



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

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 18, 1890.

NUMBER 50.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, - - ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN,

W. H. McKEE.

THE public schools are for all creeds, or no creed—Catholic, Protestant or Agnostic; for all nationalities, native-born and foreign—for the American, the Irishman, the German or Italian. This makes them impartial, secular and comprehensive. No other system can exist in this country so long as it is republican in manner and form.—*National View.*

“BOTH the Decalogue, and codes of the most advanced governments,” says Mr. Crafts, “forbid murder, thefts, adultery, false witness, and Sabbath work. Religion renders to God the things that are God’s by forbidding these things chiefly as sins against God; governments renders to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s by forbidding them only as crimes against man.” But a failure to keep Sunday is not a crime against man, and should not be made so by law. Sunday is religious, and to require its observance is to require the observance of a religious institution.

“UNLESS morality is rooted in a reverent love of God, it will be driven before the sudden gusts of temptation like ‘rattling autumn leaves’ before the winter’s winds. If it looks upon religion as the best ‘Chief of the police’ merely, and not as the interpreter of everlasting verities it must of necessity be destitute of force. Short of the willing sacrifice of self to the righteous claims of God, and the cheerful movement of the mind within the limits of a supreme law, there is no pure or durable morality. Religion is the root

of which the purest morality is the flower. The flower cannot exist without the root; and the root cannot exist and have vitality without the inflorescence in morality.” And yet men imagine that the State can teach morality, and that it can teach morals without teaching religion at that!

National Reform and the “Civil Sabbath.”

WITH its issue of October 2, the *Christian Statesman* began a series of articles, to continue for three months, by Rev. W. F. Crafts, the “founder of the American Sabbath Union.” It seems that the *Statesman* is making a sort of a campaign out of it. Last year Mr. Crafts could say that he was not connected with the National Reform system; now, however, he is a thorough convert. He has gone the whole course. He has adopted the National Reform organ as principal channel of communication; he advocates the National Reform Amendment to the Constitution of the United States to make this a Christian Nation, while asserting all the time that it is a Christian nation. In short, he advocates the whole National Reform scheme. This will appear as we proceed because we intend to notice from time to time such portions of the matter which he presents as may seem worthy of attention.

The articles are to form a supplement to the two books already published by Mr. Crafts on the Sabbath question. The first article is entitled, “Is the Sabbath Surrendered?” After mentioning a number of publications on the Sabbath question, he says that “the unanimity of these numerous books in recognizing the Decalogue as the basis and guide of Sabbath observance, at once represents and strengthens the general conviction of British and American Christians that the Lord’s day is also the Christian Sabbath.” Two of the books which he mentions amongst the valuable ones are “The Abiding Sabbath,” by Rev. George Elliot, of Washington City, and the “Lord’s Day,” by Professor

A. E. Waffle, of Jamestown, New York. These are two prize essays, the former \$500, and the latter \$1000. We have at this office a pamphlet of 173 pages, written by the editor of THE SENTINEL, which gives a thorough review of both these books. Anybody who will carefully read the books or this pamphlet either, will see clearly enough that so far as these books are concerned, the Sabbath of the Decalogue has certainly been surrendered. This pamphlet will be sent any where in the United States or Canada on receipt of twenty cents.

Mr. Crafts says that the Sabbath organizations which have recently multiplied in numbers all recognize the perpetual authority of the Sabbath law of the Decalogue, and that the lecturers on this subject have “made the fourth commandment their leading theme,” and “every lecturer for the Sabbath stands on that platform.” Under the circumstances this is a grand admission. The last Sunday book which Mr. Crafts has issued is “The Civil Sabbath.” During his whole campaign of the present year he has made the civil Sabbath his constant theme, and now, at the end of his tours round about and across the Continent, he makes this positive announcement, that every lecturer for the Sabbath stands on the platform of the fourth commandment and makes that his theme. This demonstrates by his own words that which we have constantly held, and which we have told the people all the time, that the plea made in behalf of the civil Sabbath is a fraud; and this shows also that they know it to be a fraud. But they know that they cannot win the favor of the people for their movement if they present it as it is, and as they know it is, in fact, in behalf of the religious Sunday; and therefore in their words they plead for the civil Sabbath, while in their hearts they know it is the religious Sunday that they have in view.

By this means they are enabled to win favor that it would be impossible for them to gain if they should plead for what they really want. And strange to say they

have won favor in the very quarter where it would naturally be supposed there would be the least possible hope of it. That is amongst the Liberal Leagues. Even the the American Secular Union acknowledged itself ready to sanction "Sunday laws enforcing the observance of Sunday" as "an economic" institution—at which Mr. Crafts laughs slyly in his sleeve and replies to the Secular Union that there are even now no Sunday laws of any other kind, and that they do not want any other. But when they get the Sunday laws which they do want, and the enforcement of the Sunday laws which already exist as they want them enforced, then the Secular Union and everybody else will find out that there are no economic reasons for Sunday laws, nor any other than religious reasons. Then the people who have allowed themselves to be wheedled with the purring notes of the "civil Sabbath song" will find that they have sold themselves to the despotism of a *religious Sunday*. They will then also know that which we have always said, and still do say, that the pretensions of ecclesiastics who grasp for civil power can never be trusted.

There never was a Sunday law made that was not religious; and there is not one now on the statute books of any State in the American Nation that is not religious and that was not intended to be religious when it was put there. We know full well that in some cases judges have said that these laws are civil, and that they are not religious; but not only is this not true, but every judge who has ever said it has clearly violated one of the fundamental principles of the interpretation of law. That principle is, that, the meaning of a statute is fixed when it is adopted and it is not different at a subsequent time when a court has occasion to pass upon it. A statute is not to be made to mean one thing at one time and another at some subsequent time when the circumstances may have so changed as perhaps to make a different rule in a case seem desirable.

The foundation, the meaning and the intent of every Sunday law that has ever been enacted has been, *at the time of its enactment*, religious and religious only. And now when the progress of the American people under the enlightening influences of the national Constitution has carried them beyond any recognition of laws enforcing religious observances, judges on the bench endeavor to subject to a religious statute, the free spirit of the American people *by making these statutes civil*, and reading into them a meaning that is not there, that was not intended to be there when the statutes were made, and that never can truthfully be put there.

