



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

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 30, 1890.

NUMBER 5.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

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

It seems that some effort was made in the last Congress to have some action taken on the Sunday-Rest bill, and that even on Sunday. The secretary of Legislation of the American Sabbath Union in complaining of "the God-defying, law-defying Sabbath desecration by Congress" on the Sunday before inauguration day, says: "The Christian men of Congress did not, as on a former occasion, prevent a Sunday session by denying the right of Congress to require Sunday work of any of its members, and retiring in a body, and so destroying the quorum. Instead of such a protest, there was only a shallow jest, called up by a Sunday motion relating to the Sunday-Rest bill, that it was not proper to work on such legislation on the Sabbath." That was not a shallow jest. That was a very wise and a very pious observation. We suggest that that gentleman be made chairman of the committee that has charge of the Sunday-Rest bill.

THE *Chicago News* of the 6th inst., has the following item:—

Mr. Joseph W. Morton of Chicago takes issue with the statement of the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, of the American Sabbath Union, that the petition for certain Sabbath reforms which was presented to the last Congress was signed by more than ten million adults. "To contain ten million signatures," says Mr. Morton, "would require at least 166,667 sheets, making more than 347 reams, which, at the average rate of twelve and one-half pounds to the ream, would weigh more than two and one-sixth tons. The length of the petition would be a little more than sixty-three miles." Mr. Morton is very confident that no such petition was ever presented to Congress on any subject.

Of course, no such petition was ever presented. The *SENTINEL* has repeatedly shown how the petitions referred to were

made to represent such a vast number of petitioners; and it is certain that there has never been in any country a greater abuse of the right of petition. Whole denominations were counted on the strength of the vote of a few men not chosen for any such purpose; and even worse than that, the whole Roman Catholic Church was counted as petitioners, simply because Cardinal Gibbons wrote a letter to Mr. Crafts, saying: "I am happy to add my name." It is true that, owing to the strenuous efforts being put forth by the friends of Sunday legislation, there is a growing sentiment in favor of such laws, but it is not true that any such number as they claim have ever petitioned for a Sunday law in any legitimate manner.

No Morality Possible Without Religious Doctrine.

LAST week we printed the offer of the American Secular Union of a \$1,000 prize for the best essay embodying "the purest principles of morality without inculcating religious doctrines." Personally, we are considerably interested in this thing. Our interest, however, is one of curiosity rather than of practice; because such a manual as the Union desires, will be a curiosity in itself, if such a thing can be created at all; and it will also be a curiosity to see how it is done when it is done.

The circular announcing the prize says:—

It is desired that the manual for which this premium is offered shall not be a *reading* book for schools nor a mere *code* of morals, much less a *system* of ethical philosophy, but rather a concise yet comprehensive and suggestive exhibit, with familiar and practical illustrations of those universal foundation principles and axiomatic truths which underlie all sound morality and *rightfulness*, thus developing and educating that inherent *moral sense* which is more or less common to all rational beings. In short, to show how to teach children the *natural* and *essential* difference between right and wrong, and the reasons therefor.

It is perfectly proper to teach children, as well as older people, the essential difference between right and wrong; and every

reasoning creature, not only desires, but absolutely demands to know the reasons therefor. But in moral things, in inculcating the principles of moral right or wrong, it is impossible to give reasons for it without inculcating a religious doctrine. The reason for that which is right or wrong must be based upon authority. But to leave out of these reasons all idea of any authority, except the authority of man, is to have in fact no basis for morality. The human conscience refuses to recognize the authority of man in the realm of morals. If it rests upon the authority of man, one man has just as much authority as another. Each man's idea of that which is morally right is, to him, more authoritative than any other man's idea of right can be.

Therefore, to carry into effect the intent of this prize offer, there must be established an aristocracy of ideas in regard to what is morally right or wrong. Not only that, this aristocracy of ideas might be established; those ideas might be embodied in a manual; but how shall the children and the people at large be caused to receive them as authoritative? Every person will assert his right to reject the whole thing, reasons and all. If it be said that the State shall adopt this for the public schools, and enforce it, then there is at once established a despotism of ideas in morals, and freedom of thought is no more. It is impossible to escape this if once there is a step taken in that direction. But we understand that the Secular Union recognizes the absolute equality of mankind, and the absolute freedom of thought. These being the principles of the Union, it never can set forth any system of morals with any authority at all, according to the plan suggested in this announcement.

In the realm of morals, the mind and the conscience of man require reasons resting upon authority, and that authority must be superior to man's. That authority is the authority of God; the conscience of man will recognize no other; and the logic of the question will admit of no other. That authority is expressed either

by the Lord, through his word, to the individual conscience, or by man assuming the place of God and by despotic power forcing its dictates upon men, crushing out individuality and freedom of thought.

The authority of man in the place of God, is expressed in two ways and only two. One of these ways is exemplified in the Papacy and its history. With this, the American Secular Union is well acquainted, and justly abhors it. With the other form, we are persuaded the Union is not so well acquainted, or it would never have made the offer it has on the basis upon which it has made it. According to the idea of the Union, and in fact according to the abstract idea, somebody's view of what is right or wrong must be taken as the authority; and as the Union requires that the reasons for right or wrong shall be kept strictly upon the basis of the natural within the realm of the secular, in this case it must be the view of the majority. What the majority shall say is right or wrong, that *is* right or wrong. But while it is only the views of men the mind and conscience of man will refuse to receive it as authoritative in the realm of morals. Therefore, as we have seen, if it is to be made effective, it must be so by the assertion of power, and in this case the power of the State, which, in the government of the people, is simply the power of the majority. But even though it be a majority, when it embodies the views of the majority upon questions of right and wrong, and makes those views authoritative, and compels everybody to accept those views, that is a despotism crushing out freedom of thought, no less than is the other, though it be not under the name of Papacy. And no less than the other also, this is simply man putting himself and his authority in the place of God and his authority. This is paganism.

