



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

VOLUME 8.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 2, 1893.

NUMBER 43.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

EDITOR, - - - - - ALONZO T. JONES.

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

THE National League for the Protection of American Institutions has sent to the public press a circular letter,—addressed to the candidates of all parties for the position of delegate to the forthcoming constitutional convention in the State of New York,—with a request for editorial comment.

THE constitution of this league states the purpose of its organization, as follows:—

The objects of the League are to secure constitutional and legislative safeguards for the protection of the Common School system and other American institutions, and to promote public instruction in harmony with such institutions, and to prevent all sectarian or denominational appropriation of public funds.

The National League is absolutely unsectarian and non-partisan in character. It is proposed to secure an amendment to the United States Constitution prohibiting sectarian legislation by the States. The Amendment, in form as submitted by the Law Committee, has been adopted by the Board of Managers.

The general secretary and original promoter of the league is Rev. James M. King, and the chairman of its law committee is Wm. Allen Butler.

THE constitutional amendment which the league has formulated and presented to Congress and advocated before its committees, is this:—

No State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or use its property or credit, or any money raised by taxation, or authorize either to be used, for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding, by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or otherwise, any church, religious denomination or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking, which is wholly, or in part, under sectarian or ecclesiastical control.

Petitions asking favorable action upon this proposed amendment have been extensively circulated, and, throughout the entire summer, visitors to the World's Fair have been asked for their signatures to it, at a booth on the second floor of the Liberal Arts Building.

"A RESPECTFUL request to candidates of all parties for delegate to the New York State constitutional convention, for their opinion in reference to questions touching the protection of American institutions, and especially of the separation of the Church and State and of religious liberty," is the language with which the letter is entitled, then, with the proper blanks for the addressing of the candidate personally, it proceeds to say that it speaks in behalf of "The National League for the Protection of American Institutions" and "the constituency which it represents"; and that its purposes, principles and work "are in strict accord with the provisions of the National and State Constitutions," and with the pledges of the Republican and Democratic parties in 1876; it pleads further that "the membership of the league is absolutely non-partisan and unsectarian in character," and appeals to its list of officers and members to substantiate the plea.

AN expression of opinion is then asked upon a number of points, with spaces left below each query for the reply. Here will be the proper opportunity for comment. This is the first question:—

I.—Do you hold that the American principle of the separation of Church and State must be sacredly observed by the National and State Governments, for the preservation of peace and for the security of civil and religious liberty? Are you willing to give your help in this State toward securing definite Constitutional safeguards to perpetuate the separation of Church and State, and toward correcting the legislation which has arisen in violation of that principle?

The correct principle of the separation of Church and State,—that the State has no authority in civil matters,—that every man must "render unto God the things which are God's, and unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," is not primarily an "American" principle, although first governmentally enunciated in the Constitution of the United States. It is first a divine and biblical principle; it is a fundamental and natural principle necessary to be observed strictly in the formation of an equitable civil code; for, in so far as this principle is not followed, just in that degree is the resultant civil policy inequitable and iniquitous. This was the purpose of the establishment of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, to preach the neces-

sity for the sacred observance of this principle, and to raise its voice in condemnation of the legislation which has arisen, and is to arise, in violation of that principle, and to point out its attendant evils, their origin and result.

THE league has asked this question of these candidates and of the press,—let it make a candid reply to its own query. Will the league freely accept the full gospel of the separation of Church and State? If the league holds that the "principle of the separation of Church and State must be sacredly observed by the National and State Governments," it holds, with the SENTINEL, that the national Government did an unconstitutional and a suicidal act when it interfered, and dogmatized, in a religious question, and in obedience to the demand of religionists legislated to secure the observance of a religious and ecclesiastical requirement at the World's Fair. Did the league oppose this? or will it speak in condemnation of it now? At the great Methodist Conference, in Omaha, what did the general secretary of the league say in opposition to the resolutions purporting to commit the entire denomination to a request to Congress to pass an unconstitutional and irreligious act? Did he say that the principles of the league, of which he was secretary, required him to plead for the sacred observance by the national Government of the principle of the separation of Church and State, and, that that would necessitate that he should ask Congress, for himself and his organization, that it avoid all assumption of authority in a religious matter? Did the secretary say this, or did he, then and elsewhere, uphold and vote for the resolutions asking for the Sunday closing of the World's Fair by act of Congress? Did the league agree with him in that course? If it did not, why is he still its secretary? If it did, how can such a contradiction of its own publicly expressed principles be explained? Will the league say directly, as it has by implication, that its purpose is to secure the separation of Church and State and the union of Church and State,—that its purpose is to oppose the interference of Congress in religion, and to advocate the passage of religious legislation by Congress? That is what it has done and is

doing, and there is every evidence that it was organized for no other purpose than to pursue just such a contradictory course. The list of names constituting the membership of this league is a roll of the wealthiest and most influential men in this country. Have these men given the force of their names and influence in total ignorance for what and to what it has been given? or is it possible that in this matter they are unable to see and comprehend inconsistencies which in ordinary business and professional questions would have been perceived and avoided before they could have become evident to others?

WM. ALLEN BUTLER, the chairman of the law committee of the league, and who drew up the proposed amendment to the Constitution which the league presents, has advocated that amendment before the judiciary committees of Congress. The same man is pointed out as a lawyer of the greatest legal acumen and highest prestige in the ranks of those who favor and work for religious laws and legislation. That it is with reason that they do this is shown by published documents from his own pen. At the International Sunday Rest Congress held not long ago, in Chicago, he presented the principal paper, a lengthy and learned dissertation upon Sunday laws and in support of such laws and legislation. How does Mr. Butler harmonize the two inconsistent positions which he takes, as chairman of the law committee of "The League for the Preservation of American Institutions" asking Congress to pass favorably upon an amendment to the Constitution requiring that no State shall enact any law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,—and at the same time, before an international congress, upholding and advocating, with all the legal astuteness and learning gained by a long life at the bar, the religious laws enacted by the legislatures of the different States in continuation of the religious enactments of an English Church and State polity? How can he harmonize these inconsistencies? How does the league and the American Sabbath Union reconcile this anomalous course of Mr. Butler? Has he taken a retainer on both sides of the case? Or is the cause of the Sabbath Union and the league identical? If so, which is it that is sailing under false colors? These are pertinent questions for the league, the Sabbath Union, and Mr. Butler. They are especially pertinent when it is asked whether this question which the league has put to delegates and to the press has been asked in good faith or not. In this the league and Mr. Butler are in a sad dilemma; they must either acknowledge bad faith or plead their ignorance of what is religion, and what is religious legislation, and what are religious laws.

Does the chairman of the law committee, and the secretary of the league, and the league itself answer, Yes! to its own question? Will it give its influence in this State, and elsewhere, to the correction of legislation which has arisen in violation of the principle of the separation of Church and State? Will it help to secure the repeal of the law under which sixty-three tailors, of this city, have been held under bonds of one hundred dollars each to appear before Justice Koch, on Nov. 16, to answer to the charge of having desecrated Sunday by common labor? But there is no need for a reply to these ques-

tions. The league and its law committee will be known by their deeds.