Civil Sunday laws are judge-made laws, and that only, and that in direct violation of one of the soundest principles of jurisprudence. Even though every judge in the United States should say that Sunday laws are civil only, it would not be

true. It would not be true even though the laws in question were enacted with that intent. But it is doubly false when every one of these laws is not only religious in itself, but was enacted with religious intent. There is no such a thing as a civil Sabbath. Sunday laws never enforce the observance of Sunday as an economic institution, nor can Sunday laws be justified by physiological, secular or any other reasons. They are a connecting link in the union of Church and State. They are religious only and are the relics of the religious despotism that is in the past, and at the same time are ominous signs of the one to come.

A. T. J.

Religion in the Public Schools.

A CONFERENCE, which was held in this city, of ministers from twenty-three ecclesiastical bodies called by the Presbyterian Synod to consider the necessity of introducing moral instruction into the public schools, revealed about as many different views as there were speakers. Of course, nothing is settled by such a discussion; certainly the public school system of the State is not likely to undergo any material change as a result of the Conference. It serves, though, a useful purpose in classifying ideas and stimulating thought; while from the general course of the discussion we may learn what to accept and what to reject.

Perhaps the most elaborate address was delivered by Mr. Wm. Allen Butler, who argued for the absolute divorce of the Church and State, and the freedom of religious opinion and worship as fundamental ideas in our system of constitutional Government as embodied in the Constitution of this State. So far, well. But when our speaker declares that "the legal status of the public schools in this State includes the existing and controlling power of the Christian religion," and further, that "the Constitution and law of this State authorize religious," but not as he says, "doctrinal teaching in the public schools," we cannot accept the statement. It is true that by general consent the Bible was for a long time, yet is, and may continue to be, read in the public schools. There is no objection to this when read by general consent. But on the other hand, as the Code of Public Instruction in this State says, "there is no authority in the law to use as a matter of right any portion of the regular school-hours in conducting any religious exercises at which the attendance of the scholars is made compulsory;" and again says the Code, "Neither the common school system nor any other social system can be maintained unless the conscientious views of all are respected." In such utterances and others that might be quoted the legal status of the public schools in this State is shown to be different from that stated by Mr. Butler.

We cannot as a people too strongly insist that religion in the public schools shall not be taught against the opposition of those who support the schools. We indeed hear not a little—and the plea went in the Conference—about teaching "non-sectarian Christianity," as being the common law of the land. Touching this we remark, first, there is no such thing as non-sectarian Christianity; and secondly Christianity is not the common law of the land. As to the first, reading a Protestant version of the Bible is sectarian as against the Douay or Roman Catholic version. As to the second, even in England, whence the common-law theory is derived and applied to this country by its advocates, Lord Coke declared "the common law adapted itself to the religion of the country just so far as was necessary for the peace and safety of civil institutions, and only where by their inevitable effects they became offenses against *man and his temporal security*. In like tenor was the decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court [Commonwealth *vs.* Kneeland]; of Justice Clayton of Delaware [State *vs.* Chandler]; while the Supreme Court of Ohio [Bloom *vs.* Richards], declares, "Neither Christianity nor any other system of religion is a part of the law of this State." We could quote at greater length but have not the space.

To conclude: We have religion, but the State may not teach it. . . . We must keep our public schools as they are—that is, keep them from sectarian teaching. In this way alone will the State preserve the school against the assaults of the Roman Catholics who would disestablish the system if they could. It will be an evil day for the State that sees the downfall of the public school system through the machinations of the Roman Catholics, and that is the way its downfall will be compassed, if, indeed, it ever is, which God forbid.—*Christian at Work*.

Troublesome Questions.

A REVEREND gentleman in a Western town, discussing the question of religious instruction in the public schools, plaintively asks:—

Suppose some little boy reads a paragraph about the star of Bethlehem; he raises his little hand and inquires of the teacher, "What is the star of Bethlehem?" Is the teacher to answer that the enemies of Protestant Christianity have removed that star from heaven?

Certainly not. To say that anybody has removed the star of Bethlehem from heaven would be a falsehood, and no teacher would be justified in lying to his pupils. In such a case the teacher should refer the pupil to his parents or guardian for the desired information.

But let us carry the supposition a little further: Suppose the Bible is used in the school and some little boy reads Mark 16:16, and asks, "What is baptism?" Shall the teacher undertake to instruct

him upon that subject? Or, if the little fellow reads from Eze. 18:20, the words: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," and asks the teacher to harmonize it with the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, shall the teacher undertake to instruct him in the various doctrines of future rewards and punishment? Or suppose the pupil should read 1 John 5:7, 8, and ask some question on the doctrine of the trinity, shall the teacher undertake to instruct him in regard to that? and if so, what particular doctrine shall he teach the child? Such questions instead of being avoided by the use of the Bible in the public schools are only multiplied, and nobody will pretend to say that it is the duty of public school teachers to undertake to answer them. C. P. B.

"The Religion of Humanity."

THE New York *Press*, of the 29th ult., has an editorial notice of the late Conference on moral education in the public schools, from which we quote as follows:—

There is rather more of a theological tone than is desirable about the discussion that has been conducted by some very good Christian ministers this week, about moral education in the public schools. There is the same old tendency to identify religion with theology, and to assume apparently that if common ground can be found on which Protestants and Catholics can stand, the humanitarian end of the Unitarian Church, the Hebrews and Ethical Culturists and Agnostics will accept the teachings of theology in the public schools, on the general theory that "this is a Christian Nation."

Now this Nation, or any other nation, can be Christian in its religion without being Christian in its theology. The word "religion" has the same root "*lig*," as the word "obligation." It signifies something binding, and that something is a sense of duty. All learned students of the science of morals admire the Christian system of morality. It is imbedded in our national Constitution itself. The recognition of the rights of another to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the Anglo-Saxon doctrine of fair play, is an application of the Golden Rule enunciated by Jesus of Nazareth.

