

AMERICAN SENTINEL

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.—Thomas Jefferson.

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER 4, 1889.

NUMBER 45.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK;
18 POST ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.;
12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.

EDITORS,
E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES.

"THE Sunday-law cranks of Boston," says a New York paper, "have been snubbed by another judicial opinion. In a case brought to test the legality of towing on Sunday, Judge Thompson, in the Superior Court, held 'that vessels coming to the port of Boston have a right to come to docks on Sunday, and that it is a work of necessity to bring the vessel in whether by the sailors on board or by those in another boat towing her.' The prosecution was instituted by religious fanatics of the Elliott Shepard kind."

AN attorney-at-law, in Washington, D. C., writes thus concerning the AMERICAN SENTINEL:

"EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL: A number of copies of your paper have recently fallen into my hands. Its doctrines are logical and its arguments insuperable. Before seeing it, I had attended some of the meetings held here by the advocates of the so-called Sunday-Rest bill, where I saw miles of petitions, and listened to many fine speeches, and signed the petition. Since seeing your paper, I have become converted and signed an opposing petition. You are right in thinking there is danger in that bill."

M. A. G. says we are in the fog. We request him to read Luke 6:41, 42. After these statements it is astonishing to hear him say, "We protest as strongly as anyone against the union of Church and State." But what does he mean by a union of Church and State? It is a union "between the State and some particular organized church or denomination." This kind of a union of Church and State we never expect to see. Was the Church united to the State in the days of Constantine?—All will admit that it was. How was it done?—A council was called to decide what were the principles of the Christian religion common to all. These were enforced by law. The very same thing in substance and principle is proposed by Senator Blair and formulated in the joint resolution S. R. 86, proposing an amendment of the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religious and free public schools, introduced into Congress May 25, 1888. The National Reformers favor this amendment. Hence they favor a repetition of the same thing done in the fourth century, or the same kind of a union of Church and State made at that time. The

church is the body of Christ. Col. 1:18. The members of the church are members of his body. 1 Cor. 6:15; Eph. 5:29, 30. Those who have the religion of Christ form the church of Christ, and for Senator Blair to propose legislation enforcing the teaching of the "principles of the Christian religion," is to propose a union of the Christian Church with the State; and for the National Reformers to favor that amendment is to favor a union of Church and State—W., in *Prohibition Journal*.

"Legitimate Recreation."

IN the report of the thirty and thirty-first years of the New York Sabbath Committee, we find a section on the Saturday half-holiday movement, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:—

"The Saturday half-holiday movement, from which much was hoped in its indirect influence upon the Sunday observance, has not accomplished as yet what was expected from it. Said Governor Hill, in a speech at Dunkirk, with reference to this measure: 'There may be a legal difficulty in dividing a day, making only one-half of it a legal holiday. That difficulty can be avoided by making every Saturday—the whole day—a holiday. Saturday would thus be set apart as a day of recreation and pleasure, and the following Sunday would become, what it was intended to be, emphatically a day of rest, and a better observance of Sunday would be promoted. Sunday is rapidly becoming a day of recreation, especially in the summer season, instead of a day of rest. Such a holiday would afford every workingman an opportunity for pleasure, for some travel, for visiting friends, for study, and for whatever other legitimate recreation he may desire to take.'"

There are two points suggested by this which are worthy of serious thought. The first is in connection with the claim that the Sunday law is a temperance measure in that it will close the saloons on Sunday. It is well known that when the charge of discrimination is made of tacitly making the liquor traffic legitimate on other days by excluding the sale of intoxicants on Sunday, the Sunday-law people say that it is necessary because people are idle on Sunday, and, therefore, are then more subject to the attractions of the saloon; that if the saloons are closed on Sunday, when people are idle, the bulk of their traffic will be taken away.

The fallacy of this claim was shown in the SENTINEL a few weeks ago by a quotation from the *Voice*; but the effort of the Sunday-law movers to have Saturday made a half or a whole holiday is the strongest demonstration of the hollowness of their temperance professions. While professing to want the saloons closed on Sunday in order simply to protect the idle laboring men, they, at the same time, work to have the preceding day made a holiday, in which the workingmen shall be idle. But we have never heard

of a Saturday-closing movement, so that it would seem that the saloon is dangerous to idle men only on Sunday.

But what is specially interesting in the paragraph we have quoted is the closing sentence in the extract from Governor Hill's speech. After recommending the setting apart of Saturday as a day of recreation and pleasure, so that Sunday might become emphatically a day of rest, he says: "Such a holiday would afford every man an opportunity for pleasure, for some travel, for visiting friends, for study, and for whatever other legitimate recreation he may desire to take!" That is the object of the proposed Saturday half-holiday; it is to allow the workingman time to take the recreation which he needs, but which would be prohibited by such a Sunday law as is desired. And what is the recreation? Read the above sentence again. It is travel, visiting friends, and study. Nothing could more plainly indicate that the proposed law would prohibit such quiet recreation as visiting friends and studying. Surely this would be the Puritan law with a vengeance. It would involve the spying into houses by the minions of the law, to see who is reading the newspaper or studying, or to see who is receiving an innocent visit from a friend. It is a striking comment on the inevitable working of a Sunday law, that its friends cannot make even the most incidental allusion to it without revealing the cloven foot of the Inquisition.

E. J. W.

What It Means.

THE fathers of our Constitution builded wisely when they inserted the provision that liberty of conscience must remain inviolate. To maintain that bulwark of liberty there must be a continuous and absolute separation of State and Church and public schools from all religion. To guide the public-school system to its destiny it is absolutely essential that religious influence be far removed from the schools, and that sectarian doctrines be forever eliminated. The blending of popular education with religion has been fully illustrated by the present condition of Germany, where the fatal effects are now shown. Atheism and infidelity exist to a larger extent than in any other civilized country. Commenting on this subject a valued exchange says:—

"Nothing can work so great a hardship as to cram into the minds of children religious opinions opposed to their home training—opinions, perhaps, which they have been taught to regard as fatal to eternal salvation. The only one that will be pleased at this is the teacher who is spreading on earth the dogma of some particular creed. Religious instruction in the public school means a gradual retrogression to the union of Church

and State, and this union means a tyrannical government and a corrupt priesthood. It has been so in all ages, and we are not so superior to our ancestors that we may thrust our hands into the fire and escape without being burned. Religious instruction ought not to be ignored, but the home and the church are the places wherein both precept and example will be most effective; but if liberty of conscience is valued at all, keep religion away from public schools."—*Jewish Times and Observer*.

Hon. William Jackson Armstrong on Religious Legislation.

