



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

VOLUME 8.

NEW YORK, APRIL 13, 1893.

NUMBER 15.

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, { CALVIN P. BOLLMAN.
WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

THE chairman of the General Committee on Religious Congresses of the World's first Parliament of Religions has given for publication a general programme of the sessions of the parliament, which continue from Monday, September 11 to Wednesday, September 27. The influence which this assemblage of religionists will have on the formation and advancement of a generally accepted religious formality throughout the world, will make the convening of this parliament one of the marked events in the world's history.

THE first day is to be set apart for addresses of welcome and fraternal fellowship. The subject for the second day is "God," in history, in the theistic teachings of the various historic faiths, in modern science and modern theistic thought,—with a presentation of the doctrines and history of the Catholic Church.

The third day the subject is to be "Man,"—his nature, dignity, imperfection, place in the universe, nature of life, spirituality, immortality and perfectibility;—various views of future life, human brotherhood, relations and duties to God. In the morning, afternoon, and evening, respectively, the Christian Church (Church of the Disciples), the New Jerusalem Church, and the Jewish Church, are to present their doctrines and history.

THE Hebrews have accepted an opportunity to be heard in the Congress with satisfaction and have organized their committees of preparation already. In the report of a meeting of prominent Hebrews, from all over the United States, called at Chicago to arrange and perfect plans, it is said:—

An appeal will be sent out stating that since the existence of their religion, no such opportunity has ever been extended to the Hebrew to set himself right before the world, and that the time is

opportune to correct many grievous misconceptions regarding Judaism. A committee was appointed to name the speakers and the subjects for discussion.

These subjects have not yet been published. It would be a dramatic incident, indeed, if some Rabbi, full of the beauties, glories, and terrors, of Sinaitic lore would give an exposition of the fourth commandment.

THE subject for the fourth day is "Religion Essentially Characteristic of Humanity," as shown by, and in the essential expression of the relations between God and man,—the supreme end and office of religion,—religion and religious worship represented by various faiths,—religion as distinguished from moral life,—spiritual forces in human progress, and certainties in religion. The United Brethren Church presents its history and doctrine in the morning and the Reformed Episcopal in the afternoon.

The fifth day is to be occupied with the consideration of "Systems of Religion,"—importance of the serious study of all systems of religion,—rules and conditions of such a study,—history and present state of the study,—dead religions and what they have bequeathed,—to what degree has each religion justified the God of all the earth in the historic evolutions of the race,—the vital, practical, deficiencies of each religion; these deficiencies to be set forth in each case by some representative of the religion discussed. In the morning of this day the doctrines of the Universalist Church are to be set forth and in the evening the Jewish Church has the time again.

THE study for the sixth day is "Sacred Books of the World,"—the sacred books as literature,—religion interpreted by the poets,—what the Jewish, Christian, and other sacred literatures have wrought for mankind,—the penitential psalms of all races a revelation of common needs. The Unitarian Church in the morning and afternoon, and once more the Jewish Church in the evening.

The seventh day of the session, Sunday, September 17, the subject is "Religion and the Family,"—the marriage bond,—education of children — the religious home,—need of a religious rest-day. In

the afternoon and evening the Presbyterian Church presents its doctrines.

From this it will be seen that the exhibit of religions is not to be closed on any day of the week, but continues without rest or cessation throughout the seventeen days. To be independent of the Sunday closing of the Fair, the meetings are all to be held in the new Art Palace on the lake front.

THE subject for the eighth day is "The Religious Leaders of Mankind," the incarnation idea,—incarnations claimed by different religions, their history and worth,—the sympathy of religions.

The ninth day, "Religion in its Relations to the Natural Sciences and to Arts and Letters,"—can the knowledge of religion be scientific?—how philosophy and the natural sciences can give aid to the science of religion,—how the science of religion gives aid to other sciences,—religion and music. The Evangelical Association presents its doctrines in the morning, the Friends Church in the afternoon, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the evening.

THE tenth day the subject will be "Religion in its Relation to Morals,"—essential oneness of ethical ideas among all men,—agnostic notions of conscience, duty and right,—relations of religion to the chastening and perfecting of human nature,—ethical systems and ethical types produced by various historic faiths,—different schemes for the restoration of fallen or faulty man,—general belief in the need of vicarious sacrifices. Morning, afternoon and evening the Protestant Episcopal Church continues the presentation of its doctrine and history.

"Religion and Social Problems" occupy the eleventh day with a discussion of religion and labor,—religion and wealth, religion and purity,—religion and temperance,—purity, the erring and criminal classes,—comparative benefits conferred upon woman by the different religions. The Reformed Church in the United States presents its doctrines in the morning and afternoon.

THE twelfth day is given to a consideration of "Religion and Civil Society,"—love of country,—observance of law,—

loyalty to institutions and rulers,—perils of great cities,—is present day religion adequate to meet the requirements and dangers of modern life?

The evening will be occupied with a presentation of the religious mission and needs of the African race; in the morning, the African Methodist Episcopal Church; in the afternoon, the Orthodox Friends.

The thirteenth day "Religion and the Love of Mankind," the fraternity of peoples,—duties of European and American nations toward China,—international justice and amity,—arbitration instead of war,—religious mission of English-speaking nations. Morning, afternoon, and evening, the Society of Christian Endeavor presents its history and work.

The fourteenth day of the session, Sunday, the 24th, "The Present Religious Condition of Christendom,"—what religion has wrought for America. In the afternoon the Society of Christian Endeavor again occupies the time, and in the evening, the Evangelical Church of North America.

The subject for the fifteenth day is "Religious Reunion of Christendom,"—its desirability, principles, obstacles, and encouragements.

In the morning the Evangelical Church of North America continues its presentation, and the afternoon is given to the Swedish Evangelical Mission Covenant in America.

On the sixteenth day the entire range of thought is brought to a focus in the consideration of "The Religious Union of the Whole Human Family,"—the world's religious debt to Asia, Europe and America,—and the points of contact and contrast between the different religions disclosed by the conference.

The Baptist Church occupies the day for the presentation of doctrine.

The subjects for consideration the seventeenth and last day sum up the whole matter, "Elements of Religion as recognized and set forth in the Different Historic Faiths,"—"Characteristics of the Ultimate Religion,"—what is the center of the coming religious unity of mankind?

Immediately following this will be the Missionary Congresses, the Congresses of the Evangelical Alliance and other religious organizations. Farther time is also to be given to denominations not assigned to the period of the parliament for the presentation of doctrine and history.