Those who worship Jesus of Nazareth as God incarnate ought to be the readiest of all, in view of these his plain teachings, to come together with Hebrews and Liberals and Agnostics on a humanitarian application of his moral teachings to the purposes of public instruction. The rights of the minority, who, while accepting his supremacy as the world's greatest teacher of morals, are not agreed as to his theological status, require that theology should be kept out of the question. We can no more have a State theology than we can have a State Church. The "religion of humanity" is unsatisfactory as a theology, but that and nothing more is all the religion that the public schools have any business to teach. The point where humanitarian religion stops and theology begins is just the right place for the public schools to draw the line.

It seems to us that the writer of the foregoing attempts to make a distinction where there is no real difference. It is true that religion and theology are not synonymous, yet there is not, we apprehend, that distinction which some imagine that there is. "*Religion*," says Webster, "as distinguished from *theology*, is subjective, designating the feelings and acts of men which relate to God; while *theology* is objective, and denotes those ideas

of God which man entertains respecting the God whom he worships." That is, theology is the theory, while religion is theory reduced to practice.

"The word 'religion' has," says the *Press*, "the same root as the word 'obligation.' It signifies something binding, and that something is a sense of duty." Very good; but according to Webster's statement of the difference between *religion* and *theology* this root means more than a sense of duty in the abstract; it means a sense of duty toward God. "*Re*" means "back again, or anew," and "*lig*" means, as the *Press* says, obligation, or something binding; it follows that the Christian religion means binding again to the Christian's God. The sense of duty is religion; but before there can be that sense of duty there must be some knowledge of God, or at least some mental conception of Deity, however false that conception may be.

Again, the *Press* says, "a nation may be Christian in its sense of duty without being Christian in its theology." But that this is impossible appears from the fact that the sense of duty is Christian only as it springs from an acknowledgment of the authority of the Christian's God; but without Christian teaching or Christian theology, there can be no proper conception of the true God, hence no sense of duty to him.

The whole idea of the *Press* writer evidently is that the morality inculcated by Christ should be adopted and taught in the public schools without any reference to its Author, and without giving it the added prestige of the name of Christ; that is, it would be Christianity with *Christ* left out. But there can in reality be no such thing as Christianity without Christ. Acts are *Christian* only as they spring from Christian motives. The New Testament teaches that even the common everyday acts and duties of life are to be done "to the glory of God." It is the motive as much as the act itself which constitutes an act Christian. There can be, therefore, no such thing as Christianity with Christ left out; and no Christian would be satisfied to teach the "religion of humanity" even as Christ taught it, without telling who it was that taught it, and thus adding to it the influence of his name and nature.

Christianity is vastly more than a code of morals; it is a divine scheme for the moral elevation of men who have sinned. It not only teaches men how to live, but it teaches them how to become free from past transgression; it promises pardon for sins that are past, and gives assurance of power to overcome temptation and avoid sin in the future. Both the pardon for the past and the power for the future come through Christ. It is manifest that to leave Christ out of Christianity is to emasculate the whole system, and leave man to struggle in the slough of his own moral corruption without pardon for the

past or strength for the future. The *Press* says that a nation can be Christian in its religion without being Christian in its theology; but such Christianity as that would be no better than the paganism described by the Apostle Paul in the first chapter of Romans. It is true that the State cannot properly teach theology; it is equally true that every Christian should insist that it shall not teach as Christianity or as religion, the morality inculcated by Christ, but with Christ left out. The State must in justice to all let both religion and theology alone. C. P. B.

An Iniquitous Measure.

THE Blair Sunday-rest bill is still before Congress, waiting the opportune moment when it can be pushed forward by its friends with hope of success. It was introduced in the Senate by Hon. H. W. Blair, December 9, 1889, read twice, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. This bill has been repeatedly published, and is familiar to most of our readers. To those who have not given the matter thought, the law contemplated in the bill seems reasonable, and the arguments advanced in its favor plausible. We wish, at this time, to point out some of the reasons not only why the bill should not become law, but why every citizen of this Republic ought to raise his voice against it.

1. It is unconstitutional in that it is religious legislation. We know that it is claimed that it is not religious legislation; only a "civil Sabbath" is desired. But the Sabbath is not a civil institution; it is a religious institution, and the bill recognizes repeatedly that phase of the question. The bill is, according to the title, to secure to the people not only the privileges of rest, but of "*religious worship*." Among the prohibitions of Section 3, are works which are not the "observance [of the first day] as a day of *religious worship*." Thus the bill has a religious object, as shown in the title and the exceptions made. It is therefore religious legislation, and is contrary to the First Amendment to the Constitution, which declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The first-day Sabbath is a so-called Christian institution, and its establishment by law is the recognition and establishment of that religious system to which the institution belongs. The Constitution is right, as proved by the history of all religious legislation of the past. The bill is unconstitutional, and therefore wrong.

2. The bill, if it became law, would subject many people—good, honest citizens—to the whims and caprices of their neighbors. The first section declares that no person, etc., "shall perform or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business *to the disturbance of*

others; . . . nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation *to the disturbance of others* on the first day of the week, commonly known as Sunday, or during any part thereof." See also section 6. There are many professed Sunday-keepers who believe in recreation on Sunday. There are many men, whose work confines them through the week, who find rest and recreation in working in their garden on Sunday. There are those who observe some other day as a Sabbath who, to support themselves and families, are compelled to work on the first day at their regular business, which they, of course, under the Constitution, have the right to do.

But why mention these classes? asks one. The law would not interfere with them if they did not "disturb others." But that is just the point. They could do no known work, they could indulge in no game or exercise on Sunday without disturbing some bigoted Sunday-keeper. Whether such an one saw his neighbor at work or not it would *disturb* him just as much as though that neighbor was hammering on his door-post. Many consciences are easily disturbed by the acts of others. The good Sunday-keepers of Scotland were so disturbed a few years since that they could leave their devotions on the day which they held as holy, to stone some fishermen who attempted to land fish on that day. Some good Sunday-keepers of the East are greatly disturbed because California has no Sunday law. Well-meaning and merciful men might, through mistake, pass such a law, but religious bigots would make it cruelly operative.