IN the course of a lecture on "Romanism and Civil Liberty," delivered in this city on the 21st ult., Hon. William Jackson Armstrong, of Washington, D. C., the well-known lecturer and journalist, spoke as follows concerning the efforts of certain so-called Protestants to secure the passage of a national Sunday law:—

One of the official organs of these misguided associations has said: "Whenever the Roman Catholics of this country are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them." Not a doubt of it!

Well! the Roman Catholics of the United States in their just-closed convention at Baltimore, have accommodated some of these fanatical gentlemen. They have accepted the proffered hands of the Sunday-Rest faction to establish by law a national Sabbath. The coalition has been made.

Nature makes no indication of a Sabbath. The sun continues to shine, the birds to sing, the flowers to bloom, and the rivers to run, every day in the year. But after fifteen centuries of debate, these pious people, who represent only a fragment of the religious and Christian world, have decided which of the several days in dispute the Almighty has definitely appointed for rest and religious exercise by man; and they have resolved, with characteristic intolerance, to enforce this decision by law on their fellow-men. That was precisely the policy of the Roman Inquisition for three hundred years.

Their legislative mouth-piece at Washington has been equal to the occasion. He has formulated and introduced in the United States Senate an elaborate bill, by which all recreations on the first day of the week other than that of religious exercises, shall be, so far as the national government is concerned, prohibited to Americans by law.

That bill lies before me. An examination of its provisions in detail would be an evening's entertainment. I hesitate to speak with disrespect of a scheme near to the hearts of so many good folks—as Douglas Jerrold hesitated before speaking disrespectfully of the equator. But I am under the disability suggested by the Reverend Sydney Smith, who said that he made it a rule never to read any book he was called upon to review, for fear of taking a prejudice against it. I have read this bill. I have taken a prejudice against it. I am constrained to say that, in my judgment, if you will take this bill and perforate with a street-car conductor's bell-punch all its misleading rhetoric and palpable sophistries, it will be found to resemble a remnant of Irish lace, or the countenance of a colored gentleman emerging from the varioloid. There

is a legend of Siam that they once had in that country an exceedingly small and pretentious king. That very small king was afflicted with a very large cancer. After a counsel of the royal surgeons, they operated for the removal of that tumor. But when they had taken away the tumor, it was found that the throne was vacant. A cancer had been king of Siam. That pretentious little king was all cancer. It would not do to operate for the excision of cancer on the United States Senate bill for Sabbath rest.

There are a thousand reasons why this bill should not become American law. The attorney pleaded to the court that there were thirteen reasons why his client was not present in court—and that the first of these reasons was that his client was *dead*. The first objection against this bill for Sabbath rest is that you cannot make men tired by law so that they can rest only in one way on Sunday. It is the assumption of this bill that two doctrinal sermons and four prayers will act as an invariable tonic on a tired man. They will not always do it.

To enact this bill would be to re-enact the joyless Puritan Sabbath, on which, it is said, a man could not kiss his wife—though he had neglected that connubial obligation during the other six days of the week. The enforcement of such a measure would make more infidels in six months than the feeble preaching and vigorous intolerance of the advocates of Sabbatarian legislation have made in half a century; and that is a strong statement. The sacredness of the voluntary Sabbath would be lost by its becoming involuntary.

One of the pretexts of this legislation is that it is to enforce merely a civil day of rest in favor of that fraction of American workingmen now employed in the government mail service, on railway lines, and in other occupations. But the serpent trail of religious legislation is over it all. Its purposes for religious ends are distinctly and unblushingly avowed by the high priests of American Protestant intolerance, who are its inspiration. These benevolent gentlemen would enact, forsooth, a day of Sabbath rest for workingmen, and cut off by the same stroke the recreations and innocent enjoyments in which four-fifths of American laborers are accustomed to seek, on that day, relief from six days of toil and confinement. That is Christian altruism with a vengeance!

I have no respect for the one-sided statement of any question. I have no respect for the platform of the autocrat. I have no respect for the opinion of the man who fears to face its free discussion. At any future or appointed time during my stay on this coast, I will cheerfully divide this platform with any representative of this claim for enforced rest by law, who desires to demonstrate its alleged merits before intelligent Americans. But I admonish that champion in advance, that if he seeks to vindicate his cause under the principles of American liberty, rather than by the right of religious majorities to impose their observances on their fellow-men, its merits will be found to be conspicuous by their absence.

Such legislation as this has its origin in a total misconception of the problem to be solved. Some of its objects may be desirable. But they are not desirable through invoking the sword of the law to enforce them. They are desirable by quite other instrumentalities. What American workingmen need is not more rest on one day in the week, but more rest every day in the week, and greater facilities thereby for self-respect and improvement, which cannot come by Sabbath

laws, but by the elevation of the sense of American justice.

If the Sabbath of a majority of any religious faith can be appointed by law through the power of majorities, then that Sabbath can be abolished by law. It can be proscribed in turn in favor of the Sabbath of any other religious majority. The Jew and the Seventh-day Baptist may by force of attainable numbers enact their Sabbath in its stead. The infidel by the right of an emergent majority may extirpate the Sabbath of the Christian, and silence by law the sound of church bells that disturb his secular ear. And if in this nation the zeal of religious convictions could again successfully invoke the arm of the secular State for intolerance, better that that dream of the atheist were realized, and that churches and alleged religion were banished from this land. Religion that persecutes is not religion. It is the doctrine of an imperial state of this Union, solemnly uttered by its highest civil tribunal, that "true Christianity does not shield itself behind majorities; that a form of religion that cannot live under equal laws, ought to die."

The day on which discrimination for religious opinion is inaugurated in the administration of this government, will be the day of the death of the republic—the failure of the American experiment—the funeral of civil liberty.

The American Protestant who clamors for the aid of the State to impose upon his fellow-citizens the least of his religious observances, has not a leg to stand on while demanding of Rome the abatement of her claim for State support of parochial schools. Let him first remove the beam from his own eye. The logic of civil liberty is inexorable. It does not end at the doors of the Catholic Church. The reprobation of the unconstitutional and un-American demands of that church, from the standpoint of sectarian hostility, is an attempted debauchment of the public conscience. There is no force in such warfare. The arm that strikes is unhinged at the shoulder. This is the land of religious liberty. The contests of creeds should be the contests of Christian charity.

Protestantism should know better. It assumes to have been the peculiar defender and champion of religious liberty since Luther. It has no excuse. It has nowhere any temporal head to serve. Rome, at least, is consistent. Her policy for thirteen centuries has been the same—the aggrandizement of her earthly power. What could it avail the supreme Deity of the universe that his power shall be recognized by the civil governments of this world? That kingdom is spiritual,—it exists in the hearts of men, or it does not exist at all. Jesus of Nazareth was the respecter of civil liberty.

