



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

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 6, 1890.

NUMBER 6.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

EDITORS,

E. J. WAGGONER, ALONZO T. JONES.

A BEAUTIFUL illustration of the benefit which the Church derives from an alliance with the State is presented in the case of the English Marquis of Ailesbury, who is the patron of twenty-one church livings in the Established Church, while at the same time he is debarred from all English race-tracks for cheating.—*Review and Herald.*

No intelligent man will condemn our churches as long as they are kept entirely distinct and separate from the State. But every Republican and every Democrat, every American should resent to the bitter end every attempt of any church to mix "things spiritual and things temporal," to join Church and State, or to make laws to compel men to conform to any code of morals.—*Topeka Republican.*

THE *Christian Advocate* of this city notices a recent case at law, in which a verdict was brought into court on Sunday, and says:—

Colonel Ingersoll, for the defendant, rose to move to set aside, or for a new trial. Judge Ingraham declined to transact any business on Sunday, beyond the mere receiving and recording of the verdict, necessary to relieve the jury, and told the anti-Christian to wait till Monday. If the latter and his abettors (some of them nominal Christians) get their way, there will be no rest-day in this country.

The SENTINEL is not an admirer of Mr. Ingersoll, nor are we in sympathy with his views upon religious questions, but we fail to see in the facts stated by the *Advocate*, any justification for the fling made at that gentleman and "his abettors." We have no idea that Mr. Ingersoll wants any judge to do business on Sunday if he doesn't want

to, nor do we know of anybody who wants the laws of the land so changed that courts shall uniformly do business upon that day. If judges and other court officials want to observe Sunday religiously or otherwise, nobody ought to object, and the SENTINEL does not object; but it does object to laws requiring those to observe Sunday who do not wish to observe it, and that whether they religiously observe another day or not.

An Important Discussion.

MONDAY evening, January 13, at the annual meeting of the Presbyterian Union of New York City, there was a discussion upon the question, "To what extent, if any, should religion be taught in the public schools?" Dr. Josiah Strong, secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, and Dr. David G. Wylie, argued in favor of religion in the schools; Doctors D. H. Greer and Howard Crosby argued against it. It was an interesting discussion. Dr. Strong led. He began by criticising the Roman Catholic position. He said that position is to be regretted but not to be wondered at. The object of the public school is to make good citizens; the object of the parochial school is to make good Catholics. The removal, therefore, of the Bible from the public schools as a concession to Catholics would be a needless sacrifice, because the primary object of Roman Catholic teaching is the Roman Catholic religion, and any school in which that is not taught is not acceptable to the Catholic Church. In answer to the Roman Catholic call for the division of the school fund, he said it would probably destroy the public school, and would certainly violate the principle of the entire separation of Church and State. He argued that the public schools are not Protestant because distinctive Protestant doctrines are not taught.

Now it is certainly a distinctive Protestant doctrine that the Bible, without note or comment, is the Word of God. And when Protestants insist that the Bible, without note or comment, shall be read in the

public schools, and the Protestant Bible at that, and then claim that the schools are not Protestant, and that no distinctive Protestant doctrine is taught there, is to be guilty of a casuistry that stultifies every one who makes such an argument.

The speaker next turned his attention to the "secularists." He said: "The secular theory is built on a wrong application of a right principle. The right principle is the entire separation of Church and State, while the wrong application of the principle is a failure to make a distinction between the Church and religion. There must be a separation between Church and State, but there must not be a separation between religion and the State. Our Government is, and always has been, religious. The principle of separation between Church and State forbids sectarian teaching in the public schools; but the principle of the union of religion and the State does not forbid undenominational religious instruction." But he did not tell how the State was to discover what is undenominational.

He said, "Self preservation is the first law of nature. If the State has a right to exist, it has the right to do whatever will perpetuate that existence." This is not a valid argument at all. It bears the blemish of the whole National Reform system: that is, that the State is an intelligence separate from the people who compose it. If the State were an individual, as really as is any individual person, then this argument might be allowed. But the State is no such person. The State has a right to exist simply because it is impossible for it to do otherwise. The State cannot commit suicide; the State exists in the nature of things as the result of the existence of man in society. In the sense in which the words were used by Dr. Strong, the State has not the right to do whatever will perpetuate its existence. Because, especially in religious things, what seems to the State necessary to perpetuate its existence, is often only a cruel, unmitigated tyranny. And even then it is doubtful whether the existence of the State is perpetuated thereby. In the early

days of Christianity, the Roman State considered its existence to be in danger. It decided that as the State had the right to exist, it had the right likewise to do whatever was necessary to perpetuate that existence, and that it was, therefore, necessary to put a stop to Christianity. It therefore punished with many untold torments, even unto death, the profession of Christianity. Without entering upon the question as to whether the existence of the Roman State was perpetuated or not by such proceedings, it is certain that the Roman State had no shadow of right to do to Christianity what it did. This, we are persuaded Dr Strong himself will concede because, assuredly he cannot justify it without condemning Christianity; but in conceding this, his whole argument is gone. The truth and the sum of the whole matter is, that with religion the State can have nothing to do whether professedly to perpetuate its existence or not.

The speaker further argued that "the State must teach fundamental religious truths because it is good for the State. The State cares nothing about another life." But the State cannot teach religious truth, fundamental or otherwise, without having to do with another life. Religion relates primarily to the recognition of God and another life.

Next he argued that it is not so much preceptive instruction that is required as it is practical. He said, "The lying of children in this country is not because of a lack of knowledge of how to tell the truth but because of a lack of will." But he did not attempt to tell how the State is to create in the mind of a child the will to tell the truth when the disposition is there to tell a lie instead.

In answer to the suggestion that the children be taught religion in the home and the Sunday-school, he inquired, "How are all those children to be got into the Sunday-school? And, as they cannot readily be got into the Sunday-school, how are these children to be taught reverence for God, for man, for woman, and for law? There is little reverence and therefore little authority in the American home—except that of children over the parents. In the school is where the State can touch children with a moulding hand, and if reverence is to be taught who shall do it if not the State?"

