



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

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, MAY 29, 1890.

NUMBER 22.

The American Sentinel.

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

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN,

W. H. McKEE.

PRINCIPLES are fundamental truths. In the Declaration of Independence we have this grand principle: "All men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty," etc. The leading principle of the Bible is, that our first duty, hence our first right, is to love and worship God unmolested. This is religious liberty. The beauty of a principle is, that nothing but truth will fit it. Hence principles are touch-stones which distinguish the true from the false.—*M. E. Steward, A. M., in Southern Sentinel.*

THE following quotation from Professor W. G. Sumner, of Yale College, makes an excellent statement of an important truth. Knowledge is not enough; there must be with it sufficient character to make a right use of it:—

"The moralists have never been satisfied with the old adage that knowledge is power. They felt the lack of the moral element in it: that is to say, they felt the lack of the element which it was their business to supply. The adage, however, was true. Knowledge is power, and, in itself considered, it is nothing more. The notion that knowledge makes men good is one of the superstitions of the nineteenth century. Knowledge only gives men power. It furnishes a chance. It brings with it, however, the grim alternative already described. Will the man who has it use it for good or for ill? That is a moral question. It finds its answer in the springs of character, and the independent self-determination which lies deepest in the essential elements of each

man's personality. This, by the way, is one of the reasons why there is no sound social or personal strength which is not founded on the training of the individual. It is the reason why individual character is the spring of all good in man or the State, and why all socialism is profoundly immoral. Wherever collective standards, codes, ideals, and motives take the place of individual responsibility, we know from ample experience that the spontaneity and independent responsibility which are essential to moral vigor are sure to be lost."

"A Redeemed Commonwealth."

SUNDAY, May 4, Rev. Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst, of Madison Square Presbyterian Church, this city, delivered a sermon on the scripture text, "And I John saw the Holy City, the New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." It was directly in the line of the Church and State preaching that is constantly becoming more and more prevalent. He declared that "heaven is a redeemed commonwealth." Now a commonwealth is "an established form of government, or civil polity, or, more generally, a State." His statement amounts to this then that heaven is a redeemed State, but no State has yet been redeemed. If heaven be therefore a redeemed State, there is as yet no such place because there is no such thing. Heaven was, before there ever was a State, and will be after all States are gone.

This criticism is not a play upon words, for the rest of his sermon shows that such is his idea of what heaven is, and that the redeemed commonwealth is the culmination of history, and when we reach that place, then that place and that commonwealth will be heaven. He says:—

Now if a redeemed commonwealth is appointed of God to be the culmination of history and the end toward which he is working, then that end we are to consider as a law regulating or determining the methods by which, as God's workmen, we are to help in the achievement of God's aim and ambi-

tion. If it were only a question of how many individuals could be brought to their knees and induced penitentially to accept Christ as their Saviour, then all we should have to do, as a church, would be to teach the doctrines of repentance and regeneration, multiply our missions, strengthen our evangelistic forces and count the converts.

Thus Mr. Parkhurst's view of the purpose and work of the Church is that it is to save States instead of souls, and that the song of the redeemed in that day will be that the Lord had saved every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, and not as the Scripture says, that the redeemed are gathered "out of every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people."

It would be difficult to form a statement of God's purpose as revealed, that would be more directly contrary to the truth than is this statement by Dr. Parkhurst. In the Scripture there is no such thing announced, nor contemplated, as a redeemed State. No State will ever reach the other world. No State will ever be redeemed. There will be some *people* redeemed out of all the States that have ever been. This theory springs from the idea that is so largely held, of the conversion of the world. But that idea is totally false: it is contrary to every statement of Scripture. When the world ends, it will be in wickedness.

The record is that "in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." 2 Tim. 3:1-5. And, instead of there being any promise or prophecy that they will all become good, and better and better, the record is that being thus bad they "shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived." And having grown worse and worse, when the end comes, and the heaven departs as a scroll when it is rolled

together, and every mountain and island are moved out of their places, then the word of God is that "The kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free-man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?"

There has been no more deceptive doctrine invented than that which teaches the conversion of the world, and the redeeming of commonwealths. The Saviour did not die for commonwealths, he died for individuals. All may have eternal life if they will. Yet in fact many have chosen, and many do still choose the other way instead, and every man is at liberty to choose which way he will. "Whosoever will, let him come." If he will not, he may go the way of his choice. The truth is that it is *in fact*, "only a question of how many individuals can be brought to their knees and induced penitentially to accept Christ as their Saviour;" and therefore it is true that all that the Church has to do "is to teach the doctrines of repentance and regeneration, multiply its missions and strengthen its evangelistic forces" for that very purpose. Whenever the Church ceases to do that, it then ceases to be a Church in the proper sense of the word. And too many of them have ceased to do it, and there is too much preaching of this kind that leads in the way for more of it to be done.

Those who profess to be the representatives of the Church have forgotten what the Church is, and what its work is. These are the ones who neglect the humble task of preaching to individuals the doctrines of repentance and regeneration, and enter upon a course of ambitious political action, to convert cities, States, and nations as such. Leaving individual action, individual responsibility, and individual influence, they undertake to convert men by wholesale. They make the city Christian by electing a mayor who will enforce Sunday laws. They make the Nation Christian by incorporating the name of the Saviour in its Constitution and laws. Thus they hope to obtain a redeemed commonwealth.

Yes, it was in this way that the Roman Empire was redeemed; thus it was made a redeemed commonwealth. But it was worse after it was so redeemed than it was before. Such a redemption multiplied and heaped up wickedness to such an extent that human society could not bear it; it had to be utterly swept out of existence, as it was, by the flood of savage barbarism that swept the Empire from one end to the other. Such a redemption in that day ended in utter ruin. Such a one wrought again in this day will end in the same

thing; and whoever will escape it needs as an individual to turn to Christ and penitentially accept him as the Saviour.