THIS is the league's second question:—

II.—Are you in favor of constitutional and legislative safeguards for the protection of the Common School system and other American institutions; and are you in favor of the promotion of public instruction in harmony with such institutions, and of preventing the application of public funds or property for the benefit of sectarian instruction, or for schools or institutions under denominational control?

What is intended in this question by the expression "and other American institutions," leaves open a broad field for speculation. Most people would wish to withhold a reply to that until the institutions were specified. But, with this exception, there should be but one opinion in regard to this query; all should favor the most perfect protection of our common school system, and its complete defense from all sectarian, or denominational, or religious interference or bias, and oppose all application of public funds to religious purposes, either in denominational schools or elsewhere. This would be a necessary result of an affirmative reply to the first question regarding the separation of Church and State.

But here again appears another strange inconsistency. It was not many years ago that the chairman of this law committee advocated, before an assembly called in the study of the good Dr. Crosby to discuss the subject of religious education in the public schools, the giving of religious education in these schools at the expense of the State, and did so with much vigor and fervor. However strange this may be, it is unquestionably true. This league seems unfortunate in its associates. Its principles are evidently of little repute even in the house of its chosen friends.

THE league's third question is this:—

III.—Are you in favor of requiring in the education of all the children of the State, elementary instruction in the fundamental principles of our Government bearing on the rights and duties of citizens, with the proper supervision by the State authorities of all schools, in order to insure these ends?

Is this entirely honest? "Proper supervision by the State authorities of all schools" may mean a great deal, and it may be interpreted to mean far too much. In fact, supervision by the State exercised over private or denominational schools would destroy their independence immediately, and make them State schools supported by private contribution. This is not the way to secure the end desired, and that the instruction mentioned is desirable, and indeed necessary, is most certainly true.

THE fourth question is brief:—

IV.—Do you believe it wise for controverted questions of denominational or ecclesiastical claims to be settled by political majorities?

What can be thought of the wisdom of asking such a question? Civil politics has nothing to do with such subjects. Political majorities could not by any possibility settle them if they tried. It would certainly then be the part of wisdom to let them alone.

THE fifth query is as follows:—

V.—Are the words "to all mankind" in Article 1, Sec. 8, State constitution, to be interpreted, as some political leaders claim, as guaranteeing to convicts confined in State institutions for crime, the right of choice as to the form of public reli-

gious instruction and worship to be provided for them at the expense of the State?

The supposition is here that religious instruction and worship in State institutions is to be provided at the expense of the State. This is inconsistent with an affirmative answer to the first question, and also inconsistent with the constitutional amendment which the league offers. If the principle in that amendment, and in the first question submitted, is sound and worthy of acceptance, then the State has nothing to do with the religious instruction and worship of the inmates of its institutions, except to allow them that which they shall choose, or give individual missionary workers reasonable access to them; and this, in its full interpretation, is just what the words in question should be held to mean.

THE sixth question is composite:—

VI.—Do you believe it was wise for the State to introduce the disturbing factor of controversy as to religious belief into politics?

a. By legislation which forces upon magistrates and police justices the consideration of the religious belief of parents and guardians, in their commitment of juvenile delinquents? (Laws of New York, 1878, Chap. 404; Amended, 1879, Chap. 240.)

b. By the large grants yearly made from the State, County and City Treasuries to private educational and eleemosynary institutions under sectarian or ecclesiastical control?

c. By legislation which imposes on the courts of the State a duty heretofore unknown, of regulating the character of public religious instruction and worship to be held in institutions which receive grants of public money? (Laws of New York, 1892, Chap. 896.)

This question in itself, as well as in the three different phases into which it is elaborated, is answered by the reply which is given to the first question. Those who advocate the separation of Church and State can have no belief as to the *unwisdom* merely of such action as this by the State, but must oppose utterly every such thing from the beginning, as being matters in which the State has no control or authority whatever.

THERE are three other questions submitted in regard to institutions for the support of vagrant children and paupers which have no religious bearing, unless it may be that they are intended to elicit replies which can be used to antagonize Roman Catholic institutions of that character, which are supported more or less by public subscription, and also receive municipal appropriations. This suspicion of insincerity in the last three questions is strengthened by the facts set forth in a table accompanying the letter, showing that the city of New York has appropriated to such purposes, from its "Excise Fund" during the last ten years \$6,173,258.54, and that, as shown by a comparison for the month of August 1893, the Roman Catholics have received of this amount more than five times as much as all other denominations put together.

There is also with this another table showing the sums appropriated yearly by the city of New York from "taxation and general fund" for the support of inmates of various charitable institutions; six Roman Catholic, four Protestant, three Hebrew, and nineteen undenominational; and that, out of over twelve millions of dollars appropriated to these, in ten years, the Roman Catholic received \$5,526,733.34; the Protestant, \$365,467.34; the Hebrew \$1,106,363.23; the remainder going to undenominational charities.

Those who consider what the showing contained in these tables is intended to

convey, and who realize the inconsistencies involved in the constitutional amendment which the league proposes, the queries submitted in this letter, and the contradictory positions on matters of religious law and legislation taken by the promoters and officers of this organization, must require something more than mere protestation before they can believe that this league is anything other than another American Protective Association in disguise.

Both propose similar things. Both show an equal inability to comprehend the principles which they themselves have enunciated. But the American Protective Association is the more candid and the less subtle of the two, for it leaves no doubt as to who it considers its enemy, and also that it does not love its enemy.

In this series of questions which the league has sent out it commits and convicts itself. The lack of consistency between the constitutional amendment and the first question, and the succeeding questions, show conclusively that it is not the intent of the league to consistently follow out its principles even if it has any adequate understanding of them as they are stated.

The humiliating truth seems to be that the League for the Preservation of American Institutions is nothing more than an expression of Jesuitical Protestantism seeking to aggrandize itself by antagonizing Romanism. The two are, therefore, but exhibitions of the same force from opposite poles.

W. H. M.

Civil Government—Its Origin and Object.

Civil—Pertaining to a city or State, or to a citizen in his relation to his fellow citizens or to the city or State.—Webster.

Government—The exercise of authority; the administration of laws.—*Ibid.*

By these definitions it is clearly seen that civil government points out the duties that we owe to each other and to the city or State as civil beings: and exercises authority in seeing that these are carried out.

