church:—

The Exposition should be closed on Sunday, and I am glad that a decision to that effect has been reached; though I had no doubt as to the result. An opposite course would be opposed to the best interests of religion.

Rev. W. D. Williams, Pastor of the Plymouth Congregational Church:—

I think clergymen are of one opinion concerning the subject of closing the World's Fair on Sunday. In the interests of labor, morals, and religion, the decision is a most desirable one.

The editor of the *Pacific Churchman*

holds sound views on the question of religious liberty, and is able to give his reasons therefor. He is in favor of opening the World's Fair on Sunday, and only suggested the compromise of closing in the forenoon and opening in the afternoon out of "deference to a sentiment" which he appreciates, and does not "think it just to ignore." All will recognize the principle which he enunciates,—when, referring to those who conscientiously observe Sunday, he says, "They have a perfect right to hold their opinions and to practice them. They have, however, no moral right to compel others who do not share those opinions to act as if they did,"—as being sound and logical. He also expresses a truth when he says, "To open the World's Fair on Sunday is not to compel those who do not believe in Sunday opening to enter its gates and perambulate its grounds. But to close the World's Fair on Sunday is, in no slight sense, to compel an observance of the day which a majority of our citizens do not believe in."

It is gratifying to know that some men who occupy the editorial chair of the religious press, and stand in the pulpit, have the courage to express such sound sentiments on this question.

D. T. JONES.

The American Political System.

It was declared to be the opinion of the United States Senate, in 1829, that, "Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are always dangerous." There exists at the present time in this country the most extensive religious combination the world ever saw, and it exists for no other purpose than to effect a political object. We are evidently entering a serious crisis in our national life. By careful study of the principles which underlie our American political system, every citizen should seek to understand what is involved in the political success of this intensely un-American and most dangerous movement.

In the development of the American idea of government many futile attempts were made to formulate a complete assertion of the principle involved. Of this class is the resolution adopted by the New York provincial congress, June 24, 1775, as follows:—

Resolved, That neither the parliament of Great Britain nor any other earthly legislature or tribunal ought or can of right interfere or interpose in any wise howsoever in the religious and ecclesiastical concerns of the colonies.

This was too general to give protection to each individual in the colonies against any interference in his religious concerns by the government of his own colony.

The Virginia declaration of rights, adopted June 12, 1776, is more to the point. In the Constitution of nearly all the States, similar assertions have been adopted. Section 16 reads as follows:—

That religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, and not by force or violence; and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity towards each other.

In the discussion of this resolution Madison said:—

The free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience, is something which every man may demand as a right, not something for which he must ask as a privilege.

We can more fully realize the force of

these "self-evident truths" when we unselfishly assert the other man's right to believe and worship as he chooses, or not to worship at all if he chooses. Freedom to do a thing necessarily implies equal freedom not to do it. It is the selfish assertion and reiteration of our own rights that leads us to forget the rights of others and try to force them to conform to our way.

The words of Christ (Matt. 7:12,) "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets," were his explanation to his followers, of what constitutes proper obedience to the law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." As Christ's legal opinion this rule is binding upon all Christians, unequivocally requiring them to accord to others in all things, the same right and privileges they would wish accorded to themselves. It does more than this.

It exposes the character of those who claim the name Christian, but have so little regard for this fundamental law of Christian conduct, that they seek to enforce upon others hollow formalities of their own lifeless, if not absolutely, hypocritical, profession. The law of Christianity is the law of love, "For love worketh no ill to his neighbor." And that the principle of freedom of conscience for every man, as embodied in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by our Constitution is in harmony with it, is a "self-evident truth." These principles should be maintained by Christians and all others. "By their fruits ye shall know them."—*Ira D. Blanchard, in Duluth Evening Herald.*

Sunday Funerals.

