



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

VOLUME 8.

NEW YORK, MAY 11, 1893.

NUMBER 19.

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.

FROM the beginning the real questions involved in the movement for the Sunday closing of the World's Fair have been ignored. Only a small and uninfluential minority has stated and defended the principle which applies to the matter, and attention to it has been studiously avoided by all in authority.

THE utter failure to comprehend what was at stake in this is an example of stupendous governmental folly and mental blindness, not equalled since the Jew sundertook to raise Christ to an earthly throne and then crucified him because he did not meet their mistaken expectations. The Supreme Court dictum that this is a Christian Nation, and the congressional legislation to enforce religious ceremonial, is the nineteenth century expression of the same fatal error of the temporal rule of Christ.

CHRIST'S kingdom upon earth does not come by stress of law or force of arms. That which attains religious dominion by such means is antichrist. Does not the whole world know this? Such as do not already know it, or have not had the opportunity to learn, will have the opportunity; and if they do not acknowledge it to be so it will be because they themselves are not Christ's but belong, of their own choice, to antichrist.

THAT which was of supreme importance in this crisis was the voice of the court of last resort, and the decree of the highest legislative authority. Whether the behest of these should be obeyed or not in this instance was of the very least moment, except as to the individual responsibility of those who in this acknowledge religious allegiance to the temporal power. Whether the Fair shall be opened or closed on Sunday is of the same category precisely as the Sunday opening or closing of stores,

gardens, parks, and museums to which an admission is asked, elsewhere throughout the country. Exactly the same principle applies and should govern in all these cases from the smallest to the greatest.

THE SENTINEL has said months ago that in all probability it would not be definitely known whether the Exposition was to be closed on Sundays or not until the Fair was already in progress, and that whatever the result in that regard might be, the agitation of the subject of enforced Sunday observance would not only continue but increase. This has proved to be so. Since Congress adjourned, having irrevocably committed itself to a religious precedent, no one who looked at the matter in the proper light has taken any interest in the question as to whether the Fair should in reality be open or closed on Sunday, except as being interested that the course should be taken which would most clearly show to the greatest number of citizens the legislative error which has been committed, and awaken the consciences of the greatest number to the realization of the fact that their allegiance in religious things is to God and not to the State.

THE discussion of this question, irrespective of the Sunday closing or opening of the Fair gates, and the feeling upon it, will grow more and more intense as time goes on. New phases of this and allied questions, unexpected and totally unforeseen, will develop from time to time. An instance of this has already occurred in the movement of the workingmen to rest and attend the Fair on the seventh day, and begin their week of labor on the first day according to biblical time. The expression of opinion, and prejudice, and arrogance, and ignorance, which this has called forth from many of the clergy is remarkable, suggestive, startling! What spirit inspired that Chicago clergyman, who, when told of this purpose of the Central Labor Union, said, "If the Union is in earnest let them try it. Then we will see if there is any law in this country!" How thoroughly in the white heat of prejudice engendered by this, has that false assumption of charitable interest in workingmen and their rest day been burned away. In

the fierce light of this blaze of actual feeling not even a trace is to be seen of disinterested anxiety for the defense and protection of the workingman. The dragon cannot always masquerade under the similitude of the lamb. Its voice will sometimes betray it.

THE haughty threat of this Chicago clergyman is only equalled by the arrogant exultation of another who says of the passage of this unconstitutional proviso, "Congress didn't dare to do anything else." "Congress did not dare to do otherwise than order the Fair closed." Neither is it the first time that this same thing has been said. Do congressman hear? Do congressmen read? Are they pleased to have it heralded from pulpit, and parsonage, and church steeple, that at the command of a faction they have contravened the Constitution and sold the birth-right of the Nation for a mess of pottage? When a legislative body is so thoroughly subjugated that its masters have no hesitancy in publishing the fact, without fear that the boast will militate against them and without thought for the feelings, or the reputation of those legislators upon whose necks they are treading, then the enslavement of the law-making power is as complete as it is disgraceful.

BUT workingmen do not prove as docile as congressmen. The workingman has learned from the Sunday theologians themselves the theory that no sanctity pertains to any particular day, and applying their own teaching, he says, therefore, that by their own authority no more sacredness inheres in Sunday than any other day of the six. No divine law makes it holy. If it has ever rested with man to make choice of a rest day, the right to do so resides in him as much as in any other man, or body of men, living now, or that ever did live. He will then put his right to immediate use and choose his own rest day. He knows that legislative authority may provide holidays upon which he may rest if he chooses, but he knows just as well that no human authority can properly say that on any day he shall not work any more than that on any day he shall work. He knows by virtue of his Americanism and his manhood that no man may right-

fully exercise this authority. He knows that the only Sabbath law is the divine law which says the seventh day is the Sabbath, and if he accepts the word of his pastors and masters that this is not binding, do they expect to be able to exercise greater authority over him than God, whose injunction they have taught him to despise, and by so doing have turned him over to himself and the devil? American workmen are not likely to deify any of their fellow-citizens and pay them divine honor, just yet. Therefore if not respecting the divine law which they know has never been repealed, how can they be expected to respect a human law which they know can not possibly have any divine authority and properly no human authority? And if they respect the divine law they certainly can pay no regard to the human law which is a usurper, and in contravention of the divine. This the workmen learn from the self-styled Protestant preachers, and it is reinforced to them by the words of the learned clergy of the Roman Catholic Church, who tell them "there is no command in the Bible which directs the observance of Sunday." It is Roman Catholic canon law and from that the Protestants have borrowed it. That Sunday is a Christian institution is an error,—“In the strict sense of the word it was not instituted either by Christ or his Church. It is not ordered by divine law, nor was it ordered by the Church. Constantine decreed the observance of Sunday in order to give the Christians a chance to compete with the pagans, and recognizing it as a good thing the church in her subsequent councils adopted it. At the Reformation the Protestants carried it off.” Their attempt to compel the acceptance of the Sunday dogma by recourse to law “is a grievous departure from their old battle-cry of civil and religious liberty.” Has it come to this, that Protestant America must sit at the feet of the Roman Catholic priesthood to learn not only church history, but civil and religious liberty? W. H. M.