3. The bill is also a bid for injustice and oppression. Section 5 reads:—

That it shall be unlawful to pay or receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered or for labor performed or for the transportation of persons or of property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie [hold good] for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whosoever shall first sue for the same.

A more iniquitous measure has not been framed in the nineteenth century. A man may be honestly employed by an honest man to do honest work on Sunday which interferes with no one but the men engaged. These men are there from choice. But under such a law as this the employer has no right to pay for the profits he has received from the poor man's labor; the poor man has no right to receive the compensation which is his due for service rendered and strength and time expended in legitimate, honest toil. His family may be suffering for the wages earned, but he has no right to receive them, and if he does, any vagabond, bigot, or rascal has the right to sue him and recover the same. The bill is worthy only of the Dark Ages. It is a sad thing that one man can be found to frame such a measure; it is sadder still to know that there are so many who will advocate and support it. But as it has

been framed and supported, so certainly would it be enforced if it should become law.

4. The passing of such a bill would destroy not only religious equality but civil, or political, equality. It would divide by law the people of the United States into classes, so far as the law has jurisdiction. The first class, the highly honored, would be Sunday-keepers, placed in position by a mere majority. These would be granted absolute freedom. The second class would be those who observe another day, for whom a sort of exemption is made, which really is no exemption, and which would soon be swept away for obvious reasons, as soon as the law was enacted. The bill does not prohibit their laboring on Sunday, neither does it sanction it, but it makes its legitimacy depend on so frail a foundation as the "disturbance of others." The third class will be those who do not believe in the sacredness of Sunday or religious legislation, and who do not regard any day as the Sabbath. The law counts these as criminals, however faithful or conscientious they may be. This class discrimination does not come because one class is better citizens or better men, but solely on account of a religious tenet or institution. The Sunday would therefore be the sole difference. A matter of conscience (?) with the majority is made the matter of a crime in the minority. And the man who observed another day than Sunday, whose labor disturbed the consciences of others, would be compelled by the law to render one-sixth of his income for the sake of the majority. That is, the Government would exact from him one day in the week, which it would not from the Sunday-keeper. The foregoing is a sample of Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts's boasted "equality" and "justice" of Sunday laws.

5. Such a law as contemplated by the bill would place the Government against God. The Sabbath and religious worship belong to God alone. The observance of the one and the rendering of the other are duties which men owe to their Creator, and for which they will have to give account at his tribunal. When Government, therefore, attempts to regulate, limit, or define such duties, it arrogates to itself powers and prerogatives which belong only to God, and becomes a usurper. Jesus said, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which be Cæsar's, and unto God the things which be God's." The Sabbath belongs to God; to him it ought to be rendered, not by constraint, but of one's own free will.

The foregoing are some of the reasons why the Blair Sunday-rest bill should be opposed by every good citizen, every lover of liberty, and, more than all else, by every Christian. The gospel of Christ has naught to do with civil law.—*M. C. W., in Signs of the Times.*

Memorials of 1829-30. No. 5.

A PROTEST FROM THE LEGISLATURE OF INDIANA AGAINST SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

THE interest aroused in the Sunday agitation of 1829-30 can only be fully appreciated by those who went through the Sunday campaign in California in 1883, or who have read the theological conflict between Arianism and Athanasianism in the Roman Empire. Mr. Ben: Perley Poore, an old official of the United States Senate, in his "Reminiscences" (page 101), says: "The members of several religious denominations were prominent in their demonstrations, and in *Philadelphia, chains secured by padlocks, were stretched across the streets on Sundays* to prevent the passage of the mail coaches." Is it a wonder that such fanaticism called forth the remonstrances which are here being presented?

The "reiterated and untiring efforts" of these religio-political agitators, who were flooding Congress with petitions, began to assume a serious aspect. So much so that the Legislature of the State of Indiana considered that a formal remonstrance on its part was demanded. It accordingly passed the following memorial, which was transmitted by the Governor, February 15, 1830, to the parties mentioned in the resolution:—

MEMORIAL OF THE STATE OF INDIANA.

The memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana respectfully represents:

That we view all attempts to introduce sectarian influence into the councils of the Nation as a violation of both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution of the United States and of this State, and at the same time dangerous to our civil and religious liberties, inasmuch as those charters secure to every man the free exercise of his religion and the right to worship the Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and inasmuch as any legislative interference in matters of religion would be an infraction of those rights.

We, therefore, most respectfully remonstrate against any attempt, by a combination of one or more sects, to alter the laws providing for the transportation of the mail, and against the passage of a law to regulate or enforce the observance of religious duties, or which may interfere with what belongs to the conscience of each individual.

That all legislative interference in matters of religion is contrary to the genius of Christianity; and that there are no doctrines or observances inculcated by the Christian religion which require the arm of the civil power either to enforce or sustain them.

That we consider every connection between Church and State at all times dangerous to civil and religious liberty; and, further,

That we cordially agree to and approve of the able report of the Hon. R. M. Johnson, adopted by the Senate of the United States at its last session, upon the petitions for prohibiting the transportation of the mail on Sunday; and while we protest in the most solemn manner against every attempt to enforce, by legislative interference, the observance of any particular day, yet we believe that both the spiritual and temporal interest of mankind is promoted by setting apart one day in the week for the purpose of rest, religious instruction and the worship of God.

Resolved, That his excellency the Governor, be requested to transmit a copy of the foregoing memorial to each of our Senators and Representatives

in Congress, and to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives." *

The result of these memorials was to bring forth the celebrated report of the House Committee on Post-offices and Post-roads, of which Colonel Johnson, of Kentucky, was chairman at this time. The report was even more emphatic than that which the Senate had adopted the previous session. Thus meeting a signal defeat again, the movement considered that the opposition was too strong at that stage of our history, and reluctantly retired to the background until a more convenient time and a people less jealous of their liberties should come upon the stage of action; and then, profiting by their former defeat, to enter the struggle with renewed vigor, and to tear down as far as possible the secular features of our Government. May their present and all future attempts be as successful as was the celebrated Sunday movement of 1829-30 is the patriotic wish of

W. A. BLAKELY.

Sound Opinions.