The proposition of the American Secular Union, in this matter of its \$1,000 prize, is the very philosophy of Roman paganism in particular. In the Roman system, the idea of the State, that is, of the majority, was the highest idea of the science of right and wrong. What "the Senate and people of Rome" said was right, that *was* right. What they said was wrong, that was wrong. The Senate and people expressed their voice and their will, in this matter, in law, therefore, a maxim of the Roman law was, "What the law says is right." But *the Roman State was the supreme deity*; and thus originated the maxim, "*Vox populi vox Dei*—the voice of the people is the voice of God." This is the philosophy of the circular of the American Secular Union calling for a manual of morals based upon the authority of man. It is true, the Union does not, in set terms, propose to make the State openly a deity. Nevertheless the result is the same, and by such a system, the majority is put in the place of God, and asserts the power and authority of

God upon the mind and conscience of man.

These are the two means by which morality, and the reasons and the authority for it, are discovered and asserted by man. One is the Papacy, the other is paganism. Both are false. The truth lies above them both in genuine Christianity. Real Christianity takes the moral code as it came from the hand of God asserting the eternal principles of right and wrong, resting upon the authority of God—Christianity takes these principles and, depending alone upon the power and the gracious influences of the Spirit of God, it seeks by persuasive argument and sound reason to impress them upon the individual conscience, and enables men, through faith in Christ, to attain to the perfect manifestation of "the purest principles of morality." It is both logically and practically impossible to inculcate the purest principles of morality without inculcating religious doctrine, because, as we have seen, in the realm of morals the mind and conscience of man uncompromisingly requires authority above the authority of man—that is, above the natural and the secular. But just as soon as we get above the natural and the secular, we are at once in the realm of religion, in the realm of the recognition of God, and that is religion. Thus it is demonstrated by the experience of man, that, in the very nature of things, it is impossible to give instruction in the purest principles of morality without inculcating the purest religious doctrine, and that the religious doctrine of Christianity. Because in Jesus Christ God is revealed; and in the will of God there is announced, and in the faith of Jesus Christ there is secured the practice of, the purest principles of morality that ever can be known to the mind of man.

The trouble is that the American Secular Union makes a mistake in this and aims at too much. It requires that which it is impossible to secure by the means which the Secular Union is disposed only to employ. The object of the Union, "the complete separation of Church and State in practice as well as in profession," is a laudable object. It is worthy of the sympathy, the support, and the co-operation of every Christian as well as every other man. In this, it has the hearty sympathy and co-operation of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. But in *its* effort to assure this, the Secular Union undertakes too much. In its opposition to the encroachments of the religious upon the civil authority it allows the pendulum to swing too far and would cause the civil authority to encroach upon the realm of the religious. In its attempt to keep separate the spiritual and the secular powers, the Secular Union attempts to do, by the secular power that which can be done only by the spiritual. It attempts to do by the civil power that which can be done only by the religious power. It attempts to inculcate

and secure the practice of the purest principles of morality without inculcating religious doctrine, while it is absolutely impossible to instruct in the principles of morality, whether pure or impure, without inculcating religious doctrine; and while it is absolutely impossible to separate morality from religion.

We say it kindly: Let the Secular Union revise its position. Let it draw its lines more clearly. Let its object be indeed a complete separation of Church and State in practice as well as in profession. Let it confine itself to the secular, to the maintenance of which it is pledged and for which it in fact exists. And while doing this, let it leave to the Church matters pertaining to things spiritual. While opposing the encroachment of the Church upon the power of the State, let the Secular Union see to it that, so far as in it lies, the power of the State shall be kept within its proper jurisdiction, and that it shall not invade the realm of the Church. Let the Union see to it that the State shall have to do only with things civil, while it leaves to the individual conscience that which pertains to religion and morality.

Let the Secular Union draw its lines here and it will be relieved of the heavy burden of trying to do that which it is impossible to do with the means which the Union would only employ. It will also thus be relieved of the inconsistency of contradicting itself by even unintentionally attempting to do the very thing which it exists for the sole purpose of preventing.

What the American Secular Union wants in the prize manual for which it has advertised, is a manual clearly defining the principles in which the State may give instruction without trenching upon the domain of the religious: the principles which the State may inculcate within the proper limits of the civil jurisdiction. And, in fact, we are inclined to believe that this is what the Union intended to secure; but the Union makes the unfortunate mistake of confounding morality with civility, and asking for a manual upon the purest principles of *morality* without inculcating religious doctrine while it means only *civility*. The State is secular and exists in the realm of the natural and has only to do with that which is civil. It can never have anything to do with that which is spiritual, moral, or religious. The Secular Union and its work belong in the realm of the State and cannot, under its title, have anything to do with things spiritual, moral, or religious. Let the Secular Union confine itself within the limits of its proper jurisdiction and it will do well.

We have now favored the Union with printing its announcement, and with our comments upon it, and we sincerely hope that the Union will favor us with the earliest copy of the prize manual that it can possibly send to our table. A. T. J.

Taxing Church Property.

WHETHER we like it or not, the drift of political sentiment is everywhere in the direction of taxing church property the same as any other.

This was expressed in the constitutional convention in Washington Territory by the adoption of a clause forbidding the release of any kind of property from its proportionate share of the public burdens. The object of this was the taxation of churches, private schools, and charitable institutions.

California has had a similar provision for several years in its Constitution. Though at first opposed by a large minority, it has grown in popularity until it is now accepted as a matter of course even by the most thorough-going churchmen. Some of them express the belief that the poorer churches should be exempt, but this simply corresponds to the opinion held by many political thinkers (among them ex-Secretary McCulloch) that all small property holdings should be exempt. So far as the costly city churches are concerned, the sentiment favoring their taxation is almost unanimous.