An Historical Study on the Tendency of Modern, Liberal, Theological Thought.

In the second century of the Christian era, the world of philosophical and theological thought was already much divided and subdivided into contending sects. There were the Epicureans and the Academics, the Stoics and the Platonics, each with a different view of God, and each having a different solution for the great problem of life. Among the Jews, there were the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Essenes, and the believers in the mystic Kabbala.

Christianity, itself, so recently descended from heaven in garments of light, had already bedraggled its robe in the filth of earth. Besides those who still cling to the simple teaching of Christ and the apostles, there were the Judaizing Christians, the Nazarenes, or the Ebionites, as they were afterward called, and the Gnostics already subdivided into several sects, but all of them combining Christianity with oriental mysticism.

Then, there were a hundred different forms of pagan worship, originating in as many different nations now conquered by the overflowing armies of Rome, and all flocking to the Pantheon to find place in that temple of all the gods. Each creed and each system of philosophy asserted

itself with more or less dogmatic force, and proclaimed itself in possession of the ultimate truth.

What wonder that under such circumstances, there should arise a set of good, whole-souled, broad-minded and generous-hearted men, who, to use Mosheim's words, “disapproved of the controversial spirit, which obliged every one to swear allegiance to the dogmas of his master.” Such were the Eclectics, who did not believe that any one creed was broad enough to hold all the truth; but rather that the truth lay dispersed in scattered fragments among all the systems of belief and philosophy. As their name implies, they “professed to simply follow truth, gathering up what was accordant with it in all the philosophical schools.” “Especially they avoided altercations and a sectarian spirit.” Could all the religions of the world have come together on exhibition in some grand international congress of religions, what a magnificent opportunity for the formation of such a creed. However, in the early days, men had to do without such modern appliances, and these Eclectic philosophers seemed to succeed tolerably well, for, says Mosheim: “This philosophy was adopted by such of the learned in Alexandria, as wished to be accounted Christians, and still retain the name, the garb, and the rank of philosophers.” But even this school soon proved too narrow for these liberal thinkers; and it was soon merged into another, which for broad and comprehensive liberality, could not possibly be surpassed by the genius of a modern, even though his maw should succeed in digesting and unifying a whole international congress.

Says Mosheim: “This eclectic mode of philosophizing was exchanged near the end of this century (the second), when Ammonius Saccus, with great applause, opened a school in Alexandria, and laid the foundation of that sect which is called the ‘New Platonic.’” The same historian thus states the contrast between the two schools in a way to reveal the increased liberality of the latter. “The Eclectics held that there was a mixture of good and bad, true and false, in all systems, and therefore they selected out of all what appeared to them consonant with reason, but rejected the rest.” “But Ammonius held that all sects professed one and the same system of truth, with only a little difference in the mode of stating it, and some minute difference in their conceptions; so that by means of suitable explanations, they might, with little difficulty, be brought into one body.” And again, “The grand object of Ammonius was to bring all sects and religions into harmony.” The historian proceeds to relate how all forms of philosophy and religion—the Christian included—were combined into one system and harmonized by means of allegorical interpretations. Surely here is a breadth of good fellowship and liberality which would even now rejoice the hearts of the most enthusiastic projectors of the prospective Congress of Religions. But how wide was the influence of this philosophy back there? how fully was the experiment tried? and what was the result? Surely these are important questions. Let the historian answer. “At Alexandria, almost no other philosophy was taught from the time of Ammonius down to the sixth century.” Again, “The school of Ammonius gradually cast all others into the

back ground.” “From Egypt it spread, in a short time, over the whole Roman Empire and drew after it almost all persons inclined to attend to metaphysical studies? Origen, the disciple of Ammonius Saccus, succeeded his preceptor in the presidency of the school. He continued the same methods of allegorical interpretation, applying them especially to the sacred Scriptures, thus mixing and harmonizing (?) all forms of pagan ceremonies and pagan philosophies with the Christian religion. Thus originated the Papacy, which, as a system of religion, every student of history knows, is simply a combination of paganism with Christianity. For as Gavazzi says, “Almost all forms of paganism are now in the Roman Church.” This liberal school was the fountain head of Roman Catholicism.

Origen's method of interpreting Scripture became so universal that he is, even to-day, by Chambers and others, called the “father of biblical criticism and exegesis in Christendom.” He was the father of that *gloriously liberal* Pagan-Christian philosophy, which ripened into the Papacy. Mosheim says: “This new species of philosophy imprudently adopted by Origen and other Christians, did immense harm to Christianity.” “For it led the teachers of it to involve in philosophic obscurity many parts of our religion which are in themselves plain and easy to be understood, and to add to the precepts of the Saviour not a few things of which not a word can be found in the Scripture.” “Finally, it alienated the minds of many, in the following centuries, from Christianity itself, and produced a heterogeneous species of religion, consisting of Christian and Platonic principles combined.” “And who is able to enumerate all the evils and injurious effects which arose from this new philosophy; or, if you please, from [this syncretismus] this attempt to reconcile true and false religions with each other.”

The most wonderful fact of all is, that just while those liberal philosophic Christians were decrying “all sectarianism,” and repudiating “the controversial spirit,”—just while they were laying the foundations of that broadest and most liberal of all schools of philosophical religion, of that “syncretismus,” as Mosheim calls it,—just then they were laying the foundation of the Papacy that in its bigotry burned men for heresy for more than a thousand years. A new “syncretismus,” could it be brought about at the Congress of Religions, would produce the same results. If that one in the second century grew into the Papacy, this one would grow into the image to the Papacy. This growth would be as much more rapid than that, as the nineteenth century is more intense than the second. It matters not how much men may talk of liberality, nor how sincerely they may decry the sectarian and the controversial spirit; they did the same there.