THE *Christian Inquirer*, a Baptist paper published in this city, has in its issue of December 4, a symposium on the proper attitude of Baptists as to religious instruction in the public schools, from which we take the following extracts:—

Baptists have stoutly maintained from the beginning the doctrine of the independence of Church and State. Loyalty to that doctrine forbids the teaching of religion by the State as clearly as it forbids the assumption of civil functions by the Church. "Religion" is a word which needs definition, and if the State be allowed to define it she will always do so in the interests of the dominant ecclesiasticism, which may be, as it often has been, godless. That we may keep God in the State let us keep religion out of its control; and rather than sanction the authority of civil Government as a religious teacher we shall do well to adopt the parochial school system, and transfer control of all education from the State to the churches. But the public school system of the American Union is the direct outgrowth of religious liberty, and its most glorious expression. It furnishes a common sphere in which religion can be illustrated but not taught, adorned, but not enforced, and if the churches are half alive within their proper domain society can receive only blessing from such so-called secular schools.

EDWARD BRAISLIN.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Church and State are separate, though each reacts upon the other. The functions of the State are civil, of the Church religious. The public school is a civil institution supported by the State. No religious instruction, therefore, can be given in it. The State can no more teach religion than the Church can make laws. Through the home and schools of its own the Church must care for the religious training of the young. Intelligence being the basis of true citizenship the State must educate, but for the State to attempt to teach religion is simply to furnish a valid plea to any sectarian body to demand a division of the school fund.

W. W. BOYD.

Newark, N. J.

Our convictions and teaching in regard to "religious liberty" compel us to hold that no religious tenets of any sort shall be taught in the public

schools. Absolutely equal rights must prevail in an institution supported by public taxation.

NATHAN E. WOOD.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

I strongly favor giving up the reading of the Bible in public schools. That seems to me clearly the Baptist policy—separating Church from State. Equally clearly is it the best policy, disarming all reasonable opposition to the schools. Much has been lost in not resorting to it earlier.

E. BENJ. ANDREWS.

Brown University.

For the public school teacher as such to teach religion as a part of his duty to the State is for him to usurp a function which does not belong to the State; to concede the claim of the papal Church; to play the tyrant; to degrade religion by unholy alliance. The formal teaching of religion in State schools is not Americanism, not Christianity, but Hildebrandism, State-Churchism.

T. EDWIN BROWN.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Sunday Mails.

A WESTERN Pennsylvania clergyman has been criticising Wanamaker as an ungodly public servant for allowing the mails over which he has the supervision to be carried on Sunday. To this charge Wanamaker has made a reply, in which he repudiates responsibility for the offense and refers the clergyman to Congress as the body with whom authority in the matter resides. He also takes occasion to say that in his opinion Sunday rest for mails in transit is impracticable. "To stop the handling of Sunday mails," he says, "means to stop the wheels of the railroads throughout the country at twelve o'clock on Saturday. In that event there would be no protection for mails in transit. Hundreds of thousands of dollars pass through the mails every day, and the custody of the mail in a car standing on the track, while crossing the prairie, or even at a small village, would be a serious matter. It would be a great accomplishment for Sunday rest if the mail dispatched from Omaha or San Francisco could lay up at twelve o'clock Saturday night, but what would become of the postal clerks, engineers, and train hands is not clear."

We have not seen the full text of Wanamaker's reply to the clergyman; but he is abridged as saying that if any community, by the petition of a considerable majority of its population, would ask for the absolute closing of its office on Sunday the request would receive favorable consideration. "Still," he adds, "it must be remembered that the post-office is not a private office, and that it is the duty of its servants to serve according to law," and he admits . . . "that those who have different views of Sunday keeping have a right to consideration."

Mr. Wanamaker's recognition of the truth that the post-office is not a private office, to be open or closed according to the religious prejudices of the postmaster and his fellow church members, marks quite a long step in the direction of sense. . . . He might now go farther and declare that

the post-office is not a religious office, and that therefore religious reverence for Sunday cannot be regarded as a good excuse for stopping mail trains on that day. People who do not want their mail carried on Sunday should deposit it on Monday morning. It is not practicable for ships to lay-to over the holy day, but mails will go anywhere from the Atlantic to the Pacific between one Sunday and the next.—*Freethought*.

The Trend of the Age.

THE Washington *Post* recently published the following New York letter, under this heading:—

P A T E R N A L I S M T H E E N D .

A WESTERN PROPHET OF EVIL.

"It is generally conceded, I believe," said a well-known Western lawyer of prominence, "that we are not only growing more powerful as a Nation year by year, but that we are drifting slowly and surely toward what is called a paternal Government. Both of the political parties have contributed to that end. We have only to study the record of recent Congresses to note the rapidity with which we are travelling in that direction. The whole tendency of national legislation is to the enlargement of the powers and the extension of the duties of the general Government. Of late years my legal practice has involved some of the broader constitutional questions, and this gradual change has forced itself upon my attention. The political complexion of the new order of things does not disturb me. On the contrary, this gradual modification of our original system must be regarded as the legitimate and beneficial result of a higher state of civilization.

Whether it is so regarded by all men or not, we may as well admit that such a change is in progress. There are those who lament the change. I do not. There are those who think this departure from the early tenets of our fathers is the forerunner of national decline and dissolution. But they are growing fewer every year. Even the great body of the Democratic party has cut loose from State rights and strict construction and become converts to the paternal school. In my section of the country the proposition for the general Government to assume ownership and charge of the telegraph lines and railroads is no longer looked upon as undesirable, but if put to vote in a general election it would receive the sanction of three-fourths of the people. If you and I live ten years longer we'll probably see it accomplished. Postal savings banks will follow. And—"

"The loaning of Government money on farm mortgages?" was suggested.

"Very likely. Why not? Why shouldn't the farmers have an equal right with the national bankers?"

"Are they all Socialists up there in the Northwest?"