In the Eastern States the sentiment against exemption is also growing, though in a less marked degree. It is in the main confined to political students, and to the more strenuous supporters of the public school system who oppose the education of a part of the children in parochial schools. Not until all church property is taxed, they maintain, can we make sure that all our children shall have a common education in the principles of American citizenship and be united in sentiment and sympathies.

Curiously enough, England has taken an important step in the same direction. Only a short time since a considerable sum was bequeathed to a foreign missionary society, and the executors under the will claimed that it should be exempt from the tax upon bequests. Lord Chief Justice Coleridge decided that the probable excellence of the charity in no way lessened the claims of the State. The amount of the tax on the bequest was the State's money and not the testator's. To remit it was to increase by just so much the burden upon the remaining taxpayers. Such an increase of the public burdens could not take place except by the direction of the public itself. No exemption could therefore be permitted.

In the same way it might be maintained that in this country, where all private property is held subject to a lien for annual taxes on the part of the State, the value of this lien is in fact public property. To remit the tax when the property is transferred to a religious institution, is therefore to increase the amount of the charity out of the pockets of the remaining taxpayers. Such, at least, is the philosophy of the refusal of California and

Washington to exempt the property of religious and charitable institutions. It is the logical carrying out of two American principles: First, the complete separation of Church and State; second, equality before the laws for property as well as men.—*Commercial Advertiser.*

Let Americans Be Americans.

IN the following editorial from the *Tribune* of this city there is a valuable point, one which we wish there was made much more of throughout the land. The aping of European ways by Americans is a shame and a disgrace to every one who does it.

"At the Holland Society's dinner on Friday night Mr. Theodore Roosevelt made some remarks in an old-fashioned way upon an old-fashioned subject. After recalling the social, political, military, financial and other triumphs of American citizens of Dutch ancestry, Mr. Roosevelt made the point that whatever may have been the strength and virtue of their Holland blood, they wrought as Americans, and could not have won the renown that has rewarded their labors had they remained Hollanders here. He then proceeded to apply this point to existing situations, and to urge the duty of all foreigners to become heartily and sincerely American. This is in no sense a new suggestion, but it needs to be constantly enforced upon the attention, not only of foreigners, but of native-born Americans as well.

"There is a class of Americans, almost confined to the Eastern cities, who have seemed to think it an evidence of culture and of social and intellectual rank to indulge in supercilious reflections upon their country and their countrymen. We have lately feared that this class of people was growing, not merely among the silly creatures who have neither brains nor any use for brains, but among really estimable persons and as the result of a propaganda undertaken primarily in the interest of certain European economic theories. The zeal and industry of those in charge of the propaganda have not seemed to be satisfied with those comparisons which in their eyes show the superior excellence of foreign industrial systems, but they have felt it necessary also to sneer at all things commonly thought to be characteristic of our society.

"They sneer at our politics, declaring in effect that no such thing exists as an honest American politician; that all officeholders in this land, where we teach officeholding to be no man's right, but every man's proper aspiration, are selfish, corrupt slaves of party; that to be prominent in the council or active in the management of a party is to be utterly wicked and unclean—to be, indeed, a "machine politician" is their synonym for "devil."

They sneer at our educational system and methods, and affect to think we have no "real colleges," apparently believing it impossible for an educator to be wise without a wig or efficient as a teacher without a gown. They sneer at our press, and save themselves vast intellectual effort by throwing all their fine scorn into the quotation marks with which they invariably surround the word journalism. They have not yet got ready to attack the public school system or freedom of worship, but they do what they can to prevent the extension of the public school system, and they plainly indicate that they have more faith in the piety of a bishop who is also "my lord" than of one whose character is unaided by civil title. They apparently act upon the belief that it is a sign of broad-mindedness and liberality to take that view of a method or that side of a controversy which is antagonistic to the popular American view.

"These people are not very susceptible to arguments, but they are painfully sensitive as to the impression they produce upon others. They wish to be thought vastly clever. If it could only be got into their heads that, on the contrary, they really excite only pity and ridicule, it would probably do them good."

The Blair Sunday Bill in Secular Dress.

THE Blair Sunday bill has again appeared upon the scene of Congressional action, to seek at the hands of our present national legislators that recognition which it failed to get from the members of the Fiftieth Congress. The better to secure this, and that the public eye may not be turned upon it in suspicion, it has discarded its religious features and assumed a garb which is studiously secular. How this has been done will be evident to the reader from a comparison of the two phases of the bill, as given herewith, the essential points of difference being indicated by the use of italics and small capitals:—

THE BLAIR BILL—1888-9.

A Bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day as a day of rest, AND TO PROMOTE ITS OBSERVANCE AS A DAY OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person, or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation, shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any Territory, District, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdic-

THE BLAIR BILL—1889-90.

A Bill to secure to the people the *privileges of rest and of religious worship, free from disturbance by others*, on the first day of the week.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That no person, or corporation, or agent, servant, or employee of any person, or corporation or in the service of the United States in time of peace, except in the necessary enforcement of the laws, shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity and mercy and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement or recreation to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as Sunday, or during any part

tion of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.

SEC. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal-route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: *Provided*, That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decrease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the Postmaster-General shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter and shall make regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: *And provided further*, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails, it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week.

SEC. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited; and any person or corporation or the agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation who shall willfully violate this section, shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten or more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.

SEC. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited; nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord's day.

SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered, or for labor performed, or for the transportation of persons or of property, in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery

thereof, in any Territory, District, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.

SEC. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal-route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: *Provided*, That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decrease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the Postmaster-General shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter and shall make regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: *And provided further*, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week.

SEC. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited; and any person or corporation, or the agent, servant or employee of any person or corporation who shall willfully violate this section, shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten or more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.

SEC. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States, on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited; nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the first day of the week.

SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered, or for labor performed, or for the transportation of persons or of property, in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery

thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.