But do any of these people, Romish or Protestant, know what they do? Do they know the essence of their demand? Do they not see the destroying demon of intolerance they invoke for their own children? They would break the columns of the great Constitution and let fall the fragments of its temple upon their own heads. They forget the ages of blood from which this fabric of freedom has been slowly reared. They forget that the liberty for the most intolerant atheist is the liberty for the humblest Christian in this land—one and the same. They forget that man cannot be made religious by law. They demand a civil government with the affirmation of creed. They would make discrimination for opinion. They would roll back the centuries and persecute for faith. Intolerance is a two-

edged sword. Fanaticism begets fanaticism. What if, their beliefs being established and entrenched by law, there should sweep back in this republic, as once in France, against ecclesiastical oppression, the tides of unbelief, and the Goddess of Reason should sit crowned in the Capitol? What if, invoking their example, the infidel and agnostic should establish a government of the negation of God, and visit their faiths with their own intolerance?—In that bitter hour they would recall the sacred teachings of the fathers of this nation, and the countenance of Liberty would glow with a divine radiance only in the moment when it was lost.

Since the beginnings of man the features of the Absolute have been veiled. Standing between two worlds, with instincts beyond life, and hopes beyond death, from this "bank and shoal of time," man has looked with straining eyes towards the Unseen—attempting to illumine with his frail candle of reason the halls of the Eternal. Afflicted by sorrows, he has awaited in all times and all lands the merciful justice of the Unknown. With moan and tears he has in many a name and tongue formulated in creeds his measure of the Infinite. Every faith that has given courage to our kind has been held sacred by its worshipers. Every doubt, to the eye of Mercy is yet more sacred than faith, for it gropes in suffering. For the struggling tides of men,—fellow-workers and pilgrims on this mist-ridden shore,—the wisdom that remains for this world is charity—the doctrine out of Nazareth—the creed of love to all mankind. On American soil, a century ago, by the guidance of history and the inspiration of the Great, we built for the hope of the world the political monument of this sublime creed. Under its impartial shadow the worshipers of Truth, whether in church, or wood, or mosque, or synagogue, or temple, have known no discrimination for opinion. Let it be the oath of Americans to guard that monument forever.

An Appeal to the W. C. T. U.

THE W. C. T. U. have a column in the *Healdsburg Enterprise*. In the issue of that journal of July 3 they have an article entitled, "Sabbath Observance." They speak of the efforts put forth for the Blair Sunday-Rest bill; and all the results thus far, they say, are God's answers to their prayers. That is, they would have us believe that the Lord answered prayer in behalf of an unscriptural method to obtain an arbitrary law to compel observance to an institution which not only has no divine authority, but which is a rival to the sacred rest-day of God's own appointment!

Sisters, just think of that, will you? Is it not possible that you may be wrong in ascribing the result to your prayers? God heareth those who ask according to his will (1 John 5:14); but did you ask according to God's will? Where is it contained in God's will that Sunday should be observed? Where is it revealed that any religious institution of any character should be forced upon the conscience of anyone, whatever his belief or unbelief? Paul said, "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we *persuade* men." 2 Cor. 5:11. You think, sisters, that the judgments of God will fall upon this people because of their violation of God's law; your brothers of National Reform so talk. Believing, therefore, in the terror of the Lord, why do you not take the scriptural way, and *persuade* men? Is it be-

cause you lack the other means, which gives power to persuasion,—the word of God with its precepts and promises? Be honest, sisters, with your own souls; why support unscriptural institutions and in such unscriptural ways? They continue:—

"Opposition to this Sunday-Rest bill comes mainly from two sources: The liquor dealers and the Seventh-day Baptists and Adventists, the first class opposing it as an infringement of personal liberty, the second as an infringement of conscience. We shall now spend no time on the first class, both because their opposition is nothing like as pronounced as that of the seventh-day people, and because the personal liberty plea has been so often and so ably answered in another connection.

"The second class of opponents are entitled to most respectful consideration, both because we always respect conscientious scruples, and because of the persistent, concentrated efforts they are making to defeat the bill. It seems as if those two churches which believe that Saturday is the true Sunday are bending all the energies which other churches expend in home and foreign missions, in Christian philanthropy of every kind, upon the one effort of defeating the Sunday-Rest bill. The country is flooded with their literature, on which they expended twenty thousand dollars last year, and their strongest men and women are instant in season and out of season, defending their cause. It is a significant fact that in this opposition of our seventh-day friends the Jews take no part."

On the above we wish to offer a few observations which we hope may prove a benefit to our W. C. T. U. sisters.

1. They acknowledge that the great opposer to the present fight of this woman's *temperance* organization is not the rum power, but two bodies of temperate and temperance Christians—and these must submit or be crushed. Is it for this purpose the Union was organized? How sadly fallen!

2. Seventh-day people do *not* believe that "Saturday is the true Sunday." But Saturday is the true Sabbath. They have no more claims for Sunday than any other day. Its name indicates its origin as a day for religious observance.

3. The Seventh-day Adventist Church (and we doubt not the Seventh-day Baptist Church—we speak for the former) put more energy and more money in foreign missions last year than ever before. It can safely be said that they did more work in this direction in proportion to their wealth and numbers than any denomination that espoused the cause of the Blair Sunday-Rest bill. All their efforts against it were extra above their regular work.

4. Yes; they probably expended more than twenty thousand dollars. Why not? Was not their cause a worthy one? We praise God that they did so much. We wish they could have done more.

5. "Their strongest men and women are instant in season and out of season, defending their cause." Then they are doing just what God commanded that the minister of the word should do. But they advised no arbitrary methods; they demanded nothing from the State themselves; they only asked that equality before the law which the Federal Government grants. They contended not for *privileges*, but rights,—rights for all equally with themselves. Was this the principle upon which our sisters strove?

6. The Jews *did* take part in this opposition. Both the *Jewish Exponent* and the *Jewish Times and Observer* had forcible articles against the proposed bill.

7. Our sisters belong to a "Christian" organization. They profess to be Christians, that is,

followers of Christ, obedient to his precepts. Did they ever read the following precept?

"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." Matt. 7:12.

This does not mean Methodist men, nor Baptist men, nor Prohibitionists; it means all men—Jews and Gentiles, believers and unbelievers, Christians and pagans, Sabbath-keepers and Sunday-keepers. Would you have the pagan compel you to adore his gods and keep his sacred days?—Then force upon him yours. Would you have the infidel compel you to forego all worship, all service to God?—Then compel him to honor your religious observances. Would you be compelled to observe the seventh-day Sabbath, the true Lord's day? (Would God that you reconsciences, enlightened by the word and Spirit, would so compel.) Then force upon the seventh-day-keeper your high day, contrary to his conscience and welfare.