ONE would not naturally suppose that Sunday-law enthusiasts would carry their claims of Sunday sacredness so far as to seriously deny the right of a man to die on a day which would necessitate holding the funeral on Sunday; but such would seem to be the case, from the following clipping from the *Uxbridge (Canada) Journal*, under date of June 9, 1892:—

At a meeting of the Ministerial Association of Stouffville, the following resolution was unanimously carried:—

WHEREAS, There is a tendency to select the Sabbath day for funerals, and we believe such funerals to be detrimental to the proper observance of the Sabbath, and the spiritual interests of our congregations, therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Ministerial Association of Stouffville, agree not to attend or conduct funerals on the Sabbath, unless absolutely necessary on sanitary grounds; and that we request that funeral sermons be not preached on the day of interment, but at the regular service on the following Sabbath; and further request that the ministers be consulted before final arrangements are made.

From the foregoing it would appear that it is a sin to attend funerals on Sunday, notwithstanding men die, and the natural order of events points to Sunday as the day of interment.

Would it be less fallacious to request that men postpone their death till some other day, when the "Ministerial Association of Stouffville" could attend the funeral without remorse of conscience?

It is not because it is so much of a sin to attend Sunday funerals, but to bring Sunday to the front as the "American Sabbath" that these enthusiasts are working.

What is wanted is to set up the "golden image" on the "plains of Dura," and to compel all classes to "fall down and worship" it. J. L. CUPIT.

Grand Ledge, Mich.

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

THREE boys have been arrested in Pittsburg for putting up a tent and selling refreshments on Sunday. They are to be prosecuted to the "full extent of the law."

THE *Pearl of Days* reports that the American Sabbath Union has printed and sent out one hundred thousand copies of Elliott F. Shepard's "Brief" in favor of keeping the World's Fair closed on Sunday, which was presented at the hearings before the Congressional Committees on the World's Fair last April.

THE *Northern Christian Advocate* says that in New Orleans the Sunday law is violated, but that "The American Confederation of Labor has entered into an alliance with the Sunday Rest League to secure its enforcement, and it is believed that the opposition must give way."

Thus one by one, through apparent self-interest, or some other deception, different organizations are led into this great delusion.

THE *Philadelphia Record* has this editorial on the subject of Congress and the Sunday closing of the World's Fair:—

Apart from the immediate question of closing the World's Fair on Sunday there can be no mistaking the ulterior object of this Sabbatarian crusade. Should it prove successful, the reaction against personal liberty and social progress will not cease until every street-car shall have been stopped, and every library, academy of arts, and museum, closed on Sunday. The Sabbatarians have not hesitated to avow that their purpose is to re-establish the puritanical policy of the seventeenth century. In the debate on the Quay amendment Senator Frye, of Maine, passed a eulogy on the puritanical Sabbath, and fervently expressed a hope of its speedy restoration in this country. Other senators, in their Sabbatarian zeal, gave utterance to like views. This is the real meaning of bigotry's persistent attack upon the Columbian Exposition.

It seems that in North Carolina indulgence in gymnastic exercises is a desecration of Sunday. The pugilist James Corbett, while on his way through North Carolina to fight with John L. Sullivan at New Orleans, was so forgetful of the religious duty of complete Sunday rest required by the municipal regulations of the town of Charlotte, N. C., as to take, while stopping off there on Sunday, some modification of his customary daily physical exercise.

A posse of police was detailed to arrest him, and he was obliged to leave his special car on the track under the surveillance of the Charlotte police, and take another train to escape the consequences of his failure to observe the requirements of Carolina religion. Those who intend to stop over Sunday in the village of Charlotte hereafter would do well to telegraph in advance for instructions, unless they are in search of regular employment in the chain-gang or are composed of the stuff of which martyrs are made.

COMMISSIONER DOUGLASS, of Washington, D. C., received recently an application from a retail grocer requesting permission to keep his store open on Sundays, as his stock was perishable, and to close his store on that day would cause him great loss.