SEC. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal-routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, District, or Territory into another State, District, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, *but the same shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH DAY.*

It will be noticed, first, that a conspicuous change has taken place in the introductory clause which defines the purpose of the bill. As originally defined, its purpose was "to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, . . . and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship." Now it is merely "to secure to the people the privileges of rest and of religious worship" on that day, "free from disturbance by others." The religious phase of the bill has disappeared entirely. It is now intended only as a mild and beneficent civil regulation, having in view the laudable object of securing to the people the privileges of undisturbed rest and religious worship on the first day of the week, of which it seems they have in some way been deprived!

This great change having been made in the object for which the bill was framed, we naturally look for a corresponding change in the bill itself. But here a strange fact presents itself; there is no change in the body of the bill at all. The same measures which one year ago would accomplish the object of securing to the people the enjoyment of the Lord's day as a day of rest, and promote its observance as a day of religious worship, are now considered necessary merely to give people a chance to rest and worship undisturbed! All those little phrases which upon the first appearance of the bill stamped it as a religious measure, have been pruned off, and it now appears labeled, "civil regulation." But it is the same old bill, imposing the same restrictions and exacting the same penalties. The change of label does not make it more desirable, or any less deserving of universal and uncompromising opposition.

Another strange thing which the above comparison brings out, is the sudden

thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.

SEC. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal-routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, District, or Territory into another State, District, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, *nor shall the provisions of this act be construed to prohibit or to sanction labor on Sunday by individuals who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day than Sunday as the Sabbath or a day of religious worship, provided such labor be not done to the disturbance of others.*

change which seems to have taken place in the public conception of the first day of the week. Only one year ago this day was as the bill stated, "commonly known as the Lord's day;" now the first day of the week is "commonly known as Sunday." It must be that the secularization of the day is indeed taking place at a rapid rate!

It is further noticeable that the authors of the bill in its present form have provided it with the semblance of an exemption clause for those who observe some other than the first day of the week. In the latter half of the last section it is stated that the bill shall not be construed "to prohibit or to sanction labor on Sunday by individuals who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day than Sunday as the Sabbath or a day of religious worship." There immediately follows, however, the qualifying clause, "provided such labor be not done to the disturbance of others." By referring to the first section, we find that all that the bill requires of any one, observer of Sunday or non-observer, is that he shall not engage in labor on that day to the disturbance of others. The bill when it was before the last Congress, contained the same provision. The propriety of the term "semblance," as used above, is therefore evident. The bill virtually says, with true National Reform generosity, that where persons religiously observe any other day than Sunday, they shall not, on this account, be prohibited from labor and recreation entirely, but shall have the same privilege which all others enjoy of engaging in such labor and recreation on Sunday as will not be to the disturbance of others! This is doubtless in the line of those "concessions" of which we have heard from Mr. Crafts and others, and for which, as he says, observers of the seventh day have never shown any great disposition to be thankful.

It is hardly necessary to say that the thin secular guise in which this bill now makes its appearance, does not make it any less worthy of the strenuous opposition of every patriotic and liberty-loving American citizen than it was before this guise was assumed. The character and intent of the bill were plainly shown when it was introduced as a bill to "promote" the observance of the "Lord's day" as "a day of religious worship;" and the addition which the past year has made to the stock of wisdom of its originators, comes too late to make its secular guise effective. The bill is the same now that it was when first introduced, and in the opposition which we trust will be brought against it from all quarters, its advocates will have to meet this fact, and with it the stigma which must in every candid mind attach to their work, as a result of their manifest hypocrisy.—*Review and Herald.*

"My kingdom is not of this world."

Compelled to be Saved.

IN the Elgin, Illinois, convention of Congregational ministers, November 8, 1887, Dr. W. W. Everts, of Chicago, in speaking of the prevalence of Sabbath desecration and its remedy, said: "This day is set apart for divine worship and a preparation for another life. It is the test of all religion." That is to say, Sabbath-keeping is the test of all religion, and he who will not keep the Sabbath has no religion. But if he will not keep it he must be forced to, and thus act as though he had religion, no matter how corrupt at heart. Such a law would be, only could be, productive of the rankest hypocrisy. God will never accept of such a coerced religion. We admit, with Dr. Everts, that the Sabbath was given to assist in a preparation for another life; but when measures are adopted to compel men to prepare for another life, it is going beyond the jurisdiction of the Church or the State.

Dr. Everts further said: "He who does not keep the Sabbath does not worship God; and he who does not worship God, is lost." Exactly, and a law to compel people to keep the Sabbath is nothing less than a law to compel people to worship God. If they will *not* keep the Sabbath, and thereby worship God, they are lost; therefore, they must be *compelled* to keep the Sabbath, worship God, and be saved.

Obedience to God, voluntarily rendered, is the greatest test of love and the highest form of worship. Said Christ: "If ye love me, keep my commandments:" John 14: 15. But who ever heard of Christ compelling the people to show their love to him by forcing them to keep his commandments? The Scriptures set forth no such principle. The Sabbath belongs to Christ, and when on earth he told the people that he was Lord of it. Mark 2: 28. There were Sabbath breakers all around him, but he did not appeal to Cæsar for a law to compel them to keep it. He used the best means for saving people,—persuasion mingled with the deepest love. If compulsory measures had been a potent agent in saving those for whom he came to die, he might have used them.

It seems to be the design of ambitious clergymen, who are more zealous for an outward display than for inward piety, to transform this Government from a civil to an ecclesiastical power, and have a few men like the Roman pontiff, sit upon ecclesiastical thrones and make their interpretations of the Scriptures the law of the land. As a stepping stone to this they make Sabbath observance a test of personal religion and worship, and then tell the people they are lost if they do not come up to the test, thus trying to frighten them into favoring a Sunday law.

It is a good thing to keep the Sabbath and worship God; but it is a detestable, thing to *compel* people to keep it, and deceive them into the idea that obedience

to such a law will save them. If the people cannot see the motive of those engaged in this Sunday-law business, it must be because they will not, or do not, investigate the matter, and reason from cause to effect.