Are the *Christian* women of your organization prepared to interpret the "golden rule" in this way? Are you prepared to be active agents in the oppressive measures which are being pushed forward under the name Christian, by professedly Christian men? The tyranny of the Dark Ages began with milder and more plausible claims than are now made by those clamoring for a religio-civil sabbath. The sure effect of such legislation will be to make hypocrites of many who prize temporal advantage and convenience above conscience, and oppress others who regard conscience and the word of God above all earthly advantages. Christians, indeed, do not look here for results or rewards. Are the W. C. T. U. prepared to meet their present work in the light of the judgment?—*Signs of the Times*.

Religion and the Majority.

THE following editorial article from the *St. Louis Republican* is worthy of a careful reading, as it contains much food for serious reflection:—

"In his essay on 'The Policy of the Massachusetts Colonists towards Quakers and Other Dissenters,' Mr. Henry L. Southwick, of Boston, states, with the precision of a lover of historical truth, facts that will never cease to have a contemporaneous interest while there remains a possibility of oppression through public opinion expressed in legislative enactment. These facts have been often examined. It is well enough known that very soon after landing on Plymouth Rock the 'Pilgrims' banished John and Israel Brown for being Episcopalians; that they drove out Roger Williams, elder of Salem church, for declaring 'the new and dangerous doctrine' that 'the magistrates should restrain crimes and not control opinions;' that Mrs. Hutchinson was also banished for a similar offense of dissent; that when the Baptists proclaimed that 'Christians ought to tolerate Christians,' Obadiah Holmes was whipped for the heresy; that Clark, Crandall, Gorton, and many others, were fined or banished; that under the general acts against Quakers they were to be arrested on their entrance to the colony, 'committed to the house of correction,' 'severely whipped,' 'kept constantly at work, and none suffered to converse or speak with them during their imprisonment;' that under a still severer law, every Quaker returning from banishment should, 'for the first offense, suffer the loss of one ear; for the second offense, the loss of the other ear, and for the third offense, have his tongue bored through with a hot iron;'

and that under these and similar laws Mary Dyer, William Robinson, Marmaduke Stevenson, and William Leddra were hanged, while others, men and women, were whipped, branded, and maimed.

"The impartial examination of this record shows that the question back of it was that of the difference between 'liberty of conscience' and 'license.' The political principle asserted was the absolutism of the majority to decide where liberty ends and license begins. This principle is still practically asserted in our politics—even in our constitutions made for the express purpose of denying the existence of absolute or inherent right in the majority. And it is curious that these expressions, wherever found, relate to matters of religion. The constitutions adopted during the first fifty years of the Union tend more and more towards that of Virginia, in which there is no qualification whatever of Roger Williams' declaration that it is the duty of magistrates to restrain crimes, not to control opinions.

"The rise of Mormonism in the West checked this tendency and caused a reaction towards the opinion that the majority is absolute judge of what is or what is not religious license. The opinion is expressed in the constitutional qualification that 'liberty of conscience shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, nor to justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace, or safety of the State.'

"This limitation is inserted in American constitutions of most recent adoption. It may, therefore, be called the more modern view of religious liberty in distinction from the unqualified declaration of the old Virginia bill of rights, but it must not be forgotten that it is precisely the view of the practical assertion of which the Puritans have been so generally condemned. It makes the public opinion of the majority the judge of what constitutes 'licentiousness,' and endangers society. The Puritans thought that it endangered society for the Quakers to be 'moved by the spirit' to speak from the benches in church. They considered all acts inconsistent with their own views of liberty as nothing more than licentiousness, dangerous to civil peace and religious order.

"While we retain their theory, it is inconsistent to condemn their practice. It is unwise, because it is untruthful, to assert that we have outgrown their theory when we revive it and embody it in our constitutions and bills of rights, where it is only innocuous for lack of an issue to vivify it with the strength of a persecuting public opinion."

There is a danger and a difficulty, as intimated by the *Republican*. But is it not possible to draw the line at a point where it will neither trench upon the rights of conscience nor endanger the well-being of the State? It certainly is possible. "We hold these truths to be self-evident,—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men." These words from the immortal Declaration of Independence set forth the only proper function of civil government, namely, to secure to all their natural or "inalienable" rights. To this end the weak must be protected from the aggressions of the strong, the person, property, and reputation of rich and poor must be alike guarded; but here proper government

ends; civil law can of right go no further. But it may be asked, Is it not within the province of civil law to forbid and punish adultery, and to prohibit prostitution? Certainly it is, but only because these things cannot be practiced without infringing upon the rights of some whom the government is bound to protect. Adultery is a violation of the marriage contract; therefore it is not only the right, but it is the duty, of the State to forbid and to punish it. Likewise fornication imposes upon the community criminals and paupers, besides unnameable evils; therefore the State must forbid and punish it. It has been truly said that "liberty is a circle bounded on every side by the rights of others," and when anyone oversteps those bounds it is the province of the government to restrain him, but not otherwise.

Georgia's Sunday Law.

SUNDAY-OBSERVANCE laws are most often heard of in connection with the retailing of liquors and other merchandise. While they have some influential support upon theological grounds, it seems probable that with the mass of citizens the chief idea is to guard against practices tending to generalize Sunday labor. It will be well then that the operation of these laws should be scrutinized with reference to the different principles indicated. A case has been reported from Georgia where a laboring man was convicted of digging a ditch on Sunday to carry off the foul water from his cellar. A preacher was the complaining witness or instigator of the prosecution, and the culprit was sentenced to a year's imprisonment and to serve in the chain-gang. If the facts are anywhere near correctly reported there is no question what the verdict of public opinion must be upon such a case. It strongly illustrates what may be called unchristian Christianity, and becomes a proper subject of remark for the secular press, because the civil law is the force brought into action.

So far as special religious beliefs are interwoven in the texture of society, they receive such recognition as appertains to civil order, the prevention of offense, and shock to the feelings of persons, and the avoidance of commotions and marked ill feelings which produce social and public discord. If not at this line where shall the limit of State authority in religious matters be fixed, assuming that the American people are well determined to respect the principle of religious liberty where they perceive it? From an evangelical standpoint a large toleration of Sabbath freedom should be the sincere desire of every Christian. The Pharisees made much of Sabbath observances, but the founder of Christianity reproveth them by example and question, asking which of them would not take his ox out of the ditch on the Sabbath. It would seem that the Christian spirit would always seek to recognize a right motive where such might exist.