The great historical fact still remains that the Church and the world have arrived at the recognition of the rights of conscience only as the multitude of contending sects have made a universal creed impossible. The only unity that can exist concomitantly, with liberty, is the divine unity, not of an external creed, but of internal truth. Nothing could be farther from this unity of truth than the tendency to a miserable compromise with error, of the New Platonists of the second

century, and the believers in the Congress of Religions, in the nineteenth. Beside this unity of truth, however, there is but one kind of unity possible. It is the papal unity—the unity of an enforced creed. The history of the world proves that just as the majority professing a creed becomes large, and the minority rejecting it, small, just in that proportion is the temptation to enforce it by law irresistible. Especially is this true, if the creed itself, as always happens in such cases, is a miserable compromise with error, that can not meet victoriously, on a fair field, the truth taught by the few. In other words, just as every step towards diversity of positive beliefs has been a step towards liberty, so every step toward such a unity always has been, and always will be a step toward despotism, and this notwithstanding all the fine talks about liberality and liberty.

Such is the unavoidable tendency of modern *liberal* theological thought. The final outcome of it all will be, as before, a creed so *liberal* as to call itself Catholic or universal, and still so bigoted as to persecute, with merciless severity, all dissenters.

In such strange antitheses does the world move. The serio-comic picture which the Emperor Hadrian gave of the immediate result in Alexandria, may well make us pause and think here, for the same, or a like result, would surely follow. Says he: "Those who worship Serapis are Christians, and those who call themselves bishops of Christ are worshippers of Serapis. There is no ruler of a synagogue, no Samaritan, no presbyter of the Christians, who is not an astrologer and a soothsayer. The patriarch of the Jews himself, when he comes to Egypt, is forced by one party to worship Serapis, by the other, Christ. They have but one god, who is none. Him Christians, Jews, and all races worship alike."

G. E. FIFIELD.

Sunday Measures in California.

THAT California has had no Sunday law has long been the wailing cry of the National Reformers and kindred spirits, in this Sunday law agitation. And while it can not yet be said that that State has an out and out Sunday law now, yet it is so very near akin to it that it is equivalent to the same thing. During the last session of their legislature the following act was passed:—

An act to provide for a day of rest from labor.

Approved Feb. 27, 1893.

The people of the State of California, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Every person employed in any occupation of labor shall be entitled to one day's rest therefrom in seven; and it shall be unlawful for any employer of labor to cause his employes, or any of them, to work more than six days in seven; *provided, however,* that the provisions of this section shall not apply to any case of emergency.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act, the term day's rest shall mean and apply to all cases, whether the employe is engaged by the day, week, month, or year, and whether the work performed is done in the day or night time.

SEC. 3. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect and be in force thirty days from and after its passage.

When the foregoing act was introduced a number of the papers said it would not amount to anything; others that were a little more sagacious said that it was only the first step in the direction of a stringent Sunday law. But since the

foregoing was passed and approved, several succeeding steps have been taken. The following amendment to the "Civil Code" of California was passed and approved March 23:—

An Act to amend section seven of the Civil Code of the State of California, relating to legal holidays and non-judicial days.

The People of the State of California, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section seven of the Civil Code is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

7. Holidays, within the meaning of this code, are every Sunday, the first day of January, the twenty-second day of February, the thirtieth day of May, the fourth day of July, the ninth day of September, the first Monday of October, the twenty-fifth day of December, every day on which an election is held throughout the State, and every day appointed by the President of the United States or by the governor of the State for a public fast, thanksgiving or holiday. If the first day of January, the twenty-second day of February, the thirtieth day of May, the fourth day of July, the ninth day of September, or the twenty-fifth day of December shall fall upon a Sunday, the Monday following is a holiday.

The same amendment was made to the "Political Code," and also approved March 23. Not being satisfied with their efforts in the direction of Sunday laws, and evidently desiring to make a clean sweep while they were at it, they amended the "Code of Civil Procedure" by adding the paragraph last above quoted, and in addition they added another section to read as follows:—

SEC. 2. Section one hundred and thirty-four of the Code of Civil Procedure is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

134. No court shall be open, nor shall any judicial business be transacted, on Sunday, on the first day of January, on the twenty-second day of February, on the thirtieth day of May, on the fourth day of July, on the ninth day of September, on the first Monday of October, on the twenty-fifth day of December, on a day upon which an election is held throughout the State, or on a day appointed by the President of the United States, or by the governor of this State, for a public fast, thanksgiving, or holiday, except for the following purposes:

1. To give, upon their request, instructions to a jury when deliberating on their verdict.

2. To receive a verdict or discharge a jury.

3. For the exercise of the powers of a magistrate in a criminal action, or in a proceeding of a criminal nature; *provided,* that the Supreme Court and the superior courts shall always be open for the transaction of business; *and provided further,* that injunctions and writs of prohibition may be issued and served on any day.

The first measure seemed like quite a tame affair; one day's rest in seven was all that was asked for; but having secured this, they immediately set about the work of deciding which day that one day in seven should be, by placing Sunday among the holidays of the State. A great deal of work has been done in California in favor of religious freedom; and it was hoped that these Sunday laws, which are a relic of the Church and State regime of the Middle Ages, were entirely swept from their statutes. Many had the hope that California would keep itself clear in this matter; but the people of the United States should be awake to the fact that we are on the verge of a revolution backward into the ecclesiastical despotism of four or five centuries ago, when a man was allowed to think, and believe, and act only at the dictates of the representative of a hierarchy. And while some are making great boasts of our rapid advancement, and that the world is getting much better, the careful student of our times, who is acquainted with the history of the past, must see that these efforts to meddle with the rights of conscience, forecast no good. When the Sunday laws that we already have are being used by bigots

and fanatics to oppress and persecute those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week rather than Sunday, it is time for every citizen to raise a protest against enacting any more such intolerant laws.

A. O. TAIT.

The Sure Result.

ALL morals and the moral law belong to God. The ten commandments, or the moral law, seek to direct not only the actions but the thoughts of men. The moral law reveals the character of God. God only knows the heart. He alone can rule morally.