E. HILLIARD.

Christ's Kingdom Not of This World.

THERE was a constant expectancy upon the part of Jesus' followers that he would take to himself regal power, and reign as king. Human power was inseparably connected with their ideas of success; and this expectancy often found expression in queries which plainly show the shape their hopes had taken. But the Saviour did not encourage the idea of associating his work with the kingdoms of the world. Exactly the opposite. He taught the doctrines of brothership instead of lordship; he called his disciples "friends," not servants; he taught meekness instead of "the manly art of self-defence;" humility, instead of pomp and pride. He taught that it was better to suffer wrong than to commit it; that it was better to be aggrieved than to be the aggressor; that mercy and forgiveness should prevail over justice, which was to be committed to him who judgeth righteously.

These characteristics plainly mark both his teachings and his life from beginning to close. When Peter resorted to the sword, he rebuked his spirit, and substituted kindness. When James and John suggested that the argument of fire from heaven be used upon those Samaritans who would not receive him, Jesus said, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Luke 9: 55, 56.

He held at his disposal "more than twelve legions of angels;" but he never invoked the physical constraint of one of them to defend his cause or enforce his creed.

"Learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart," exclaims the great Author and Finisher of the Christian faith. It would have been well for the cause, and for its adherents since that time, had they fully comprehended the real spirit of the cause they profess, and possessed more of the spirit of its Master. But from that time until the present, men have sought to place the cause of Christ upon the support of civil power. Legislators and rulers have been petitioned and besought to take the interests and institutions of the Church under the fostering wing of legal protection; and wherever this has been tried, the result has been most disastrous to pure and undefiled religion. The Saviour says, "My kingdom is not of this world." Nor is this world any part of Christ's kingdom.—*Bible Echo, Australia.*

"Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers." Titus 3: 1.

Encouraging Words.

THE Oakland (California) daily *Times* of January 10, notices the removal of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to this city, as follows:—

"DEPARTURE OF A FAITHFUL SENTINEL."

"Oakland has one religious paper the less by the removal of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, published for four years in Oakland, by the Pacific Press Publishing Company, to New York.

"The ability of this paper, under the editorial charge from the first of Elder E. J. Waggoner and Professor A. T. Jones, has been marked, and its deserved success phenomenal. Starting as an eight-page monthly, in January, 1886, it attained the first year to a circulation of over 136,000 copies, and the third year of more than 600,000. Last January it became a weekly and had a circulation during the year of over 1,000,000 copies. Its avowed aim, thus far consistently and energetically carried out, has been to oppose every principle, effort or movement which tends in any way to a union of Church and State, and to preserve inviolable the strictly secular and non-sectarian attitudes adopted by the fathers of our Republic and embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution, as also in the Constitutions of this and all the other States of the Union. An organized, determined and persistent effort is being made to overturn this fundamental principle and introduce a religious amendment which, if adopted by Congress and endorsed by the popular vote, will thoroughly sectarianize the Constitution. Against this movement the AMERICAN SENTINEL is dotting and is bound to do valiant battles. It holds, with Roger Williams, that 'civil government should rule in civil things only,' and, with George Washington, that 'every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable to God alone for his religious faith,' and that any interference with this right in the way of penal Sunday laws or otherwise is a wanton and flagrant usurpation and should be resisted by every loyal American citizen with his utmost power.

"In principles and sentiments the *Morning Times*, with most of its brethren of the secular press, fully agrees, and we are glad to see in the last issue of the AMERICAN SENTINEL a hearty acknowledgement of sympathy and encouragement extended by various representatives of the California secular press, and particular by the Oakland *Morning Times*.

"The change of location to the metropolis of the Nation and the center of the battle on this national question, is undoubtedly a good one, and we believe and predict that the AMERICAN SENTINEL will at least double its last year's circulation of 1,000,000 copies during the current year."

A Lawyer's Opinion.

THE *Washington Post*, of January 12, has the following sensible communication from a prominent lawyer of that city. We commend it to the careful consideration of our readers:—

“The *Post* of January 6, 1890, published a dispatch from London, of the date of January 5, which says:—

The Rome correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette* has had a remarkable interview with Monsignor Satelli, which reveals a mental grasp on the part of the prelate, fairly noteworthy. The whole report is a gem, but this is perhaps the best thing: “All our bishops in the United States,” says Satelli, “are treated as sovereign princes, and Archbishop Ireland is the personal friend of Harrison. As a Democrat, he belongs to his party. He told Harrison that unless he would pledge himself to make concessions to the Catholic schools, all the Catholics would withdraw their votes from him. So he was obliged to do so. The public corporations, too, are only too glad to fulfil the wishes of our bishops, even before they are expressed.

“I think there must be some mistake about this; but the charge is one of such grave significance that President Harrison owes it to himself, and to the country at large, to stamp it with a prompt denial.

“Our Government is purely secular in its character and purposes. It is vested with no ecclesiastical power whatever. It has no right, nor any constitutional power, to appropriate a single dollar for the support of Catholic or of Protestant schools, or schools of any religious denomination, nor to legislate, in any way, for or against any religious sect, or on the subject of religion. Every Catholic in the land is entitled to the same consideration, the same protection, the same benefits and advantages as the Protestant, the Jew, the Mohammedan, and the infidel, and no more; all are entitled to the same consideration and the same protection.

“Our Government is not a Christian nor an anti-Christian Government; nor in any sense an ecclesiastical Government, but purely secular; it is designed for the benefit and protection of all classes of men—men of all religions, and men of no religion.

“On the other hand, the Papal Government, so called, is purely an ecclesiastical organization, and is invested with no civil powers. There may be some points of agreement and contact between the Papal hierarchy and the several Governments of Europe, for the reason that in all the Governments of Europe there is, to some extent, a mingling of civil and ecclesiastical powers. But with our Government it is entirely different. Between the Papal hierarchy and the Government of the United States there is no point of contact or agreement; nothing upon which the two can mutually and officially act. The one is spiritual, the other temporal.