No matter if the preacher would not make a drain on Sunday, he should be able to concede that his neighbor might have a good conscience in doing so. To prosecute one who does a good work and does it with a good conscience is to outrage humanity, disgrace religion, and bring into disrepute the creed of the prosecutor. The inspiration for such prosecution is bigotry. But if the law lends itself to bigotry the law is wrong. It cannot undertake to protect every feeling which alleges itself to be religious. If a Puritan is hurt to think that another enjoys a good din-

ner on Sunday, that form of asceticism cannot be protected from sentimental shock, for the State will utterly refuse to go back to ascetic theology as a substitute for religious liberty in its polity, and Puritanism has rarely been that of Christian States.

When such prosecutions and laws capable of such applications cannot be defended on Christian principles, and for the honor of the Christian churches and people, what shall be said of them in the light simply of the American constitutions, which are not distinctively Christian in any theological or ecclesiastical sense? This must be said—because it is surely felt by many citizens—that if such laws are to be applied with the senseless bigotry characterizing the Georgia case referred to, it will be necessary to dismiss the hope that ecclesiastics and justices can be relied upon to exhibit sound discretion, and the Sunday laws must be overhauled and amended so as to render outrages of the character alluded to impossible occurrences for the future.—*Galveston Weekly News, November 14.*

Some Apparent Truths.

"AMERICA is not the only country," says the *Sunday School Times* of October 24, "that is vexed and perplexed by the problem of religious education in public schools. France has been making an experiment in this matter, within the last half dozen years, that is well worth noting. In 1882 the law was passed completely withdrawing the public schools from the influence of the clergy, and substituting 'moral instruction' in the place of religious, without defining in detail what the authorities understood by such 'morality.' One of the features of the present exposition is a massive volume, compiled by the well-known Protestant theologian and dean of the Paris faculty, Dr. Fr. Lichtenberger, from 558 official reports of school directors and inspectors sent in, by order of the government, for the purpose of learning how the law has been working. The result is severely disappointing to the advocate of purely secular education and of the substitution of vague and general principles of morals for positive religion.

It is impossible to systematize the answers given; but it is clear that endless confusion prevails as to what 'moral instruction' is, and that, in any shape or form, it cannot take the place of religious training. Positive Protestants, like Lichtenberger and Edmund de Pressensé, acknowledge the failure of the secularization of the schools, but do not advocate a return to the old system, lest the Roman Catholic clergy be given once more the absolute control which they formerly possessed. But Pressensé in his *Revue Chrétienne* declares that a morality not based upon a positive Christian foundation is absolutely valueless, and urges that this new 'moral instruction' be banished from the schools; that the instruction in general be made as moral as possible; that religious instruction be imparted outside of the regular school hours in the school buildings themselves; and that, in general, the training of the coming generation in the principles of Christianity be advanced in every possible manner. It is exceedingly doubtful whether the authorities will take any steps in this direction."

The *Catholic Review* of November 9 quotes this, and says, "Some truths that even the blind could see are rapidly coming home to Protestants." Certainly, and one of those truths which ought to be apparent, is that no system of educa-

tion which is practicable among people of mixed creeds, can ever take the place of the church and the home, or furnish the instruction which should be given by parents and spiritual advisers. It is true that "morality" cannot be inculcated without religion; and it is equally true that religion cannot be taught without a creed, for a creed is simply that which is believed. If religion is to be taught in the schools it must be defined, and that definition will be somebody's creed, and if it is adopted by the State it will be the established creed of the State. The only possible solution of the religious educational question without making the schools sectarian is for Christian parents to do their duty toward their children in the home, and for all Christians to do their duty toward all classes as opportunity may offer. The State cannot teach religion unless it has a religion to teach; and State religions have never resulted in anything but evil. The history of Europe and of the South American Republics and Mexico proves this.

The Public Schools.

THE following communication from Mr. G. F. B. Leighton, president of the Horticultural and Pomological Society of Norfolk, Virginia, to the *Public Ledger* of that city, puts the matter of the total separation of religion and the public schools in a way so pointed and plain that no one can fail to see it:—

In a recent issue of your paper, I noticed remarks from eminent divines as to the feasibility of introducing religious instruction in our public schools. As your columns are open to all phases of subjects, I offer the views of an outsider in this matter.

We are commanded to work six days. From time immemorial, with civilized nations schools have been established for the purpose of training youths for the most intelligent performance of that work—schools formed and freely sustained by tax in country, town, city, and State, showing that their importance is appreciated throughout the land.

One-seventh of the time is set apart for another purpose, giving rest from the school rotation, and directing the mind to moral and religious education in the establishment of Sunday-schools as auxiliary to pulpit instruction.

Should a teacher in the Sunday-school make the diversion of demonstrating a problem in geometry he would be driven from his position for introducing a subject at variance with the object of the school, yet no more out of place than the introduction of religious training in our public schools.

The parents of our scholars are made up of many religious sects, each believing that their church is nearest right. Should a majority of any school district be of a particular persuasion, such views would be inculcated as would suit them, resulting in the overthrow of the usefulness of the school system.

When one-seventh of our time devoted to moral and religious education, assisted by the Sunday-school, the pulpit, and the home, proves inadequate to the best interests of our country, we must admit that we are in a most deplorable condition.

I regard the preservation of our Constitution, under which we have passed a century of prosperity, to the fact that we have had two great political parties to watch each other; but also in part to the multiplicity of religious demonstra-

tions, which strenuously oppose the connection of Church and State, which some parties apprehend at a future day.

Let our schools remain free from the stain of religious dissensions, and continue to form the bulwark of American freedom, demonstrating to other nations that we have a spot where all religious sects are protected in the full exercise of their peculiar tenets, and their children instructed in what pertains to the duties of the six days' work, leaving for the seventh day the duties as aforementioned.

Mr. Crafts on Sunday Laws.

THE following letter from an occasional correspondent in Philadelphia explains itself and contains several items of interest:—

EDITOR SENTINEL: The City of Brotherly Love, a city in which there is the best Sunday observance in the country, was honored recently with the presence of Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, field secretary of the American Sabbath Union, who preached in Bethany Presbyterian Church, on the "American Civil Sabbath." Your correspondent went to hear him, and as he was to speak on the "American Sabbath," I expected that he would take his text from some history of America, which would tell of the time when the Americans made America, when they rested from their work, and made the "American Sabbath" to commemorate the work. But lo! he did nothing of the kind, but took a text from the Bible (Nehemiah 13), and started off by telling us that these people in Nehemiah's time were engaged in *Sunday trade*, which I couldn't believe, as I was always taught that Sunday is the first day of the week, and this trading occurred the day previous.