A subordinate officer to whom the matter was referred, stated in his indorsement on the papers that there is no law to keep the store closed on Sunday, and recommended that he be allowed to keep open, as requested. Commissioner Douglass, however, wrote the following on the subject:—

"The letter asking permission to keep a grocery-store open on Sunday for the sale of 'perishable' articles, such as meats, etc., was duly received, and referred to the Police Department. It has been returned, with a favorable recommendation by Lieut. Kelley. The lieutenant says that there is no law to prevent the doing so. I am not so sure there is no law to prevent this. In the first place, the Decalogue seems to forbid it. In the second place, by early and late common law decisions in England, Christianity has been held to be a part of the common law of that country.

"And, in the third, the supreme courts of this country have always held from the first that when the first settlers from the mother country came to America they brought the 'common law' with them as a vital part of their birthright of principles of government and social order. It will not be disputed that the Decalogue is a prominent plank in the Christian platform. I have often thought that an indictment might be framed under this idea.

"If not, it certainly has force enough, in my mind, to induce a refusal of such a request, and leave the party to stand on his rights in the matter as the courts may determine. For these reasons, with others not now mentioned, but generally understood or adopted, I must vote to refuse the request. Besides, all the articles called perishable can be preserved, by the use of an ice-box."—*Pearl of Days.*

THE *Pearl of Days* is not satisfied with the multiplicity of organizations now existing for the furtherance of enforced Sunday observance, but advocates the establishing of still another. It says:—

The need of a national society, thoroughly organized and generously supported, to meet the assaults upon the Sabbath originating in high places, is the deep conviction of very many. The sacred day will never be fully saved to us so long as we think its foes are only to be found in the saloon, in alliance with the grosser forms of Sabbath desecration. The consciences of the intelligent masses must be appealed to. There must be such a moral atmosphere created as will favor discussion of the great Sabbath principles taught in the Bible. In other words, there must be greater attention given to finding out what God's will is concerning the fourth commandment.

If this new organization would really give itself to finding out what God's will is concerning the fourth commandment the result of the investigation would astonish the author of this paragraph.

THE Pittsburg preachers and their "Law and Order" detectives continue to make life uncomfortable for the people of Pittsburg on Sunday. The *Pittsburg Dispatch* notes the following incident:—

The Law and Order Society's movement against the pernicious selling of milk, etc., after 12 o'clock Saturday night is occasioning a great deal of criticism. Alderman Rohe says there are six or seven informations being prepared by the society for the violation of the law, but thinks the charges against the dealers are for selling ice-cream and cigars. He stated that any one brought up before him charged with selling milk, ice, or bread, on Sunday, would be discharged. He considers the application of the law to the selling of a glass of milk as stretching things too far.

A gentleman who had just gotten off a train went around the city Sunday morning about 1 o'clock in search of something to quench a thirst which he had been cultivating for many miles. He first tried the saloons, but found none open. Next he plead with the drug-store clerk even for a glass of vichy, but to no avail. He became desperate at last, and went into a Smithfield restaurant and meekly asked for a glass of milk. He nearly fell from his seat when the waiter informed him it was against the law to sell milk on Sunday without being served with a full meal. He sat meditating for a while, then, with a great deal of reluctance, said, "Can you give me a glass of water without violating the law?" After forcing the liquid down his throat he went out muttering to himself, in not very complimentary language, about the kind of a place he had fallen into.

Such facts as these show conclusively that the more those who seek the enforcement of Sunday laws gain the more they will demand.

THE purposes to which Sunday laws may be, and are, put, is well shown in this item from *Our Country*, published at Boston:—

A summons has been served on William H. Mace, of Stoneham, the well-known proprietor of the refreshment saloon at the northerly end of Spot Pond, calling him into court to-morrow morning to answer to the charge of keeping an open shop on the Lord's day. An interesting story is told in connection with this case.

Before Mr. Mace opened his saloon there was a contest between him and one Michael McCarthy in the matter of obtaining a lease of the land on which his building stands, it being a very desirable location. Mr. Mace secured the lease, and since then it is alleged that McCarthy has been endeavoring in one way and another to make matters unpleasant for Mace.

Last Sunday Mace left his horse in front of McCarthy's house and weighted him, while he went into his own saloon, which is near by. It is said that McCarthy came out and commenced moving the horse away, whereupon Mace ordered him to let the horse alone, and some hot words followed. It is alleged that soon

after this incident McCarthy reported to Chief of Police Houghton that Mace was keeping his place open on Sunday, and this led to the complaint and summons against Mace.