A. T. J.

A Criticism Answered.

NOT long since an article appeared in this paper over my signature in which I used the following words:—

The only way to prohibit the liquor traffic is to prohibit it, not one day in the week, but every day. To make criminal upon one day in the week that which is perfectly legal at all other times, is simply to place a premium upon official corruption; to make possible persecution, as in Tennessee; and to educate people to disregard and despise the law.

This sentiment was subsequently criticised by the *Colorado Graphic* as follows:—

But how can Mr. Bollman, if he is serious, claim for prohibition for the six days what cannot be secured for the one day? A gentleman who stands so nobly for equal rights; so manfully against religious legislation, which is always sumptuary, how can he even suggest a prohibitory law and consistently maintain his other positions? Did he not read that in Bangor, in prohibition Maine, one hundred and fifty saloons (speak-easies) had been discovered and were closed by the Mayor, and that in thirty days thereafter there were fifty others discovered? No, sir; sumptuary legislation is a failure.

The writer does not pretend to say that prohibition has ever been a success in the sense of stopping all liquor drinking, or even all liquor selling, especially in large cities; nor does he pretend to say that it ever will be a success in any such sense. But be that as it may it proves nothing as to the merits of the question. Theft and prostitution, and gambling and lotteries are forbidden by law, but they are not prohibited in the sense of being absolutely prevented. They are, however, greatly lessened by the laws against them, and so has liquor selling and the evils which spring from it been greatly reduced by prohibitory laws in Maine, Iowa, and Kansas. It is, therefore, idle to argue that because saloons (speak-easies) exist in Bangor, prohibition is wrong or even that it is a political mistake. The only question is, Has the State a just right to prohibit the traffic in intoxicating drinks?

The *Graphic* assumes that prohibitory laws are of the same nature as Sunday laws, and other measures of religious legislation. This is a mistake as can easily be shown. About the only thing in common between them is that many religious people favor both. But the fact that religious people are in favor of two measures does not prove that they are both equally good or equally bad. Prohibition is in no sense religious. Very many religious people do not believe in it, while a great many people who make no profession of religion are in favor of it as a matter of public policy, and as necessary for the protection of life and property. The evil effects of liquor drinking are not confined to those who drink. Every intoxicated man is a menace to life and property, not his own life and property merely,

but the lives and property of others; and can it be that society has no right to protect itself against the danger?

Again, the traffic in intoxicating liquors entails upon the State enormous expenditures for the apprehension, trial, and imprisonment of criminals, and for the care of paupers. Crime and pauperism are the legitimate fruits of the liquor traffic, and can it be that the State has no right to prohibit that which has proved itself to be the most prolific contributor to our prisons, alms houses, and insane asylums? Certainly right and justice demand the prohibition of a business that burdens the State as the liquor traffic does. Suppose that the State has no right to prevent a man from drinking what he pleases, and that where and when he pleases, does it follow that it has no right to prohibit the public traffic in that which beggars whole families and turns them out paupers to be supported by those who by honest toil have accumulated property which bears its just proportion of taxation?

But it is said that prohibition interferes with personal liberty. Proper prohibition will never interfere with personal liberty. Moreover the cry of personal liberty does not come as a rule from the men who drink, but from those who grow rich by ministering to the most depraved appetites of their fellow-men. The liberty which they demand is liberty to enrich themselves by burdening the public with paupers and criminals. Are they justly entitled to such liberty? Hardly.

Liquor men themselves grant the right of the State to *regulate* the traffic in which they are engaged, and that not merely for revenue but to restrict the evils which it engenders. But the right to regulate carries with it the right to prohibit. And this is one reason why the State has no right to legislate upon religious matters, or in any way regulate the exercise of religion. If the State had the right to require or to forbid one religious observance, it would have the right to require or to forbid any or all others. This is why all Christians who prize religious liberty as they should, and who are willing that others should enjoy the same privileges that they themselves do, oppose all State interference in religious matters. They insist that all must be left absolutely free to worship or not to worship just as they please. But every body recognizes the right of the State to regulate liquor selling; to say that A may sell, and that B shall not sell. But whether they realize it or not, if the State has the right to say that one man shall not sell intoxicating liquors it has the right to say that no man shall sell such liquors. Did liquor dealers for a moment believe that their business is as legitimate as any other, and that the "right" to sell liquor rests upon the same ground as the right to worship, they would demand, not license as they now do, but

absolute freedom. But while prohibitory laws are purely civil, and the enacting of them not only the right but the duty of the State, Sunday laws are of an entirely different character. Sunday is a religious institution; its friends call it the *Christian Sabbath*, and most of them insist that it ought to be kept in obedience to the fourth commandment. It is therefore no more the right of the State to enforce its observance than it would be to enforce baptism or the Lord's Supper.

Laws forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquors to be used as beverages, violate no man's conscience. Nobody sells whiskey as a religious duty. The whole traffic is demoralizing and fraught with danger to life and property, and liquor dealers themselves know and acknowledge that this is so. But a failure to religiously keep Sunday endangers neither life nor property; it makes neither criminals nor paupers. Many good citizens and earnest Christians do not regard Sunday, because they do not believe that there is any divine law requiring its observance, and they exercise their God-given right to labor upon that day; but in so doing they do not prey upon others, they do not injure anybody in any way, nor do they burden the State. In short, there is no similarity whatever between Sunday work or business, and the liquor traffic: and there is and can be no more similarity between Sunday laws and prohibitory laws. The reasons for Sunday laws are wholly religious; while the only proper reasons for prohibition are wholly civil and political. C. P. BOLLMAN.

Education Does Not Give Character.