Civility and the civil law belong to man. Civil rulers should seek only to direct the actions of men in a civil manner. Civil rulers can not know the heart of man, and therefore can not rule morally, and should never seek to control conduct toward God. Hence, God says to man, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's." Both thoughts and actions stand before the Most High for judgment. But only the overt act of incivility can the civil rulers hope to control. A man can not surrender his personal rights to civil law or society. They are the basis of all civil law and inalienable. Civil law begins only when personal rights are assailed. Whenever civil rulers break over the civil boundary line, civility becomes uncivil. When civil rulers legislate upon man's duty to God, civil law becomes uncivil, and they that obey such laws and persecute under them are no longer civilians but villains in society; civil rule is broken; terror and anarchy prevail; life and property are unsafe; liberty and happiness are gone. This has always been and always will be the sure result.

Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, in his pride assumed to put himself in the place of God and command his subjects to worship an image contrary to the moral law and personal rights, and beyond his right of authority as a civil ruler. He had a perfect right to rule his people in a civil manner but when he assumed to dictate in matters of worship then his right to rule was taken away, and he driven to the beasts of the field, there to learn that God rules in morals. Again, Ahasuerus, King of Media and Persia, in his delight to honor his favorites and hearken unto their petitions, transcended his civil powers and bade his people bow, and reverence Haman, the wicked prince. The sure result followed this,—thousands of lives, liberty and happiness, were lost before the civil power was restored. Again, Darius became the ruler, and, partaking of the vacillating traits of Ahasuerus, his father, not being instructed by his faults as a civil ruler, made the same fatal blunder of dictating in matters of worship, together with the governor, princes, counselors, captains and the chief men of his kingdom, and the lions' den proved them guilty. Thus the sure result followed quickly upon civil rulers forming a confederacy upon a religious question,—a union of Church and State. Again, "The sublimest incarnation of power and a monument the mightiest of greatness built by human hands which has, upon this planet, been suffered to appear" was the Roman Empire. Proud of her conquests and exceeding jealous of her claims she sat mistress

of the world and asserted the right to rule in all things human or divine.

The idea of the State was the highest idea of ethics; and within that was included all actual realization of the highest good. Hence the development of all other good pertaining to humanity was made dependent upon this.—*Neander*.

Worship the gods in all respects according to the laws of your country and compel all others to do the same. But hate and punish those who would introduce anything whatever alien to our customs in this particular.—*Gibbon*.

This was a close union of Church and State in the Roman law. The highest idea of good to the Roman mind was to worship according to the civil law. Hate and punish those who would dare refuse. This clearly shows to us how that mighty empire brought upon the world the most gloomy period, known in history as the Dark Ages, in the which the lives of over fifty thousand martyrs declare unto us the destructive power hid away in a union of Church and State. This blood declares unto us that the civil power can not have anything to do with religion. This blood declares unto us that the Church can not govern the civil power. This blood declares unto us that the civil power is ordered of God, and when civil governments usurp the prerogative of God he gives them over to the hands of Satan for destruction. Thus the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, and the Roman Governments became self-destructive by the self-same cause, *i. e.* civil rulers putting themselves in the place of God and dictating worship. Notwithstanding all these facts of history, and the First Amendment to the Constitution pointing out the causation and forbidding a repetition in our Government, the President of these United States, instead of his veto, deliberately put his seal to a declaration of Congress saying the first day of the week is the Sabbath day, contrary to the voice of God from Mount Sinai, in thunder, saying, "*The Seventh day is the Sabbath.*" The union of Church and State is confirmed in the United States since Aug. 5, 1892. The test is upon the people. "Choose ye this day whom you will serve."

P. A. REED.

Not the Best Way.

THE *North American*, of Philadelphia, has the following paragraph:—

General Grant once said that the best way to get rid of a bad law was to rigidly enforce it. It was probably a desire to test the wisdom of that remark that prompted the State Typographical Union yesterday to endorse the old Blue Laws, affecting the publication of Sunday newspapers. The obsolete laws governing the case, and which for more than a century have been permitted to rest in "innocuous desuetude," were framed at a time when newspapers, railroads and electricity were unknown. Entirely out of harmony with the present condition of things, these so-called Sunday laws would probably never have been "resurrected" but for a band of selfish Pittsburgers born a hundred or more years too late. Now that the "crusaders" have been, in a measure, successful in harassing the newspaper publishers of Pittsburg, they will doubtless proceed on their victorious march against the directors and stockholders of the various Allegheny County horse-car lines, and with every prospect of success. Whatever their motive might have been, the self-sacrificing indorsement of the printers was for the best. If the Puritan Sabbath is to become a legal institution in Pennsylvania, let us have it at once and be done with it. Let the law making a penal offense all works on Sunday, except those of "necessity and charity," be rigidly and equally enforced, and let there be no half-way business about it either.

It may be that General Grant made the remark credited to him, but if he did he was in error. The best way to get rid of a bad law is, not to perpetuate its injus-

tice by continuing to enforce it, but to make an end to the bad law and the wrong done under it by a summary repeal. It is sometimes true, of course, that the rigid enforcement of an unjust enactment may so call attention to the hardship which it works as to secure popular attention and united effort for the abrogation of the offensive law. But in order to reach this result the law must be made offensive to a sufficient number of a certain influential class of society. On the other hand if those who suffer are but a comparative few without a noticeable voice in public affairs, their outcry against the injustice done them will be ignored and the obnoxious law be allowed to remain, rather than make the acknowledgment that the statute books are at fault and the legislature and judiciary have erred.

It is certainly true that it is not the best way to obtain the repeal of a bad law—to enforce it. Two wrongs can not make one right. The maxim, if maxim it is, is as much as to say that the sense of abstract justice and the love of right, for right's sake, has left the hearts of the people, and the only way to secure their attention to the wrongs they are doing their fellow-men is by making sure that the blows they deal shall rebound upon themselves. Perhaps this is so; but if it is it is not the first and best resort but the last and worst. No, repeal an unjust law; do not enforce it.

W. H. M.

How It Is Done.

AMONG the convention jottings in the *Christian Statesman* of Feb. 25, '93, there is recorded this suggestion:—

It is a good thing to meet our legislators face to face. . . . They are men of like passions with ourselves, influenced by hopes and fears, and would do much better than they do if good men would aid them by frequent suggestions in person or by letter.