"If you call that Socialism three-fourths of us are Socialists. Not in the sense of wishing to turn things over at once by force, but as desiring a paternal Government by law, yes—nearly all.

This frank avowal from the lips of a hard-headed lawyer and wealthy citizen, who makes his temporary home at the Hoffman House, was enough to deprive a man of his breath. He continues:

"My statement is not a speculative one at all. Nor has it any political significance, in the narrow and common acceptance of that term. I am a Republican, but never was in politics, and never will be. I am speaking now as an independent citizen. I am speaking, too, only of the people of the section of country I know something about. Perhaps there are other sections where the sentiment is the same.

* "American State Papers," class vii, page 240; published by authority of Congress in 1834.

From what I read of the Farmers' Alliance in the South, and from the recent action of the railway employes in this State, and from general report of sentiment elsewhere I should say this idea was becoming general—but I do not insist on that. The cry of paternal Government is no longer a bugbear. In principle it is not a new departure. It is now only a question of growth. We begin to recognize this from the Supreme Court down."

"Do you think this change in our system is the way to reach the greatest good to the greatest number?"

"Ah, now you want an opinion!" he exclaimed. "My opinion on this point is worth no more than any other man's. To the public it is worth nothing. I have been merely stating facts that have come under my observation. I would not call it a change in our system—the system remains the same—elections by the present process, officers and terms of office the same. It is more properly a change in the application of the system and one contemplated as possible by the framers of the Constitution. It is the national progression of a great people. We improve on the old model as we go along. The war of '61 demonstrated that the original plan needed a vigorous overhauling. I think it improved things materially. Even those who opposed it, arms in hand, think so now. So the paternalizing of the Government—the bringing of it nearer to the new wants of the people—may result in increased personal happiness and national prosperity.

"The question of farm mortgages is a very serious one in the Northwest. People who pay eight and ten per cent. on their borrowed money begin to feel the hopelessness of their situation. The source of all national wealth is in the producer, and the agriculturist is the great producer. In times of financial stringency from over speculation, the Treasury of the United States comes promptly to the rescue of the Wall Street operator. Why should not the Government come to the assistance of the farmer when he gets in a financial hole? I do not suggest any particular way; but let it find some practical way."

"What's the matter with the Government leaving the money with him, instead of taking it by taxation and loaning it back to him?" was inquired.

This query rather floored the political economist from the Northwest, but he recovered in time to observe that it was a scheme worthy of consideration.

"And in this progressive system of paternal Government where do you draw the line of demarcation, where the Government shall stop, and where the people may think and act for themselves? Will it be at the governmental control of the telegraph lines, the railroads, the establishment of postal savings banks, the taking up of the farm mortgages at a nominal rate of interest? Or will it extend its uniformed hand to the running of flouring mills, breweries and manufactories, &c."

"I would draw no line. The representatives of the people in Congress assembled would presumably represent the views of their constituents in the matter. This Government is supposed to be by the people, of the people, and for the people. The trouble is that you consider the Government as something apart from, something not of, the people—it is the people, acting for themselves. The Government belongs to the people, and not the people to the Government. I have just been trying to enforce this idea in an argument before the Secretary of the Interior, at Washington, in a big land case. If the people want their Government to stand in its official capacity between them and poverty and ruin, they have the right to demand that it shall do so, and this without reference to preconceived theories, or of governmental systems of other countries. There is a legal way to express this demand, and that is through the ballot-box and the impartial administration of the laws made by their representatives."

The open expression of such sentiments as these, coupled with a clear view of the social, political, and legislative tendency of

the times, is an evidence of the beginning of the end. Month by month it becomes more certain that there are increasing numbers of able, influential men throughout the country, who not only see the political storm-cloud rising, but hail its coming as a coveted opportunity for action and the profitable exercise of their abilities.

W. H. M.

Petty Persecution.

THE *Truth Seeker* relates the following story of petty persecution for opinion's sake, illustrative, also, of the folly of making criminal upon one day that which is held to be perfectly legitimate upon other days:—

Returning from the American Secular Union Congress, Mr. L. K. Washburn stopped to lecture at Alliance, Ohio. There he learned of an attempt to preserve the "Sabbath" holy by persecuting a Freethinker. Mr. P. L. Dattlebaum, in common with other dealers, has kept his cigar store open on Sundays for years. He carries, in connection with cigars and tobacco, a line of gents' furnishing goods. His Sunday trade, however, has been mostly in cigars. One Sunday in October he sold a linen collar, and was notified the next morning by the police authorities to close his place of business on the following Sunday. He did so, but noticed that every other cigar dealer kept open store the same as usual. Not thinking all were treated alike, Mr. Dattlebaum opened his doors when the next Sunday came around and was arrested on Monday morning. He was again arrested in two weeks for the same offense. He appealed his case, and we shall await with interest the decision of the higher court. What makes the case look like persecution is that not another person has been ordered to close his cigar store or has been arrested for selling his goods on Sunday. Mr. Dattlebaum is an outspoken Freethinker, and thinks that religious prejudice has prompted the action against him. But imagine the authorities of a city or town giving a license to sell tobacco, cigars, etc., on Sunday, and prosecuting a man for selling a linen collar on that day, exclaims Mr. Washburn. It seems that cleanliness is *not* next to godliness in the opinion of some people. We are at a loss to understand how a Christian can strain at a linen collar and swallow a plug of tobacco or a cigar on his Sabbath day. It would seem as though a man with a clean collar would make a better appearance on and do greater honor to the Sunday than a man with a cigar in his mouth, but evidently the Christian conscience is more wounded by the sale of clean linen on the Sunday than by the sale of a filthy weed.

Is it any wonder that infidels abound when such things are done in the supposed interests of Christian institutions?

THE *Young Men's Era* says of THE SENTINEL that it "is evidently published in the interest of those who oppose the general observance of the Sabbath day." It is evident that the editor of the *Era* knows nothing about THE AMERICAN SENTINEL. The editors of this paper keep the Sabbath, and use their influence to persuade others to keep it also, but they are opposed to all laws requiring anybody to keep either the Sabbath or any other day for any reason whatever. The Sabbath is a religious institution, and Sabbath-keeping is a religious observance; and both should be absolutely free from the trammels of civil laws.