Question, why was civil government demanded? Because of sin, which was the working out of selfishness. This invaded the rights of others, and a demand for the protection of life and property arose, in order that man's natural rights might be secured. This is seen in the history of Cain and Abel, and here is where civil government began. When these two brothers offered sacrifices, and Abel's offering was accepted while Cain's was rejected, Cain's anger arose, then the Lord began to reason with him: "Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door: and unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him." In ruling over Abel, Cain was to give to him his natural rights, which he evidently refused to do, for as soon as opportunity presented itself and his anger was strong enough, he slew his brother, and thus took away his natural rights to life and happiness. When the Lord demanded of him his brother's life, Cain's rebellion was stirred again, and he said: "Am I my brother's keeper?" In all this Cain rebelled against God and civil government, and the Lord punished him for it by bringing an additional curse upon him and the ground. "When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield

unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth." Afterward Cain acknowledged God's justice in establishing civil government and pleaded for self-protection, saying: "My punishment is greater than I can bear . . . and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me." But the Lord promised him protection, saying, "Whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should slay him."

Later on we find that as selfishness increased and men's lives became more and more in danger, the Lord said, "At the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." In this inspired record we have the origin and object of civil government, namely, that which secures to each person his or her inherent rights to life, liberty and property, and protection in the use of the same.

Liberty is here used in the sense of perfect freedom to think, speak and act out one's own convictions of duty in matters of faith and religion, irrespective of any other man's opinion, so long as he does not take away the same rights from others by so doing. This definition applies just as fully with reference to life and property as it does in matters of faith and religion.

From these facts it will be seen that the civil power has nothing to do whatsoever with a man's religious belief or practices; this is a matter that pertains solely to each individual, independent of every other individual or government. No matter whether a person be a Christian or a Catholic or a Buddhist, the same rights belong to each one alike; they may worship, how, when, and where they please, so long as they do not infringe upon the same rights of others, and the civil government has nothing to say about it because these are inherent rights that existed before civil government existed, being co-existent with man himself. God gave these rights to man, and he is responsible to God alone for the exercise of these rights. Moreover, our Government cannot give these rights because it never possessed them to give; and this fact is well stated in the Declaration of Independence—"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." No one could ask more or less of any government, neither can any government grant less or more; for this is complete and perfect liberty both civil and religious. It is just what Jesus Christ established and taught when he said, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." It is just what our Constitution guarantees to all its citizens in the First Amendment—"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

These rights and privileges were further guaranteed to the citizens of this Government in Article 6 of the Constitution, last clause—"No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States." By these quotations it is plain to be seen that the founders of our Government un-

derstood the true object of civil government. But lo! and behold, all these principles, which every lover of liberty supposed were granted to them, are being taken away.

H. J. FARMAN.

An Unholy Alliance.

Editor American Sentinel: A new and nefarious scheme has been initiated out here on the Pacific Coast, to combine the Catholic and Protestant churches and form an unholy alliance between Church and State, in connection with our public school system.

Rev. Dr. Pond, pastor of Bethany Congregational Church, San Francisco, has been working on the plan for several months, and recently presented his scheme in a paper read before the Monday Club of Congregational Ministers, where it received a general and hearty indorsement. It was published in last week's issue of the *Pacific*, and I enclose you a copy.

The SENTINEL has proved a true prophet for it has predicted just such an iniquitous and monstrous attempt. Dr. Pond's premises are precisely the same as those recently enunciated by the Roman Catholic Archbishop Riordan, in a discourse on religious education, that it is impossible to secure this education in connection with our public schools, under the present secular system; that church services, including Sunday-schools, are entirely insufficient for it; that home instruction cannot be depended on, and therefore that church schools are absolutely necessary. The Government schools give secular instruction and it is unnecessary that the church schools should undertake that, if "mutual relations" can be established between the public schools and the church schools, and what Mgr. Satolli calls "parallel action" be thereby secured. The church schools would supplement the secular instruction of the public schools with religious instruction pure and simple, making the Bible, either Catholic or Protestant, the text-book, teaching the Christian evidences, history and ethics from the standpoint of Bible Christianity, and a general system of theology. Under this plan the public schools and the church schools instead of being antagonistic or competitive, would be coöperative.

Under this alliance, Dr. Pond says, "the studies pursued in the church schools would become electives in the public school curriculum, and children attending church schools would be dismissed one hour earlier on that account, and the record of credits in church-school studies would contribute in due proportion to the standing which the pupil attains in the public schools."

The "demand" on the part of the Protestant Churches, backed by "the immense political influence of the Romish Church," for such an alliance between the secular and church schools it is declared would be "irresistible." And this Protestant D.D., you will notice, quotes at some length from a recent address of the Papal Alegate Mgr. Satolli, to show that "Romanists and Protestants can pull together," to this end.

A cunning scheme, a crafty plot! a fine entering wedge to secure a national religion by this instruction given by trained and salaried teachers, in buildings connected with the churches. And, as a starter, Dr. Pond is now bending all his energies to secure the funds for the erec-

tion of a church-school building on a lot adjoining his church.

It will *cost* to carry out this scheme, he admits, but thinks it will *pay*. Yes, Judas was paid. How long before Government would be called on to assume the expense of running this religious annex to its secular system, on parallel lines?

These are indeed perilous times for religious liberty, and without religious liberty how long will civil liberty survive? Foes within, and foes without; foes in one's own household of faith. Protestant pastors hob-nobbing and counselling with Italian priests to betray religious liberty! Alack and alas! "Who shall guard the shepherds?" Let our SENTINEL continue ever faithful.

J. L. HATCH.

Oakland, Cal., Sept. 14.

The Lord's Day.

THE beloved disciple had been banished to the isle of Patmos "for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." Just when this took place is not known with positive certainty, but it was certainly many years after the ascension of Christ. While there he had wonderful visions, and this is how he begins the account of them. "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice." Rev. 1:10.

From this we know that there was a certain day known at that time as the Lord's day, and that John, as a faithful follower of Christ, observed it. We may also know that if the Lord had a special day for his own there, he must have it still. Let us see if we can find out what day it is. The only place where we can surely find it is the Bible.

In the fifty-eighth chapter of Isaiah we find the Lord's day mentioned in these words: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride on the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Verses 13, 14.

Here the day which the Lord himself calls "My holy day," is "the Sabbath." Now what day is the Sabbath? The Lord himself tells us this, also: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shall thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Ex. 20:8-10.

It is plain that the Sabbath—the seventh day—is the same day that in Isaiah is called by the Lord "My holy day." With these two texts alone we have found that the Lord's day is the Sabbath—the seventh-day of the week. Therefore the day on which John was in the Spirit, and received visions of God, was the seventh day, the Sabbath. Thus, to put the matter into compact form: The seventh day is the Sabbath; it is the Sabbath of the Lord; it is a holy day, and is to be kept holy; the Lord himself calls it "My holy day;" John was in the Spirit on the Lord's day; therefore John was in the Spirit on the Sabbath day.

We have further evidence. At one time Jesus and his disciples went on the Sabbath day through the corn; and his disciples being hungry, began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. The Pharisees,

who were ever on the watch to find something against Jesus, accused his disciples of breaking the Sabbath. There can be no question as to what day of the week this was, for the Pharisees observed the seventh day of the week strictly, that is, in outward form. So when they said, "Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the Sabbath day," they had reference only to the seventh day. This is of value, incidentally, as showing what day of the week it is that is called the Sabbath day in the New Testament.