“And it is for that reason that there has never been any official representation of either at the court of the other during the

century of our existence as a nation. What would be thought of the Episcopal Church of England, or the Greek Church of Russia sending a minister plenipotentiary or ambassador to represent the interest of either at the Government of the United States? And yet the papal authority is no more dominant in civil affairs in Italy than is the Episcopal Church in England, or the Greek Church in Russia.

“It may be well to note in this connection, the bill recently introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, “To prevent persons [in the District of Columbia] being forced to labor on Sunday.” The title prefixed to this bill is a misnomer. It is not even pretended, either by the provisions of the bill itself, or by its author, that any person in the District of Columbia has been compelled to labor on Sunday, at any time since the abolition of slavery therein.

“This bill, if passed, will be in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States, which declares that ‘Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.’

“It is based upon the false and shabby pretense that mankind are by nature so fond of labor and so ambitious to work as to call for the restraint of law to save them from the consequences of overwork, while, in fact, it is designed by its authors as an entering wedge for a wide system of aggressive laws on religious subjects in derogation of the Constitution and of the civil rights and religious freedom of the citizen.

“It is high time to sound the alarm, when a comparatively small, but influential, and well-organized body of ambitious and unrestful Protestants, and backed by the Jesuits of the Catholic hierarchy, boldly and openly seek to change the character, if not the form of our Government, from a purely secular to an ecclesiastical or priestly rule, which experience has proved to be, of all forms of government, the most tyrannical, the most cruel, and the most oppressive. C. H. B.”

A Correspondent Who Is Anxious.

A reader writes as follows, from Dassel, Minnesota:—

“EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL: I have been an interested reader of your valuable little paper for some months, and feel to bid you God speed in your work, and hope you will soon be able to double the size of the SENTINEL. I have been so anxious about the Sunday movement, and fear so much to see the Blair Sunday bill become law, that I have determined, God being my helper, to try to warn the people of the impending danger of Sunday and other religious laws. I am not a Seventh-day keeper.”

We sincerely wish that there were thousands of other people in this country who would become as anxious as that and act in this same way to relieve their anxiety.

A New Boycott.

GENERALLY speaking, absolute consistency in any human enterprise that is at all complex in its bearings is impossible; but the efforts of those persons who would compel the cessation of all work on Sunday are rather unusually inconsistent. Consistency, while not essential (in fact it may often be a sign of weakness), is nevertheless held to be a jewel; and inconsistency *in extremis* becomes absurdity.

The attempted coercion of the people of the United States to observe a certain Sabbath in a certain way, is absurd.

The people of this Republic have attained to a certain degree of intellectual independence. Thinkers of great thoughts doubtless are rare, as they have ever been, but thinkers of practical thoughts have become exceedingly numerous; and the habit of social self-reliance, fostered by political freedom, has engendered a corresponding intellectual or mental self-reliance, which is freeing the race from superstition and moral bondage exactly as popular education frees it from literal ignorance.

People no longer believe that kings have divine rights—at least the people of the United States do not. In fact, the Declaration of our Independence teaches us that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. The Constitution of the United States recognizes no higher source of power than the “consent of the governed.” That idea has permeated the social as well as the political fabric.

The Church is a social institution, with spiritual jurisdiction over its members. That the ministers, pastors, or priests have any powers beyond those delegated by the consent of their congregations or flocks is not now generally believed; yet that assumption seems to be the “head and front” of the so-called Sabbatarian movement.

That a man should rest one day in every seven is not at all unreasonable. But to compel him by law to rest one day in seven, and to designate by law which of the seven shall be the day of rest for him and all other men, is a measure to which the “consent of the governed” can never be gained. It is arbitrary and unreasonable, regarded from any but a sectarian standpoint. True, the commandment enjoins: “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,” etc. . . . But when they seek to impose upon unwilling fellow citizens such observance, they must of necessity show a higher source of authority than any named in the Constitution; and it is then that the inconsistencies of divers religious systems and the basic discrepancies of denominational opinions become fatal weaknesses which stamp the acts of the Sabbatarians with the seal of absurdity.—*Peulo (Col.) Sunday Opinion.*

ONE of the recommendations adopted by the Paris International Sunday Congress, upon "The Weekly Rest Day from a Social Point of View," is this:—

The smallest amount of rest which man ought to have is one day in seven; we mean by that, the Sabbath day, for that which is necessary for man is not a lay of relief from labor only, but a day for true moral elevation.

If it is a day of rest simply from a social point of view, what matters it which day it is. From a social point of view, one man or a thousand men can rest just as well on one day as another. But that is not what the Congress meant to recommend. The Congress "means" that the Sabbath day is the one which shall be observed for rest and which is the smallest amount of rest that any man ought to take, and that not for physical rest primarily, but for true moral elevation. In this the Congress abandons the social point of view, adopts the religious, and places the day of rest upon the religious basis, and by so doing, it contradicts itself in its recommendation. But this is not an exceptional case by any means. No argument has ever yet been made professedly from a civil or social point of view that did not in fact rest upon the religious. And no such argument ever can be made. The thing is religious in itself. It cannot be made anything else and by no argument can it ever be made consistently to appear anything else.

REFERRING to the Blair Sunday Bill now pending in Congress, the Litchfield (Minn.) *Independent* says:—

We have no hesitancy in giving our opinion that such legislation would be an act of bigotry not worthy this day and age. Let the Government keep its hands off from any interference with the religious conduct of the people so long as the rights of others are not concerned. If the stability of the Christian religion now dominant in this country depends on any bolstering acts like the Blair bill, better let the structure topple at once.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *World-Herald* (Omaha, Nebraska), writing upon the Sabbath question, says:—

"While I am in favor of having one day in seven to be observed as a day of rest, or holiday, I believe with Martin Luther, that it is wholly wrong to have any law compelling anyone to observe it as a holy day, and all who are sincere in believing such a law to be right do so through the prejudice of education, not from truth, reason and facts, for they contradict such a thought."