Now this sounds all well enough, and indeed the suggestion rightly followed would doubtless lead to a better condition of things publicly than we now see. Especially would this be true if only good and wise men gave assistance in that direction.

There is however a degree of latitude in the application of these "suggestions" which might more properly be observed with very beneficial results not only to "ourselves" but the *Statesman* as well and the body politic in particular. This will readily appear from the frank acknowledgment that is made that "ourselves" are subject to "passions" and "influenced by hopes and fears" as well as the legislators. This being true will bear special recognition, and "suggests" the need of more than human wisdom to guide these "passions" "and prejudices, if you please," of both the suggestors and the suggested to, else the blind might lead the blind and themselves and the Government fall into the ditch. Which thing has been done in the past and after the manner so ardently advocated by the *Statesman*.

We have in the same issue some of these "suggestions" of "ourselves" as represented by the speech of Rev. W. J. Robinson before the Judiciary Committee of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives on the Sunday Newspaper Bill. After the preliminary amount of adulation of the men addressed he said:—

We appear before you not to instruct you in your

official duties, neither to persuade you to the faithful discharge of them, nor to antagonize you in your convictions of what is right and proper in your official conduct, but to assure you of the sympathy, approval, and support of the great body of your constituency which we represent."

Now if he had no instruction to give relative to official duties, no persuasion to faithfulness and no antagonism as to their convictions of what was right and proper, it would seem that he might better yield the floor to some one else as he had voluntarily confessed that he had no message save the "assurance of sympathy" which he fully expressed in "instructive persuasion" and "antagonism," the very things he had denied his purpose to do.

As to his reasons for appearing before that honorable body he said:—

And why do we come to you? simply because we have neither the right nor the power.

Since he had stated that his sole purpose was to give "assurance of sympathy," it is somewhat vague as to what this "neither the right nor power" might mean, except we let his own words of "instruction" to the committee represent what he would do did he occupy their places, which is undoubtedly the intention of such language. Having artfully tried to conceal his true purpose under the cloak of "assurance of sympathy," he then followed with such words of "instruction" and "persuasion" as have but few parallels in this Nation. In speaking of the source from which the body addressed had received their authority, he continued:—

And whence comes this authority to you? From what source have you derived it? Not from your fellow-citizens. . . . But the authority comes from God. And he alone can give to one man the right to lay his hand with controlling authority on the person, property, and rights, of his fellow-men. You are acting in his name. You are the expounders of his will to your fellow-citizens in the department of their civil relations and conduct.

Now if there was not a goodly amount of "instruction" and intent at "persuasion" in this, and if "ourselves" did not have some purpose of "influencing" these "demagogues" it is hard to see the force of this statement. But farther we read:—

But he has not left you to determine what is his will in the matter of rights and obligation of men in their civil capacity. He has distinctly enunciated these in his moral law which is summed up in the Decalogue. You are empowered and required therefore by your acceptance of the legislative functions of the civil magistracy to place upon the statute books, as the binding law of the State, this infallible summary of human rights and obligations.

For downright instruction and persuasion this man of "passions" has but few peers. His argument summed up amounts to this. The legislators are the expounders of the will of God (which is his law) to their fellow-men, and having interpreted that law are in duty bound to place their interpretation thereof as the binding law of the State. How admirably this is in line with the action of the late Congress in the interpretation of the fourth precept of the Decalogue. How quickly the "assurance of sympathy" became the loud voice of ecclesiasticism, uttered to persuade those men not to repeal that twin relic of paganism, a Sunday law. Can the reader for a moment think that God, as this man has testified, has given any man, or set of men, the right to lay hands with controlling force upon the rights of his fellows? Can it be that legislators are to be instructed, nay, persuaded; nay, antagonized, that they shall interpret the law of God and cause such

interpretation to be forced upon the consciences of men? Has it come to that stage of results that our legislators not only *listen* to such "instruction" and "persuasion" but actually *follow* it? It is ever so. And the "hopes and fears" that influence these men to do this are demonstrated to be none other than the "hopes" of office and the "fears" of not getting or retaining it unless they yield to such "instructional persuasion," etc. The *Statesman* has given, unwittingly it may be, a perfect example of how this influence is used.

C. A. WYMAN.

Church and State.

[Of a bill before the Minnesota Legislature, a correspondent of the St. Paul *Daily News* writes to the editor of that journal as follows:—]

PERMIT me a little space in your valuable paper to examine and dissect a certain bill now pending in the House, known as House File No. 413; the same being a bill making Sabbath-breaking a misdemeanor, punishable by a penalty of \$100, or ninety days imprisonment, or both. The judiciary committee, to whom the bill was referred, have amended by making the fine \$50, and recommend the passage of the same.

The bill partakes altogether too much of the spirit of paternalism, being offered ostensibly in the interests of certain clerks, who are not satisfied with the law as it now stands imposing a fine of \$10. But as they desire the enjoyment of certain privileges, they ask the State to become an accomplice in denying to others equal privileges, and compelling others to do as they think they ought to do. If those who offer the measure wish to keep Sunday, let them educate their consciences to as strict an observance as they may desire, but let not the State become an accomplice in the compulsory observance of religious institutions. But if they desire the law because they fear loss of position in case of obedience to their convictions, then let them learn lessons of independence and self-respect, and self-reliance, and not ask the State to do that which would be but to deprive them of their own manhood, by making the State the conservator of their own rights; for in so doing they become but slaves to the State and exalt the State above the people. Moreover, if these claim the right to observe Sunday as a day of rest, religiously or otherwise, let them remember that the right of their neighbor not to observe the day, or to observe it as he pleases, is just as dear to him and just as sacred, and they have no authority, morally or legally, to deprive him of that right. And yet again, let the promoters of that bill remember that the constitution of the State is the safeguard of the rights of the citizen, and also prescribes the acts of our legislators in all such matters, and stands as a barrier against all such legislation.