But Jesus would not allow that his disciples had done wrong in plucking and eating corn on the Sabbath day. Still later, on that same day, when about to heal a man, he said, "It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days." To the Pharisees he said, in defending his disciples from the false charge of Sabbath-breaking: "If ye had known what this meant, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day." Matt. 12:7, 8.

Since it was the seventh day, which the Pharisees professed to keep, and which they charged the disciples with breaking, it was the seventh day of which Jesus declared himself to be Lord. For "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." How did Jesus come to be Lord of the seventh-day Sabbath?—By making it, and setting it apart for man's use. Thus, after the account of the six days of creation, we read:—

"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them, and on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. 2:1-3. The same one who created was the one who rested on the seventh day. But the Lord Jesus Christ is the Creator of all things as we read in John 1:1-3; Col. 1:12-17, and many other places.

Christ is Lord of the seventh-day Sabbath, therefore, by virtue of his being Creator. He says of his people, "I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Ezek. 20:12. So the Sabbath is a sign that in Christ as Creator we have "wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption." Consequently, the Sabbath must endure as long as the facts of creation endure; as long as it is a fact that Christ is Creator, and that he has power to redeem. Hear his words on this point:—

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5:17, 18.

"And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17.

And though the present heaven and earth pass, they will be created new, and the promise is: "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Isa. 66:22, 23.

E. J. WAGGONER.

The Influence of Puritan Religious Legislation Upon Subsequent Christianity.

[Continuation of a thesis by T. J. Van Horn of the University of Chicago.]

To one who has studied the history of criminal legislation it will appear that Puritan legislation in general was a decided improvement upon previous codes in its spirit of humanity. Bancroft says, "A crowd of offenses was at one sweep brushed from the catalogue of capital crimes." But when we remember that in the name of religion about fifteen crimes were punishable by death, we at least get some idea of the cruelties of legislation preceding this age. We feel like justifying the remark of Ellis, that "The only possible attraction which an historical student in these days can find in rehearsing the policy and rule of puritanism in early Massachusetts, and the only relief of which he can avail himself in facing its repelling feature, is in the attempt to trace the chronological and philosophical relation in puritanism in the development of theories, beliefs, and experiments in human society and government.*

We cannot hope to answer the question, what has been the influence of this legislation upon subsequent generations with anything like mathematical precision. So many causes have been acting and reacting: so many streams of influence have converged to color our present religious life: that it would be difficult to say what would be distinctly Puritan. There would be little dissent, however, from the proposition, to which I have already alluded, that there are many things of genuine worth in the moral and religious life of America to-day which are an heritage, more or less direct from puritanism. But we are to distinguish between the influence of those sterling qualities of honesty and integrity of purpose exhibited in the lives of these men, and the influence of their legislation which was the expression of what was abnormal in their religious life. It is true that the laws enacted by the people are expressive of the moral character of the people. But the Puritans revealed in the application of their laws to human society, a total misconception of the relation of the Bible to civil government, and the true method of its application in the suppression of evil. The system of legislation prescribed for ancient Israel, although the best which, in the state of development, God could make use of, was not the ideal system.

It was the radical mistake of the Puritans to attempt to apply this system, which God alone knew how to use, to people in a more enlightened age.

It would be pleasant as panegyrist have done, to dwell only upon the bright side of their life and its influence: but ours is the more sombre task of dwelling on the influence of their legislation. Let us consider, first, its direct influence:—

What, then, must be the effect upon the general public of seeing a man sitting in the stocks for what the civil authorities regard as a violation of the Lord's day? What must be the effect upon the mind of one in whom there remains a spark of the spirit of liberty on seeing a man banished from his home and forced to flee in the middle of winter into the wilderness for daring to deny the immortality of the soul: or openly condemn or oppose the baptism of infants: or "purposely depart

*Puritan Age in Mass., p. 80.

the congregation at the administration of that ordinance?" or the "ordinance of the magistracy"? What reproach must be brought upon the cross of Christ among non-Christians by seeing the authorities, his professed followers, whipping through the streets at a cart's tail, even so offensive characters as the Quakers doubtless were then? By an enactment in the name of religion, fining a person heavily for keeping them over night or even attending their meetings: by seeing them even tried and executed as capital criminals. What bitter prejudices must be engendered against religion in the minds of those outside of the church, by being deprived of the privileges of citizenship, on account of not being able to conscientiously join in church relationship with the Puritans, and yet be compelled to pay his assessment for the support of the preacher established among them! How ample the opportunity for criticism of the religion of Christ when its avowed adherents, basing their authority upon God's word, impose the penalty of banishment for the persistent denial of a doctrine so utterly unscriptural as infant baptism; and a fine for carrying a burden, or traveling on Sunday, concerning whose sanctity the Bible is entirely silent. Yet, that which, on prior grounds, we conclude must have been the influence of these things, is confirmed by what the influence upon public sentiment actually was when Roger Williams was forced to flee from the colony for teaching doctrines out of harmony with the established creed; when Anne Hutchinson and Wheelwright were banished; when Dunster was deposed at Harvard; when a storm of indignation arose in the colonies and in England over the fine of forty pounds, twenty pounds, and five pounds respectively, imposed upon three persons, and the cruel whipping inflicted upon one of them, who would not pay his fine, for holding a private meeting for preaching and administering the Lord's Supper. It affords some relief to know that many in the court opposed these severe measures; but this could not check the prejudice excited against Christianity by their cruelties, nor stay the tide of popular hate which was rising against puritanism and hastening its overthrow.

Second, its decline:—

History has entered its protest against the aim, such as the Puritans had in view, of setting up a kingdom of God on earth by civil power. Christ himself has said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and it was a wide departure from the Christ method when the Puritans attempted to force men to be good. Consequently, we should expect to see the reaction which took place in England upon the fall of puritanism there and the restoration of Charles II. Let us call Green to witness:—

In an instant the whole face of England was changed. All that was noblest and best in puritanism was whirled away with its pettiness and its tyranny in the current of the nation's hate. Religion had been turned into a system of political and social oppression, and it fell with their fall. Godliness became a byword of scorn: sobriety in dress, in speech, in manners was flouted as a mask of the detested puritanism. Butler, in his "Hudibras," poured forth insult on the past with the pedantic buffoonery for which the general hatred, far more than its humor, secured a hearing.

Duelling and raking became the marks of a fine gentleman, and grave divines winked at the follies of "honest fellows" who fought, gambled, swore, drank, and ended a day of debauchery by a night in the gutter. Life among men of fashion vibrated between frivolity and excess.