In the arguments on the subject of "Education and the State," which are now so widely made, it is often stated that ignorance is the mother of crime, and that therefore it is for the interest of the State that its citizens should be intelligent if it would have good citizens, as intelligence is the mother of virtue. This is not true. It would be hard to prove that ignorance is any more the mother of crime than is intelligence. The ignorant are not the only ones who commit crime. Go to any penitentiary, and, although we have not actually tested the matter, we feel perfectly safe in saying that of the inmates, it will be found that those who can read and write are not the minority. Ninety-four per cent of the criminals of New York State can read. Thousands upon thousands of boys to-day, are reading stuff that tends infinitely more to make them criminals than the inability to read could possibly do. It is a fact that from one of the Western penitentiaries a regular newspaper is issued. All the type setting, editorial work and everything in connection with it, is done by the regular convicts of the penitentiary. With hundreds, yea, thousands of people in the penitentiaries, the trouble with them was

not that they could not write, but that they wrote too much, and too well, especially other people's names. The bank wreckers, the embezzlers, and the forgers, are not persons who are ignorant, they are people of excellent education.

This is not in any sense an argument in favor of ignorance and against education. It simply illustrates the fact that education does not give character, while it is, in fact, only character that counts. A man may have an excellent character and be either ignorant or educated, but if he is not honest he will steal, whether he be ignorant or educated. In fact, if he be not honest, the probabilities are that education will make him the greater thief, as in the case of the forgers, the bank wreckers and the embezzlers.

Let the people be educated most completely everywhere, but let character be built up in them at the same time.

What Is Truth?

THE best definition I have ever heard is as follows: "Truth is that which, in the face of all possible opposition, can be shown to be in conformity with fact and sound reason." It follows from the very definition that truth is never afraid of error or falsehood. It always meets them squarely and openly, never asking any unfair advantage, never afraid of competition, and therefore never found asking for a monopoly.

Tried by this standard, the true nature of the Sunday-law movement will at once appear.

The champions of this movement were *personally invited* to be present at the Washington Citizens' Meeting, and were assured a fair opportunity of being heard, and of maintaining the truth and right of their positions. Not one of them was there, though some of them, at least, were in the city. They preferred to wait till their own convention, where no one who differed from them was allowed the slightest chance to say a word.

They argue everywhere that it is only a *civil Sunday law* they want. The leading speaker of the American Sabbath Union argued this for an hour in my own hearing, declaring vehemently that we misrepresented the Union entirely, when we said they were seeking religious legislation; and asserting that they only wanted civil Sunday laws in the interests of the "poor over-worked laboring man."

After his speech he passed out a document to all in the audience who would accept it. It contains the following extract from the constitution of the American Sabbath Union, which states its true basis and object.

Article I. Name: The American Sabbath Union.

Article II. Basis: The basis of this Union is the Divine authority, and universal and perpetual obligation of the Sabbath.

Article III. Object: The object of this Union, is to preserve the *Christian Sabbath* as a day of rest and *worship*.

So it seems that if they are only asking for civil Sunday laws, they are asking for them for a religious purpose; namely, to preserve the day as a day of rest and worship. A law that is desired and obtained for a religious purpose, is a *religious* and not a *civil* law.

Why not call it so? Ah! it would defeat their purpose. Any work that is compelled to resort to such deception is *not the work of God*.

They bring forth their Sunday-law Bill for the District of Columbia, and ask us to look at its title, and see how innocent it is. "A bill to prevent people from being *forced to labor on Sunday*." How innocent! How evidently in the interests of liberty! But stop! When you read the bill itself, it is a bill to compel people to stop laboring on Sunday, whether they want to or not. Why did they not name it, A bill to *force people to stop laboring on Sunday*? Oh! this would have been a true title, but *truth* would here, as everywhere else, defeat their object.

Again, I heard the leader of this whole movement say in the Convention held on December last, in New York City, that they were going to introduce this local bill, and concentrate all their effort upon it. Why? Was it because the people of Washington and the District of Columbia were such terrible Sabbath breakers? No, for he admitted that they kept the Sabbath here as well as anywhere in the Nation.

He said, "If we can get the United States to pass a Sunday law for the District of Columbia this year, Congress will then have declared Sunday laws constitutional, and will have no excuse for not giving us a Sunday law for the Nation next year."

Why was not this argument used in Washington instead of the foolish plea that although the people have been very good Sabbath-keepers in the past, they have but just discovered that they have no Sunday laws, and so must have one right away, or they will engage in revolution,—working on Sunday?

Again I say, it would be the truth, and truth wherever, or whenever it is told means the destruction of all their plans. Out in a city in California, they wanted a Sunday law, but they did not know what to name it. Shakspeare said, "What's in a name?" But he had not learned the philosophy of the Sunday-law advocates, if he had he would have said, "There's millions in it," or rather, every thing in it. Some of them in California were honest enough to want to call it a "religious Sunday law," others said that would never do, call it a "civil Sunday law;" still others said, "say it is only 'a police regulation.'" They finally decided to call it a "sanitary regulation." It seems to be really as difficult a matter to name a Sunday law, as for a young father and mother to name their first baby.

Now, in general, I should have more faith in a sanitary regulation, if it came from the doctors, than if, as in this case, it came from the ministers. There was a time when nearly all the sanitary regulations came from the ministers instead of the doctors. In those days, even in the large cities, sewers were unknown, and all the filth was thrown into the street; and then the people trusted to charms and priestly incantations, and holy relics, and miracle cures, to deliver them from the pestilence.

This, too, was in the time of the Inquisition,—the Dark Ages of ignorance and persecution. I believe also among the Indians to-day, the medicine men are both priest and doctor. This is only another evidence among many, that the Sunday-law movement is a long step backward toward ignorance and error, and superstition and savagery. In this instance, however, the ministers of California made such wonderful advancement into the mysteries of hygienic science, that they discovered that milk sold on the streets after 5 o'clock Sunday morning, was dangerously *unsanitary*. Again I say, truth does not have to resort to such subterfuges. The truth will always bear to be openly and fairly stated.