FROM a human and intellectual standpoint, the consecutive and cumulative plan of the subjects to be treated in this parliament are remarkably adapted to attain the end sought, that is a consensus of thought and opinion upon a common center for the establishment of a universal man-made religion. That which is expressed here is a philosophic religion. The coming religious unity of mankind, according to this, will be a philosophy, and not the gospel of the Son of God by whom alone there is eternal life, and through whom only we may keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

This is not true religion, but it is full of a lofty enthusiasm. It is the highest development of self-worship to which the human mind has yet attained. It is the flowering of the religio-philosophic thought of the ages. It is the realization of the dream of the Indian Emperor, when twenty centuries ago he called to-

gether the magi from all the then known world to his city of Patalipootra. In this age they will do well to emulate the free spirit of King Piyadasa who enjoined upon all in their discussions and lives to revere their own religion and abstain from reviling others. As a lineal delegate from this ancient Parliament of Religions, the Buddha Gaya-Maha-Bodhi Society of Calcutta sends its Secretary. If the mystic white-robed Buddhist represents faithfully the thought that has come down to him through the centuries it would be interesting indeed to hear his views upon "The Observance of Law" in reference to "The Need of a Religious Rest-day." Will this last Parliament of Religions remember and advocate the brotherhood of man, or only the sisterhood of religions?

W. H. M.

Ought to Be Left Free.

THE utter confusion of ideas that prevails in the minds of many relative to the teaching of the Scriptures concerning Sunday, is well illustrated by the following reference made by the Boston Sunday *Herald*, to a petition presented by the Sunday Protective League of Massachusetts to the Railroad Commission asking that the railroads of that State be restricted in the matter of Sunday trains:

Under any construction of the Mosaic law of Sunday observance, the running of trains is an offense which should not be tolerated.

It ought to be understood by everybody that there is no such thing as any "Mosaic law of Sunday observance." Sunday is a day entirely unknown to the Scriptures by that name, and is wholly unknown to the Bible except as one of the six working days. The only law for its observance is that part of the fourth commandment which says, "Six days shalt thou labor." This includes Sunday. But this is the very way in which the Sunday Protective League of Massachusetts, and every other Sunday league in the world, is determined the day shall not be observed.

But while the *Herald* does not apparently have a doubt of the application of the divine law to Sunday, it does not think it necessary, nor even wise to arbitrarily forbid work upon that day. It says:

It is eminently desirable, both upon moral and sanitary, as well as upon religious grounds, that those who are in constant active employment should be accorded a day of rest, and we imagine that corporations as well as private individuals having persons in their employ arrange, with rare exceptions, that this shall be secured. It is commonly the case that this is granted on Sunday, not only because of divine injunction, but also because of greater convenience. But a plan of allotting work as to time which would serve its purpose under the conditions as they existed some hundreds or thousands of years ago, and in sparsely settled communities, has little applicability to modern times, and to our densely populated cities.

Growing bolder, the *Herald* continues:

There is an inconsistency to many of the petitions that have been advanced having for their alleged purpose the suppression of Sunday work. Thus it is urged that Sunday newspapers should be prohibited, and yet the greater part of the work upon a Sunday newspaper is performed before 12 o'clock Saturday night, and it is the Monday newspapers, against which anathema has not been declared, that calls chiefly for work during the twenty-four hours of each Sunday. As far as we remember, the only city in this country where the people have been in any way consistent on this newspaper question is in San Francisco, where years ago, though not recently, the morning newspapers appeared every morning except Monday morning, although, curiously enough, this at the time was a city where the ordinary observance of

Sunday was as little regarded as in any municipality within our national borders.

Having unearthed one inconsistency in the matter of enforced Sunday rest, our Boston contemporary continues:

Another instance of inconsistency in these petitions is found in the fact that the defenders of a Sunday rest do not seem to have included the street car service within the scope of their condemnation. With the steam railroads there is a decided difference between the number of trains run upon week days and those run upon Sunday; in fact, on some of the roads the Sunday trains are run at embarrassingly infrequent intervals. But the street car service is substantially the same on Sundays as it is upon other days, and we dare say that on pleasant Sundays in summer the number of cars in service is greater than during the week days. To ask that these should be prohibited—and this is what consistency would require—would bring out into strong relief—we will not say the absurdity, but the impossibility of such a demand.

In view of the difficulties which surround the question of Sunday regulation, the *Herald* concludes that

the rule that should be laid down by the authorities in acting upon matters of this kind is the sensible one that all productive work, or work that may be termed incidental to production, might be rightly prohibited, and we would include also the sale and purchase of merchandise when the latter operations were not essential to the immediate welfare of society—such as the sale of food. But even this line should be drawn with broad liberality, so as not to interfere with the comfort and well-being of the people. Sunday in this way would be made to serve men as a day of rest and reasonable recreation. But while such a construction would prevent the opening of workshops and wholesale and retail stores for purposes of trade, and would also put an embargo upon the general running of freight trains on Sunday, it would prohibit the carrying of passengers either by steam or street cars.

This is not bad from the standpoint of one who believes in paternalism in government; but the *Herald*, without seeming to see its own inconsistency, proceeds to show that even this limited regulation of railroads is not necessary. It says:

This is in effect the limitation that the railroads already observe. They run no more trains on Sunday than the proper convenience of their patrons require, and the special trains which are run upon Sundays during the summer months—a service that the protestants before the railroad commissioners ask to be cut off as constituting "cheap and coarse excursions"—give in the main a pleasurable, healthy and reasonable change to many thousands of people who could not otherwise find the time to thus enjoy themselves. The railroad companies run a few trains on Sundays to distant points such as Chicago, New York, Portland and the like, but the other Sunday trains that they run are intended almost entirely for suburban travel, and afford opportunities for transportation which could not be cut off without serious detriment to all classes of our people, church-goers as well as others. We should say that if there was any fault to be found with the railroad companies with respect to their suburban train service on Sunday, it was that they did not run quite as many trains as the convenience of their patrons required, and that any change made should be in the direction of improving in this respect their facilities. There has been very little desire shown on their part to set Sunday rules at defiance, for most of the new trains that have been put on have been so placed at the earnest solicitation of those who were regularly to use them.