Lord Rochester was a fashionable poet, and the titles of some of his poems were such as no pen of our day could copy. Sir Charles Sedley was a

fashionable wit, and the foulness of his words made even the porters of Covent Garden pelt him from the balcony when he ventured to address them. The Duke of Buckingham is a fair type of the time, and the most characteristic event in the duke's life was a duel in which he consummated his seduction of Lady Shrewsbury, by killing her husband, while the countess, in disguise as a page, held his horse for him and looked on at the murder.†

Green admits that it is easy to exaggerate the extent of this reaction. Yet there was a similar reaction in Geneva following Calvin's rigid discipline; and we are not surprised to find that historians assign, as one of the causes of the gross immorality and grossness which prevailed in New England early in the 18th century, the reaction against puritanism. The stormy political aspect of the times; the immigration of a new class of inhabitants; the Half Way Covenant; and new currents of sentiment from the Old World under the influence of the rising spirit of radical inquiry; are the four causes, assigned by Dorchester,‡ of the decline of puritanism in New England. The last of these was owing, in some degree, to the reaction against the hyper-Calvinistic mode of thought so characteristic of puritanism. While the Half Way Covenant was the direct result of the reaction against the Puritan law which excluded persons from the privileges of citizenship unless they were church members.

Thus, puritanism could not avoid the logical consequences of its fundamental error, and the system fell by the force of its own inconsistencies. But its influence did not end with its fall. It projected into the stream of religious thought and action vicious principles, along with its elements of good, still active, whose influence we shall attempt to trace as we consider the influence of puritanism on nineteenth century Christianity.

(To be continued.)

"We Christians Have Changed the Day."

[This Methodist divine says "We Christians have changed the day." Compare with this statement the words of the *Catholic Mirror* to the same point, lately published in these columns. The facts upon this question must be acknowledged sooner or later by all. It will then resolve itself simply into the question: Will I observe the day God consecrated or the day which man has substituted? Then follows immediately the question of the right of the State to enforce observance of a day, and whether or no its religious edict shall be obeyed.—Ed.]

THE *Chicago Herald*, of May 22, quotes Rev. James Miller, pastor of the Marshfield Avenue Methodist Church, as preaching the following words to his Methodist congregation the day before:—

Then again, if this ancient Sabbath law is still in force, it is still good for the day as well as for the manner of its observance, but we Christians have changed the day and have decreed that the first and not the seventh day shall be observed as the Sabbath, and we have done this without any pretense of authority from either the Old or New Testament, except that which is strained and forced to meet the emergency of an argument.

Everything considered, Mr. Miller's statement of facts concerning the unscriptural grounds on which Sunday observance rests, is deeply significant. Historically, "We Christians," means Roman Catholics, against whom Methodists are not slow to bring grave charges, because they pervert the truth by false traditions.

Taking Mr. Miller's words as reported by the *Herald*, and the charge of perversion lies against the Methodists, with pertinent sharpness.

† Green's Shorter History of England, p. 607.

‡ Dor. Christianity in the U. S., p. 138.

Do not Methodists attempt to show that the Bible requires Sunday keeping? They do; but as Mr. Miller candidly confesses, their arguments are "strained and forced to meet the emergency." A divine law against making Sunday a common day, without which there can be no transgression, does not exist.

What about the consistency and the Christian honesty of admitting that there is no such law, and then assuming that there is, and that men are wicked because they disregard what does not exist? Is that Christian, Christ-like?—*Evangel and Sabbath Outlook*.

Results of "Christian Statesmanship" in America.

[The following list of items is from the *Christian Statesman* of October 21. In this the *Statesman* enumerates a few of those events throughout the country, continually increasing in frequency, upon which it prides itself as being the result of its Christian statesmanship.]

THE city council of Napa, California, has passed an ordinance closing the saloons on Sunday, which goes into effect October 1st.—The Trade Association of Philadelphia Druggists has recently discussed the proposal to close drug stores on Sabbath afternoons. Action was deferred to the next meeting.—The *Minerve*, a Catholic paper of Montreal, complains of the increasing Sabbath desecration of that city, specifying Jews' bakers' wagons and Jewish milliners working at their windows.—The Lord's Day Observance Association of Canada will ask the Ontario legislature to define the class of voters who may use the ballot in Sunday car elections; to provide that such elections may only be held at stated intervals, and that, when held, the usual safeguards shall surround the polling-booth.—The retail butchers of Sioux City, Iowa, have all entered into an agreement to close their places of business on the Sabbath. September 10 was the first day for observance of the agreement, and with two or three exceptions the markets were closed. Those who did not close are to be arrested by their fellows in self-defense, if they cannot be persuaded to close voluntarily.—The Grocers' Protective Association of Indianapolis, Ind., has been formed for mutual benefit and to promote the proper observance of Sunday.—Steps are being taken to prosecute Robinson's Shirt factory of Bayonne, N. J., for noisy Sunday work.—Four barbers of Knoxville, Tenn., were recently arrested by a fellow barber of that city for Sunday work. The law is one secured by the barbers of the State in their own behalf.—At Cramer Hill, Pa., on October 5, representatives of the churches met to form a Union Sabbath Committee to check Sabbath desecration.—The Grocers' Association of Kansas City, Mo., has called on the city prosecutor to know whether the laws protect them against Sunday work. He has replied that Sunday sales of provisions are specifically forbidden, and that he will prosecute all cases brought to him with proper evidence. [The last four items are from "Pearl of Days" column in the *Mail and Express*.]—The *Advent Review and Herald* reports that the Grocers' Association of Kansas City have sent out to their members a card for their windows, containing the following announcement: "This store will not open for business on Sunday on and after October 1."—The same paper reports that Sheriff Whit-

comb, of Berrien Springs, Mich., has notified the merchants of that town that Sunday traffic must cease.—Also, that the Muncie, Ind., baseball club having been arrested for charging admittance fee on the Sabbath, have been again arrested for a subsequent offense in which, as an evasion, no charge was made at the gate, but seats were sold on the grand stand.—Also, that the Topeka pastors have condemned Sunday excursions to the World's Fair and to the G. A. R. National Encampment.

The Purpose of the Agitation to Close the Midwinter Fair on Sunday.