But let us examine this "sanitary" argument for Sunday laws. Briefly stated it is as follows: "The physical health of every man and woman demands rest on one day in seven. It is for the good of the State that its citizens should be kept in robust physical condition. Therefore the State may, and must enforce the observance of Sunday rest for civil and sanitary reasons. Admitting the premises for the present, for the sake of argument, let us see if the conclusion follows, or rather let us see where this logic would lead to if adopted by our Government. It is a demonstrated hygienic fact, that the health of every person requires a bath at least once a week. Must the State, then, enforce by law the taking of a bath once a week upon all its citizens? and if so, must it send spies into every family, and even into every private bath room to see that the law is obeyed?" The physical health of all persons, demands about nine hours sleep a night. Must the State by law compel every one to retire to sleep at 9 P. M., and remain in bed until 6 A. M.?

It is evident that when the State once commits itself to the care of the physical health of its citizens there is no stopping this side of the "paternal government" of the past. The difference between the theory of such governments and our American theory of government, is just the difference between slavery and liberty. The difference between the kind of people raised under such laws, and those raised under our free institutions, is the difference between *children* and *men*.

There are many cases recorded of sudden death, caused by a fit of anger, and

it is well proven that all true religion is conducive to good health, and all evil and unrestrained passion tends directly in the other direction; so the government that takes upon itself the guardianship of the physical health of its citizens, might, reasoning thus, establish religion, and bring back the Inquisition at once. They might do this, and claim they did it all for *civil* and *sanitary* reasons, just as the Sunday-law advocates do. Thus it is seen that even admitting their premises, their conclusion does not follow.

But the premises are unproven assumptions. It is not true that every person, whatever his age or occupation, needs just one day's rest in seven for his physical health. Some need much more, and some have such light work and such robust health that they can do with much less. Thus the whole civil or sanitary Sunday law argument, is based on *false* reasoning from a *false* premise.

G. E. FIFIELD.

The National Reform Idea an Absurdity.

DR. DAVID MC ALLISTER seems to think that religion depends upon the statutes of States and the edicts of empires. In this, he joins in opinion with the most rabid of atheists and anarchists who constantly charge religionists with being the dupes of power exercised through State authority.

The Emperor Constantine made Christianity the religion of the Roman Empire, and to this fact, many unbelievers in Christianity attribute its extraordinary growth. The very opposite of this is more probably the truth. Gibbon shows very plainly that Constantine himself, vacillated between Christianity and the old State religion of Rome almost to the end of his days, just as politicians seeking support from contending factions now do, when doubtful as to which party is most likely to prevail. It is often a fine stroke of political policy, for an aspirant for power and fame, to espouse what outwardly appears to be the weaker party in a State, and thus connect his name with its rise, and growth into full power and control. The statesman who has the shrewdness to fall in with the rising tide of public sentiment, at the proper moment, is sure to reap power and emoluments in the end.

Primitive Christianity was the religion of the poor fishermen of Galilee; and while their hearts were warmed, their hopes inspired, and their enthusiasm kindled by it, it was laughed about and scoffed at, by the Scribes, the Pharisees, and the fashionable people of the time.

In Rome, Christianity took root among the workingmen—the poor and the lowly, in the cities—as radical reforms generally do. And its methods were so quiet, and its early adherents so peaceful, that, to use the words of Gibbon, it "gently insin-

uated itself into the minds of men, grew up in silence and obscurity, derived new vigor from opposition, and finally erected the banner of the cross on the ruins of the capitol."

In its primitive purity, Christianity had no use for the State as a means of propaganda. It grew and spread through the cities in spite of the State, and State religions, which, sooner or later, were always found to be its deadly enemies.

Why should the aid of the politician be invoked, to strengthen and support a movement having for its object the *reform* of public opinion, while *his* object as a general rule, is to quietly *float* with popular opinion *as it is*? Convince him that you have the votes to carry him along, and he is with you. Fail to do this, and he is in your way.

No religion ever remained pure and true to humanity, that sought to carry forward its propaganda by means of political strategem, political power, and political spoils.

The idea that the State can make *itself* moral, by the formula of "Be it enacted," is to invoke from the masses of the people, a moral force which, by hypothesis, does not exist among them; and it is as absurd, under our theory of popular government, as the attempt of a man to lift himself by the straps of his boots.

First plant the moral force in the hearts and minds of the masses—get them in love with the true, the beautiful, and the good; let them come to hate inequality of rights, and despise slavery in all its myriad forms; let them see the beauty of truth and the economy of righteousness; and there will be no occasion for wrangling as to what religion the "State" should believe in.

The truth is, the State, as such, does not and cannot believe in anything. A law book cannot think or feel, and can neither do right nor wrong. When a king is imagined to be the State, it might be presumed to have a moral character, or more probably, an immoral character. But when the State becomes the concrete result of the conflicting opinions and passions of sixty-five millions of people—a mere compromise, reflecting the opinions of no one individual,—it cannot be said to have a moral character, or a religious belief.

The Rev. R. M. Somerville evidently is not satisfied with the proposition to simply print the name of God in the Constitution. He wants Christ recognized as a politician also, to the extent of having his name mixed up with the names of the lawyers that figure so largely in our old musty law books. It is the old antiquated notion of religious *things* instead of religious men. Make the *things* sacred in order that they may make *us* pious! Does it not smack of image worship and idolatry?

When will the Church learn that moral

force can be transmitted only by the tender cords of sympathy and love? Does not all experience prove that the State is incompetent to *force* men to love and believe, by means of policemen, courts, and armies?