Throughout his speech, the Doctor seemed to have forgotten entirely that there is such a thing in the world as the Church. Certainly these defects exist which he has named. There is sore need that religion and reverence and authority all should be taught. But so far as his speech went he could discover none but the State to teach these things. But it is impossible for the State to teach them; and the task of teaching these things was never committed to the State by the Source of all authority, religion, and reverence. Is it true that the Church has so fallen

from its place and so far lost the true idea of her mission as not to be worthy of consideration in such a question as this so that the only alternative is to have the State to do it?

He argued that the question as to what, and how much religion should be taught, "should be settled by a local authority;" and "especially in the cities great care must be exercised and a middle course pursued between secularizing and Protestantizing the schools."

Dr. Strong was followed by Dr. Greer, Episcopalian, rector of St. Bartholomew's Church, New York City. No synopsis can do any manner of justice to Dr. Greer's speech, and it was impossible for us to obtain a *verbatim* report. It was an overwhelming rejoinder to Dr. Strong, and at the same time a masterly assertion of immutable principles both Christian and American. In answer to Dr. Strong's attempted distinction between the Church and religion, he said: "Such a distinction is impossible. The introduction of religion into the public schools is the introduction of the Church into the public schools, and is, therefore, a union of Church and State. The distinction is further attempted upon the question of religion, that it is not dogmas of faith, but fundamental truths of religion, that is to be taught. But how shall religion be taught without dogmas? It may be taught without some dogma in which you do not believe; but it cannot be taught without some dogma in which you *do* believe. We cannot conceive of a church without doctrine. And religion cannot be introduced into the public schools unless it is doctrinal in the sense of being definite, positive, and precise. To speak of the Church without doctrine is to talk of daylight without the sun, of an effect without a cause.

"But it is said that nothing denominational shall be taught, but only those points in which all Christians are agreed. Who will tell us what these points are in which all Christians are agreed? Is it the infallibility of the Pope? Is it the divinity of our blessed Lord? 'The doctrine of God,' you say. What God? And what kind of a God is it in which all Christians are agreed? Is it a God who proposes to save men through the purifying processes of pergatorial fire, or is it a God that proposes to save all men without any fire at all? Is it the God in which the Unitarian believes, or is it the God in which the Trinitarian believes?"

"But it is asked, 'Should not the Bible be read?' The mere reading of a few words from the Bible from day to day is not of such a positive sort of religious instruction as yet to have excited any special conflict. In the event of a conflict, which is easily possible, the State to be consistent would have to prohibit even the reading of the Bible in the public schools. Here also the question arises, What Bible? Is it the Bible that says 'repent,' or is it

the Bible that says 'do penance?' Is it the Bible that says 'immerse' or is it the Bible that says 'baptize?' Is it the Bible that contains the Apocraphy, or is it King James' version?"

"The question of the reading of the Bible in the schools might become a burning question, and the State would then have to decide what Bible should be read. And as soon as the State does that, then some denomination will secure political control in its own interests, as is the case with Mormonism in Utah to-day. But it is said that this makes the schools 'godless.' This cry is more rhetorical than true, and, to many, sounds worse than it is. It might be brought with equal propriety against those schools which teach only business and penmanship, and schools of mechanics, and of arts. These are in the same sense godless. But they are not ungodly. They are godless because they are schools with a definite purpose in view, which purpose is not the teaching of religion. That purpose is followed without reference to religion. Not that those who give instruction there are atheistic or irreligious men, but because those schools do not exist for the purpose of giving instruction about God or about religion.

"The Church can best do its work when it does it without any connection with the State. The State can best do its work without any connection with the Church. This is the theory to which we are committed by the Constitution. Let the Church arise to an apostolic faith; let her be inspired by an apostolic spirit; let her be fired with an apostolic zeal; let her be clothed with apostolic power; then she can face the world as the apostolic church did, and by force of character can influence the State and the school vastly more than it would be possible to do with all the power and machinery in the State at her command. By this means it is possible for Christians to make Christianity so dominant that nothing but Christian personality will influence the public schools. It is not the reading nor the reciting of a set form of words that makes truth effective; it is the character, the living personality that is behind the words. The schools are here for everybody and for every class. The schools must be kept broad and comprehensive, and must not be encroached upon by any religious body upon any pretext whatever."

Dr. Wylie was the next speaker. He is a thorough-going national reformer. After speaking in opposition to the Roman Catholic theory, he denounced the secular theory as "atheistic," and then argued for a religious State at once. A goodly portion of his argument was also an appeal to sentiment and was simply a begging of the question.

Dr. Crosby's speech was rather a summing up than a decided argument and was quite brief. Of this speech we were able to obtain quite a full report. He said:—

"We have been subject of late to an educational craze in which we have forgotten and overrun the limits of American principles, both in the matter of attempting the teaching of religion by the State and of teaching the higher sciences by the State, with both of which, in my opinion, the State has nothing to do. It has no right to be teaching the higher education. The best thing that could be done with the Normal College—and I hope President Hunter is here to hear me—would be to turn it into a grand central police station. The best thing that could be done with the College of the City of New York—and I wish General Webb was here—would be to turn it into a prison for boodlers. I think we have no more right to instruct freely the children of all citizens in the higher mathematics and the calculus and philosophy than we would have to tax the people to give each child a thousand dollars to set him up in business. And on the same democratic, American principle I think that half of what is done in the public schools could be done away with. The only argument for schools established by the Government at all is to make citizens able to understand what our Government is. In other words, we should only teach children in the public schools to read, to write, to cipher, and to know what the American Constitution is. That should be the entire curriculum in the public schools. Beyond that we have no right to go.

"We have got into an educational craze in this matter, and the way to get out of it is to limit the work of the State to where it belongs. We should no more expect to teach religion in the public schools than to teach it in a mechanics' institute for the learning of a technical trade. We have many excellent organizations for benevolent work that are not concerned with the subject of religion. Are these benevolent institutions atheistic or irreligious? It is not the business of the State to teach religion. It is the business of the Church. The State teach religion? I want the State to get a little religion first. Of course, if we are to have religion taught by the State in this democratic country, we shall have it taught by the local government. We cannot take a single step in the teaching of religion without injury. We have no right in this country, which invites all persons of all creeds, to set up one of our religious notions as against the religious notions that any one else may honestly hold. Just as far as we do it just so far we encroach on the stability which is the basis of our Government.