THE whole object of this agitation concerning the closing of the Midwinter Fair is to obtain a California Sunday law. The closing of the Fair is but a mighty lever to that end. The professed ministers of Christ and religious organizations by anti-christian methods (ignorantly no doubt) are endeavoring to force the directors of the Fair to close on Sunday. If these directors so decide of their own free will, this is their privilege; but if they be compelled to do it by the law of the State, the law is wrong, because the closing of the Fair for religious reasons pertains to that with which the State has nothing to do. If it be compelled by "Christians," these Christians are using anti-christian methods. The language of the gospel is "persuade," "beseech," "entreat," "come." It recognizes man's free will. Jesus came not to condemn, to judge, to coerce, but "to save," "to minister." See John 12: 47; Matt. 20: 28; Luke 9: 51-56. But efforts are now being made to *coerce* the conductors of the Fair into the closing of it. The initial step toward this was taken by the Christian Endeavor Societies of Alameda County, July 17, in the following resolutions:—

WHEREAS, Sunday opening of the Columbian Exposition has proved to be so objectionable to the larger part of the intelligent citizens of these United States, as seen by the strong protests against it, and the multitudes who on that account have refrained from attending said Fair; and,

WHEREAS, The Christian Endeavorers of California hold in high regard the good name of our State, as well as the moral character of our people, which will be greatly affected by the manner of conducting the proposed Midwinter Fair; and,

WHEREAS, We firmly believe that Sunday opening on that occasion would be a dishonor to God, and a grievous violation of his law, therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Christian Endeavorers of the Alameda County Christian Endeavor Union, welcome the coming of this Fair, and we do most earnestly petition that the Lord's day be respected by closing the gates on that day; and we suggest to all Christians and law-abiding citizens of the Pacific Coast the eminent propriety of taking no concessions at the Fair and of entering into no contracts regarding exhibits or other matters without a clear, irreversible clause securing Sunday-closing during the entire time of the Exposition; and be it

Resolved, That we recommend to the president of every Christian Endeavor Society in this county to prepare at once and present to every adult member of his society, church, and congregation, a petition setting forth these facts; and be it further

Resolved, That our corresponding secretary be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the corresponding secretaries of every union in the State, and ask them to pass similar resolutions and circulate such petitions to their societies.

Note that the whole matter is based on the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, an object specifically "religious," and as such so demand. "The larger part of the intelligent citizens of these United States" refer to the protests of the Church people against the opening of the Fair. It is safe to say that not more than two-thirds of the Protestant members ever personally pro-

tested against it, while many in the Episcopal Church, and the greater part of the Roman Catholic Church, and millions belonging to no church whatever, were positively for Sunday opening. Surely it cannot be said that the small minority which protested and boycotted and anathematized and threatened are the larger part of the intelligent people of this country. It is true that many stayed away because they did not want to pay a full price for a half show. This is what the "Christian" boycott accomplished, by the gospel of force and coercion, but not by Christian means.

The second reason given by the Endeavorers why the Fair should be closed is to save "the good name of the State as well as the moral character of our people." We have before shown that no law, State or divine, will be violated by opening the Fair on Sunday, and the "good name" of the State is not so much to be sought as its right action, and no power in this world can "affect" "the moral character of the people" without the consent of the people as individuals. With their *choice*, not their compulsion, rests their morality. In this the Endeavorers arrogate to themselves the authority to say what is moral for the people of California, and to take such step as they think will prevent immorality. The Church has no business to make or dictate laws for the State. It is a position which Christ himself would not assume (John 18: 36; Luke 12: 14), and he expressly forbade his Church exercising such prerogative (Matt. 20: 25-28; 1 Cor. 4: 5).

The next step of the Endeavorers is to declare their conviction that to open the Fair Sunday is "a dishonor to God, and a grievous violation of his law." And they want the directors of the Fair to close for that reason; and more than this (for the object is a State Sunday law), they want the *people of this State to say* that the opening of the Fair Sunday, an act which would be perfectly legitimate on other days, is "a dishonor to God and a grievous violation of his law." If they could compel the closing of the Fair, then the prestige of this step would be used on the legislature; and when the legislature yielded and passed a Sunday law for the same reason (and a religious reason is the only reason why a Sunday law is desired), the State would stand as the sponsor of religious faith, the authoritative interpreter of divine law. It would come between the soul and Christ. The conscientious who were equally good citizens, but who interpreted the Bible differently, would be forced to suffer. Then would be true what the United States Senate declared in 1829:—

Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for violation of what government denominated the law of God.

THE BOYCOTT.

Then comes the resolution to petition "that the Lord's day be respected, by closing the gates on that day;" and then they "suggest" (a mild term for advising a boycott) "to all Christians and law-abiding citizens of the Pacific Coast the eminent propriety of taking no concession," etc., or, in other words, not to patronize the Fair unless their demands be complied with. We say again that every man in California who treats his fellow-men civilly, though he labor every Sunday, is as *law-abiding a citizen* as the most earnest Endeavorer in the State. The words are an insult to the State and its people, though

it is evidently not so designed. The spirit underlying all Sunday laws is responsible for the insult.

There is more in the resolutions, which we have not space to consider. These resolutions are scattered throughout the State, and we understand have been cordially indorsed generally by the Endeavor Union. The Christian Endeavor Society stands at the very head in its influence at the present time in religious circles. And right in the initial stage of the Fair, when its promoters are struggling for funds to insure its success, these religious societies of the State take this advantage to compel the recognition of a religious institution. Compelling it here, compelling it in municipalities, the next step will be to compel it in the State.

But the Endeavorers are not alone. The preachers of San Francisco and Oakland met in San Francisco September 14, and asked the directors of the Exposition "at the earliest possible moment to declare that the gates of the Midwinter Fair shall be closed on Sundays," and in order that this may be done, they unite in asking for a Saturday half holiday. One of the reasons which they give for the closing of the Fair is that—

the accomplishment of this patriotic object will *barely depend* upon the due observance of the weekly rest day, that most beneficent institution which has become incorporated in our national civilization, which commands the respect, not only of the churches, but of the best thinking classes outside of the churches.

We do not know what is meant by the first two lines of the above quotation unless it is that, unless the Sunday is respected by the Fair, its accomplishment will be made a very difficult matter by the religious classes. These ministers were from the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, and Christian Churches.

With all of these is the religious press, and behind it all is the American Sabbath Union. Dr. Edward Thomson, the active agent of the union in California, boasts that the union now has twenty-nine denominations in its organization; that by its efforts "twelve counties in California have passed some kind of a Sunday-closing ordinance." Read the report of his speech in the San Jose *Daily Mercury* of September 11. In that he plainly declares that it is for a State Sunday law that he is working; that "this is a Christian Nation;" that "Congress has established religion;" and that the Sabbath "cherished by our fathers and mothers," "this sacred day," must be handed "down to the generations to come."

These, and many more utterances which we have not space to give, clearly show just what the churches (with few honorable exceptions) are working for in California. It is by every plea which can be made save that of liberty, by every subterfuge and sophistry unworthy of equality, patriotism, and Christianity, that these people seek to turn backward to the Dark Ages our now free State. It is to degrade into the dust of tyranny, by religious bigotry and arrogance, the only State of any great influence which is not cursed by religious laws to-day. And the churches which are behind this movement, it matters not how honest their intention, are forsaking Christ and his power and laying hold of earthly power.—*Signs of the Times, Oakland, Cal.*

KEEP the Church and State separate.

Another Gospel.

A UNITARIAN minister, in San Francisco, recently preached a sermon in advocacy of opening the Midwinter Fair on Sunday. A press report of his discourse says:—

The ministers who have so strenuously advocated the closing of the World's Fair, were severely hauled over the coals for the manner in which they threatened legislators, and were set down as a lot of corrupt politicians themselves.