Now as their representatives have obligated themselves by an oath to support that constitution, let them not ask these representatives to violate their oath of office, and override the safeguard of the rights of the people, as they would do should they consent to legislate upon such questions. The constitution is the supreme law of the State, and as the supreme law of the State, in simple, plain, and unmistakable language, does forbid any such legislation, let them not forget their high privileges and duties, as citizens, of obedience to and maintenance of the su-

preme law of the State. And let them not become supreme law-breakers, by advocating a measure so directly opposed to the supreme law; nor should they urge others to become such, by enacting such a law.

And let those who would urge its passage never forget that if they admit that the State may interfere in respect to the rights of their neighbor, and legislate in this case as they desire against the rights of a neighbor, the State may by the same right and by the same power, legislate to take away your rights, should the tables be turned in behalf of your neighbor. Thus it is, we can see the wisdom and the justice of the denial by the constitution, of the right of interference in such matters, by the State. More than this, admitting the right of this interference would justify the right of the State to legislate and prescribe the mode of baptism and its adoption; or the enforcement of any other Christian ordinance.

But, if it be urged as a religious necessity, and because it is an institution of the Church, let all remember the words of the Author of the Christian religion, when he said, "My kingdom is not of this world, else would my servants fight." And at one time when one of his disciples would use the sword in defense of his Master, Christ said, "Put up thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword." And yet again: "Render therefore to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." So we must conclude that coercion in matters of religion is not according to the plan of the Author of the Christian religion, and therefore is not Christian. Evidently, Cæsar has enough to do to take care of civil matters. And this is the only thing for which the State is ordained—to care for all things civil. And as Cæsar—the State—is ordained in civil matters, it can not know anything about religion. And as the State does not, in the very nature of the case know anything about religion, it has always made a bad job, in intermeddling itself with religion. It has always made a failure, and always will make a failure whenever the attempt is made. There is nothing but evil in the attempt, and nothing but evil can come out of it. And so it is much better for all concerned, that the State let religious matters alone.

But if any would urge it from a civil standpoint, let these remember that if the Sunday had not been a religious institution, we never would have heard of Sunday laws, with fines and imprisonments. It is an utter impossibility to separate it from the religious, and make it civil. But let them show their sincerity by dropping this, and urging the passage of a bill to give all employes a day of rest without losing their situation, giving the employé his choice of the day. Let them put themselves in the other men's shoes, and ask the State to enact no law of which they would not be willing to bear its penalty, should the tables be turned.

As all this is true of the proposed legislation, so is it also applicable to any and all past religious legislation by the State. This being the case, then it is true that the Wacek bill to repeal these Sunday laws, is as meritorious a measure as is this one to be deplored. And every argument here offered is as applicable against all religious laws, and proves the advisability of the passage of the Wacek bill. One thing should never be forgotten, and

that is the fact that all the persecution that has stained almost every page of modern history, can of a truth be laid at the door of religious legislation. And such persecutions can never be made possible in the absence of such legislation. Then let the State protect all in the enjoyment of their right, but grant special favors to none.

H. F. PHELPS.

Catholics and Continental Union.

[This article is from the *New York Sun*, of the 22nd ult. Editorial comment on it will be found on the last page of this paper].

THE movement in the province of Quebec, ostensibly aimed at political independence, really contemplates incorporation with the United States. That such would be the outcome of Quebec's separation from the Dominion and from Great Britain is not denied by ex-Premier Mercier, who has become the chief advocate of the project among French Canadians. But the French Canadians can hardly be induced to vote for an independence which will mean annexation, unless their clergy are convinced that the interests of the Catholic Church would not suffer through the conversion of the province of Quebec into a State of the Union. At present not only the priests of rural parishes, but some of the most distinguished members of the Catholic hierarchy in Montreal and Quebec seem imperfectly informed respecting the limited powers of the Federal Government in matters of religion; which the States regulate for themselves.

In these circumstances, it is possible for American Catholics, whether members of the clergy or laity, to powerfully further the continental union movement. Especially is this true of the Catholics of New York City, whose relations with Montreal are intimate, and of the Catholics of the New England States, which, during the last twenty years, have received a tremendous inflow of French Canadian immigrants. There is incessant communication by letter, and there is frequent personal intercourse between American Catholics in this portion of our country and their co-religionists in the province of Quebec. What they say will be believed, and they have only to set forth facts with which all our citizens ought to be familiar. They have only to send to their friends in French-speaking Canada copies of the Federal Constitution to convince them that while the Federal Government is forbidden to establish a particular Church in the country at large, there is nothing to prevent a given State from doing so. The Virginians might, for instance, have continued, had they so chosen, to pay tithes to the Episcopal Church formerly established in their colony, and the citizens of Massachusetts might have continued to grant special privileges to ministers of the Congregational or so-called Orthodox Church. If the people of Quebec saw fit, after their province had been transformed into a State of the Union, to embody in their State Constitution a provision for the payment of tithes such as are now paid to the Catholic clergy, the act would lie wholly within their competence. To give, indeed, our friends in Quebec a still more striking illustration of the breadth of the powers reserved to States, we may point out that our Federal Constitution would not debar them from perpetuating the law of entail within their borders. It was some years after the adoption of the Federal

Constitution before the law of entail was abolished in the State of New York.

The truth is, that arrangements for the support and inculcation of religion are, under the American system, left in the hands of the people of each State. If this fact was once brought home by American Catholics to the clergy of Quebec, the luke-warmness with which the latter at present regard the movement for continental union would be transformed into earnest, concerted, and triumphant advocacy.

Dangerous Defenders.

THE newspapers report that in South Carolina a young woman has been excommunicated from a Presbyterian Church because her engagement in a telephone company requires her to render telephone service on Sunday, and that in Pittsburg, Pa., the business manager of a daily paper has been fined for publishing a Sunday edition. A few months ago a Sabbatarian in Tennessee was fined by the courts for working on his farm on Sunday; he felt himself compelled by his conscience to observe the seventh day instead of the first as his Sabbath. These cases illustrate a curious ignoring of the function of law in its relation to the religious life. That function is not to compel righteousness, but to protect rights.