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.

THOSE who wish to do so and who have not already had the opportunity of so doing, or who have neglected it, are requested to sign BOTH of the following petitions and send them to W. H. MCKEE, 225 A Street, N. E., Washington, D. C. If room for more names is desired the petition may be cut out and pasted on to a sheet of legal cap.

To the Honorable, the House of Representatives of the United States:—
We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way give preference to the principles of any one religion above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion; but that the total separation between religion and the State, assured by our National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it.

To the Honorable, the Senate of the United States:—
We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way give preference to the principles of any one religion above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion; but that the total separation between religion and the State, assured by our National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it.

THE Minneapolis *Journal* reports a dispatch from Winnipeg, Manitoba, which says: "The most important judgment ever given in Manitoba was delivered by Judge Killam, November 24, in the celebrated appeal of the Roman Catholics against an Act passed by the last Legislature abolishing separate schools. The decision is against the Catholics, but the case will be appealed to England, as the Catholics will not be satisfied until a decision is obtained there."

DO YOU USE A FOUNTAIN PEN?

Then you need the **COMBINED INK BOTTLE AND PEN FILLER**, consisting of a bottle holding ink sufficient to fill a pen 8 or 10 times, with a Patent Rubber Cork and Filler, all inclosed in a neat wooden case with a screw top, making the safest, most complete, compact, and convenient article for the use of traveling men and others now extant. Weighs when filled with ink less than three ounces.

Imitation Rose-wood case, 25c.
Real Box-wood, " 50c.

Sent post-paid on receipt of price.

Address,
PACIFIC PRESS PUB. 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.

The following numbers are now ready, and will be sent to any address post-paid on receipt of price:—

- No. 1 *The National Reformed Constitution.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 2 *Religious Liberty.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 3 *Evils of Religious Legislation.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 4 *The Blair Sunday Rest Bill.* Price, 7 cents.
- No. 5 *The Blair Educational Amendment.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 6 *Purity of National Religion.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 7 *National Reform and Rights of Conscience.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 8 *The American Papacy.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 9 *The Salem Witchcraft.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 10 *National Reform is Church and State.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 11 *What Think Ye of Christ?* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 12 *Bold and Base Avowal.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 13 *The National Reform Movement an Absurdity.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 14 *The Republic of Israel.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 15 *National Reformed Presbyterianism.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 16 *A Lutheran View of the National Reform Movement.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 17 *Religion and the Public Schools.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 18 *The National Sunday Law.* Price, 25 cents.
- No. 19 *Rev. W. F. Crafts Against the Editors of The American Sentinel.* Price, 10 cents.
- No. 20 *Romanism and Civil Liberty.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 21 *Why We Oppose Religious Legislation.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 22 *The American Sabbath Union and Human Rights.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 23 *A Civil Sunday Holiday.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 24 *Blair's Sunday Rest Bill and Joint Resolution, introduced December 9, 1889. (Exact copies, with notes).* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 25 *Civil Government and the Decalogue.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 26 *National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 28 *A Religious Political Movement.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 29 *Arguments on the Breckinridge Sunday Bill. The Object and Price of Exemption Clauses.* Price, 10 cents.
- No. 30 *A Civil Sabbath. What It Amounts to.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 31 *Union of Church and State. What Constitutes Such a Union?* Price, 1c.

Address:
Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
OAKLAND, CAL.

Or, **Atlantic Tract Society,**
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

SIBERIA AND THE NIHILISTS

WHY KENNAN WENT TO SIBERIA,

By **William Jackson Armstrong,**

(Late Inspector General of United States Consulates.)

This is one of the most intensely interesting and thoroughly reliable contributions to literature on Russia and the Nihilists ever published. It comprises Mr. Armstrong's famous lecture on "Siberia and the Nihilists" (delivered first in Cooper Union, New York, and afterwards by special request of many eminent men in Lincoln Hall, Washington), together with some exceedingly interesting letters and newspaper criticisms from the pens of the author and George Kennan, the Siberian traveller.

EVERYBODY SHOULD READ THIS BOOK,

because no one can be intelligent upon the subject of which it treats without familiarity with its contents. Besides, the book is a powerful stimulus to that love of liberty so essential to the maintenance of free Government.

It contains some pointed and caustic criticisms upon Mr. Kennan's defense of the Russian Government after his first visit to that country, and explains

WHY KENNAN WENT TO SIBERIA

the second time. The *Century* articles which were the result of that visit fully justify the position taken, and the statements made by Mr. Armstrong in 1888.

160 PAGES, PAPER COVERS, PRICE 25 cents.

PACIFIC PRESS, NEW YORK, N. Y., and OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.

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 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.

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.

HEALTH FOOD CRACKERS

HEALTH produces wealth; and good health can not be made of poor material. The agitation of this health question for some years in the past has created a demand for

HEALTHFUL FOODS,

in the manufacture of which we have for the past ten years been engaged. The demand having constantly increased, we have found it necessary to greatly increase our facilities by the addition of new and the latest improved machinery, etc. We are now well equipped, and prepared to fill all orders, and to extend our business into new fields.

Our Foods and Crackers are made from the choicest grains and are strictly pure, justly entitling them to the name above given.

SAMPLE PACKAGES

Of assorted Health Food Crackers sent post-paid on receipt of fifty cents. Write for descriptive circular and price list to

Battle Creek Bakery Co.,
163 WEST MAIN ST.,
Battle Creek, Mich.

IS THE PAPACY IN PROPHECY?

BY THE

Rev. Thomas W. Haskins, M. A.,
Rector Christ Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

The above is the title of a treatise written by the author at the request of the Ministerial Union of Los Angeles, California. It grew out of a discussion upon the present aspect and aims of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, the author taking the ground that the rise, progress, present and future condition of the temporal power known as the Papacy, or Vaticanism, is outlined in the prophecies of Holy Scriptures with sufficient accuracy to determine what the "Papacy" is, and what is to be its future development and ultimate end.