Religious laws have always made an acceptable weapon for the malicious and the hypocritical against their neighbors. This will be found to be no less true now than in preceding generations.

The *Cottage Pulpit*, of Nashville, Tenn., publishes this outspoken expression of noble and worthy feeling in reference to the fines and imprisonment suffered by Christian citizens of Tennessee under the State Sunday laws:—

In regard to the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Henry County, and elsewhere in this State, we have this further suggestion to offer: That if the intelligent Christians belonging to the communities where these men have been arrested would step forward and refund fines that an ignorant or prejudiced justice of the peace or judge has imposed upon them, under mistaken zeal for the maintenance of the State's laws, they would honor Christ and his cause by it, and relieve themselves and the church in Tennessee of the appearance of complicity and approval of such disgraceful proceedings. Or, perhaps better still, to show the world that America's boasted heritage of religious liberty is not all a sham and a fraud and a mockery here at the core of the Nation,—here in the old "Volunteer State," as her citizens so proudly call her, because of her readiness to defend the national honor when the frontier was invaded, why not, you Christian men of honesty and intellect, exert your influence upon the governor of the State and have him remit the fines, as we presume he has the power to do, and thus cleanse the hands of our good commonwealth of the uncleanness, and her fair name of the stigma, of being thought a reviver of the old inquisitorial fires of persecution under color of law.

This account of an interview between a Presbyterian clergyman of Stillwater, Minn., and Archbishop Ireland on the public school question is from the *New York Herald*:—

The Archbishop charged the public schools with being godless, and professed a desire to introduce religious elements into them. I suggested that when I went to school we recited the Lord's prayer and read from the Scriptures, and asked how they were driven out. He confessed that it was largely owing to Catholic protests.

I again suggested that committees of all religious denominations meet and formulate a ritual to be used as a text book, containing religious instructions that would not be objectionable to any sect and that no persons of good morals could object to.

He objected on the ground that I would not confess to the Catholic idea, admitting that what Catholics wanted was the teaching of the Catholic religion in the schools. He cited an instance in which the State legislated in a matter of religion, requiring the observance of the Sabbath, and remarked that the State didn't do that for the sake of religion, but to require the observance of Sunday as a day of rest.

He then said: "Why not legislate immediately in that way in the matter of the public schools?" Claiming that by such a plan the State would immediately arrange religion, I objected to the Sabbath as not being a parallel, the Sabbath being common to both Catholics and Protestants, but that the Catholic religion which he was advancing in his plans was not common to both Catholics and Protestants.

The Archbishop frankly admitted that the Protestant's conscience had good reason to be offended when Sisters of Charity were introduced into the Central Public School buildings and placed over Protestant children. I asked if I might infer from that that the garb of the Sisters of Charity had a teaching force. This he practically admitted.

The Archbishop is an astute and plausible talker; but, as I said to him, his plan involves the impossible condition of putting religious instruction by the State in schools, which is contrary to the laws and conditions of the State.

I suggested that this plan was one that could stand only on its merits, and in the eye of the law this religious element robbed it of all merit. He seemed confident that some compromise would be arrived at by which the difficulties would be met. I gained from him the information that his efforts are by no means considered at an end.

It will be noticed that in antagonizing the Roman Catholic prelate it was necessary for this Presbyterian to acknowledge the impropriety and impossibility of the State teaching religion in the public schools, although this position directly crossed the suggestion which he had previously made as to the formulating of "a ritual to be used as a text book, containing religious instructions that would not be objectionable to any sect."

• JUST ISSUED!

CONTAINING

- 60 New Hymns,
- 50 New Songs,
- 40 Old Favorites,
- 10 National Songs.

Songs of Freedom

* *
A PATRIOTIC COLLECTION

BY F. E. BELDEN.