Physical force is available to control *action* only. The attempt, through physical force, to make men love one another, is to make them hate and despise one another.

Let the fashionable churches come down to the level of the working people, as the early Christians did, and show their sympathy for the poor and lowly—not so much by alms-giving and begging as by showing them what their *rights* are, as well as their errors; by teaching them that no man has the right to acquire wealth through the power of the State—that the State can have no wealth to give to some without first taking it from others—that the man who sells his vote for money, is selling, not only *his* rights, but *other* people's rights; by teaching consistent, genuine righteousness all 'round, and everywhere, in high places and low, in public and private relations; let all this be proclaimed as God's law, and I venture to say more sympathy will be excited, more minds will be awakened and more churches will be filled, than would result from printing the word God in all the law books and school books, or by chalking his name all over creation by State authority. * * *

Washington, D. C.

Unmerciful Mercy.

At the Protestant Episcopal House of Mercy, in this city, there is held against her wish, and the wish of her parents, a Jewish girl sixteen years old. Two years ago at her home she acted very unruly, was disobedient to her parents, and quarrelsome with her brothers and sisters, and the parents asked the police justice to commit her to a reformatory, that she might be subjected to stricter discipline than they were able to bring to bear, until she should learn better how to behave herself. The police judge sent her to this Protestant Episcopal House of Mercy, as there is no Hebrew reformatory in this city. Now the parents desire that she shall be released. They tried to secure her release upon a writ of *habeas corpus*, but it was refused because it seems that by somebody's influence other than that of the parents, she had been regularly committed to that institution until she is twenty-one years of age. The parents have earnestly besought this institution of "Mercy" to let them have their child, but the institution still holds her, and, it seems, proposes to hold her in spite of all that the parents may wish.

If such a thing as this were done by the Roman Catholics, what a universal howl of execration would go up from Protestant

throats! But, as it is, we have not seen mention made of this in a single paper outside of the one that made the announcement. We can hardly help wondering whether the managers of this institution ever heard of Christ, or of Christianity. It is certain that the name of the institution should be changed; for such proceeding is anything but merciful. Such action is a libel upon both the name and the Author of mercy.

Make a Note of This.

IN endeavoring to show that the enforcement of rigid Sunday laws is not inconsistent with the liberties of the Jews, Mr. Crafts, in his "Sabbath for Man," page 258, says:—

It is not sufficiently emphasized that the Jew is left absolutely free to observe the seventh day. He can close his shop; he can refuse to work.

Herein lies a principle. As long as a man has the privilege of closing his shop and refusing to work, he is free to observe a day. Question: What man has not this privilege? Certainly all men have it, the Christian as well as the Jew. Then what Sunday-keeper is not absolutely free to observe Sunday? They all are. What consistency, then, can there be in Mr. Crafts and his party pleading for a law to prevent persons from being *forced* to labor on Sunday," as they did in Washington last February, at the hearing of the House Committee on the Breckinridge Sunday Bill?

In closing his shop, the Jew of course will lose trade, and in refusing to work, perhaps lose a job; yet, says Mr. Crafts, he is left "absolutely free to observe the seventh day." The Sunday-keeper can do the same and be left just as free to observe the first day. Let us not forget to emphasize this. Law in one case is as unnecessary as in the other.—*W. A. Colcord, in Review and Herald.*

Not a Christian Law.

THE *Christian Statesman* refers to the illegal divorces granted to Hebrews in this country by Jewish Rabbis, some of whom assume the prerogative of the State in such cases, and then it says:—

These facts illustrate the necessity for maintaining and enforcing carefully the distinctively Christian laws of the American Government.

We have nothing to say against the better enforcement of the laws in such cases, or against the necessity for better and more uniform laws governing the subject of divorce, but we do object to having such laws styled "Christian laws." To say that they are Christian laws is to say that marriage is a Christian institution, and that the State has a right to enforce Christianity by legal enactment.

The chief object of the *Statesman* at the present time seems to be to make the people of this country believe that they have

already legislated upon Christianity, and that, since they have already enacted some "Christian laws," there is no reason why they should not now go on and legislate upon Christianity to any desired extent. This is their argument precisely, and it shows what must be the inevitable result if religious legislation is ever begun in this country. It shows the imperative necessity of watching every move of legislative bodies, that no false step shall be taken which will establish a precedent for legislation upon Christianity.

We agree that laws regulating marriage are right; that is, that there should be such laws; but we deny that marriage is a Christian institution, or that in passing such laws it is necessary to legislate upon the Christian religion.

1. Marriage is not a Christian institution because it originated before Christianity. It was instituted about four thousand years before the commencement of the Christian dispensation. In fact it was instituted before the fall of man, and consequently before man needed a Saviour and Christianity to redeem him.

2. Christian institutions are for Christians. If marriage were a Christian institution, then none but Christians would have a right to marry. But people who are not Christians have as much right to marry as those who are; therefore, marriage is not a Christian institution.

3. No one can be a Christian without observing all known Christian institutions. Hence, if marriage was a Christian institution, no one could be a Christian unless he was married. But that the *Christian Statesman* itself knows is not true.

Therefore we say that laws which regulate marriage are not Christian laws, but civil laws. A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

The One Object.

At the Garnett, Kansas, Sabbath-rest Convention, held in March, there was noticeable a general diversity of opinion on almost every point brought up except one. Some observed Sunday, because the fourth commandment is binding. Others observed it because of the resurrection of Christ and the completion of redemption on that day. Some believed it to be verily the seventh day from creation; while another had no less than a half dozen reasons for changing to the first day. Some believed in keeping the Sabbath according to the most strict laws of the Puritans; while another believed in an entirely different manner of Sabbath observance.