THE GRANDEST BOOK ON THE GRANDEST SUBJECT

AND WITHIN THE REACH OF ALL.

We have just issued a special "TOUSIST'S EDITION" of our grand book entitled.

IN THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS

THE YO SEMITE VALLEY

AND BIG TREES OF CALIFORNIA.

The most authentic and most intensely interesting description of this wonderful region ever written. It is the same size page and contains everything that our elegant Subscription edition does, except the artotype plates. It is printed on a fine quality of thinner paper, bound in flexible cloth binding, and makes a beautiful book. It contains nearly 500 pages of text and

OVER ONE HUNDRED ILLUSTRATIONS.

and portrays by aid of the artist's genius and the author's facile pen the lofty mountains and charming valleys, the placid lakes and thundering cataracts, of the world-renowned Yo Semite. The mission of this work is to make the best possible representation of the marvelous scenery and sublime natural wonders of this unique region.

PRICE, \$1.50 PER COPY.

Read what others say of it:—

"Many books have been written about the glorious and wondrous story of the Sierras. But it seems to me that this scholarly and venerable pioneer who was publishing an illustrated magazine devoted largely to the themes he celebrates, when many of the younger authors were still at their nurse's knee, is the one man who is entitled, by his culture, his fine tastes, and, above all, his long and wonderful experience, to write the one great and responsible authority about the Heart of the Sierras."—*JOAQUIN MILLER.*

"The illustrations, the text, the whole atmosphere of the volume, are worthy of their great subject, the Yo Semite—and what could I say more?"—*REV. JOSEPH COOK.*

"It is a truthful, interesting, and instructive work."—*GALEN CLARK, Yo Semite Valley. (For sixteen years the Valley's Guardian.)*

"As might have been expected, Mr. Hutchings' story of the Valley that he knows and loves so well, is no cold description, but read with all the charms of a romance."—*San Francisco Hotel Gazette.*

"Those who have not seen Yo Semite cannot do better, short of going to the Valley, than by purchasing Mr. Hutchings' handsome volume."—*The Sacramento Record-Union.*

In order to place this valuable book—the only one of the kind—within the reach of everybody, we offer this edition at the exceedingly low price of \$1.50 per copy, post-paid. Send on your orders quick, while the edition lasts.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW

THIS PAMPHLET CONTAINS THE ARGUMENTS IN BEHALF OF THE RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS, AND IN OPPOSITION TO THE BLAIR SUNDAY-REST BILL, WHICH MR. JONES PRESENTED BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR DECEMBER 13, 1888.

Mr. Crafts has pronounced the report as published

"MIGHTY INTERESTING READING."

And Mr. Jones' comments will make it more so. His argument is enlarged to what it would have been without Senator Blair's interruptions, objections, and counter-arguments, and is accompanied with answers to all of his objections and counter-arguments. As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this Treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially Legislators, lawyers, judges, and other public men. The argument is based on Scripture and history, constitution and law, showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday bill, an analysis of the Sunday laws and other religious legislation of the different States, the

Sunday-Law Movement of the Fourth Century.

AND THE

Sunday-Law Movement of the Nineteenth Century.

The Methods Used in Securing Indorsements to the Petition for the Blair Bill, and the Workings of Such Sunday Laws as are Proposed for the United States.

The Work Contains 192 Pages and will be Sent Post-paid on Receipt of 25c.

Send for it! Read it! Send it to Your Friends!

Address all Orders to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

THE BEST DUPLICATING INKS

FOR USE WITH

"CYCLOSTYLE," "MIMEOGRAPH,"
"COPYGRAPH."

Or any Duplicating Process in which a Stencil is used, are the

Celebrated "Redding Inks."

They Dry Fast, will not Blur nor Clog the stencil, Dry or Harden on Roller or Pallet, and are in every way

A SUPERIOR ARTICLE.

Send for Price Lists and Samples of Work Done with these Inks.

REDDING INK CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

WATERMAN'S IDEAL FOUNTAIN PEN.

HAS THE MOST RELIABLE arrangement for feeding the ink from the reservoir to the pen.

It has the same sure principle of operation (capillary attraction) and simple construction (a split) that have been used by the ordinary dip pen for 5,000 years to carry the ink to the paper.

Remember it is a combination of the BEST material, workmanship, and principle of operation. Don't waste your time or shorten your life with any other. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET

Neat, cheap, serviceable. They perfectly secure pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it cannot fall out when stooping. Can be easily and safely attached to any part of the clothing. A small investment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or pencil.

PRICES.

No. 1. Russia leather, for 2 pens . . . 10c.
No. 2. Russia leather for 3 pens . . . 15c.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets superior in every particular to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

ROMANISM AND CIVIL LIBERTY

BY HON. WILLIAM JACKSON ARMSTRONG.

The above is the title of a recent issue of the Sentinel Library which contains a *verbatim* report of a powerful lecture delivered by this well-known speaker, in Oakland, California. Price, 4 cents. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL

AND

TEMPERANCE ADVOCATE

A THIRTY-TWO PAGE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, devoted to the dissemination of true temperance principles, and instruction in the art of preserving health. It is emphatically

A JOURNAL FOR THE PEOPLE.

Containing what everybody wants to know, and is thoroughly practical. Its range of subjects is unlimited, embracing everything that in any way affects the health. Its articles being short and pointed, it is specially adapted to farmers, mechanics, and housekeepers, who have but little leisure for reading. It is just the journal that every family needs, and may be read with profit by all. Price, \$1.00 per year, or with the 300-page premium book—"Practical Manual of Hygiene and Temperance," containing household and cooking recipes—post-paid for \$1.40. Address,

PACIFIC HEALTH JOURNAL,

OAKLAND, CAL.