THE ORIGINAL SONGS were written by DANKS, BUTTERFIELD, BARNES, EMERSON, HERBERT, HAKES, TOWNE, RUSSELL, OGDEN, TENNEY, DAVIS, SWENEY, BELDEN, and others.

Selected Musical Compositions by HAYDN, MENDELSSOHN, VERDI, SULLIVAN, GROOS, WILHELM, MASON, CLARIBEL, etc.

THE ORIGINAL HYMNS were written by D. W. MCCOURT, REV. DWIGHT WILLIAMS, MRS. L. B. PRICE, M. B. DUFFIE, T. R. WILLIAMSON, MRS. L. D. A. STUTTLE, JOHN TALMAN, FANNIE BOLTON, EMMA L. PARDON, ALBION F. BALLENGER, MARY L. LA FORGE, ELIZABETH ROSSER, J. J. ELLYSON, VICTORIA A. BUCK, R. F. COTTRELL, WM. BRICKEY, S. B. WHITNEY, F. E. BELDEN, etc.

Selected Patriotic Hymns by BRYANT, WHITTIER, DWIGHT, DRAKE, JOAQUIN MILLER, FELICIA HEMANS, THEODORE TILTON, REV. HENRY ALFORD, REV. LEONARD BACON, etc.

120 pages, embracing a large number of songs in the interests of

Religious Liberty,
Soldier's Reunions,
Independence Day,
Memorial Day,
Washington's Birthday, Etc.,

Arranged as SOLOS, DUETS, TRIOS, QUARTETS for both Male and Female Voices, CHORUSES for both Male and Mixed Voices, PATRIOTIC SONGS FOR CHILDREN, etc.

The principal object of the book is to oppose efforts tending toward a union of Church and State.

PRICES, Postpaid:

Heavy Manila Covers, cloth joints, 35 Cents.
Strong, Flexible Cloth, cloth joints, 50 Cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO., 43 Bond St., New York City.

HEALTH FOODS.

PURE CRACKERS AND BISCUITS,
and Cereal Coffee

MANUFACTURED BY THE BATTLE CREEK BAKERY COMPANY

ESTABLISHED IN 1881.

We manufacture a choice line of these goods, entirely free from lard and all adulterations, at the following prices:—

"A"	Fruit Biscuits, white flour, sweetened, per lb.	15c
"B"	" " " whole wheat flour, " " "	15c
	Fruit Crackers, not sweetened, " " "	15c
	Lemon Cream Biscuits, " " "	15c
	Graham " " " " " " "	12c
	Oat Meal " " " " " " "	12c
"A"	Graham Crackers, slightly sweetened " " "	10c
"B"	" " " not sweetened " " "	10c
"A"	Oat Meal " " slightly sweetened " " "	10c
"B"	" " " not sweetened " " "	10c
	Whole Wheat Crackers, " " "	10c
	White " " very palatable, " " "	10c
	Carbon " " " " " " "	15c
	Gluten " " " " " " "	30c
	Cereola, a prepared grain food, in bulk, " " "	10c
	Pure Gluten, " " " " " " "	40c
	Wheat " " " " " " "	20c
	Cereal Coffee, prepared from grains only, a very choice and healthful drink, in one and a half lb. packages (Once used, never again refused),	25c

These goods are put up in boxes, at the following prices:—

Fruit Biscuits, A and B, 31 lbs. per box,	\$4.00
Lemon Cream Biscuits, 26 " " "	2.60
Graham " " " " " " "	2.60
Oat Meal " " " " " " "	3.00
Any of the above Crackers, quoted at 10 cents per lb., 35 lbs. per box,	3.00
Cereola, in cases of 50 packages, one and a quarter lbs. each,	6.00
Cereal Coffee, 25 packages,	5.00

Cereola and Gluten are prepared foods, thoroughly cooked and ready for use by the addition of some fluid, as milk and cream, fruit juice or water, as best agrees with the individual.

Cereola is a universal Health Food, and is calculated for use both in sickness and health. It is the same as formerly advertised under the name Granola.

Goods, to the value of eight dollars, will be sent on the receipt of six dollars, being 25 per cent. discount.