The argument is that there are now no more Sunday trains than there should be because there are no more than are required to meet the demands of the patrons of the roads. This amounts to about this, namely, that the people should be permitted to do as they please upon Sunday—in the matter of using steam and street cars. This is correct; but why in that more than in other matters? Why limit any legitimate business upon any day? The whole thing resolves itself into this: If Sunday is a sacred day, and if it is the duty of the State to see that it is sacredly regarded by the people, then no considerations of convenience ought to enter into the matter at all. But if no such obliga-

tion rests upon the State, then every man ought to be left free to spend the day as he sees fit. There is absolutely no reason why it should be, so far as the law is concerned, different from other days. The only reason that it is different is that it is by many regarded as a religious day; but that is a reason with which the State ought to have nothing to do. The people ought to be left just as free in the matter of Sunday observance as in all other religious practices.

C. P. B.

The Church and the World.

[The following reprint is from the *New Zealand Herald*, Auckland, New Zealand. This article is very interesting as showing a movement towards Church union and religious centralization, in advance of the great effort which is to be made for that end in the international religious council at the World's Fair.]

UNDER the above heading your correspondent of the 11th instant commends the organization of the Council of Churches in Victoria, and in high praise recommends a similar organization for New Zealand, and inquires "which of the Protestant churches in Auckland will be first to take the lead?" To all of which we wish to offer our solemn protest, and call the attention of your readers to a few of the dangers of such an organization, and to the fact that the first Protestant church that moves forward in this direction will be the first to step down from the exalted platform of Protestantism, "the Bible, and the Bible alone, and the entire freedom of the individual conscience to receive or reject its teaching," to the position of the papist, "the ministry and the ecclesiastical council."

In the Victorian Council each church is to be represented in proportion to its numbers, and the primary object of the council, it is stated, is "to review the various political measures as they are brought forward and judge them by a moral standard. If they decided that any proposed measure is morally right, the churches will support it; if not, they will oppose it with all their united strength." In other words, we have the spectacle of ministers of Jesus Christ, commissioned only to preach the word of God to the people, forming themselves into a political caucus, and instituting a religious boycott against any party or measure not in harmony with the mind of the council. Is this a proper use for the ministry to make of the influence given them by their call to the gospel ministry? Is an ecclesiastical union any better than a secular union? Is an ecclesiastical boycott any holier than any other boycott? For shame! Have the ministry forgotten the statement of Christ, that his "kingdom is not of this world;" and that, "ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them; but so shall it not be among you"? And so it is not among the ministers of Jesus Christ when they are attending to their ministry.

Persuading men, preaching the Word faithfully, accompanied by the power of the Holy Spirit,—these are the agencies, and the only agencies for good, put into the hands of the ministry of God. But in all ages, as the ministry have neglected these, have they sought for civil power, and obtained and used it, not for holy ends, but to most unholy. Men who might once have been able to have given sound counsel upon moral questions, because of

their relations to God, become hard, exacting, tyrannical agents of Satan to enforce by civil power the dogmas of their councils, and to anathematize every honest dissenter.

These councils will not stop with boycotting political movements not to their minds, which is a sufficient evil; they will legislate upon religious matters, and demand the enforcement of religious institutions by civil power, and require that offenders be properly punished; and so the Inquisition is the legitimate child of such councils, and the men who preach that "vengeance and recompense belong to God," take it upon themselves to act for God, and become very zealous for his honor in things not delegated to them. The worst, the most cruel and wicked machine this world has ever seen, is an ecclesiastical council wielding power over the civil State. The Church and the State should be kept forever separate. Both have legitimate ends, and only attain them when separate. Both are degraded by a union. The State is ordained of God in matters civil, and is to be implicitly obeyed by all citizens,—Christian or otherwise—in all matters relating to civility, the relations of man to man. But in things moral or religious it has no dominion whatever. The statement of Christ, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's," clearly separates them. The things of God are not to be rendered to Cæsar—the State, nor to God through Cæsar, but directly to God. The Bible abounds in clear distinctions of these two powers. Daniel and his fellows were definitely required by God to submit to the power of Babylon in all matters civil. Jer. 27. But the same God sustained by mighty miracles the refusal of these same persons to submit to religious requirements enforced by civil law. See Dan. 3 and 6.

In the words of your correspondent, slightly changed, we say: "It is difficult to foresee the enormous influence for evil that this council will exercise both on the Church and on the world."

Gibbon, the able historian of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, has recorded for the profit of this generation the workings of ecclesiastical councils in the earlier centuries, that we would do well just now to review.

G. B. STARR.

Church and State in Hungary.

THE contest between Church and State continues to rage in Hungary, and open war has been declared between the bishops and the government. Hitherto the Hungarian clergy have been fervent patriots, but their Magyarism has of late been set aside in favor of Vaticanism, and they are beginning to take their politics as well as religious commands from their ecclesiastical superiors. It is absolutely necessary that some order should be brought into the confusion of the marriage laws of Hungary, and the influences opposing reform will doubtless be overcome, notwithstanding that the clericals number among their supporters the leading magnates of the land. The Hungarian Government has a well disciplined majority in the lower house of the Reichstag, and this majority is determined that the existing trammels shall be swept aside, and that marriage shall be recognized as a civil contract, leaving every one free to follow his or her inclinations as to a religious ceremony.

The policy of reform is greatly strengthened by the expressed adherence of Louis Kossuth, the veteran Hungarian patriot, who, in receiving a deputation of his fellow countrymen a few days ago, declared that the ecclesiastical programme of the Hungarian Government was the key to Hungary's future, and that this programme ought to be supported unconditionally by all lovers of the country. These words from the venerable leader in the struggle for Hungarian independence, now in his 91st year, will be received like an inspiration by the large majority of his countrymen, and will fortify their resolution to carry to success the programme which Kossuth so cordially approves. In the end, no doubt, the clergy will accommodate themselves to the desires of the nation, and cease their futile opposition to the dictates of modern enlightenment.—*New York Press.*

Maintaining Orthodoxy.

IN an old volume of "Dialogues," published in London about a century ago, the Rev. John Macgowan sets out in the quaint style of the period the inconsistency of mingling civil and religious things. The author, who died in 1780, was minister of a London dissenting church. Of the difference between truth and orthodoxy, he writes as follows:

I readily grant, and none can honestly deny it, that the Scripture is the standard of truth; but truth and orthodoxy are two things very different, and sometimes diametrically opposite to one another. Bible doctrine is the same in all ages and nations, but orthodoxy in one nation differs, at least, as much from orthodoxy in another nation, as the several climates do from one another. To go no farther than Britain, you see what is south of the Tweed accounted the purest religion in the world, is, upon traveling farther towards the pole, deemed corrupt, superstitious, and antichristian. So it is vice versa. Moreover, what has been orthodox and apostolic in one age, has had the misfortune to become quite heterodox and damnable in the next; so that there is no certain standard of orthodoxy in any nation, but truth is always the same and knows no standard but one.