The tendency of the modern Protestant ministry to force special legislation through the coercion of legislators, is becoming a conspicuous feature of their warfare. As there is no example of Christ or his apostles operating in that line, it is clear that those who do endeavor to "persuade" men by the argument of threatened political defeat, are preaching "another gospel" than that preached "in the beginning;" for the gospel of the Founder of the faith was not urged in that way, nor is it possible to reach the hearts of men by any process of civil law.—*Signs of the Times.*

Money for Sectarian Purposes.

[The following is a concise statement of the relation of Protestants and Roman Catholics to the Government finances, by a correspondent of the *Loyal American.*]

WOULD it not be well to give a few facts regarding the use of public money for sectarian purposes?

In the year of 1885 a "Bureau of Catholic Missions" was established at Washington, D. C. The chief design of this was to "push Catholic schools upon the Government as earnestly as possible." In September of this same year, this same bureau secured from the commissioner of Indian affairs, Mr. Adkin, the following statement:—

The Government should be liberal in making contracts with religious denominations to teach Indian children in schools established by these denomina-

tions. It should throw open the door, and say to all denominations, "There should be no monopoly of good work. Enter, all of you, and do whatever your hands find of good work to do, and in your efforts the Government will give you encouragement out of its liberal purse." In other words, the Government, without partiality, should encourage all the churches to work in this broad field of philanthropic endeavor.—*Congressional Record, of July 25, 1890, p. 8341.*

The door was thrown open at once, and the Catholic Church entered with a number of professed Protestant churches to secure the governmental "encouragement" thus offered. In the five succeeding years they made the following record of drafts upon the people's money, as shown by the *Congressional Record* above quoted:—

| | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| In the year 1886— | Catholic \$118,343 | All others \$109,906 |
| In the year 1887— | Catholic \$194,635 | All others \$168,679 |
| In the year 1888— | Catholic \$221,169 | All others \$155,095 |
| In the year 1889— | Catholic \$347,672 | All others \$183,000 |
| In the years 1889-90— | Catholic \$356,767 | All others \$204,993 |

| | | |
|---|-------------|-----------|
| Total for Catholic schools | \$1,138,786 | |
| Total for all other denominations and all other schools | | \$821,683 |

But President Harrison, with General Morgan as Indian Commissioner, determined to stop these appropriations, and let the churches support their own missionary work. But the administration was forced to make confession before the Senate, by Senator Dawes, that "it found it impossible to do that;" and "that it was impossible to retrace the step." Finding "it was impossible," it was determined to allow no increase. But the Catholic Church ignored the wishes of Congress, and secured the increase she desired for the year 1890, of \$44,000.

Seeing that the Catholics were getting the lion's share, as they always do, the Protestant churches raised the cry of "thief." But this was in bad taste, com-

ing from those who had shared the plunder, and established a precedent.

Nearly all the Protestant churches have now changed their mind, and concluded to take no more "encouragement" from the Government. But what can they say? The Catholic Church says: "We have not changed our mind. You once said it was the right thing for Government to do. We agreed with you. And we believe it still. You opened the doors. We entered together. And now we shall keep the door open." And so millions of dollars of the people's money is being used for the advancement of sectarianism. And to this extent does Rome rule the Nation. And still Protestants sleep on and vainly imagine that she is becoming Americanized. H. F. PHELPS.

St. Paul, Oct. 16, 1893.

BOOKS FOR LITTLE ONES.

We are pleased to say to our many friends who have asked us in regard to books for little ones that

BIBLE PICTURES AND STORIES,

AND ITS COMPANION,

Little Folks' Bible Gallery,

contain the most perfect and complete outfit of Bible illustrations and stories that we have been able to find. We can recommend them, or either one, to every one desirous of obtaining something good as a gift for a child. Size 7 x 9 inches, 96 pages each; 44 full-page pictures in one, 45 in the other.

Price \$1 each, or both together, post-paid, \$1.75.

PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,

43 Bond Street, New York City.

Abiding Sabbath And Lord's Day.

BY ALONZO T. JONES.

A pointed review of the \$500 and \$1,000 prize essays in support of the Christian Sabbath, so called. Those desiring some \$1,000 reasons for keeping the first day of the week, will find them here. 173 pages, 20 cents. Pacific Press, 43 Bond St., New York City.

THE BATTLE CREEK SANITARIUM HEALTH FOODS.

For more than sixteen years the Battle Creek Sanitarium has maintained a Health Food Department, at first for the benefit of its patients and patrons, later, and for more than a dozen years, with increased facilities, to supply the general public. Within the last year **More than 150 Tons** of the following named foods have been manufactured and sold:—

- Oatmeal Biscuit,
- Medium Oatmeal Crackers,
- Fruit Crackers,
- Plain Oatmeal Crackers,
- No. 1 Graham Crackers,
- No. 2 Graham Crackers,
- Plain Graham Crackers (Dyspeptic),
- Wheat Granola,
- Whole Wheat Wafers,
- Gluten Biscuit, No. 1,
- Gluten Biscuit, No. 2,
- Rye Wafers,
- Carbon Crackers,
- Avenola,
- Granola,
- White Crackers,
- Gluten Wafers,
- Infants' Food.

Granola, The Gem of Health Foods.

Our Granola, which has now been manufactured by us for nearly seventeen years, is unquestionably the finest health food ever devised, and is greatly superior to any of the numerous imitations to which its success has given rise.

TO THE PUBLIC: This certifies that the Battle Creek Sanitarium Health Foods, manufactured by the Sanitarium under the name of the Sanitarium Food Company, are made under my direction and supervision, and that Granola and the other special foods manufactured by this company, are not made or sold by any other firm or person except their duly authorized agents. J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

Our goods are shipped to every part of the world—to Australia, New Zealand, India, Persia, and other foreign countries, as well as to all parts of the United States; and in every instance they have demonstrated their wonderful keeping properties. The following are a few of the hundreds of testimonials received from persons who have for years made use of our foods.

I have for three years used the "Health Foods" in my family, and can heartily recommend them, both for purity and health-giving properties. MICHIGAN. C. F. PORTER, D. D. S.

Your "Health Foods" are the wonder of the nineteenth century. I have used Granola but a short time, but have already experienced relief from indigestion and acid, or flatulent dyspepsia. I also find the Zwiebach nourishing and toothsome. INDIANA. D. M. KAUFFMAN.

I have personally tested your excellent food known as Granola. It is highly pleasing to the taste, easy of digestion, and the most nutritive cereal production with which I am acquainted. DR. R. W. BULA.

Your Granola is the best selling invalid food I have ever handled. I have already sold nearly two thousand pounds. NEW YORK. A. J. BROUGHTON.

We have used your "Health Foods" in our family for three years, and can not get along without them. Having been troubled with dyspepsia and chronic inflammation of the stomach, I find that your Granola, Avenola, Wheatena, and Gluten are the only foods that I can eat with safety. CONNECTICUT. WM. M. MERRWIN.