"The State has no right to go further than to teach the simplest branches of education. The whole curriculum can be gone through with in three years, and when we limit public education to that, we shall solve this problem which has been agitating, and is agitating us, and will continue to agitate us. We must learn

that in our public schools we must recognize the rights of all."

There were about two hundred and fifty or three hundred people present, and although there were quite a number who were in favor of the idea of religion in the schools, it was easy to see that the great majority were decidedly against it; which, we were very glad indeed to see. There is one point, however, that is of considerable importance. Dr. Strong is secretary of the Evangelical Alliance of America. He is fully committed to a union of Church and State, and, as far as in him lies, he commits the Alliance with its influence and its methods, to the same things wherever he can.

A. T. J.

National Reform Work in Cincinnati.

January 20, 21, there was held in the city of Cincinnati, a "Christian Convention," to consider "what can and ought to be done to save our land from the rising tide of vice and immorality." While ostensibly held in response to a call signed by eighty-two persons, of whom seventy-three were ministers, the fact that not one in ten of these persons were present, and that the convention was presided over by Rev. J. M. Foster, secretary of the National Reform Association, and attended by such men as Rev. Sylvester Scovel, Rev. D. McAllister, and Rev. W. F. Crafts, shows it to have been held in the interests of the National Reform movement.

The real work of the convention, apart from a two-days' exhibition of oratory and sophistry, is expressed in the following preamble and resolutions which were unanimously adopted and will in due time be presented before the Legislature at Columbus:—

It must be admitted that God, the Supreme law-giver and Judge, is the source of all civil authority and will surely punish all who persistently dispise his authority; as he has declared in his word. 'The Nation and kingdom that will not serve me shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.' A truth time and again recognized by the early statesmen of our Government, by our legislators and by Congress as late as 1863, when the Senate of the United States resolved that devoutly recognizing the authority and just government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and nations, and sincerely believing that no people, however strong in the justness of their cause, can prosper without his favor.

This convention is fully convinced that vice, morality and crime in any community destroy its happiness and material prosperity, and it is equally true of States and nations, and since a disregard of the Sabbath and other moral laws of God—laws which belong to the State as well as the churches—is one of the factors in promoting these vices, immoralities and crimes, we regard it as of the utmost importance that the States, in the interest of good government and the prosperity of the people, should especially protect the Sabbath as a day of rest; therefore,

Resolved, That our Constitution and laws should be freed from all ambiguities which obscure their meaning and thereby give encouragement to the practice of vice and crime and render it difficult to enforce the penalties of violated laws.

Resolved, That the laws on our statute-books in reference to protecting the Sabbath as a rest day should be faithfully enforced all the more as they are in the interest of the whole people.

Resolved, That this convention hereby petitions the General Assembly of Ohio to amend the laws relating to our police court juries so as to bring them into line with the laws selecting juries for our county courts.

Resolved, That this convention cannot but reprobate in the strongest terms the disregard of the sanctity of the judicial oath and the principles which have heretofore made trial by jury the bulwark of personal liberty, by juries, which, contrary to admitted evidence of guilt, have, nevertheless, acquitted culprits because they did not approve of the laws which they had violated.

A glance at some of the papers read will suffice to show the spirit in which these resolutions were conceived, and the sophistry of the arguments employed.

The paper read by Judge M. B. Hagans was a prominent feature of the first day's programme. He started out to consider the subject of "The Civil Sabbath," but soon branched off into history, carrying his hearers back 2,500 years to the time of Nehemiah, and thereby surprised the thinking portion of his audience, who must have wondered what Nehemiah or anyone else living in his time knew about a "civil" Sabbath. He referred to the action of Nehemiah in closing the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day and threatening to lay hands on Sabbath desecrators,—an argument having no possible bearing upon the subject of a "civil" Sabbath, since Nehemiah did this, not to protect the poor laboring men from the slavery of their Sabbath toil, but to enforce the observance of the Sabbath as a religious institution, lest they bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath. It is to the religious side of the question that the advocates of a "civil" Sabbath always gravitate in their arguments. Judge Hagans needs to be informed that we are not now living under a theocracy, and have no one to stand in the place of Nehemiah, unless we concur with Mr. Crafts in the idea that "the preachers are the successors of the prophets,"—a theory which it would greatly stretch the credulity of most of us to accept.

The idea that the Sabbath should be enforced because it has a place in the common law of the land, was another boomerang which the Judge hurled at the opposers of a "civil Sabbath." Did the Puritans, from whose legislative efforts our Sunday laws have descended, enact those laws in the interests of a "civil Sabbath"? Did the Church of England, from which the Puritans obtained their legislative ideas ever do this? Did the Roman Catholic Church, from which the Church of England sprang, ever demand legislation in regard to a "civil" Sabbath? Everybody knows better. Our Sunday laws are the relics of an age when Church and State were united, and Sunday was enforced as a religious institution, and this stamps them as religious laws, appropriately included in our

statute books under the head of "offenses against God and religion." Such is the genealogy of our present Sunday laws, which Judge Hagans and others of similar bias would like to see enforced under the guise of "civil" regulations. Under the inspiration of his theme the Judge sighed for mayors in our great cities, like Nehemiah who was not troubled with police boards and the jury system, but was himself mayor and chief of police at the same time,—a sigh which will not be extensively echoed among the people of those cities, or the officers of our municipal corporations.

Rev. John Pearson read an able paper on "The Minister and His Responsibility for Public Sentiment," and, unconsciously perhaps, hit the National Reform theory a blow squarely between the eyes. Ministers of the gospel and churches were not, he said, to come down from their high position to take part in the battle of politics, but to stand as watchmen on the walls of Zion, speaking out loud and boldly on all questions which concern public morals. This they ought to do, and the place for them to do it is in the pulpit. But the trouble is that ministers preach smooth things there, and then call on the legislatures to do the work they leave undone, by compelling people to be moral by law. Such preachers would do well to read over and study the great commission under which they profess to be working: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching [not compelling] them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you." This defines the legitimate sphere of the Christian minister, and when he becomes an advocate of compulsory morality, he is engaging in a work which Christ has never commanded or sanctioned.