Thus it was all through the Convention on all points except the one great object,—that of having a law to enforce the observance of the day. All arguments were made for this one purpose. It mattered not though the reasons given were contrary the one to the other, they would

make the final conclusion point to the enactment and enforcement of a Sunday law, and that would seem to harmonize every thought.

The indications were that they think the Lord is not able to pass sentence and execute judgments against the violators of his law, and has consequently passed it over into their hands, for them to look after and enforce. So now they seem to think it incumbent on them to bring to pass some means whereby they can punish the transgressors of God's law (according to their interpretation of his law), and clear themselves of this great responsibility.

It is not surprising that they should come to such a conclusion, when we remember that one of their men has said, "In this work we are undertaking for the Sabbath, we are the representatives of God." It is the principle upon which the Papacy was built; and the Papacy was only the natural outgrowth of the principle. The establishment of this principle is their object. OSCAR HILL.

The Educational Amendment.

In a recent editorial on the Blair Educational amendment, the Virginia City *Chronicle* says:—

"Should the amendment become a part of the national law the necessity would at once exist for each State, or Congress, to establish by law a system of public schools, and to declare in such law what are the 'fundamental, non-sectarian principles of Christianity.' The Legislature of each State would declare by statute for the government of the schools what are such 'fundamental principles,' and thus there would be a separate religious school code for each of the forty-two States. Considering human nature as we find it, could any sensible person say that the Legislatures of forty-two States could be brought to agree on what are and what are not the 'fundamental, non-sectarian principles?'"

"The inevitable confusion and conflict which would appear in such legislation but serves to show the soundness of the principle and popular sentiment, that the establishment of religion is not and should never be a function of civil government. The principles of the Christian religion should be left for the Church and not the State to determine. It can hardly be considered that the average member of a State Legislature, or of Congress, is fitted either morally or intellectually to determine for the people, the Church or the schools what is true religion."

So far as the National Government is concerned, the people of the United States, considered as a body politic, have no religion to teach, no doctrine of God to promulgate, and no form of worship to sustain or enforce.—S. T. Speer, D. D.

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.



DECLARATION of PRINCIPLES.

We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ.
We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.
We believe in supporting the civil government, and submitting to its authority.
We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.
We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.
We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation by the civil government; that we and our fellow-citizens may enjoy the inestimable blessings of both religious and civil liberty.

OFFICES.

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY;
225 A ST., N. E. WASHINGTON; 28 COLLEGE PLACE, CHICAGO.

C. ELDRIDGE, - - - - - President.
W. H. MCKEE, - - - - - Secretary.

The People Speak.

THE following editorial report from the daily *Bodie Miner*, of California, is worth reprinting here. It has the right ring and a good deal of it:—

Last Tuesday J. H. Cook and J. A. Wheeler of the National Religious Liberty Association, arrived in Bodie. These gentlemen are travelling through Eastern California and Western Nevada, obtaining signatures to petitions to Congress asking that body to refrain from any legislation whatever looking to a union of Church and State in the Government of the United States. Considering that we have got along very comfortably, very happily, and very prosperously for over a hundred years without any such cranky nonsense, no sensible man thinks there is any sense in starting it now. The movement which Mr. Cook and Mr. Wheeler are urging is a simultaneous one in every State and Territory in the Union, agents canvassing everywhere for signatures to Congress to let the Constitution remain as it is so far as regards religion or religious tests. Returns of signatures to Washington are made weekly. These gentlemen commenced canvassing for names as soon as they arrived in town, and about every lady and gentleman who understood the matter readily signed the petition.

A mass-meeting was held in Miners' Union Hall on Thursday evening. The meeting was called to order by Watkin Morgan. Orlando E. Jones was selected for Chairman, Watkin Morgan acting as secretary.

Chairman Jones read the Blair Sunday-rest Bill and the Joint Resolution proposing to establish religion in our public schools. Mr. Jones then proceeded, in his customary clear and perspicacious style, to point out the absurdity of legislating on those subjects at all. We are happy, contented, prosperous, rich, and the boss of the world; let us remain so.

F. P. Willard made a very neat and telling little speech in support of the petition, and was heartily applauded throughout.

Harvey Boone, while declining to make any remarks, heartily indorsed the petition and the object of the meeting.

J. H. Cook, who is thoroughly familiar with the entire subject, explained it very lucidly, after which the following resolutions were presented and read:—

Resolved, That we, the people of Bodie, Mono County, California, in mass-meeting assembled, are steadfastly opposed to the adoption by Congress of the United States of the joint resolutions introduced in the Senate by Senator Blair, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, respecting the establishment of religion and free public schools. That we are opposed to the passage by Congress of the Blair Sunday-rest Bill, and to its kindred measure introduced by Mr. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, and to all other legislation looking to the establishment of any system of religion by the Nation, or by any State; or restricting the right of any citizen to engage in any legitimate, lawful pursuits on any day of the week.

Resolved, That the first section of the joint resolution for the amendment of the Constitution respecting an establishment of religion and free public schools, which reads as follows: "No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," is not designed to guard the rights of the several States, but to muzzle them, and thus center the power of legislation on the subject of religion for the several States, in the national Legislature.

Resolved, That article second of said joint resolution which proposes to establish and maintain a system of free public schools in which are taught the fundamental principles of the Christian religion, is destructive of the principles of religious and civil liberty, and is wholly un-American in its inception, and deserves the universal condemnation of every American citizen.