In ordering, please remember that the rate of freight on 25 lbs. will be the same as on 100 lbs.

Remit by Bank Draft, Money Order, Express Order, or Postal Note. No private checks accepted.

Write us for special rates on large lots.

REFERENCES.

To whom it may concern:

We the undersigned, residents of Battle Creek, Mich., take pleasure in stating that Mr. Joseph Smith, manager of the Health Food Department of the Battle Creek Bakery Co., has resided in Battle Creek for nearly 20 years, and is a competent and responsible man, and of long experience in his line of business, and one whose goods we can heartily recommend to the public.

- URIAH SMITH, Editor *Review and Herald*.
- HON. W. C. GAGE, Ex-Mayor.
- J. B. KRUG, of Krug's Business College.
- THOMAS H. BRIGGS, M. D.
- HON. GEORGE WILLARD, Pub. Journal.
- S. S. FRENCH, M. D.
- R. T. KINGMAN, Vice-President City Bank.
- M. RORABACHER, M. D.
- HON. W. H. MASON, postmaster.
- HON. J. W. BAILEY, Ex-Mayor.
- T. E. SANDS, M. D.

Address, BATTLE CREEK BAKERY CO., Battle Creek, Mich.

SACRED CHRONOLOGY.

BY SYLVESTER BLISS.

This work treats of the Elements of Chronology, the different systems, and the various eras, and gives the chronology of the principal events recorded in sacred history from the creation, till the death of St. John. It also contains a vindication of the numbers of the Hebrew Scriptures. As an aid to investigation it is invaluable. The book has been thoroughly revised, and an entire chapter added, on the

PEOPLING OF THE EARTH.

This chapter is an exposition of the tenth chapter of Genesis, and gives an outline of the beginning of history and

THE ORIGIN OF NATIONS.

No student of history can well be without this book. 300 pages, cloth binding, with side stamp, \$1.00.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY.

12th & Castro Streets,
OAKLAND, CAL.

43 Bond Street,
NEW YORK.

SMITH'S
COMPREHENSIVE DICTIONARY

OF THE BIBLE

WITH MANY IMPORTANT ADDITIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS.

Designed to be a complete guide in regard to the pronunciation and signification of Scriptural names;

THE SOLUTION OF DIFFICULTIES

respecting the interpretation, authority, and harmony of the Old and New Testaments; the history and description of Biblical customs, events, places, persons, animals, plants, minerals, and other things concerning which information is needed by an intelligent and thorough student of the Holy Scriptures, and of the books of the Apocrypha. Over 1,200 royal 8vo. pages. Cloth, \$5.00; library, \$6.00

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
12TH & CASTRO STREETS, OAKLAND, CAL. | 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.



NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 15, 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 *Youth's Companion* thinks in order to keep the school out of politics, "the only possible rule is to make the school a place of instruction in the fundamentals of knowledge, in morality, and in religion so far as all are agreed. Schools so constituted and no others, should be supported by the public taxes."

A fine conception, truly, of what a public school should be. But where can the religion be found upon which "all are agreed?" Has anybody ever discovered such a religion? and if anybody were to discover it would it be worth teaching to anybody in any place?

MANY regard liberty of conscience as one thing and liberty to practice according to the dictates of conscience as quite another thing. But there is and can be no liberty of conscience without liberty of action. The Constitutions of most of the States of the Union contain some guarantee of liberty of conscience. The Constitution of Tennessee, for instance, provides "that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience." This would seem to be ample provision, and yet the courts of Tennessee have so far ignored it as to practically nullify it by making it guarantee only the right to believe and practice the tenets of one's sect, without the right to disregard laws made in aid of other sects. But this is a vital point; the conscientious Christian can not practice that which he does not believe.