Again, in answer to the question, "Has any sect besides the papists been found to persecute those who differed from them?" he says:

Yes, every sect who has, at any time, been happy enough to grasp the reins of government for the time being. The worthy papists bore the hell of orthodoxy for the space of twelve hundred and sixty years, during which time much blood was shed by open massacres, secret assassinations, pretended judicaries, acts of bloody faith; and at last to finish the bloody reign of antichrist, England, France, the Netherlands, and the valleys of Piedmont swam with the gore of such who would believe the Bible sooner than the voice of the priests. Queen Mary's reign furnished the orthodox in her day, with a fine opportunity of discovering their zeal for the church, by murdering those who believed and obeyed the Bible; but her reign being short, and Elizabeth ascending the throne upon her demise, the other scale rose uppermost, and the Protestants, in their turn, became orthodox, i. e. got the government into their hands.

O, the violence of reputed orthodoxy! Those same gentlemen were no sooner emerged from prison than they also let the world know that they were not to be differed from with impunity; that the formula of their faith and worship must be regarded with as implicit obedience as that in the former reign imposed by the papists. Now the Presbyterians, Independents, and other Congregationalists felt the weight of their rage, or, if you please, zeal for orthodoxy and the good of the Church. Now the prison-keepers and their friend, Master Ketch, had pretty near as good a run of trade as in the reign of Mary. And now the wilds of America began to be well peopled with English Protestants who oppressed dissenters; and the good Episcopalians at home, kept the fleece to themselves and had all the good of the Church before them. But those said Presbyterians and Independents had no sooner crossed the ocean for conscience' sake, and found themselves secure from

Episcopalian rage, than they themselves commenced orthodox, and set up their own formula as the standard of religion, to which they required as implicit submission from others as the good bishops of England had ere while done for themselves; and now the poor antipedo-Baptists and Quakers were taught, that a *mittimus* is a *mittimus* whether it is signed by a papist, an Episcopalian or a Presbyterian, and that sentence of death is to be dreaded as much from the mouth of the latter as of the former. Those same dissenters who had so lately found Old England too hot for themselves, by the glowings of priestly zeal for orthodoxy, soon made New England too hot for the poor Quakers and antipedo-Baptists; who, to escape the rage for presbytery, fled, the one to Pennsylvania and the other to Rhode Island, that they might not be compelled to worship God according to other people's consciences and contrary to their own.

Another century has gone, and we see unmistakable indications that many of the children of those who fled from the Puritan persecutors of New England have now fallen away from the principles which their fathers championed, and are joining those who are working in the old way for present-day "orthodoxy." Of such as these, Edmund Burke once uttered, in the House of Commons, the scathing words:—

It is not the proud prelate thundering in his commission court, but a pack of manumitted slaves with the lash of the beadle flagrant on their backs, and their legs still galled with their fetters, that would drive their brethren into that prison house from which they have just been permitted to escape.

So the old order of things goes on and on, because the great majority of men choose to remain the slaves of human nature, rather than to lay hold of that new life, the fruit of which is "love, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith."

W. A. SPICER.

Their Side Well Stated.

[The following letter was first sent to the *Post-Intelligencer*, of Paris, Tenn., where the late arrests and trials of Seventh-day Adventists for Sunday work have taken place. The letter is written by a member of the church at Springville which has sustained the persecution. It is a fair and earnest statement of their case;—refused admission into their own county paper, it is given space here.]

To the Editor of the *Post-Intelligencer*:

As a consequence of the trials of the Seventh-day Adventists in the last term of the Circuit Court, considerable interest has been awakened in the public mind, much more it seems than by any previous trials of similar nature. One evidence of this fact is to be seen in the interest that our county paper is taking in the matter.

Not only is the public mind in our county being aroused in regard to the Sabbath question, but throughout the United States compulsory Sunday observance is receiving much attention by the friends of that day; and also those who oppose the enforcement of Sunday-keeping by the civil law are not silent.

But there are some facts connected with the indictment and prosecution of our people that are worthy of very careful thought. When a class of people or a person is misrepresented, as a natural result human nature demands a defense; such is the case in this matter. Now, that we are misrepresented (though possibly unintentionally), by those who might be regarded as our enemies, is apparent to any one who knows anything about the true character and principles of Seventh-day Adventists. We have no spirit of animosity toward those who would place wrong estimations upon our character and organizations; but please permit a

few reasonable facts to be presented. We have rights and it becomes us to assert them when invaded. The constitution of Tennessee, Art. 1, under the title of "Bill of Rights," declares thus:—

Section 3. All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience. . . . That no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience, and that no preference shall be given to any religious establishment or mode of worship.

As we contemplate this provision of the fundamental law of Tennessee, we can but admire the correct principles of justice it contains. A more profound and explicit guarantee of religious liberty could not have been framed by any legislative body. What kind of liberty is here brought to view? Is it sectarian liberty only? Why no! It guarantees every man perfect liberty of conscience and denies the right of human authority to interfere with that liberty. Now, if this plain declaration was thoroughly inculcated upon the minds of all the people of our country, intolerance and bigotry would forever be smitten out of existence. This was the mind of the framers of both our State and national constitutions. Now, Mr. Editor, and readers of the *Intelligencer*, when a few conscientious Seventh-day Adventists down here in the twenty-fourth district, who observe and keep holy the seventh day of the week, and quietly go about their vocations on Sunday, are indicted by the Grand Jury, tried, fined, imprisoned and worked in the chain-gang, is it not plain that the constitution has been overridden? We are conscientious in our practice and in our belief, and while we submit to any penalty inflicted upon us because we do not meet the requirements of the Sunday law, we deny being a lawless set of people. Under the constitution we are strictly obedient.

The public was informed in the *Post-Intelligencer*, of February 17, that the National Religious Liberty Association is seeking to abolish all legislation having for its object the protection of the morals of the people; and to destroy the sanctity of the Sunday Sabbath. We, (the members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church at Springville), compose a part of this organization, and are quite well acquainted with the principles taught by it. The former accusation we deny; for the latter, it would be impossible, for there is no more sanctity about Sunday than there is about any other day. And that this association is backed by infidels, haters of God and morality, and that it tends in the least degree to anarchism (as we are told by the *Intelligencer*) is absolutely a misrepresentation.