He said that museums and art galleries should not be allowed to open on Sunday, not even those of a high order, because if those of the highest order were allowed to open, then it would be impossible to close the vile ones, as the law could not discriminate, and thus the morals of the people would be corrupted. Great is Sunday! These low museums corrupt the morals of the people if allowed to be open on Sunday, while on other days they can be in full blast, and not a word is said against them by our Sunday-law friends.

Confectionery shops, Mr. Crafts said, must be closed, because one Sunday he made it a special point to watch the children on their way to his Sunday-school in New York, and he calculated that at least \$5.00 of the children's money had gone into the coffers of the confectioners, thus depriving, as he said, the church and the missionary of money that belonged to them. This he said was teaching the children to be embezzlers. What is his remedy? Teach the children at their homes, in the church, in the Sunday-school, that it is wrong to do this?—Not a bit of it. He would have a Sunday law that would shut the candy shop and compel the children to bring their pennies to the Sunday-school. But has it come to this that the professed church of Jesus Christ has not got enough power to compete with the little candy shops?

Seventh-day observers should not be allowed to open their shops on Sunday, said the speaker, as it would interfere with the Sunday rest-day. If they couldn't get along with having them open five days, they should seek some other occupation. Truly they ought to get down on their knees and thank these would-be lords of creation that they allow them to live at all, or even take a walk on Sunday to get a mouthful of fresh air!

JOHN QUINN.

Sunday Idleness.

A COUPLE of weeks ago a lecturer named Wilder addressed the people of Summerville in opposition to the movement now on foot to exact a forced observance of Sunday by means of the laws of the United States. That any number of American citizens have become sufficiently alarmed to put lecturers into the field to resist this church movement against individual liberty, proves that the danger is not so imaginary as one might think. That there are lecturers in the field is sufficient to awaken the vigilance of all thoughtful citizens. After some investigation it may be taken as correct that Washington is the only portion of the United States where Sunday idleness is not enjoined. The Legislatures of other States and Territories have on their statute-books laws calculated to enforce idleness on Sunday, and the courts of last resort in the great majority of cases have sustained their constitutionality. It may be conceded that these acts of the Legislatures and the construction given by the courts are responsive to the sentiments of the vast body of American citizens. The reasons for this condition of affairs may be divided, like Gaul, into three parts.

The first class consists of those who regard Sunday laws as sanctions of the institution of the Christian religion, and that such laws enable many Christians to enjoy Christian privileges and prevent others from interfering with them.

The second class holds that the individual is the subject of the law's concern, and that his spiritual welfare is promoted.

The third class take the position that it is for the citizen's bodily benefit that a day of rest is established. Sunday laws are very peculiar laws, to say the best of them. They are the only laws known in the United States directed against "sin" and not against a "crime." The courts in enforcing these regulations are concerned not so much with the statutory prohibition as with the religious duty of the citizen. If industry is a commendable virtue, and idleness a vice reprimanded by holy writ itself, and despised by the useful and energetic American, idleness should never be encouraged, or, at least, not become a subject of legal enactment. The compulsion of idleness on Sunday, from a historical point of view, is a comparatively new thing under the sun. The institution of the "American Sunday" was unknown until about two hundred years ago, and is unknown now to all other Christian and civilized or uncivilized nations except the British Empire and the United States of America. Cromwell and his followers were the founders of the modern legislation. By means of the fourth commandment taken from the Jews, they transferred the Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday. The Jews had a Sabbath-day's journey. The Puritans converted Sunday into a day of gloom and solemn inspection, and tried to compel all others to conform to their pet notions and self-righteous rules. It is not as surprising to see British subjects, who adhere to the doctrine of the divine right of kings, giving their assent to unauthorized Sunday legislation, but that pliant, if not hypocritical, Legislatures in America should hang such a superstitious regulation around the necks of free Americans, is difficult to understand. Let such a union of State and Church be severed, and let no unnatural legislation at least be enacted in such cases.—*Summerville (Oregon) Annotator, Sept. 6, 1889.*

The Blessed Sabbath-Day.

Resolved, That we will use our influence by word and example against all railroad travel and excursions on the Sabbath, and against Sunday newspapers, and for legislation that will close all places of business or pleasure, and protect the Sabbath as a day of rest and worship.

The above is the main resolution adopted by the Sabbath Observance Association in Des Moines last week. There can be no doubt but that the resolution will accomplish more harm than good. There is too much of the desire to control all other people in their manners and customs, and compel them to conform to the whims and hobbies of those who resolve but do not perform. The time will never come when railroad travel, Sunday newspapers and parks, will be abolished on Sundays. The person who wrote that resolution probably commits far greater crimes every year of life than are enumerated therein. The resolution indicates too much of "the holy I" and not enough work among the suffering poor and the viciously wicked. It would be far better to pay more attention to the teachings of "Him who doeth all things well" than to attempt to rule everything and everybody, without having sufficient knowledge and power to rule themselves.

Sunday is the poor man's day. Laborers work all the week-days and have no time for rest or recreation except on Sundays. They cannot be deprived of the privilege of reading newspapers or gaining health through inhaling fresh air in the parks on the day of rest. It would be a poor kind of religion that could be injured in reading the *Sunday Register*, or in enjoying the fresh air of the parks. Des Moines now has all the restrictions on Sunday that can ever be enforced. No amount of crankism or of forcing others to do as they do can ever shut out the blessed sunshine and fresh air. All attempts to do so will only make Jordan a harder road to travel to those who might be induced to become better people if there were not so much of the unchristian spirit of painting the bright, happy world as an object to be avoided on the holy Sabbath-day. The long, tedious, and tiresome Sundays demanded by that resolution will never come.

The world is slowly reaching a better standard. The people are progressing in every good direction, but the time will never come to revive the "Blue Laws of Connecticut," or when a Christian people will demand a law or custom which will dictate that the blessed Sabbath-day shall be a cut and dried day of desolation and mourning. The writer has been ruled by a Methodist rod all his life, and yet Sunday has always been the happiest, most enjoyable day in the week in all the homes in which he has been an inmate. "Six days shalt thou labor, and on the seventh shalt thou rest," cannot be interpreted that "thou shalt sit in sackcloth and ashes all the Sundays of thy life," as is demanded by the resolution referred to. The Hebrews and Adventists rest on Saturdays, comply with the divine law, and satisfy their consciences that they are worshipping according to the light given them. They cannot be forced to worship on any other day, and it can be said to their great credit that they do not attempt to make people of other faith observe Saturday as the day of rest.