NEW YORK, JANUARY 30, 1890.

NOTE.—Any one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

THE *Christian Nation* criticises the SENTINEL for maintaining that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and makes an extended argument to prove that this is not true. We know that it is not true according to the National Reform religious-legislation theory; but it is true according to the American theory, and the American theory is true according to the Word of God.

THE American Sabbath Union prints the following inquiry:—

Is it not time to start a righteous crusade, under the laws of God and of man, in abolition of this ruinous system of [Sunday] bondage?

Oh, certainly it is! Let the crusade be started at once. Let this cruel bondage be abolished. And in order that this may be accomplished swiftly and certainly, we suggest that the American Sabbath Union change its name to the American Abolition Union. Let slavery be abolished, say we, forever!

December 29th, Mr. Crafts, of the American Sabbath Union, delivered an address at Association Hall, 86th Street, New York City. In that address he said:—

The national Lay Congress of Roman Catholics after correspondence and conference with the American Sabbath Union, passed its famous resolution in favor of co-operation with Protestants in Sabbath reform of which the following is a full and correct copy: "There are many Christian issues in which Catholics could come together with non-Catholics and shape civil legislation for the public weal. In spite of rebuff and injustice, and overlooking zealotry, we should seek alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. Without going over to the Judeaic Sabbath, we can bring the masses over to the moderation of the Christian Sunday. To effect this, we must set our faces sternly against the sale of intoxicating beverages on Sunday. The corrupting influences of saloons in politics, the crime and pauperism from excessive drinking, require legislative restriction which we can aid in procuring by joining our influence with that of the other enemies of intemperance. Let us resolve that drunkenness shall be made odious, and give practical encouragement and support to Catholic temperance societies. We favor the passage and enforcement of laws rigidly closing saloons on Sunday and forbidding the sale of liquors to minors and intoxicated persons."

Upon this Mr. Crafts remarks:—

This does not mean that the millenium is to be built in a day. This is only a proposal of courtship, and the parties thus far have approached each other shyly.

When courtship has gotten so far along as the proposal, marriage is not far off,

especially where the parties are so coy as is this species of Protestantism. And when this marriage between Protestantism and Catholicism is accomplished, what will become of the Protestant portion of the union? What kind of Protestantism is that, anyhow, which so willingly, or rather anxiously, carries on a courtship with Roman Catholics to the extent of receiving a proposal of marriage? Yes, that marriage is coming, and like every other great feature of Catholicism, it is contrary to nature—one woman marrying another. And the fruit of it will be, as pictured in the Scripture, a hideous, nondescript monster. Let there be raised up in this land a Protestantism that will assert itself not only against Roman Catholicism as such, but also against this degenerate Protestantism that has forgotten its place and its mission in the world.

The resolution "that drunkenness shall be made odious" by giving it governmental and religious sanction six days in the week, is likewise worthy of the Catholic Church.

THE organ of the American Sabbath Union says that "the opposition to Senator Blair's Sunday-Rest bill, introduced in the United States Senate, December 9, and printed in the *Pearl of Days*, is based upon a false assumption. That bill does not assume, as it is claimed, that civil legislation upon this subject appeals to the divine law for its support. Nothing of this kind appears in the bill." Certainly nothing of the kind appears in the bill, for it has been omitted for the express purpose of disarming opposition to the measure. It is, however, not a false assumption to say that the bill is a religious measure and that the motives of its promoters are purely religious. A careful comparison of the bill as introduced in the Fiftieth Congress and as now pending in the Fifty-first Congress will convince anyone that precisely the same object is to be accomplished by the bill as it now stands, as it was hoped to accomplish by it as originally framed. We print on another page an article from one of our exchanges which shows this so plainly that none can fail to see it.

WE notice that some of our exchanges, as well as a number of our correspondents, make the mistake of confounding the Blair Educational Bill with the Educational Amendment. These are not identical by any means. The Blair Educational *Bill* is a measure that has been advocated by Senator Blair for several years, and has passed the Senate several times. The object of this bill is to appropriate a certain amount—seventy millions, we think—from the surplus funds in the public treasury to the different States of the Union according to the proportion of illiteracy. But this bill does not propose in itself to have anything to do with religion in the public schools; it simply proposes to take

some of the surplus in the public treasury and divide it amongst the States for the States to use according to their own educational systems.

The Educational *Amendment* proposed by Senator Blair, is that which we have printed and commented upon in the SENTINEL. This proposes to amend the Constitution of the United States so that the principles of Christianity shall be taught in all the public schools in the Nation.

The Educational *Bill* would become a law, and of force, merely upon the action of Congress and the approval of the President. The proposed *Amendment* would be of no force until it was approved by three-fourths of the States. We shall print soon a copy of the Blair Educational *Bill* that our readers may understand just what the intent of it is. We make these remarks just now, only for the purpose of correcting the mistake that some have made, of confounding the bill with the proposed amendment. Please don't do it any more.

THE American Sabbath Union complains that, "New England is in peril from Sunday work and Sunday dissipation." How can it be otherwise under Sunday laws? The effort of the Sunday-law workers is to preserve Sunday as a religious day. Secular work is not in harmony with the religious idea of the day, therefore, work is forbidden. When work is forbidden to those who are not religious they are compelled to be idle, dissipation is the sure outcome; and that also is out of harmony with the religious idea of the day. As Sunday is held to be the palladium of salvation for the State; whatever State it is that has Sunday laws will always be in peril from Sunday work and Sunday dissipation.

THE Elmira (N. Y.) *Telegram* says:—

There is no power in the Constitution of the United States to prescribe the modes and time for the religious observance of any day in the week. The people are at liberty, without restriction, or definition of duty, to worship God in their own way, according to the dictates of their own conscience. Laws cannot be built to make a man rest when he isn't tired, or regulate the way he shall get rested when he is.

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 towards 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, . . . 75c.

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

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL.

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.