Rev. G. W. Lasher read a paper on "The Sabbath and the Working Man," repeating the familiar arguments relative to man's physical, mental, and moral need of a Sabbath rest, considering the subject from the standpoint merely of a physical and moral necessity, of which the civil law might properly take cognizance. The effect of his effort was seriously marred at the close when the Rev. Mr. Pearson arose and reminded the assembly that that was a Christian convention, that the good old-fashioned religious Sabbath was what they were principally concerned with, and that the "civil" Sabbath had been dinned in their ears quite as much as was profitable.

"A Legal Argument against Secular Common Schools," was the title of a paper read by Dr. McAllister, editor of the *Christian Statesman*. He ignored the position of parent or guardian as the overseer and inculcator of morals upon the minds of youth, and relegated this duty entirely to the State. The oath which the State demanded of its jurors and public officers furnished, in his view, a convincing reason

why the public schools should instruct the youth concerning the nature of an oath, and concerning that Supreme Being of whom it makes mention. Upon this slim foundation did he build his "legal argument against secular common schools." He even went so far as to assert that secularism, to be consistent, would be compelled to rule out Webster's Dictionary; as if there were no difference between defining the existing conceptions of religious things, and inculcating religious ideas! He would have the principles of Christianity openly taught in the public schools, which would leave to the Jew and the infidel, who did not wish their children thus taught, the happy alternative of withdrawing their children from the institutions they are taxed to support, or of building up schools of their own in that fair country to which the Rev. E. B. Graham, a co-laborer of Dr. McAllister's, referred when he said, "If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil subdue it, and set up a government of their own on infidel and atheistic principles, and then if they can stand it stay there till they die!"

Rev. W. F. Crafts arrived during the concluding part of the session, and spoke on "The National Sabbath." He maintained, among other things, that the rest-day must be a common day for all, ignoring the fact that communities of seventh-day and first-day observers exist together in many places without causing the slightest friction of the wheels of commerce, and said that it was an act of great generosity on the part of the States to exempt Seventh-day observers from the penalties of the Sunday laws. Such an exemption he evidently did not sanction. He would have all Sunday work of every kind stopped, except works of mercy and necessity (which he would want the privilege of defining), in order that the poor laboring men might enjoy their Sunday rest. One cannot help wondering why, if they are so enslaved and oppressed by Sunday work, there has never been a "strike" made by them for that rest. There have been strikes enough for almost everything else, but no strike for Sunday rest has ever been put on record. On the contrary, the laboring men have to be earnestly importuned by Mr. Crafts before they will indorse, and then not unanimously, the movement for a national Sunday law.

Space forbids the mention of other papers and speakers, in some instances able and interesting, but which did not touch so directly upon the subject of a State religion. The convention was thinly attended, about one hundred being present on an average, a large proportion of whom were women. Its effect upon the city and the State remains to be disclosed.

L. A. SMITH.

Questionable Declarations.

THE following extract from a letter to the *New York Voice*, raises a very pertinent question for the consideration of the Prohibition party, if it is indeed prohibition that that party desires. The extract runs thus:—

To the *Voice*.—The letter from a correspondent, W. H. Wilgus, in a late issue of the *Voice*, brings up one of the most important questions the Prohibition party has yet to meet. Is there any better time than the present to meet it frankly and honestly?

Judging from the platforms adopted by various States this fall the Prohibition party now stands for prohibition and religious legislation. The last is an expression that ought to be hateful to every true American. But is it too strong in this case?

These platforms call upon the State to defend the sanctity of the Sabbath in varying phrases, but to the same intent. Now, the Sabbath is purely a religious institution, and it does not alter the case to substitute the word Sunday, or call for a "civil Sabbath."

The expression is self-contradictory. The province of civil government is to prohibit that which is uncivil, but it cannot be shown that honest labor on any day of the week is "uncivil," except by allowing the religious character of the day to be taken into the account, and then the State steps outside of its proper sphere of action. However, this phase of the question needs no discussion now, for there is no effort made to conceal the fact that it is the protection of Sunday as a religious institution which is desired.

But what if we exempt the minority from the operation of such laws? That is simply to tolerate them; and toleration is a word hateful to every true American. It does not make such legislation right; it admits the right of the majority to rule in matters of conscience; and last but not least, it does not work satisfactorily, and will inevitably lead to a repeal of the exemption clause. Our papers are strangely silent in regard to these facts and on this question; but certainly no side issue will cause such division as this, for it involves a matter of conscience:

Already the beginning of this defection is apparent. The recent formation of the National Religious Liberty Association is a straw which shows, too well, what we may expect in the near future. Here is an association, composed of Christian men, heartily in favor of prohibition, loyal to our Constitution, and yet compelled by earnest convictions to unite in defense of religious liberty, and oppose the Prohibition party because of its stand on this question.

It is nonsense to invite to full party fellowship those who are agreed with us on

the main issue while such declarations in favor of religious legislation are found in our party platforms as have recently been made.

HAROLD STEARNS, M.D.

Idaho Springs, Col.

A Sample of Those "Rebuffs."

JANUARY 20 and 21, there was a National Reform convention held in Cincinnati. Rev. J. M. Foster, district secretary of the National Reform Association, had the principal part in getting up the convention. While they were working up the matter, Mr. Foster and Mr. Francis Ferry, "an esteemed elder of the Presbyterian Church," visited Archbishop Elder for the purpose of having him unite with them in the convention. Mr. Foster says, "The Archbishop received us very cordially, and was the soul of courty." After the Archbishop had received them so very cordially and so courteously, the following interesting dialogue occurred:—

Mr. Foster—"We have called to ask you if you would be willing to participate in the coming Christian convention."

The Archbishop—"You know we Catholics are very exclusive."

Mr. Foster—"The Baltimore Council advised co-operation in Sabbath Reform movements with Protestants. This led us to hope that you would stand with us in the effort to maintain the Sabbath."