Two centuries ago the law of Plymouth Colony, Massachusetts, required all parents to have their children baptized. There was certainly in itself no moral wrong in putting a few drops of water on the head of an infant; and it could do the child no harm. But the Baptists refused obedience to the law because they could not conscientiously do that which the law required. They did not so understand baptism, and in their view to sprinkle infants and call it baptism, or to do it as a religious ceremony, or to acknowledge faith in it by doing it, when they had no such faith, would have been wicked. They therefore suffered fines, imprisonment, banishment, and even death rather than yield their consciences into the keeping of

the State. And who will say that they did not do right? Who does not honor them for their fidelity to principle, and to God? Not one; all honor those faithful men as champions of soul-liberty. Yet, according to judicial decisions even the seemingly ample guarantee of liberty of conscience in the Constitution of Tennessee does not leave the dissenter from the prevailing religion free to disregard laws made in aid of the religion of other sects. And so in that State, as in some other States, the observers of the seventh day, though permitted to observe that day, are required to keep Sunday also, an institution which they look upon just as the Baptists did upon infant baptism. How much then is Tennessee in advance of Massachusetts two centuries ago?

THE revivalist Mills recently visited San Francisco, and drew such crowds that no hall or other public building in the city could accommodate them. The *Examiner* of that city, in its issue of August 20, said:—

Business will be practically suspended in this city to-day, for the men of trade have agreed to close their stores that they and their clerks may listen to the message that Mills, the revivalist, brings. . . . Here is a man free from what are called "sensational methods" who can find no hall large enough for his audiences, and can call the men of the world from their avocations to hear him. He does not have to complain of the counter attractions of the ball game, the picnic and the Sunday newspaper. He has learned the secret of interesting the world in his message, and the world is willing to take time from its own devices to listen to him.

Is not this an unkind thrust at those ministers who want everything else closed on Sunday in order that their churches may be filled?

INSTEAD of entering a vigorous and manly protest against the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists, a Baptist paper in this city, enters upon a labored defense of Sunday laws, and incidentally remarks:—

If there are any whose consciences oblige them to rest from labor on some other day, they may be relieved from the hardship of a double Sabbath by being permitted to pursue their ordinary callings on Sunday—only so as not to disturb others in the enjoyment of their day of rest.

But what would constitute a disturbance of others? Some people are very much "disturbed" by the mere knowledge that their neighbors rest on the seventh day while they work, and work on the first day while they rest. And in at least one State this annoyance has been held by the courts to amount to a public nuisance, and Christian men have been imprisoned as common criminals under this legal fiction. Such a permission as our Baptist contemporary proposes may mean something or nothing according to the whim of the courts.

BUT why should observers of the sev-

enth day, or of any day other than Sunday be permitted to work on Sunday only provided they disturb no one any more than observers of Sunday should be permitted to work on Saturday only provided they disturb no one? Why should any more protection be thrown around the Sunday keeper than around the man who keeps another day? And if in order for one to rest all must rest at the same time, and if it is right and just to require the seventh day observer to rest on Sunday so that he shall not disturb the Sunday keeper, why should not the Sunday keeper be required to rest on Saturday so that he shall not disturb those who observe the seventh day?

BUT those who keep the seventh day ask no laws requiring others to keep it also. They are not disturbed because others are at work while they are resting. They simply ask to be let alone in the enjoyment of their natural right to work when they please and to rest when they feel tired or when their sense of duty to God moves them to rest. They ask no special legislation in their behalf, and they insist that there should be none in the interests of other religionists.

An Issue of Special Value.

THE next number of THE SENTINEL, No. 37, date of September 22, will be one of special value, particularly for new readers, and for those who have not kept themselves thoroughly posted on the working of the National Reform leaven in our national Government.

Every reader of THE SENTINEL ought to order several extra copies of this number for distribution among his friends. This issue ought to reach one hundred thousand copies, and it will if the friends of the paper do their duty in circulating it.

Extra copies of No. 37 will be furnished at one dollar per hundred or eight dollars per thousand. Send in your orders at once that we may know how many to have printed.

Papers Wanted.

FRANK JEFFERS, of Lemoore, Tulare County, Cal., writes that he has good use for back numbers of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, and asks that those who have such to spare send them to him, post paid, at the above address.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL,

A WEEKLY PAPER

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore 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 less than 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.