Resolved, That the Blair Sunday-rest Bill is wholly a religious bill. Its passage would be religious legislation, therefore, is in conflict with the first amendment. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." That it is in conflict with the words of Christ, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." That it places a high penalty of crime on conduct not essentially criminal. That it is designedly loose in its wording, "labor to the disturbance of others," giving every advantage in law to any religious bigot who may chance to have had his mental equilibrium disturbed by Sunday labor, subjecting the offending party to a fine from \$10 to \$1000; also the premium bid for any one to spy out persons who may have labored and received pay for said labor, in conflict with said law; to bring suit in his own name, and for his own use, and recover said money; all of which speak plainly of the religious and intolerant character of the said bill; that they call loudly on every American citizen to come to the rescue and demand the preservation of the Constitution, as it now is, with all its safeguard against any religious legislation, and protection alike equally to all.

After the reading, N. B. Ward moved that the resolution be adopted. Carried, the vote being unanimous.

Those present were then invited to sign the petition, which all did with alacrity.

Friday morning, Messrs. Cook and Wheeler, having performed a good work in Mono County, left for Hawthorne, and will continue their labors to Candelaria, and down through Inyo.

**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 at-
tached to any part of the clothing. A small invest-
ment 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 sim-
ilar styles formerly sold and still offered at much
higher prices. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Or OAKLAND, CAL.

THE SENTINEL LIBRARY

A Semi-monthly Publication

Devoted to the defense of

AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

And the Preservation of the

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

AS IT IS.

TERMS, 75 CENTS PER YEAR.

Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

GOOD HEALTH

Is a popular health magazine, published at Battle
Creek, Mich., and conducted by

J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Assisted by an able editorial staff.

It contains, each month, general articles on prac-
tical hygiene, and medical papers, besides a rich
variety of other matter, pithy and practical, on
popular questions, also representing the latest
scientific thought, in combination with Dr. Kellogg's
wide professional experience.

Established on Four Continents. No jour-
nal devoted to health or kindred topics has ever enjoyed
so great a popularity as this journal has earned by
its devotion to the interests of the people in the de-
velopment and popularization of knowledge on all
sanitary topics. It has been introduced into *nearly*
every part of the civilized world, and enjoys a large
circulation, not only in America, but in England,
upon the continent of Europe, in South Africa, and
in Australia. Among the

SPECIAL ATTRACTIONS

For 1890, the managers of this journal propose
during the year to devote considerable space to the
Exposure of Medical Frauds. They have,
therefore, established a chemical laboratory, in
charge of a competent chemist, for the purpose of
carrying on a series of thorough-going investiga-
tions, the results of which will be published in the
columns of this journal. **Price, \$1.25 a Year.**
Single numbers, 15 Cents. Send for specimen copy,
and terms to agents.

GOOD HEALTH PUB. CO., Battle Creek, Mich.

**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 frontis-
piece 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.

**NEW EDITIONS
CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION
IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN**

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 "Sunday-Law Movement in the Fourth Century, and its Parallel in the
Nineteenth."
CHAP. VII shows The Workings of Sunday Laws when they are enforced.
These chapters, with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States
which are printed in Appendices C and D, make this treatise **INDISPENSABLE TO EVERY LOVER OF
CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.**

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

Is a Pamphlet of 182 Large Octavo Pages, in English, Price 25 Cents; and in
German, 228 Pages, Price, 35 Cents.

MILLIONS OF COPIES

Should be Placed in the Hands of Thinking People at once. It Clearly Defines what Position
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.

**GOOD FOR ALL TIME!
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 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 accom-
panied 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.

CALIFORNIA TOURISTS

Should have a Copy of the Grand Book
"In the Heart of the Sierras."

It Pictures the World-renowned Yo Semite Val-
ley, the Big Tree Groves of California, the
Glaciers, Gold Mines, and Caverns of
this Wonderful Region. It is a

Complete Guide to the Yo Semite Valley,
Giving routes of travel, number of miles by rail
and stage; describes points of interest en route;
gives map of the Valley, and contains **160 Illus-
trations**, 28 of which are *Beautiful Full-
Page Artotypes*, and which portray the
wonderful Cataracts, Mountains, and Precipices
with all the REALITY OF A PHOTOGRAPH. Bound
in five styles. Copy in cloth, embossed in jet and
gold, gold edges, sent postpaid where we have
no agent for \$3.50.

CHEAPER EDITION.

We have just issued a special **TOURISTS' EDITION**
of this book, containing all the matter of the
other edition, printed on thinner paper, without
artotypes, bound in flexible cloth covers. Copies
sent postpaid anywhere for \$1.50.

Address **PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,**
Or 43 Bond St., New York. **Oakland, Cal.**

FORTUNE!

**Florida Phosphate Facts Freely
Furnished.**

Knowing that very many people have errone-
ous ideas about Florida, her climate, resources,
etc., and wishing to add 100,000 new names to our
subscription list, we offer to send the *Florida
Home-Seeker* till 1891, for only 50 cents, to every-
one answering this advertisement. The *Home-
Seeker* tells the truth, and nothing but the truth
about Florida. Address,

FLORIDA HOME-SEEKER,
Apr. 24-3m Gainesville, Fla.

ARGUMENTS

ON THE

Breckinridge Sunday Bill.

o o o o

Verbatim report of the speeches of Eld. J. O.
Corlies, of Washington, Alonzo T. Jones, of New
York, Editor *American Sentinel*, and Millard F.
Hobbs, District Master Workman of District
Assembly 66, Knights of Labor, together with a
brief submitted by Prof. W. H. McKee, Secretary of
the National Religious Liberty Association,

All Against the Breckinridge Sunday Bill.

An important and telling document against
all Sunday legislation, giving the basis of such
legislation, together with the object and price of
exemption clauses. Issued as No. 29 of the *Sen-
tinel Library*. Price 10 cents. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,

Or 43 Bond St., New York. **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 con-
tains 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.

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, travers-
ing, 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 Fitch-
burg 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, C. E. LAMBERT,
Gen. East'n Pass. Agt., Gen. Pass. Agt.,
363 BROADWAY, 5 VANDERBILT AVE.
NEW YORK. NEW YORK.