The Archbishop—"It is true the Baltimore Council recommended co-operation, but that is to be done as citizens. We do not recognize Protestant churches or Protestant ministers. There is only one true Catholic Church. These other denominations may teach the truth in a measure, but they are not the Church of Christ. The Catholic Church is the spouse of Christ, and to her has been committed the oracles of God. She has received authority to teach the truth. We will work with Protestants as citizens, but not as churches. During the war Horace Greeley and some others attempted to establish peace between the Northern and Southern States, but Mr. Lincoln said: 'You are good men and have good intentions. But you have no authority to act. I cannot recognize your work.' So we say to Protestants, 'You are good people. Your motives are good. But you have no authority. We cannot recognize you.' I would be compromising myself to go into a Protestant church and unite with Protestant ministers in such a convention."

Mr. Foster—"This convention is not to be held under the auspices of any church. It is called by the National Reform Association—a society made up of representative citizens in all parts of the country. It is a citizens' movement. You observe the conference is called a 'Christian convention.'"

The Archbishop—"At the same time almost all the signers to the call are ministers, and all but one of the speakers are clergymen. My going there would be construed as a concession to Protestantism. If this were a general convention of citizens, originating with the people and carried on by them, I could act as one of them. But a Christian convention carries with it the idea of the Church, and I could not be identified with that."

Mr. Foster—"The preservation of the Christian Sabbath is a matter in which all who love our Lord are interested."

The Archbishop—"That is true. I preach the truth to my people about the Sabbath, temperance, divorce, and all those questions. We have authority from our Lord to do this. You will pardon me for saying that no Protestant church has this authority. And hence I could not act with you even in so good a cause, for, in doing so, I would not be true to the Church."

This is a sample of the rebuffs that the National Reformers have been willing to receive from the Catholics for the last nine years. They have received several before, and undoubtedly they will receive others yet to come. The rebuffs are richly deserved, and these were certainly well applied.

Who can say but that the Archbishop appears to the better advantage in this matter? The Archbishop and the Catholic Church with him have this at least to their credit that what they do believe is held by them to be of sufficient importance to stand up for it without compromise; while this so-called Protestantism, that so anxiously seeks the alliance of the Catholic Church, is willing to make any compromise, and go almost any length to secure that alliance. In short, as they said nine years ago, "We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances, and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the necessities of the situation."

And yet, these are the men who require a constitutional amendment under which they may be empowered to teach religion in the public schools! Why, they do not believe the religion which they profess with sufficient confidence to make it of any effect. Religious teaching, to be of any force, must be thoroughly and confidently believed by the one who teaches it. Otherwise the best and the purest religion that ever was, or that could be, would be of no benefit whatever. And when these men hold their religious principles and doctrines at so little value that they are willing to compromise it at all, and fairly to abandon their position in order to secure the co-operation of those who flatly refuse to recognize them, then the religion which they represent is not worthy of recognition by individuals, much less by the Nation. To force the teaching of such religion as that into the public schools would be to do an irreparable injury to the youth of the United States, to say nothing of all the train of other evils that would be inflicted upon the Nation. If they believed their own profession of religion with sufficient confidence to impress it upon the people, they would not need any other power to cause it to be received; but as they do not they demand control of the national power to compel the people to receive it.

A. T. J.

THE principle of persecution, to the extent of burning heretics, is inseparable from the union of Church and State, which makes a crime against the Church, also a crime against the State, to be punished according to human law. If Americans hate anything it is the principle and practice of religious persecution, and if they love anything it is civil and religious liberty.—*Philip Schaff.*

That Sunday Crusade.

THAT Minneapolis Preachers' Sunday crusade didn't pan out quite as well as they proposed to have it. It was proposed in their original compact that on the evening of the third Sunday in January a large number of hacks or carriages would be retained and held for duty. The ministers were to be divided up into sets of threes and one of each set to make a short speech in one church and drive to another and then to a third, being followed in turn by each of the other two of his set, and thus the whole city was to be crusaded. But it didn't all run smoothly. The first hitch in the proceedings was that the managers found that some of the ministers of the city were not as straight-laced in the matter of Sunday observance as they themselves were. The first onslaught was to be made against the Sunday newspaper as "the head of all offending." But the managers found that some of the ministers were in favor of the Sunday newspaper. One of them in fact, Rev. L. G. Powers, openly declared that the Sunday paper "is more of a help than a hindrance to church work."

The second hitch in the proceedings was a consideration of consistency. They proposed to start a crusade against all Sunday work and they found that it would not look very well at the very first step, in such a crusade as that, to use a large number of hacks or carriages; as this would necessitate work on the part of somebody to get the hacks or carriages ready, and further work to do the driving, and yet further work to put the horses and hacks in the stables after the evening's crusade was over, and all this work on Sunday. They concluded that it would never do to preach against Sunday labor and at the same time require so much labor to be done on Sunday. Consequently, their sets of threes all dwindled down to one single set.

The sermons of the liberal ministers offset those of the ones who favored the strict observance of Sunday, while one minister declared that "the Lord and the Sunday newspaper cannot remain in the same house." Another said:—

"The day must include everything that any man can find helpful. The Sunday paper, while it is of no use to the average preacher, is a great benefit to thousands of others. To thousands of toilers Sunday is the only day for reading. The Sunday paper gives them a view of the great world with its true activities. It helps them on one side of their nature as well as the church helps them on the other. The Sunday paper is more of a help than a hindrance to church work. Nine-tenths of all the money for the support of churches and charities in Minneapolis comes from the men who read the Sunday papers. Protestants are powerless to establish self-supporting churches, save among reading people; and the circulation

of the Sunday paper is a fair index of the reading habits of the people. It is easier to convert a man to Christ who reads the Sunday paper than it is to make a Christian of a man who does not read at all. People will read on Sunday. Preachers cannot stop them. In a certain neighborhood in this city where sixteen hundred *Tribunes* were taken, only twenty-two have stopped their Sunday issue, while nearly four hundred have taken the Sunday issue only. Of the twenty-two, two were preachers and twenty were laymen. If opposition, such as has been given, tends thus to add to the Sunday circulation, we need not expect to see the preachers destroy the Sunday papers. The opposition to the Sunday papers is made by good men. But good men are engaged in editing and publishing the Sunday newspapers. These facts should lead the preachers to hesitate a little in their crusade."