The modern Christian home is a much happier home than the homes of the Puritans. It is a much more liberal home; it is nearer the throne; it is founded on sacred doctrines promulgated in the Bible; and it is a home that

will not be dictated to by cranks who wish to govern all other people, but who are not able to govern themselves. The resolution might equally as well have been framed against the ten commandments. It is not humane, it is not Christian, but it is of the Pharisaical spirit that was so severely condemned when the world was newer and intelligence and happiness did not so frequently draw the hearts of the people toward better life and preparation for rendering an account for having read good newspapers, breathed the fresh air, and enjoyed the blessed sunshine in the parks on Sunday. The *Register* believes in the Christian Sabbath as taught by the Bible, but not as interpreted by one-idea cranks, who have never been fully satisfied with the world, and will never be satisfied with heaven because they did not make it themselves.—*Iowa State Register, November 17.*

Will They Be Humbugged?

BARNUM used to say that no people in the world so much delighted in being humbugged as the Americans. He was in a position to know whereof he spoke, for he had tried it upon nearly all nations. The prophetic accuracy of the assertion will have been realized when the American people allow themselves to be humbugged by the "American Sabbath" idea of the American Sabbath Union. Those who observe the seventh-day "Sabbath of the Lord" have Scripture proof that it was instituted at the close of creation, as a memorial of that event. Those Protestants who maintain the so-called "Christian Sabbath" on the first day of the week, claim tradition that it was instituted by Christ or his apostles at the resurrection, in commemoration thereof; while the Catholics cite the authority of the church for the institution. But of this American Sabbath we have not even a pretended history, either of its origin or its object. We venture the prediction that if the American people allow such an absurdity to gain a legal foothold in the general government, they will find under the delusive mask nothing but the old papal-Puritan Sunday institution in all its pristine hideousness. And we will add a like prediction regarding that other seductive proposition—"a civil Sabbath"—so innocently urged upon Californians by the same American Sabbath Union. "For ways that are dark, and tricks that are vain," these various Sunday-law dodges have no equal in this day and generation.

Is It for the Workingmen?

If anyone doubts that the advocates of Sunday law are actuated primarily, yea, almost solely, by a zeal to secure a day of rest for workingmen, let them read the following preamble and resolutions adopted not long since by a Methodist conference in Wisconsin. It is true that no mention is made of the "civil aspect of the day," and that it is treated as a wholly religious question, but this is easily accounted for by the fact that those who framed the resolutions had not been properly educated in American Sabbath Union tactics. The preamble and resolutions, which were adopted without debate, are as follows:—

"We are pained to notice that there has been a growing disregard for its observance and sacredness, which we believe is largely occasioned by foreign immigration, the avarice of large corporations, and the insatiable desire of the people for amusement and pleasure.

"If something is not done immediately, we fear that a continental Sabbath, with all its evils, will be

the result. Its sacred observance is demanded by the laws of our land, and no law should be allowed to be broken with impunity, especially one which is so intimately connected with the well-being of our people. Thus the laws of our land, as well as the laws of God, are being violated by the publication of the Sunday newspaper, the running of Sunday trains, Sunday excursions, picnics, base-ball games, opening of saloons and beer-gardens on the Lord's day, with many other things, which are only winked at by many of our city authorities, who are more desirous of re-election than they are to see our laws enforced. Finally, it is a source of alarm to us that our government sets an example in violating the sanctity of the Sabbath by requiring that post-offices be opened for the delivery of mail, thus keeping an army of workmen from enjoying their God-given rights; therefore,

Resolved, That, as ministers of this Conference, we will discountenance any violation of the sacredness of this day, by example as well as by precept, and we will aid to the extent of our ability all those who are striving to have righteous laws enacted for its proper observance, and who are also seeking to have these laws enforced which are already upon the statute-book.

Resolved, That the publication of a Sunday newspaper is becoming a great factor in the destruction of the sacredness of this day, and that we will show our disapproval of this growing evil by neither reading nor advertising in those papers which publish a Sunday edition.

Resolved, That, as a church, we disapprove of the course of our government in requiring the distribution of the mail on the Sabbath-day, and that we will do all in our power to have this evil removed.

Resolved, That the open saloon and theater, picnics, excursions, and base-ball games, are violations of the sanctity of the Sabbath, and as such Christian people should be united in their efforts to have them removed from our midst.

DANIEL DOUGHERTY, in his address at the Baltimore centennial, said that in colonial times "the only religious martyrs in America were Catholics. They were spurned, slandered, villified, and the highest honors of the republic denied them by a prejudice as strong as a constitutional enactment." It is true that the Puritan governors of Massachusetts, Belcher and Endicott, persecuted the Catholics, but the Puritans persecuted the Quakers even to the extent of hanging some of them. Anne Hutchinson and Mary Dyer were persecuted by the Puritans; Roger Williams was driven into exile, and Corey was pressed to death by the Puritans for refusing to testify. There was nothing done to the Catholics in colonial days that was worse than these cruelties. In later times a Catholic religious asylum was burned by a mob in Charleston, Mass.—a foul deed but not worse than the sacking of the home for colored children by the Catholic mob during the draft and riots of 1863. The truth is that the bigotry, ignorance, and brutality in America have not been confined either to Protestant or Catholic circles. Abner Kneeland was mobbed and jailed in Boston for editing a deistical newspaper; Garrison was mobbed for publishing an anti-slavery journal. Both in Europe and America bigotry, brutality, superstition, and ignorance have committed awful crimes, and neither the Protestant nor Catholic Church can show clean hands in this respect. Where power and opportunity have been present persecution has done its work in both churches.—*Oregonian.*

THE first anniversary of the American Sabbath Union will be held in New York City from December 9 to 11. From its deliberations may be expected to go forth a grand raid on Congress for Sunday legislation, encouraged by the decision of the late Catholic congress at Baltimore to join anti-Catholics in the Sunday crusade.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, DECEMBER 4, 1889.

NOTE.—No papers are sent by the publishers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to people who have not subscribed for it. If the SENTINEL comes to one who has not subscribed for it, he may know that it is sent him by some friend, and that he will not be called upon by the publishers to pay for the same.

After January 1, 1890, this paper will be published at 43 Bond Street, New York City. Our exchanges, advertisers, and correspondents will please make a note of this fact, and send all papers and direct all correspondence, to reach us after December 15, to our new address.

THE field secretary of the so-called American Sabbath Union has a new grievance against the friends of the SENTINEL. It is that "they circulate a petition which gives no hint that it is in the interests of the *Saturday Sabbath*." And pray why should it give any such hint when it has no more to do with the "Saturday Sabbath" than it has with any other day? Does the worthy secretary discover something in that petition which is not stated upon its face? How in the world can it be in the interests of the "Saturday Sabbath" if it gives no hint of it? Surely Mr. Crafts is getting a little "rattled" because of opposition to his pet scheme for national religious legislation.