NEW YORK, MAY 29, 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.

"SOME Christians serve God so tremendously on Sunday," says Doctor Talmage, "that they are cross and crabbed all the week. Doing too many things on Sunday, they do nothing well all the rest of the week."

And the Doctor might have added truthfully that as a class such "Christians" are in favor of compelling everybody else to "serve God" just as they do, at least so far as Sunday is concerned. They are generally those who believe that the sum of all religion, worth having, is in Sunday keeping.

OF prayers in Congress, the *Christian Statesman* remarks:—

"If the silence of the national Constitution as to religion is to be construed as a deliberate and intentional renunciation of all religion by the American Nation, then such prayers, or any prayers, in Congress, or in any State Legislature, are an impertinence and an anachronism, and ought to be abolished."

That deduction is perfectly logical, and the logic ought to be turned into a fact. Chaplaincies in Congress, in State Legislatures, the army, etc., are an impertinence and an anachronism. They are a relic of the hierarchal rule of the Middle Ages, and ought to be abolished. Legally, chaplains are unconstitutional loafers; physically, however, they are strictly constitutional loafers.

THE *Sabbath Advocate*, of Stanberry, Missouri, says that "the present tendency on the part of the people of this Nation is to put down everything that tends to unite Church and State, and consequently Mr. Blair is having poor success in his Sunday legislation. Too vividly does the past come up before us to tolerate such without a struggle. We say down with everything of such tendencies. Christianity can stand without a union with the State." If the editor of the *Advocate* would take the *Congressional Record* and note carefully the number of petitions presented both in the Senate and House in favor of a national Sunday law he would not feel quite so confident as he seems to that Mr. Blair may not after all be ultimately successful in his efforts to secure religious legislation. The friends of a national Sunday law are making a "still hunt," but they are doing effective work, and if the advocates of religious liberty suppose that

there is no danger they are simply deceiving themselves. But what the *Advocate* says illustrates the situation exactly. The great danger to religious liberty in this country is due in a large measure to the indifference of the people. The great majority think that there is, and can be no danger; and at least a large minority care not a straw whose liberty is infringed so long as they are not affected. They fail to realize that the only safety for any class is in *jealously guarding the rights of all alike*.

THE bill which recently passed the Senate forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia on Sunday, was for a time prevented from passing, by Senator Blair, who desired to have it amended. Finally, however, Mr. Blair withdrew his objection to its passage, saying:—

This particular bill, it seems to be thought, is very good in the way of spoon-victuals, and I do not feel inclined to be an obstacle to the enactment of whatsoever good there may be in it into a law. *It is well to provide for the observance of the Sabbath.*

And so it appears that Senator Blair agrees with us that Sunday-closing laws are in the interests, not of temperance, but of Sunday observance. That bill ought to be killed, and we hope the House of Representatives will do it.

IN the course of a speech to the Senate in introducing a bill to repeal laws providing for the retirement of army and other officers, delivered in the Senate of the United States, April 23, Senator Reagan, of Texas, said:—

It seems to me we can only account for the creation of privileged classes in this country, on the hypothesis that it is the result of a skillfully devised plan of those in this country who condemn the political doctrines of the illustrious Mr. Jefferson and his followers, who seek by this means to subvert our Federal system of States with reserved rights, and of people with reserved liberties, and on the wreck of this system to establish a strong, consolidated, centralized Government with power to repress and control the popular will, and, in the interest of the few, to establish a Government of force and coercion in the place of our present democratic Government based on the consent and agreement of the people and States.

In these words, Mr. Reagan has expressed the greatest danger which threatens this commonwealth, and one which has already passed its inception.

THE assumption of police power over the State by the Legislature of Massachusetts for the enforcement of the Sunday-closing of saloons, and the earnest effort made by the supporters of that measure to proselyte other States to the same dangerous policy, is still another evidence of the decided trend of the so-called "reformers" toward paternalism in Government.

Mr. Dudley, of Boston, said, in the Sunday Convention, held in Washington last winter: "Massachusetts determined to

take it into her own hands to enforce her own laws and to control the police force; but in Boston was shown the force of the law—the power behind it. . . . It has been claimed that this is an interference with the local government, but it is not. Fifty-nine out of every sixty of these convictions are for violations of the Sunday law, and only one for a violation of the city law."

Thus is shown the growing tendency to place the powers which are legitimately municipal in character, in the hands of the Legislatures, and those which should be in the province of the Legislature solely, to the general Congress. And so they would usher in the age of Bellamyism—not only "looking backward," but actually going backward, politically, in an attempt to establish the "United Patriarchate of America."

THE mischief of Sunday laws is again illustrated by a case out in Indiana. Mr. C. W. Cook keeps a hotel at New Haven. Some time ago he allowed the agent of the Toledo Automatic Cigar Company to put up on the outside of his house one of those little machines into which one drops a nickel and gets a cigar. On Sunday April 20, somebody dropped a nickel into the thing, got a cigar and smoked it. Mr. Cook knew nothing about it, had nothing to do with the machine himself, nor has he any of the profits of it at all, but simply allowed the owner of it to place it there, yet *he was prosecuted for Sunday desecration*. A change of venue was secured, and the case was tried in Ft. Wayne. After deliberating all night the jury brought in a verdict of guilty with a fine of one dollar and costs, and the costs amounted to over fifty dollars.

This well illustrates the value of Sunday laws. All they are worth, or that they ever were worth, is simply to give a chance to meddlesome bigots to pester, or vent their spite upon, their neighbors. This is the only earthly thing that Sunday laws are used for now, and it is the only thing they ever will be used for; and if the Sunday-law advocates get the laws enacted which they so long for, this simply illustrates in a very mild way, what will be the fruit of them.

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,
48 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.