Another minister who had spoken the Sunday before in favor of the opening of the public library on Sunday, said:—

"Since my sermon of last Sunday evening in favor of the library opening, I have been the recipient of various tracts upon Sabbath observance from people who deem my soul in danger. For all this interest, thanks! In this severe weather I am grateful to any tract society that will kindly help to keep my fires burning. What do I care for all the councils that ever thundered upon this subject? What do I care how many ministerial associations have pronounced upon it? What do I care for all the Sabbath conventions that have ever been held? So long as I live, so long shall I take these principles regarding the Sabbath and apply them according to my best judgment. My advice to every one of my hearers is to do the same. A grain of common sense is worth a ton of theology."

The Minneapolis ministers will have to get their forces a little better in hand before their crusade will amount to much. Dr. Strong, of the Evangelical Alliance, will have to make at least another visit or two to Minneapolis before he gets those forces sufficiently allied to make their work effective. We wait to see what turn will next be taken, and what form of Sabbath desecration it is against which the Minneapolis preachers will make their next crusade.

A. T. J.

Not a Valid Reason.

THE *Lever* says that "the saloon is today a greater hindrance to the cause of Christianity than all others;" and inquires, "What will become of the Republican and Democratic voters for sustaining parties that keep the saloon as a stumblingblock between God and humanity?" We do not know what will become of them. But granting the saloon is the greatest hindrance to the cause of Christianity, it is not the only hindrance; and if the Government

is to abolish the saloon in the interests of Christianity, and *because* it is a hindrance to Christianity, then having done so much, why should it not go on and abolish the next greatest hindrance to Christianity? and the next, and the next, until it has abolished every one that there is in the world? If the Government is to take away one stumblingblock between God and humanity *because* it is such, then why shall it not continue the work and take away every one? If the Government is to do this, what is the Church for? And if government can do this, what was the Church instituted for? If it can be done by law what is the use of the gospel, and what was the use of instituting the gospel? The truth is that the reason which the *Lever* and the third party Prohibitionists, as a whole, present for prohibition, are not valid reasons at all. They are not worthy of recognition by government, nor are they worthy of the support of any man. They mean nothing short of an absolute union of Church and State. Of course they deny it, and we grant that many of them do not see it. It is true, however, whether they see it or not. Prohibition upon a proper basis is a proper thing, and a good thing, but prohibition upon the basis advocated by the *Lever*, the *Voice*, and such papers, would be an unmitigated evil.

Father Enright on the Sunday.

FOR the benefit of those who favor Sunday laws, and especially those who boast of the indorsement of Cardinal Gibbons, and the co-operation of the Catholic Church, we print the following statement of Father Enright, lately made, as to the authority for Sunday laws:—

"My brethren, look about you upon the various wrangling sects and denominations. Show me one that claims, or possesses the power to make laws binding on the conscience. There's but one on the face of the earth—the Catholic Church—that has the power to make laws binding upon the conscience, binding before God, binding under pain of hell fire. Take for instance the day we celebrate—Sunday. What right have the Protestant churches to observe that day? None whatever. You say it is to obey the commandment, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' But Sunday is not the Sabbath according to the Bible and the record of time. Every one knows that Sunday is the first day of the week, while Saturday is the seventh day and the Sabbath, the day consecrated as a day of rest. It is so recognized in all civilized nations. I have repeatedly offered \$1000 to any one who will furnish any proof from the Bible that Sunday is the day we are bound to keep, and no one has called for the money. If any person in this town will show me any scripture for it I will, tomorrow evening, publicly acknowledge it and thank him

for it. It was the holy Catholic Church that changed the day of rest from Saturday to Sunday, the first day of the week. And it not only compelled all to keep Sunday, but at the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 364, anathematized those who kept the Sabbath and urged all persons to labor on the seventh day under the penalty of anathema.

"Which church does the whole civilized world obey? Protestants call us every horrible name they can think of—anti-christ, the scarlet-colored beast, Babylon, etc., and at the same time profess great reverence for the Bible, and yet by their solemn act of keeping Sunday they acknowledge the power of the Catholic Church. The Bible says, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,' but the Catholic Church says, 'No, keep the first day of the week,' and the whole world bows in obedience."—*The Industrial American, Harlan, Iowa, December 19, 1889.*

Sunday Slavery.

THE *Pearl of Days* repeats its dismal wail about "Sunday slavery," and says that "if it is not abolished, it will soon number more millions than the Africans who were emancipated by the civil war, and the Constitution of the United States." Why don't the *Pearl of Days* make a test and carry the case of one of these Sunday slaves to the United States courts under that amendment to the Constitution which abolished slavery in the United States? Or does the *Pearl* understand that it was only African slavery that was abolished in the United States? If that is the way the *Pearl of Days* understands the Thirteenth Amendment, then we would say for its benefit, that neither the word "African" nor any other qualifying phrase is in that amendment. The amendment says that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a penalty for crime, shall exist in the United States." And that will cover Sunday slavery as well as any other kind. At least the probability that it does, is worth risking a case upon in the United States courts. Let the case be presented.

A Question.

IN Brooklyn, N. Y., four persons were convicted and fined from \$100 to \$500, for refusing to give to certain children medicine prescribed by physicians, choosing rather to treat the children by other means. They were people who believe in the "faith cure," and the children died, hence, the prosecution and the punishment. This has caused much discussion in the public press, some taking one side and others the other. All that we shall say just at this time is simply to inquire, How would it do to impose such a fine upon those who do not believe in this method of treatment—the doctors for instance—every time they lose a case?

GOOD HEALTH

THE MOST POPULAR AND THE BEST HEALTH JOURNAL PUBLISHED. IT CONTAINS THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENTS:

General Articles: Devoted to practical hygiene and popular medical papers.