It is true that the fourth commandment forbade any manner of work; and that under that law a man was put to death for gathering fuel on the Sabbath day. But the Israelites had just been released from slavery, and their condition had been one of continuous and unbroken toil. The Sabbath day of rest was given them as a boon, not imposed upon them as a burden; but in order that all might possess the boon it was necessary to protect it, at the outset, with vigorous regulations, and enforce them with severe penalties. And in a community in camp, essentially an army on the march—and this was the condition of Israel in the Wilderness—a strictness of rule is required which in a community settled in homes would be unendurable. But even in the Wilderness the Sabbath was, *legally*, merely a day of rest. The fourth commandment required no religious observance; it simply prohibited toil. Christ did not abolish the day; nor did he so much enlarge its liberties, or modify its character, as to give it a new and divine interpretation. He walked out with his disciples on the Sabbath, cured the sick, bid the healed carry his bed, approved his disciples as they gathered the wheat and ate it while they were walking through the wheat-field, and went as an invited guest to a dinner-party of considerable social importance. He gave the key to the right use of the Sabbath in his memorable saying, "The Sabbath is made for man, not man for the Sabbath." The familiar distich,

This is the day the Lord hath made,
He calls its hours his own,

exactly reverses the facts. God gives us six days in which we are to serve him; he sets apart one day in which he serves us and prepares us to render our service during the next six days. The Sabbath is a man's day, and he has a right to its privilege; a right, too, to have the protection of both State and Church for this day; but also a right to be left free to use it according to his own judgment and conscience, provided that use does not interfere with the rights of others. Something

might be said for a State which fined a farmer who called on his farm hands to work on the Sabbath, or for a church which excommunicated the president of a telephone company who required his employes to operate the telephone on the Sabbath. But to fine a farmer for quietly plowing his own land, or to excommunicate a young woman for being the medium for the transmission of telephonic messages for such as wish to send them, is to contravene the spirit of Christian liberty and misinterpret the legitimate function of both State and Church. Whether it is legitimate to plow the land or operate a telephone on Sunday are questions we do not here discuss. We only insist that so long as these operations are carried on in a way not to interfere with the Sabbath rest of others, neither State nor Church has any right to interfere.—*Christian Union*.

Shackles That Remain.

IN his "Notes on Virginia," Thomas Jefferson says: "Besides, the spirit of the times may alter, will alter. Our rulers will become corrupt, our people careless. A single zealot may commence persecution, and better men be his victims." Of the people, he says: "They will be forgotten, therefore, and their rights disregarded. They will forget themselves, but in the sole faculty of making money, and will never think of uniting to effect a due respect for their rights. *The shackles, therefore, which shall not be knocked off at the conclusion of this war, will remain on us long, will be made heavier and heavier, till our rights shall revive or expire in a convulsion.*"

Was this spoken by inspiration? Certain it is, these words are fulfilled to-day. The spirit of the times has altered. Our rulers, our legislators, have become corrupt to such an extent as to sell the liberties of the Nation, the rights of the people, into the hands of a religio-political party—a religious hierarchy. The people have forgotten their rights, feeling that they were forever secured to them, in the sole faculty of making money. There were shackles that *were not* knocked off at that time, and these are becoming heavier and heavier. And now will the people rise and demand their rights, or will they sleep on till these rights shall expire in a convulsion?

Some of the shackles that remain to this day constitute a sort of Church and State union, in the providing of chaplains in the State and national Government, and in the army and navy; in exemption of Church property from taxation; and in the religious laws that are found upon the statute books of almost every State in the Union. These, especially Sunday laws, are becoming a burden to the people. And now that Congress has given us a national Sunday law, these will become heavier and heavier under the spirit of intolerance and bigotry that exists, until persecution shall blight the fair name of every State in the Union. If the reader is inclined to say that this can never be, we only ask you to consider the ever-increasing demands for religious legislation; the persecutions of seventh-day observers in Arkansas; the noted case of King, in Tennessee, who was hunted to his death by his religious persecutors; and the more recent cases in the same State of quiet, inoffensive citizens condemned to the chain-gang for following

their own convictions of conscience in matters of religion. I refer to the persecutions of the newsboys of Pennsylvania, and the efforts in the legislature of that State the past winter to secure more stringent laws in regard to what the State is pleased to call Sabbath-breaking. I refer you to a bill introduced into our own State legislature only a few weeks ago to make Sabbath-breaking "a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of \$100 or ninety days imprisonment, or both." And this bill received a recommendation for passage by the committee to whom it was referred, under an amendment reducing the fine one half. What do all these things mean?—*Publius, in Red Wing Argus, Minnesota, March 30, 1893.*

"Religious Intolerance."

WITH the above for a heading the *Appeal-Avalanche*, Memphis, Tenn., of April 20, has quite a little to say in regard to the case of a young lady who has been disfellowshipped from the Second Presbyterian Church of Charleston, S. C., because she worked in the telephone office on Sunday. The *Appeal-Avalanche* thinks that such a course is highly reprehensible, and can not be condemned too strongly.

If it is religious intolerance to disfellowship from the church a young lady who persists in working on Sunday, what does the *Appeal-Avalanche* call the course taken by the authorities in Tennessee, who fined, imprisoned and worked in the chain-gang, honest, upright citizens who observe the true seventh-day Sabbath and who exercise their constitutional and God-given right to work on Sunday?

Though the church is not censurable, still it is pleasant to see the sympathy of the *Appeal-Avalanche* for this young lady in South Carolina, as it certainly has missionary work to do in its own State, in correcting the actual "religious intolerance" there.

A. O. TAIT.

They Knavishly Miss the Mark.

THE churches in Michigan are just now stirred over a proposed bill for the taxation of the Church property in the State. At a hearing this week in Lansing, a large number of clergymen appeared in opposition to the measure. The gentleman who made the leading speech, Dr. Radcliffe, said, "We will render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," and turning to the legislators, "You render unto God the things that are God's." This was rather an unfortunate reference, for the text misused was spoken by Christ, on an occasion when the Jews tried to entangle him, hoping he would declare himself exempt from tribute intending thereupon to charge him with disloyalty to Cæsar. But they failed and the Head of the Church laid down the principle that his Church is not exempt from the duty to pay tribute to the civil power which exists as the ordinance of God to preserve civil order.