PAPER COVERS, 25 CENTS.
CLOTH COVERS, 60 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Address,
Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK;
12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.,
Or, **LOS ANGELES CHURCHMAN, 35 California**
Bank Building, Los Angeles, Cal.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET

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

PRICES.

No. 1	Russia leather, for 2 pens	10c.
No. 2	" " " 3 "	15c.
No. 3	" " metal back, 2 pens,	15c.
No. 4	" " " 3 "	20c.
No. 5	Sealskin, for 2 pens,	15c.
No. 6	" " " 3 "	25c.
No. 7	Russia Leather, for 4 pens	25c.
No. 8	Sealskin, " 4 "	40c.

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.

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.



NEW YORK, DECEMBER 18, 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.

JOSEPH COOK says: "With a glorious American common school system and a glorious American church, there can be a glorious American Republic; not otherwise." What does Mr. Cook mean by "a glorious American church"? Does he mean a church established by law and supported by the State as the schools are established and supported?

A LETTER from Salem, Oregon, brings the intelligence that Mr. Crafts has arranged to have a Sunday bill introduced into the Legislature of that State at its next session, which begins January 12, 1891. If we mistake not the gentleman who is to have charge of the bill will find that he has a big job on his hands. The friends of religious liberty are awake in Oregon.

AUSTIN, Minnesota, is agitated over the fact that Sunday work has been done on the new public school building in that town. The Methodist Sunday school recently adopted a series of resolutions denouncing the work as "a flagrant violation of the law, and an outrage upon the religious sentiment of this community, and an open assault upon the American Sabbath."

THE *Christian at Work* remarks that "the Baptists, the only evangelical denomination that was not represented in the recent meeting in New York, at which it was unanimously agreed that church property should not be taxed, considered the question at a meeting in Baltimore on the 24th ult. All the Baptist ministers in Baltimore agreed that church property should be taxed, but differed as to the manner in which the tax should be imposed."

OUR readers will remember that in our issue of November 27, we made brief mention of the arrest of two men, Robert Gibb and William Fritz, in Howard County, Missouri, for doing farm work on Sunday. They were placed under bonds for their appearance at the Circuit Court December 2, 1890. The State Attorney, in his official zeal, forgot, or was ignorant of, an exemption clause for seventh-day observers in the legal code of Missouri. In the interim he seems to have informed himself upon this point, for when the day

set for the trial arrived, he entered a *nolle prosequi*, the State paying the costs. Large delegations had come from the surrounding country to witness the trial.

MONDAY, December 1, the American Sabbath Union filed its certificate of incorporation. Its object is "to have the Sabbath generally observed as a day of rest and worship." "The founders of the Union are General O. O. Howard, Postmaster-General John Wanamaker, Col. Elliott F. Shepard, J. F. Hurst, J. M. King, Edward G. Andrews, Robert S. MacArthur, A. C. Widekind, Leighton Williams, Robert C. Alexander, W. R. Worrell, Alexander S. Bacon, and Chief Justice Noah Davis."

It will be observed that in stating the object of the Union its incorporators say, "To have the Sabbath generally observed as a day of rest and worship." They appeal to the law-making power to enable them to accomplish their object, therefore they appeal to the State to cause men to worship.

THE second annual session of the American Sabbath Union was held in Philadelphia on the 8th and 9th insts. The session was a stormy one and anything but creditable to the management. Mr. Crafts, who made the Union, broke with it several months since, and labored independently in the West during the summer and fall. The meeting was, it appears, appointed early in the week, to shut out Western delegates, who were, as a rule, favorable to Mr. Crafts and hostile to the New York management. Nevertheless the Crafts men were there in sufficient numbers to seriously divide the flock, notwithstanding the fact that they had a Shepard (Colonel Elliott F.) over them.

Colonel Shepard was re-elected President; the incorporation secured before the meeting was approved; a board of twenty-one directors were elected; and the Constitution amended in several important particulars; but the outlook for the Union is not promising. Jealousies and dissensions are weakening it, and unless wiser counsels prevail during the coming year than appeared in the Philadelphia meeting, their bond of union may prove a rope of sand.

THE Sabbath Association of Pennsylvania seems not to have had perfectly clear sailing at its recent meeting in Pittsburg: Rev. D. S. Kennedy had been placed upon the programme for an address, which would probably never have been made had the managers of the meeting known beforehand just what Mr. Kennedy was going to say; for he vigorously opposed Sunday legislation; deprecated the idea of making people moral by civil law, and asked the assembled delegates if their interest in the Sabbath was due to any human enactment. We regret that we have not a copy of

Mr. Kennedy's speech, as we should like very much to publish it. If all ministers had as clear views of the proper relations between Church and State, and of the appropriate sphere of civil law, THE SENTINEL would not need to be published, and the so-called Sabbath Unions might go out of business, and the energy required to run them could be devoted to legitimate Christian work.

WE not only admit, but we maintain the right of the State to establish an educational qualification for voters. But it would not purify politics. Educated men are pretty equally divided between the two great parties, and so are the ignorant and the vicious; indeed the latter are dangerous to the country only as they are manipulated and used by the former. Many of the ignorant are honest, and many of the educated are dishonest.

THE King's Daughters, an organization which, we regret to say, is hand in glove with the National Reformers, has a membership of over one hundred and sixty thousand. This order comprises an "unsectarian body of Christian women," having for their original object the advancement of religion and charity. But like the Woman's Christian Temperance Union they are spending time, money, and energy on side issues.

ARCHBISHOP RYAN is credited with the following: "If all the people of the country were Catholics, and all politicians good, pious men, then such union [union of Church and State] would produce good effects, but as the world is at present, it is better to have them separate and let them work out their ends."

No Paper Next Week.

As the present volume of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL is to consist of fifty numbers, we will issue no paper next week. No. 1, Vol. 6, will bear date of January 1, 1891.

Index for Volume V.

AN index for volume V of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL has been printed, and will be furnished free, upon application, to those desiring it.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,

DEVOTED TO

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

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

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

In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, each, . . . 75c.
To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid, . . . 5s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL.

43 Bond Street, New York.