Every man has a right to keep Sunday if he chooses, but we deny the right of any one to compel us to keep it, for it is the duty of the Government to protect all, and coerce none in such matters. We ask our honorable critics if it invades their rights to protect ours? Certainly not; no one has ever testified to that.

And again we ask, where do you get your authority for Sunday-keeping? Is it from the word of God? We are unable to find it there if it is. Then we are forced to the conclusion that it is a man-made institution. And we claim a constitutional and a divine right to dissent from it if we choose. If it were a divine institution, would Divinity need the assistance of an earthly court in order that it might be kept holy? Can the civil power make a person keep a day in the

way that the Lord commanded? The answer is bound to be in the negative. Even though the civil power could compel a man to refrain from work on that day, it could not make him keep it holy.

But it is urged by some that so far as the law is concerned Sunday is a civil institution. Is it not, however, a foolish and unheard of thing to insist that any one should be compelled to keep a civil holiday? The general trend of the arguments presented to the public vindicating the observance of Sunday, and compulsory observance at that, are based on the idea that Sunday is a sacred institution. If this be true what right has any civil authority to meddle with it? Those things that are solely between the individual and God as this Sabbath question is, are beyond the jurisdiction of civil government.

In the *Intelligencer* of February 10, we find these words: "There is certainly no disposition on the part of our citizens to persecute the Adventists. All we want is obedience to the law." At the first thought this might seem like a very reasonable statement. Suffice it to say that had the law never been disregarded, no class of people on earth would have ever suffered persecution. This was all that was demanded during the Dark Ages. This is all that was demanded in New England when the Quakers and Baptists were persecuted. Even when Jesus Christ himself was persecuted to death, the plea of the Jews was, "We have a law and by our law he ought to die." John 19:7.

We read further in the same article in the *Intelligencer*: "If the law is wrong, direct your efforts to its repeal. Until this is done, it is the duty of every good citizen to obey." Then, according to this statement, the early Christians instead of promulgating the religion of Jesus Christ, should have been working for the repeal of the laws which conflicted with their religious belief; and until they succeeded, it was their duty to obey. Any one can see the fallacy of such arguments as these to sustain Sunday laws. Now, friends, if there is any authority in the Bible for Sunday sacredness, we would be glad to see it; and if you will show it to us we will appreciate it and promise you that we will repudiate our system of rest and devotion and beg pardon for disregarding the Sunday law, and will return and keep Sunday.

T. E. WARD.
Springville, Tenn.

The W. C. T. U. and the Sunday Laws.

THE agitation of the Sunday laws before the Pennsylvania legislature is bearing fruit already in that State, as is shown by this special correspondence of the *Pittsburg Leader*:

The quiet and staid borough of New Brighton is to have an infliction of the Blue Laws. Since the action of the court in refusing to grant a number of coveted licenses, there has been considerable dissatisfaction. The work is to be pushed by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and there promises to be a wailing and gnashing of teeth. A reporter called upon Mrs. Taggart, superintendent of that organization in the north ward. Mrs. Taggart is an elderly lady, intellectual, of prepossessing appearance, and has the air of being thoroughly in earnest in whatever work she takes up. When asked if it was true that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union intended to stop the illegal sale of merchandise on Sunday, the reply came, with emphasis on each word: "We intend to do all that we can." When asked, "Has any action yet been taken," she replied, "No action has been taken by the organization of which I am superintendent. There is another organization in

town known as the New Brighton Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and I am unable to say what action has been taken by its members. I am a teacher of a Sunday-school class in the Presbyterian Church, and my children tell me that they can buy all the candy they want on Sunday afternoons at the restaurants. I told them that it was a violation of the law and the constables must enforce the law, but they replied the constables buy too, so they consider themselves secure from that source. But we will compel them to enforce the law."

When asked if the Sunday newspapers would be included in the list of illegal acts she replied: "Certainly. We propose to enforce the whole law." She further explained that no arrests would be made until notices had been served to merchants to cease their illegal proceedings. Mrs. Thomas McKinney, superintendent of both the county and New Brighton organizations, and president of the Committee on Sabbath observance, was then seen. She stated that it was the intention of the organization to proceed with the work as soon as fully equipped for it. She said that the only action yet taken was a discussion among the members and a sending for copies of the law to be enforced. When these arrived copies would be sent to the keepers of restaurants and notice served that they must be observed. She said that they must be fully informed before acting so that no mistakes would be made. The copies of these laws were sent for some time ago and action is expected immediately. Mrs. McKinney was very emphatic in her condemnation of the Sunday paper but hoped that it would not be necessary for the local organization to act on that matter. Mrs. McKinney was a delegate to the Sabbath Observance Convention which met at Harrisburg recently, and praised Governor Pattison highly for his action.

This "earnest" and "intellectual" Sunday-school teacher certainly gave an exhibition of much zeal and force in the management of her pupils, but is it a zeal well directed, and force properly applied, to threaten a class of children with the constable and the court for the infraction of a supposed moral precept?

Opposed to the Gospel.

WHEN there is legislation in regard to matters of religion, there must of necessity be the use of force, for a law without a penalty is no law at all. Now, legislation upon matters of religion is sinful, not only because force is utterly foreign to the spirit of the gospel, but because it tends directly to lower the standard of religion.

Thus: When men are brought to think that the State has a right to legislate upon matters of religion; to enforce its observance, and to punish for acts of disobedience, then religion is brought down to a merely human level. The State then teaches that there is nothing more to religion than it can enforce. But it can not read a man's heart, and therefore the idea is spread that religion consists merely in outward forms. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14:23. Now there is no power either on earth or in heaven that can compel a man to believe. Faith works by love; but that which is of force is not of love; therefore that which is not of love is sin. And therefore that service which is forced is sin. So then, when Government enacts and enforces laws pertaining to matters of religion it is simply using its power to compel people to sin. Religious legislation is therefore directly opposed to the gospel.