Dress: In the interest of rational "dress reform," opposing extreme notions and by practical illustrations and suggestions pointing out the way to a sensible conformity with the laws of health.

The Happy Fireside: Devoted to the interest of the home, temperance, moral and social culture, and popular science.

True Education: Educational reform, the training of the whole individual, rather than the mind only; manual training, physical culture associated with mental training, and kindred topics.

Social Purity: This department represents the "White Cross Movement" and its interests, and all that pertains to the purity of morals in the individual, the home, and society.

Editorial: The editor, each month, serves up a rich variety of hygienic tidbits, pithy, practical, and representing the latest scientific thought in this channel.

Domestic Medicine: In this department Dr. Kellogg condenses the most practical results of his extensive experience in the treatment of the sick. The Doctor believes in the education of the people in medical subjects, and proves his faith by his works.

The Question Box: This interesting department, which affords a channel for communication between the editor of the journal and readers, will be continued. Each month this department contains medical advice and suggestions which would cost ten times the price of the journal if obtained in the usual way.

Household Science: In this department Mrs. Kellogg gives to the readers of GOOD HEALTH the invaluable results of years of work in her experimental kitchen, and experience gained in the management of the cuisine of the largest Sanitarium in the world, and the instruction of classes in the Sanitarium School of Domestic Economy. Other writers will also contribute to this department.

PRICE \$1.25 A YEAR.

GOOD HEALTH PUBLISHING CO.,
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

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.

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.

TEN LECTURES

ON

NASAL CATARRH

Its Nature, Causes, Prevention, and Cure, and Diseases of the Throat, Eye, and Ear, due to Nasal Catarrh; with a chapter of

CHOICE PRESCRIPTIONS

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Medical Superintendent of the Largest Medical and Surgical Sanitarium in the World.

The work consists of 120 pages, and is embellished with a colored frontispiece and **SIX BEAUTIFULLY COLORED PLATES**, besides many illustrative cuts of the throat and nasal cavity in health and disease. This little work costs **only 30 cents**, and is in great demand.

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.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

By A. T. JONES,

One of the Editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Scriptural, Logical, Plain, and forcible

THIS IMPORTANT WORK SHOWS CLEARLY THE RELATION THAT SHOULD EXIST BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE AT THE PRESENT TIME, AS PROVEN BY THE BIBLE AND HISTORY OF THE PAST TWENTY-FIVE CENTURIES.

Chap. I outlines vividly the relation that existed between "Christianity and the Roman Empire."

Chap. II distinguishes between "What is due to God and what to Caesar."

Chap. III shows for what purpose the "Powers that Be" are Ordained.

Chap. IV ably discusses "The Religious Attack upon the United States Constitution, and Those Who Are Making it."

Chap. V unmasks "Religious Legislation," calling special attention to the Blair Sunday Bill, now pending in Congress.

Chap. VI is devoted to the "The Sunday-Law Movement in the Fourth Century, and Its Parallel in the Nineteenth."

These and other topics of equal interest make this treatise **INDISPENSIBLE TO EVERY LOVER OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.**

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

IS A PAMPHLET OF 176 LARGE OCTAVO PAGES. PRICE 25 CENTS.

MILLIONS OF COPIES

Should be Placed in the Hands of Thinking People at once. It Clearly Defines what Position We, as American Citizens should Sustain Toward the Effort now on Foot to Secure Religious Legislation. Address,

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.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Published weekly, at Oakland, Cal., for the

International Tract and Missionary Society.

A sixteen-page Religious Family Paper, devoted to a discussion of the Prophecies, Signs of the Times, Second Coming of Christ, Harmony of the Law and Gospel; with Departments devoted to Health and Temperance, the Home Circle, the Missionary Work, and the Sabbath-school.

Price Per Year, post-paid, \$2.00

In clubs of five or more copies to one name and address, to be used in Missionary work, each, **\$1.50**

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, **10c**

SIGNS OF THE TIMES,

OAKLAND, CAL.

FATHERS

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY ELDER E. J. WAGGONER.

History repeats itself, because human nature is the same in all ages of the world. Hence, he who would know how to avoid error in the future must know how errors have developed in the past. The "Fathers of the Catholic Church" shows the condition of the heathen world at the time of Christ, briefly states the principles of ancient heathen philosophy, and shows how the adoption of these principles by prominent men in the church, and the incautious lowering of the standard of pure Christianity, developed the Papacy, which was simply a new phase of paganism. It shows that by the time of Constantine every phase of the Papacy was fully developed, and was only waiting for supreme power. The chapter on

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY

is alone worth the price of the book. Fine English cloth, substantially bound, contains about 400 pages, and will be sent post-paid at the nominal price of \$1.00.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

SEND FOR

DISCRIPTIVE CIRCULARS

OF OUR LARGE

FAMILY BIBLES.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

THE WEST SHORE RAILROAD

is one of the most popular routes for business and pleasure travel, leading to and from New York City, as well as being the most substantially built and elegantly equipped double-track line, traversing, as it does, the west shore of the historic and world-famed Hudson River, and passing through the beautiful Mohawk Valley.

By this route three express trains are run daily in each direction, between New York, Albany, Utica, Syracuse, Rochester, Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Toronto, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and the West.

The West Shore, in connection with the Fitchburg Railroad, is also the shortest line between Boston and Chicago.

Palace sleeping-cars are attached to these trains, and run through without change between the points named.

Buffet smoking-cars, with revolving chairs, are a special feature of the splendid service on the West Shore.

Tickets via West Shore can be purchased at ticket-offices of all connecting lines, and they are sold, and baggage checked through to destination from all stations of the West Shore Railroad.

For further information regarding West Shore Railroad address

H. B. JAGOE,
Gen. East'n Pass. Agt.,
363 BROADWAY,
NEW YORK.

C. E. LAMBERT,
Gen. Pass. Agt.,
5 VANDERBILT AVE.,
NEW YORK.



NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 6, 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.

We have received the first number of the *Southern Sentinel*, published at Dallas, Texas. It is devoted to the same cause as the AMERICAN SENTINEL. We heartily wish it success. May such *Sentinels* be posted all along the line.