In his annual report Governor Thomas, of Utah, says:—

"I do not hesitate to say that any temporizing policy which leaves the 'church' in a position to control the political policy of the Territory is only delaying the final settlement, and that future legislation should be aimed at the political power of the church, which has been the main pillar of its strength in Utah."

And political power will make any church dangerous to a free State. We do not mean by this that Christians can take no part in the affairs of government, or that men should not act conscientiously in political matters, but simply that churches and ministers have no right to meddle with politics as churches and ministers. An intriguing, wire-pulling, scheming, political church of any great numerical strength is a curse to any country.

SOME time since the *Los Angeles Tribune*, in giving some report of a sermon by Rev. S. J. Carroll, said: "In speaking of a national Sunday law he maintained that the mixture of religion and government had resulted in evil from the time of Constantine down to the Puritans." We thought the sentiment good and quoted it, but along comes the *California Christian Advocate* with a protest, and an explanation that Mr. Carroll didn't say it, or didn't mean it if he did. It says:—

"The truth is that Mr. Carroll incidentally made a remark to the effect that he was opposed to any union of Church and State, but he very urgently plead in the same sermon for the American National Sunday, and he strongly pleaded for the right of every laboring man to one undisturbed Sunday, protected by law both from the greed that would drive him to toil and the desecration and tumult of excursions, picnics, base-ball, etc."

Well, Mr. Carroll has then just what he wants. There is now no law in any State in this Union to compel any man to work on Sunday if he doesn't want to, and as for excursions and base-ball, he need not so much as see either of them. If he don't go on the excursions they need not trouble him, and if he don't go to the ball-

grounds, and don't read the base-ball news the next morning, he need not so much as know that people are playing ball on Sunday. If Mr. Carroll is really opposed to Church and State he cannot afford to favor Sunday legislation, for in it are the seeds of such union.

ACCORDING to Ex-Governor Sherman, of Iowa, Sunday laws contributed to the result of the late election in that State. Of course the liquor men are fast to claim that the anti-prohibition sentiment did it, but after mentioning other causes, the ex-governor is reported to have said:—

"Many liberal-minded American-born citizens voted the Democratic ticket in resentment of their liberties by the enactment of stringent Sunday laws."

For the present politicians in Iowa and Ohio will be a little shy of religious legislation, even as they have been in California since 1882, when General Stoneman was elected governor of the State on the anti-Sunday-law issue.

NOTWITHSTANDING representations to the contrary, the AMERICAN SENTINEL is strictly non-partisan and non-sectarian. Its object and principles are clearly set forth in the prospectus printed at the foot of this page, and it has never turned aside either to set forth the religious opinions of its editors or to attack the opinions of others, farther than has been necessary in defending the Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, against the attacks of those who are seeking to have it changed in the interests of their sectarian schemes. The editors of the SENTINEL have decided opinions upon all religious questions, but that fact does not make the paper a denominational organ, as everybody of intelligence who is acquainted with the paper knows, and every fair-minded man who has read it must admit. Representations to the contrary are falsehoods set afloat for the purpose of exciting prejudice by those who find themselves unable to answer the SENTINEL'S arguments.

In an impassioned plea for a Sunday law a correspondent of the *Riverside, Cal., Press* says:

"No human Sabbath legislation deals with a citizen's private life. Until he does that which interferes with the comfort, peace, happiness, or prosperity of another, no human hand can touch him."

Let us examine this statement a little and see what it is worth. We happen to have before us reports of over twenty cases of Sunday-law prosecutions and convictions in Arkansas, and in almost every case the only offense committed was doing some quiet work, such as plowing in a field, digging a few potatoes for dinner, hoeing in the garden, painting a building, gathering peaches, etc., etc. Possibly these things do not belong to private life, but if they don't we would like to know what does.

Only recently the papers have reported similar cases from Georgia and Tennessee. In the former State one man was fined \$25 and costs, amounting in all to \$46, for cutting some stove-wood on Sunday; while another man was sent to the chain-gang for a year, for digging a ditch on Sunday to drain the water out of his cellar. In this case a so-called minister of the gospel was the complaining witness. Only a few months ago a man in Massachusetts was arrested and fined for hauling a load of hay on Sunday to save it from a threatened rain.

These are only a few of many cases, not properly of prosecution for violation of law, but

of persecution for conscience' sake, for the real offense of most of these men was not in working on Sunday (for others in the same neighborhood who work habitually on that day were not molested), but in not working upon the preceding day. They were, with two or three exceptions, Seventh-day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists, and their real offense was daring to differ from their neighbors in faith and practice. And yet of a law which makes such things possible, the correspondent of the *Press* before referred to says, "It is not a 'religious ordinance,' but a civil one, inasmuch as it deals alone with the *civil Sabbath* or 'rest-day.'" We are sick and tired of such twaddle. When shall we hear the last of it?

WE learn from the *Oakland Times* that Rev. N. R. Johnston, of this city, together with Rev. Dr. Briggs, of Pacific Grove, and Rev. A. Calhoun, of San Jose, have been appointed a committee of the American Sabbath Union to organize local and auxiliary unions for the revival and enforcement of Sunday legislation. Mr. Johnston announces that he will "answer calls for service in public Sabbath-law meetings, or to preach on the Sabbath question."

A personal acquaintance with one of these gentlemen, Mr. Johnston, justifies us in expressing the opinion that no better man could have been selected as a member of this committee. Though socially a very estimable man, this gentleman is a thorough National Reformer, with all that the term implies. Though exceedingly mild and gentle in private conversation, he is so biased by his religion, inherited from the Covenanters, that he can see no reason why if a theocracy was good for the Jews it would not be equally good for us; nor why if it was right anciently to put men to death for Sabbath-breaking, it would not be the proper thing to do now. In short, Mr. Johnston cannot see the difference between a divinely established theocracy, administered by inspired men, and a man-made theocracy, so called, administered by uninspired, and too often narrow and bigoted, or even evil and designing, men. It is certainly fit that he should be a member of this committee.

THE story has been telegraphed from New York and published in some of the daily papers, that Col. Elliott F. Shepard, of the *New York Mail and Express*, offered some years ago to bribe the sultan of Turkey for \$1,000,000 to turn Christian. The story is scarcely credible, and yet the idea is no more absurd than is the National-Reform-American-Sabbath-Union scheme of making men moral and the country Christian by civil law.

WE have received from A. L. Anthony, Yountville, Cal., a copy of "The Ideal," one of the most complete pocket memorandum books and business guides which we have ever seen. "The Ideal" is accurately described in an advertisement on the *seventh* page of this paper.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, - - - \$1.00

In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, each, - - 75c.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, - 5s.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL,

43 Bond St., NEW YORK.