The Apostle Paul writes of those in the last days who have "a form of godliiness, but deny the power thereof." 2 Tim. 3:5. The gospel is the power of God. But when professed Christians appeal to the Government to enforce certain things which are wholly religious; when ministers plead for Sunday laws, so that they can have "fair play one day

in the week," they thereby admit that the gospel which they preach has not the power of God. The form is there, but by their appeal to human power they deny the power of God: for no one who is conscious of the power of God to back his message, and who knows in his own person what that power is, would insult God by asking for human power to supplement the power of God.

Again: we have read that there is one lawgiver and one judge, namely, God, and that whosoever judges another is really sitting in judgment on the law, and judging the law. But religious legislation calls for human judgment upon the law of God. For men to incorporate the laws of God into human codes, is to usurp the place of God as lawgiver, and therefore his place as judge. But this is the characteristic of "the man of sin." It is the acme of apostasy, for the apostle said that the apostasy that was working in his day would culminate in the man of sin, "the son of perdition, he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God." 2 Thess. 2:4, 5. This man of sin is the same as the "little horn" of the fourth beast of Daniel's prophecy, which is thus described: "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws." Dan 7:25.

The Roman Catholic Church is the result of the attempt to build up Christianity by means of the State. Religious legislation asked for and received by the church, made the Papacy. Therefore whenever any men, professed Protestants though they be, ask for legislation in behalf of religion, no matter to what degree, they are simply following the steps of the Papacy.

Nay, they are doing more than simply following in the steps of the Papacy; they are joining it, and becoming a part of it; because religious legislation is the very essence of the Papacy. And this is still further emphasized by the fact that it was legislation upon the Sunday that made the Roman Catholic Church. It is that which is the Catholic Church's boast, as showing its power. In "Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day," from the French of Mgr. Segur, we find the following:

It is worth while to remember that this observance of the Sabbath,—in which, after all, the only Protestant worship consists—not only has no foundation in the Bible, but it is in flagrant contradiction with its letter, which commands rest on the Sabbath, which is Saturday. It was the Catholic Church which, by the authority of Jesus Christ, has transferred this rest to the Sunday in remembrance of the resurrection of our Lord. Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants, is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the church.

Any amount of history might be quoted, if we had space, to show that the adoption of Sunday instead of the seventh day as the Sabbath, is the distinguishing mark of the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore when professed Protestants not only follow the practice personally, but fall into line and enforce its observance by law, they are identifying themselves with the Papacy.

And now read the warning against doing such a thing, and against in any way recognizing such laws when they are made. He who will read the whole of the fourteenth chapter of Revelation will

see that it deals with the time reaching down to the coming of the Lord. It presents the last proclamation of the gospel in these words:—

And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come; and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters. And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication. And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Rev. 14: 6-12.

This warning against the worship of the beast, or of his image, which is the union of any professed Protestants with the civil power, is the proclamation of the gospel, because as we have shown, religious legislation is the deadly enemy of the gospel. It is the denial of Christ as the power of God. It is the denial of God as the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and as the Creator, by that same power, of men in Christ to do his will. Therefore wherever there is any movement towards getting the State to help the Church along in its work, the voices of all who would have the gospel of Christ preserved in its purity must be raised in protest and warning. This is the message for these days. It is to present Christ as the power of God, and the righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ as the only righteousness which will cover men from the wrath of God. Who will heed it, and say, "In the Lord have I righteousness and strength." "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory"?

E. J. WAGGONER.

Traitorous Legislation.

THERE seems to be a widespread feeling among the toiling millions of this country that they have been cheated out of the opportunity for them to visit, on the only day available for most of the industrial classes, the most stupendous and magnificent exposition of the wonders of human genius that have ever been collected in the history of the world. . . . There is absolutely no valid reason for such a measure of tyranny. Every Christian scholar and every well-posted layman knows that Sunday is not any more holy than Monday; they know that it was established as a day of rest to meet the requirements of fashion; they know that there is no command to keep it holier than any other day in the Bible; they know that all that refers to the Sabbath in the Scriptures refers to Saturday. . . . But the most frightful thing about the matter is, that the Sunday-closing law for the World's Fair, practically inaugurates a fusion of Church and State in this country.

There is no reason now, taking that legislative enactment as a precedent, why the Government should not pass laws making it a misdemeanor to neglect church service; or to make it a crime to be a freethinker.

But the most painful thing of all is the

enormous multitude of fresh enemies these sectarian bigots have made for Christianity in general. They have set the hearts of millions of working people dead against religion as it is managed by the churches. It has not made them less religious but less tolerant of professional religionists. They see the hand of the tyrant peeping from beneath the sacred robe, and they are fleeing from it from one end of the land to the other.—*The Jury.*

A Commissioner's Letter.

THIS communication as to Sunday closing of the World's Fair is published in the "Pearl of Days" column of the *Mail and Express*:

Washington, D. C., March 29, 1893.

To the General Secretary American Sabbath Union, No. 203 Broadway, New York City:

My Dear Sir:—I have received the circular letter, of yourself and other gentlemen, of March 23, with reference to the Sabbath opening of the World's Fair. I am opposed to such opening. Aside from the general lowering of the sentiment of the entire country, and aside from the many and injurious influences upon the people permanently and temporarily assembled in Chicago during the Fair, it has seemed to me that, within the radius of a day's journey from Chicago, the character of the day and its accompanying morality would be disastrously disturbed.

In every city, town or village from which, by rail or boat, the people could reach Chicago and return home in a day, every character of business would necessarily be opened. It would be quite impossible to move such great masses of people on the Sabbath day, in all that radius of country, without feeding and moving them, and otherwise caring for their physical wants in all the usual ways. That would result in keeping open every restaurant, and every character of business, and probably of amusements, in running every character of vehicle, etc. It has seemed to me that the idea of the American Sabbath would receive a blow from which it would never recover.

I do not, however, understand how the local directory can claim exemption under the late appropriation of Congress. In the first place it is a gift and not a contract. In the second place, if it were a contract, it would be necessary for the local directory to come into court with clean hands before they could ask for relief. They have received all of the two and a half million souvenir coin appropriation except the \$570,880 held back as security for awards. So long as they retain that money it does not lie with them to repudiate any obligations, because the congressional condition attaches to one dollar of the appropriation quite as much as to any other dollar.

Yours truly,

A. T. BRITTON.

National Commissioner of the World's Columbian Commission for District of Columbia.

This, Dr. Knowles hopes and believes to be the sentiment of the majority of those having control of the question in the interest of the Exposition.

To Boycott Anyway.