Our baby is a testimonial to Sanitarium food. She is ten months old, weighs twenty-eight pounds, and is as ruddy and healthy a specimen as can be seen. She has actually gained flesh while cutting her last two teeth. Her flesh is firm and sound, and she is very strong. OHIO. FRED. L. ROSEMOND.

We have twins, and the little fellows are thriving nicely. The food agrees with them perfectly, and I have recommended it to many who are bringing up babies "by hand." MINNESOTA. D. W. McCOURT.

We are constantly improving our foods, and adding to our list as the result of experimental researches conducted in the Sanitarium Laboratory of Hygiene and our Experimental Kitchen. For the latest descriptive circular and price list, address,

SANITARIUM HEALTH FOOD CO., Battle Creek, Mich



NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 2, 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.

DURING the November term of court, in Maryland, seven Seventh-day Adventists, of Queen Anne's and Kent Counties, are to be tried for Sunday labor.

A TELEGRAPHIC news item, of Oct. 23, is to the effect that the Grand Jury of Baxter County, Arkansas, has indicted sixty persons for using profane language, and that a test case will be made. The entire list of existing religious laws will soon be put into active operation. These things are the flying straws which show the direction from which the storm is coming.

THE Congregational Club of Cleveland, Ohio, has undertaken to suppress all Sunday desecration in that city, and has appointed a committee to confer with other organizations and adopt some plan by which to secure a strict observance of Sunday. The "other organizations," with which the committee is to confer, are probably the Law and Order League and the municipal police.

THE municipal election in Newport, R. I., last week, according to the special correspondence of the *Mail and Express*, turned upon the Sabbath question. The qualifications of one candidate for Mayor were stated to be that he was a "churchman" and would continue the work, already begun, of "closing up the numerous small places of business on Sunday." The appearance of the "Christian party" in politics is not confined to New Jersey.

THE "Sabbath Association" of Maryland met the 9th of October, and passed these resolutions:—

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Maryland Sabbath Association invites the American Sabbath Union to hold its annual meeting in Baltimore in December, 1894, and to hold therewith a jubilee of the first national Lord's day convention.

Resolved, That Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts be elected honorary secretary of this association, to speak in this State, under direction of the president of the association.

Resolved, That the ministers of the various denominations in the city of Baltimore be requested to preach upon the subject of "Sabbath Observance" in November or December ensuing, as may be most convenient to them.

How would it do for these ministers to take as examples with which to illustrate their subject the seven cases of seventh-day observers to be tried for Sabbath observance in Maryland, during November? The commandment reads, "Six days shalt thou labor;" the first-day observance law of Maryland compels the seventh-day observer to disobey the injunc-

tion to labor six days, or else ignore the command to remember that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord. Will the ministers of Maryland advise the "Sabbath Association" and American Sabbath Union to continue to strive against God in this matter of his commandment?

In an address before the House of Representatives, on Chinese exclusion, delivered Oct. 13, Hon. James G. Maguire, of California, referring to the previous remarks of his colleague, Mr. Geary, said:—

I make the same objection to the attempts of these religious bodies to reinforce their perfectly proper personal petitions by appeals to the power and membership of their respective churches. I deny that any religious conference in this country, or any religious association in the United States, represents or is authorized to speak for the political sentiments or political opinions of those who constitute the membership of their churches. I deny that any annual conference of two hundred ministers has a right to control, or does control, or does represent, the political sentiments of the sixty-four thousand members of its faith.

These objections to this kind of petitioning are sound and sensible, and they apply with just the same force to all that wholesale "representative" petitioning which frightened the Fifty-second Congress into that piece of unconstitutional legislation for the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, which will be its shame to the end of time.

THE attendance at the World's Fair on Sunday, Oct. 15, was 82,276, and on Sunday, Oct. 22, reached the number of 140,578. Such a Sunday attendance as this together with the fact that the great World's Fair is now an assured financial success, despite the enormous initial expenditures that were made, and also in consideration of the remarkable immunity of the World's Fair grounds, during the summer, from destructive storms which have swept the country so generally, and the unusually pleasant weather and comfortable temperature which that section has experienced during the continuance of the Fair, would seem to show that the Sunday closing seers, who prophesied destruction if the Fair opened on Sunday, should be classed among the false prophets.

In the course of an extended notice of a lately published work by Judge Charles P. Daly, entitled "The Jews in North America," the *New York Sun* says:—

It is commonly said that Lord Baltimore made religious freedom the basis of his colony of Maryland, Judge Daly points out that the freedom was limited to those professing to believe in Jesus Christ and was accompanied by a proviso that any person who denied the Trinity should be punished with death. Maryland, therefore, was no place for Jews and the rigorous exclusion of all professors of the Jewish faith was maintained for a long time after the war of independence. As late as 1819, although John Adams, Jefferson and Madison united in expressing their condemnation of the intolerant restriction, the legislature refused to abolish it. A few years afterward, however, the provision was repealed.

In a pamphlet, published in 1876, by Rev. B. F. Brown, containing the substance of a lecture delivered by himself in Baltimore, upon the early religious his-

tory of Maryland, the position was taken and supported that Maryland never was a Roman Catholic colony, and that the "Act of Toleration," of the assembly of 1649, was nothing other, at the most, than the political measure of a Roman Catholic nobleman under pressure of a Protestant majority,—necessary to the maintenance of his position in authority.

In connection with the first article in this issue note the matter on page 343, entitled "Money for Sectarian Purposes." The facts and statistics in reference to national and municipal appropriations for denominational purposes here set forth, emphasize most forcibly the warning which the SENTINEL has faithfully given as to the direction in which this country is moving. Rome does already rule the Nation. Not because the Roman Catholic Church is strong enough either in numbers or influence to rule, but because her opponents, who call themselves Protestants, so Romanize themselves by the methods which they use as to become themselves Roman Catholic in spirit, and in everything but name,—which remains to them only as a cloak and a deception. Those who call themselves Protestants, and who profess to stand for the defense of Protestantism, declare that Roman Catholicism is a great political organization, and as such they antagonize it; and to do this they make an exact copy of their hated enemy and make of Protestantism a great political organization also. An apprehension of these facts will lead one to a keen appreciation of the reason and the justice of the biblical denunciation of the beast and the image to the beast.

"LET the workingman do on the Sabbath just as he sees fit," says Rev. Dr. McPherson, "so long as he doesn't infringe upon the rights of others. If he wishes to attend church, well and good, for he will be benefited; but if he does not, let him not be criticised. He should spend the day in a way that will give him recreation and enjoyment and improvement." Certainly, let the workingman be perfectly free—but stop the cars, and all but the more expensive public conveyances, so that the workingman will "see fit" to spend the day either at home or else in attending church. This is what Dr. McPherson and all the rest of the Sunday preachers really mean.

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,
43 Bond Street, New York City.