This text used to be similarly misused in the days of the agitation against the church tax, levied in England upon dissenters as well as churchmen, for the support of the State Church. In those days when the newspaper had not come within the reach of the poorer people, the political ballad singer was a power in the land and the verse writer wielded about as much influence as the newspaper editor. One of these versifiers, Ebenezer Elliot, the poet of the Anti-Corn Law movement,



NEW YORK, MAY 11, 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 Chicago *Mail* notes the fact that some sentimentalists want a World's Fair flower adopted, and remarks that, "If there were any blossom that closed on Sunday there might be some sense in it."

THE Memphis *Appeal-Avalanche* which publishes a Sunday edition and yet had, so far as we know, no protest to offer when well-disposed citizens of Tennessee were arrested, fined, and imprisoned, for quiet Sunday work, is indignant because a young woman has been dismissed from her church for Sunday work. The *Avalanche* evidently thinks that the State is the proper disciplinarian in spiritual things.

THE sentence of J. W. Judefind, convicted in Kent County, Md., of the crime of husking corn on Sunday, was thirty days, not sixty as we stated last week. We were wrongly informed by a telegram. This case has been carried to the Court of Appeals, where it will be heard in October. The other Sunday case now pending in Maryland, that of Isaac Baker, of Kent Island, has been postponed to await the decision of the higher court in the Judefind case.

THE Sunday cases in Maryland have revived the question previously raised in Tennessee as to the faith of the Seventh-day Adventists regarding the obligations imposed by the fourth commandment of the Decalogue. This question was not raised by the defense in the case of J. W. Judefind, on the contrary the broad ground was taken that inasmuch as the law required the observance of a religious institution it infringed the religious liberty of every man; but the court raised the question by remarking that it was not in evidence that the religious convictions of the defendant required him to work on Sunday.

This failure to set up the religious belief of the defendant was not an oversight; nor was it a mistake. The Constitution of Maryland declares: "That, as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to Him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty." To leave every man free to worship means more than simply leaving the individual free to choose how he will worship. No man is free to do that which he is obliged to do. It might have been proper for Mr. Ringgold to have shown under protest that

Mr. Judefind had a religion which required him to work on Sunday, but to have done so voluntarily would have been equivalent to admitting the right of the State to sit in judgment upon a man's religious convictions.

If it were the province of the State to require the individual to have some religion and to render some sort of worship to his Creator, it would of necessity be legitimate for the Government to pass judgment upon what constituted religion. Indeed the only way Government can avoid this is by confining itself to things entirely civil, for the moment it requires the individual to have any religion whatever it must of necessity become the judge of that religion.

THE Chicago *Herald* records the fact that a considerable number of theological students from the institutions near Chicago, and young ministers with suburban charges, have been enrolled as guards at the World's Fair, and quotes the police captain who enrolled them as saying that, "Several of them, in fact nearly all of them, asked to make it a provision that they be relieved from duty on the seventh day." It would be interesting to know whether this was the actual request of this ministerial police or not.

It is the boast of the *Catholic Review* that "the Church in New England has increased during the past quarter of a century not only by immigration and by the full natural increase in the Catholic population, but also by making converts of Protestants."

According to the *Review*, the Catholic Church in New England "counts to-day among its members descendants of the bitterest Puritans, the most Dutch of the New Netherlanders, and the most rigid of the Church of England men of a century or so ago. If it cared to parade the names of its proselytes, it would furnish the daily press with a sensation that would retain the public interest for much more than nine days."

AN article on another page of this paper on "The Tendency of Modern, Liberal, Theological Thought," contains much food for reflection. There prevails in the world to-day a sort of wish-washy sentimentalism that substitutes sentiment for principle and then insists that everybody shall do homage to it regardless of the principle.

To this sickly sentimentalism is due the World's Congress of Religions. This sentiment also manifests itself in the popular demand for Church union, very inappropriately called Christian union. Christian union is union with God through the Spirit, not simply organic union, nor even the so-called union upon a sentiment which involves a surrender of principle. No religion demands such loyal adherence

to truth as does Christianity, and no system involves more disloyalty to eternal verities than does this modern scheme for "Christian union;" it is not in the interests of truth but of human pride. It delights not in fidelity to principles, but deals in high-sounding titles, in grandiloquent speeches, and in numbers of three periods. Its motto is, "Man's proper object of worship is man;" and of course no more fitting representatives of the *genus homo* can be found than the prime movers in the scheme itself. Those who are in harmony with God need not concern themselves about harmony with others; they will naturally find themselves in unison with the children of God everywhere. The less they have in common with error the better.

THE article printed on another page from the New York *Sun* shows about as plainly as anything could the subservience of the press of this country to the Roman hierarchy. It is true as the *Sun* states that Quebec might become a member of the Union and still continue to pay tithes to the Roman Catholic Church, but that this fact should be held out as an inducement to the Romanists of that province to intrigue for political union with the United States is, to say the least, significant. It shows by how slight a tenure is liberty of conscience held in our American States. Only let party aggrandizement or political necessity require it and how soon politicians would consent to sweep away every guarantee of religious equality in our land!

The Romish camel already has not only his head but a considerable part of his body in Uncle Sam's tent; and it seems now only a question of time when he will occupy it all. Such papers as the New York *Sun* are contributing not a little to this undesirable consummation.

Battle Creek Sanitarium Health Foods.

THE managers of the Sanitarium Health Food Co. wish to announce to their old patrons and friends that their principal health foods are now manufactured and sold at the Rural Health Retreat, St. Helena, Cal. Several of our leading foods, including Granola, are also manufactured and sold at Union College, College View, Neb. Neither Granola nor any other of our health foods are manufactured by other parties than those mentioned above, except ourselves.

SANITARIUM HEALTH FOOD CO.
BATTLE CREEK MICH.

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.