THE St. Louis *Globe Democrat* has these paragraphs from Terre Haute, Indiana:

The Rev. R. V. Hunter, of the Central Presbyterian Church of this city, who represented the American Sabbath Union and the Young People's Society for Christian Endeavor before the committee of Congress in opposition to the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday, says it has been fully determined to test the legality of the action which the directory is reported to be in favor of taking.

The sentiment of opposition, he says, is as strong now as ever it was. He believes that from a financial standpoint the Fair management would be unwise in having an open Fair, even if they could do so legally. He has been in correspondence with the editors of thirty religious newspapers, and without exception they are not only opposed to open gates on Sunday, but believe Christian people should refrain from visiting the Fair at any time if the gates are open. Several of these editors are squeamish on the boycott phase, but express their intention to advise their readers of their own views on the subject. Mr. Hunter says the boycott idea

is repulsive to him, but that the action of Christian people in this direction does not come under the description of a boycott. It would be no more a boycott than is observed by Christian people who conscientiously refrain from going to saloons or gambling houses. He is of the belief that should it be decided to open the Fair an expression of opinion will be made by religious bodies that will cause a falling off in attendance more than enough to offset the receipts on the twenty-five Sundays.

He remarked that the management no longer discusses the Sunday question from the standpoint of its being an accommodation for wage earners, but that it is treated solely with reference to the debit and credit side of the ledger. His estimate is that not more than 100,000 persons will attend on each Sunday who would not pay the same admission money on other days. This would net \$1,250,000 for the twenty-five Sundays. He is confident that 1,500,000 or 2,000,000 persons who would have visited the fair not less than three days, will remain away. The minimum loss of receipts, therefore, would be \$2,250,000.

There seems to be a growing determination on the part of the Sunday-closing element to boycott the Fair in any case—whether open or closed. If it is open on Sunday they will boycott it from a mistaken idea of religious duty, if closed they will boycott because the management have been willing that Sunday opening should rule.

Who Is Deceived?

THE first week in April was observed by the adherents of the American Sabbath Union as a week of prayer for Sunday observance. The topics which were suggested for ministerial attention during this week were:

First.—That the influence of the World's Fair may be on the side of Sabbath observance, morality and righteousness.

Second.—That the tide of Sabbath desecration may be stayed.

Third.—That the value and beneficence of the Christian Sabbath may be better understood and appreciated, and pastors and people be faithful in maintaining it.

Fourth.—That the right of the great armies of employes in railroad and postal service to a Sabbath of rest may be protected.

It is noticeable that while this is intended to be in the interest of Sunday observance the term "Sunday" nowhere appears, but instead the word "Sabbath" is used, which distinctly applies to another day. It should be remembered that this is addressed to ministers who are well read and well-informed men. What a strange discrepancy for intelligent men to fall into in addressing an all-wise Deity! Who is deceived by this? Themselves, or God, or no one?

A Word of Commendation.

EDITOR SENTINEL: For some months past the writer has been a casual, and recently has become a regular, reader of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, in connection with general reading and study of history, secular and biblical, ancient and current.

Observing the present trend of legislative enactments and the lethargic indifference with which the American people allow their rights to be invaded, the demand for religious legislation which encroaches the domain of conscience and individual rights, and leads to the subversion of the very principle for which the Pilgrim Fathers contended—"freedom to worship God"—the position taken by the SENTINEL to resist this invasion, is brave and timely. The realm of conscience and individual liberty is sacred, and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, but it is threatened by

enactment of civil laws, which abridge the rights of individuals and of conscience.

The faithful SENTINEL raises the alarm and points out the danger in a style of concise, forcible statement, supported by cold, stubborn facts and advocated with such clear, logical, convincing arguments, that it is patent to the thoughtful that its position is entirely tenable.

Only a few days ago, a Catholic priest said, regarding the fitness of a candidate for a political office, who is not an orthodox believer, "It is altogether wrong for such men to be put up for office, the law ought to be changed so that such a man could not hold office." When it was suggested that a man's religious belief or non-belief should not disqualify him for the administration of civil law, the priest replied, "It is ridiculous to think of such a thing," that "a man who does not believe in a God [according to his creed, I suppose] ought not to be tolerated, much less elected to a public office." There it is, a demand for the union of Church and State, pure and simple.

Change the law, so as to require a religious qualification to hold office. What next? Establish an *inquisition* to determine who is eligible? How else could it be determined? Then what? Weed out of the public service all who might disturb its harmony, using the secular power to enforce the ecclesiastical decrees, the Church being the dominant party. The unerring pen of impartial history records on its bloodiest pages the results of such a combination. Are the citizens of this American Republic prepared for such consequences? The common public do not seem to apprehend any danger, but, on the contrary, are nursing and fondling the power that would strangle their liberties.

Speak out, brave SENTINEL! Shout louder! Some will hear and heed the warning, even though the thoughtless throng pass swiftly on in multitudes to the valley of decision. D. E. LYON.

Fast-day in Massachusetts.

THE fact that the historic legislative fast-day of Massachusetts has degenerated into a holiday, used almost entirely for games and revelry, has led to an attempt to repeal the statute, requiring the governor to set apart the day by proclamation. The presentation of the bill for repeal created not a little discussion among the clergy of the State, and considerable influence was brought to bear upon the legislature to retain the statute in reference to the observance of the day. In deference to this the legislature refused to pass the bill for repeal. The governor, accordingly, has issued a proclamation which must seem to the simonpure puritanic mind to be couched in rather singular terms. The proclamation reads:

WHEREAS, Our pious ancestors established the custom of setting apart, by public authority, a day of fasting, humiliation and prayer to God, that the whole people might thereon, in public and private, unite in such holy service and devotion to their Creator, as the day, alike in its name and purpose, suggested; and,

WHEREAS, Long continued usage now requires the annual appointment of such a day, although it has ceased to be devoted generally to the purpose of its origin, but is appropriated and used as a holiday, for purposes at variance with its origin, its name and its solemn character; and,

WHEREAS, This day is recognized in the statutes of the commonwealth and set apart as a holiday, and recent legislative action has decided that no change is to be made in regard to it; it therefore



NEW YORK, APRIL 13, 1893.

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 Sunday closing movement has evidently captured New Orleans. The *Mail and Express* publishes this editorial item:

There seems to be a tidal wave of moral reform sweeping over the entire country. A movement for the suppression of gambling and the enforcement of the law for the preservation of the Sabbath has been inaugurated in New Orleans. The citizens of that too long vice-cursed city appear to be in earnest in this matter. An association entitled the Sunday Closing and Anti-Gambling League, consisting of 450 of the most reputable citizens, have collected about \$30,000 for the purpose of prosecuting gamblers and for the maintenance of the Sabbath law. It is to be hoped that this tidal wave will increase in volume until the whole country is inundated by this moral reform movement.