THE "call" for that National Reform convention, lately held in Cincinnati, was signed by eighty-two persons. Seventy-three of these were preachers, the rest were made of eight laymen and one woman. And yet they try to pass that off as a representative "citizens'" meeting, simply in the interests of the State!

SECTION 11, of Article 1, of the Constitution of the new State of Washington, contains this sentence: "No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or to the support of any religious establishment." Yet, as plain as that is, it was attempted when the Legislature met to have a chaplaincy established for the State and the legislative sessions to be opened with prayer. The scheme failed as it was proper that it should. The word "exercise" shut off that relic of the union of Church and State.

ACCORDING to the *Colorado Graphic* of January 18, the people of Denver are losing interest in the Sunday-closing crusade, inaugurated there some months since. At a recent meeting in the interest of the crusade, which the *Denver News* described as "another of those great meetings," it is stated that only one hundred and seventy-two persons were present, by actual count, "including forty-one ladies and ten or more children." This certainly does not look very much like "a great popular uprising," especially in a city of the size of Denver. One great trouble about this movement is, that while its real object is the exaltation of Sunday, it professes to be primarily a temperance movement. A great many temperance people see this, and hence stand aloof from the movement which would otherwise have their support. That sort of prohibition which proposes to compromise with the saloons, allowing them six-seventh of the time in which to carry on their business, is not worthy of the name of temperance, and not a few are beginning to see it.

THE National League for the Protection of American Institutions, by its Law Committee, has reported the form of an amendment to the national Constitution, which it intends to ask shall be adopted. It reads as follows:—

No State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or use its property, money or credit, or any power of taxation, or authorize either to be used for the purpose founding, maintaining or aiding any church, religious denomination or religious society, or any institution, or undertaking under sectarian or ecclesiastical control.

That might be made a part of the Constitution of the United States, and yet, under the decisions religion could be taught and religious exercises conducted in the public schools in all the States where it is now done. Such, however, is not according to American principles, therefore the League's proposed amendment ought to be amended at once.

The People Awaken.

UNDER the auspices of the National Religious Liberty Association, there was held in Washington City, Tuesday, January 28, a citizens' meeting for the discussion of the Breckinridge Sunday bill for the District of Columbia. A good deal of preliminary work had been done. Nearly 20,000 SENTINELS and 8,000 circulars of announcement had been distributed, and eight hundred personal invitations sent out, besides printed notices in all the city papers. As a result between five hundred and six hundred people assembled. General A. A. Birney presided. The meeting was intended to be an impartial discussion of the bill. The personal invitations which were sent to all the ministers, Woman's Christian Temperance Union workers, and to six hundred lawyers of the city, besides a personal letter to Mr. W. F. Crafts, read as follows, the first being to the lawyers:—

January 24, 1890, City.

DEAR SIR:

Your attention is called to the bill for a District Sunday law now pending in the House. A citizens' meeting will be held in the Rink, on New York Avenue, between Thirteenth and Fourteenth Streets, Tuesday, the 28th, at 7:30 p. m., for the impartial discussion of the merits of this bill. You are asked to be present. If you will speak on the question please notify J. O. Corliss, 217 Fifth Street, S. E., stating whether you will favor or oppose the bill.

Yours respectfully,

THE COMMITTEE.

To the Woman's Christian Temperance Union:—

January 27, 1890, City.

DEAR MADAM:

A meeting will be held at the Rink, on New York Avenue, between Thirteenth and Fourteenth Streets, the evening of Tuesday, the 28th, to discuss the merits of the local Sunday bill for the District of Columbia, which Mr. Breckinridge of Kentucky, has introduced in the House.

An opportunity will be given at this meeting for an impartial discussion of the question. Both those who favor and those who oppose the passage of Sunday laws have been requested to be present and speak. You, as a resident of the District of Columbia, and a member of that organization which is exerting a greater moral force than any other or-

ganization in the land, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, should take an active and intelligent interest in this question in all its phases.

We are sure you are anxious to know all that can be said upon this matter, both for and against. It is therefore hoped that no previous engagement will preclude your attending this meeting.

Respectfully,

THE COMMITTEE.

Yet with all this effort but one person could be found to speak in favor of the bill. One other gentleman had promised to speak for the bill, but in the meeting turned against it, and openly opposed it. To the invitation Mr. Crafts replied:—

Your letter overtook me after several days. Our side of the case will be sufficiently presented at our convention.

W. F. CRAFTS.

The speeches, which, with the exception noted, were necessarily against the bill, will be given later, as we have time now only to print this hasty notice. At the close of the addresses the following resolutions were enthusiastically adopted:—

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 3854), entitled "An act to prevent persons from being forced to labor on Sunday," does not meet our approbation, but that we do earnestly protest against its passage, or the passage of any bill of similar import, for the following reasons, to wit:

First. There is no call or occasion for the passage of such a law. No person in the District of Columbia is, or has been forced to labor on Sunday against his will, at any time since the abolition of slavery therein.

Second. Works of necessity or mercy are not defined in the bill, and their meaning and application are left to the arbitrary prejudice or caprice of police magistrates. Under such a law, street cars, railroad trains, steamboats and private carriages might be stopped; and a citizen might be fined for preaching, for shaving himself, or having his dinner cooked on Sunday.

Third. Such a law would be a departure from the fundamental principle of the institutions of this country, which recognizes the right of a citizen to do as he pleases, provided he does not encroach upon the rights of others; and it empowers a police judge to inquire into and decide upon the conscientious beliefs of any citizen charged with doing, or causing to be done, secular work on Sunday.

Fourth. The passage of such a law is designed, and in effect would be an entering wedge for a system of aggressive laws tending to subvert the secular character of our Government in derogation of the Constitution, and the religious freedom of the citizen guaranteed thereby.

Fifth. The proposed law partakes of the most offensive features of the early laws of New England, Maryland, and other colonies of the olden time, known as "Blue laws," and is therefore a long step backward, instead of forward in human progress.

The unanimous sentiment is that it was a most successful meeting.

A. T. J.

Washington, D. C., Jan. 29.

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, . . . 58c.

Address,

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

43 Bond Street, New York.