It is this fusion of Sunday closing with proper reformatory measures, which has enabled it to obtain control of the popular mind, outside of the comparatively small element which blindly believes that Sunday observance should be civilly enforced, because it is thought to be in conformity with the law of God.

THE agitation for the enforcement of Sunday laws has reached Rochester in this State. Rev. Ferdinand L. Anderson, of that city, took advantage of the week of prayer for Sunday observance to preach to an audience of two thousand people on the "Enforcement of the law in Rochester," the law being the Sunday law. Notice has been given in the newspapers of Rochester that the law will be enforced. What a parody on proper civil procedure, if criminal proceedings are in progress to give due newspaper notice that they must be suspended, for on a given day investigation will be made. That such a thing should be soberly done is enough to brand with the mark of everlasting ridicule the law under which such a course is thought fit.

THE Carroll Institute, a Catholic club of Washington, D. C., has lately built and moved into a fine new club-house, with all the luxuries, conveniences, and useful adjuncts of library, gymnasium, billiard room, bowling alley, etc. Now comes a faction which wishes these privileges of the club-house closed to the members on Sunday. This club numbers nearly six hundred men of the Catholic Church, and is a notable assistant to the church, Georgetown College, and the Catholic University. The question has been referred to Cardinal Gibbons and the Presidents of Georgetown and the

Catholic Universities before presenting it for a vote of the club. There is an intense interest in the matter among the members. The students of Georgetown College are in the habit of indulging in out-door games on Sunday with the approval of their superiors, and Bishop Keane, of the Catholic University, is reported to have said that the only question was one of good policy, in view of the sentiment of a part of the people in the matter. It remains to be seen now in this exigency how an authoritative Roman Catholic position on the question of "Sunday observance" is to be avoided.

IN the International Sunday school lesson for March 5, on "Keeping the Sabbath," as published in the New York *Examiner*, the writer says: "Christians, as a rule, observe another day for rest than the Jews did. For this change there is no direct specific statement in the New Testament. Sunday is here and has to be accounted for." This is done in these words:

Some have traced to Constantine's edict the change in day. But all who are students know Constantine's character. He was ever politic rather than positive. And the early Christians were not easily turned from principle. Persecutions had been prevalent and men had died for their faith. The reasonable view is that Constantine tried to unite the Christian worship on Sunday with the heathen worship on the same day. He was not the man to revolutionize. If we had no other historical proof of the observance of Sunday before his day his edict would show its existence in its spirit of adopting existing customs. Christmas and Sunday have a common basis. Why should they not have a similar observance?

Enforced Sunday observance is very properly deprecated; he says, "Law can not enforce observance. It can and ought to protect observers."

But this acknowledgment of the derivation and claims of Sunday to sacredness is a just one. They are all based on the desire of Constantine, and those like him still earlier, to adapt their observance to the popular heathen custom which was practiced around them. The parallel as to Christmas is correct. Both are the continuation of pagan holidays. Sunday is therefore not the Sabbath, and has no claim to be so-called or observed.

CONGRESS refused to notice the flood of petitions from the labor organizations of the whole country in reference to the repeal of the legislation closing the World's Fair on Sunday. So far as the superficial showing of the petitions was concerned, as appeared in the *Congressional Record*, the contest was between the so-called orthodox churches on one side and the labor organizations on the other. Congress recognized the voice of the Church and bowed to it. No attention whatever was paid to the request of the organized workingmen. Their voice was ignored entirely. A remarkable result of this now appears in Chicago. The Central Labor Union, supported by a member of the Board of Directors of the Fair, has decided that, in case the Fair is closed on Sunday, organized labor will work on

Sunday that the six days of a week's labor may be filled, and take the Sabbath as a holiday in which to attend the Fair. This is poetic justice. Were it not upon too serious a subject for lightness and jest it would appeal irresistibly to the sense of humor of every one who comprehends the bearings of the subject. This proposition of the labor union, that if the Fair is closed on Sunday they will secede in a body from allegiance to that day as a day of religious rest, and abstain from labor on the true Sabbath, excites almost frenzied opposition from the Sunday-closing faction.

A Chicago clergyman cries out, "If the Union is in earnest let them try it. Then we will see if there is any law in this country!" This preacher should study two subjects to be presented at the Parliament of Religions—"Religion and Labor," and "Relations of religion to the chastening and perfecting of human nature,"—in connection with this he might read with profit the address of Thomas Morgan, representative of organized labor, before the World's Fair Committee of the House of Representatives at the last hearing on the Sunday closing of the Fair.

That \$1.50 Watch.

A FEW weeks ago, contrary to our usual custom, we admitted to the columns of the AMERICAN SENTINEL an advertisement for a firm in this city in which said firm offered a genuine American-made watch, warranted a good time-keeper, for the small sum of \$1.50. No sooner had the advertisement appeared than we were severely taken to task by numerous readers for advertising what they termed "an evident fraud." But the watch is not a fraud, either evident or otherwise. It is a genuine time-keeper, well worth, in our judgment, the price asked for it. This watch is somewhat larger in size than a three-ounce Waltham, being one quarter of an inch broader and also a quarter of an inch thicker than a Waltham. It has an imitation gold case. How well it will hold its color we can not say, but inasmuch as an imitation gold collar button can be purchased for five cents that will wear for months, or even years, it is not unlikely that this watch will, with care, preserve its appearance indefinitely. These watches are too large to be really neat in appearance, but no one who desires a serviceable and fairly accurate time-keeper at a very low figure is likely to be disappointed if he gets one of them. The same watch in nickel case is for sale by jewelers in this city for \$1.75. We regret that the harsh criticism of some of our readers has made this notice necessary.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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, - - - \$1.00.

In clubs of	5 to 24 copies to one address, per year,	90c.
" 25 to 99 "	" " "	80c.
" 100 to 249 "	" " "	75c.
" 250 to 499 "	" " "	70c.
" 500 to 999 "	" " "	65c.
" 1000 or more "	" " "	60c.
To foreign countries in Postal Union,		5 shillings.
Address,	AMERICAN SENTINEL,	
	48 Bond Street, New York City.	