



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 1, 1891.

NUMBER 1.

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 *Canadian Baptist*, of November 6, 1890, has the following: "The appropriation of public moneys to sectarian uses by State Legislatures is exciting much and increasing discussion in the United States. Thoughtful and far-seeing citizens in the different States are coming to see more and more clearly that such use of the public funds is wrong in principle and pernicious in practice."

KNOWLEDGE of good and evil affords no assurance of a greater love of the one or of a greater hatred of the other than would exist in ignorance. Our first parents no doubt found the devil well enough informed. The archangel Michael and the arch-devil Lucifer may have the same intellectual ability and the same intellectual attainments, but the fidelity of the one and the disobedience of the other make heaven and hell. Unless knowledge ripens into moral force it becomes the tool of selfishness and sin.—*Rev. E. P. Marvin.*

CARDINAL GIBBONS thinks that first of all, Sunday should be devoted to religion. Presupposing that a certain portion of the day is set apart for religious exercises, he thinks that "any recreation that will contribute to the physical, mental, and moral enjoyment of the masses should be encouraged. Baseball playing is inconsistent with a proper observance. The church desires the Sabbath to be cheerful without dissipation, grave and religious without sadness and melancholy; and prescribes the golden mean between rigid sabbata-

rianism on the one hand and lax indulgence on the other." This is all well enough for the Catholic Church; it has a perfect right to require its members to observe Sunday in this way if it so elects, but neither that church nor any other has any right to ask the State to compel people to either do or forbear any act on Sunday simply because the church holds it to be improper upon that day.

The Situation as It Is To-day.

WITH the issue of this number, THE AMERICAN SENTINEL enters upon the sixth year of its publication. When THE SENTINEL was started there was but one organization—the National Reform Association—working to secure what THE SENTINEL was established to oppose. Now there are four such organizations wholly pledged to it. These four are the National Reform Association, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the American Sabbath Union, and the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, besides the Presbyterian General Assembly, and the Methodist Conference of New York. Then, the one organization, though not very large, except in its head, was active and influential. Now, all of these organizations are much larger, very active, and very influential, both in their heads and in their members. Then, the one organization had made no decided success in securing religious legislation, now, all of these organizations have had most decided, and, to the careful student of public affairs, startling success in this bad direction

At this the beginning of this new year in an everlasting campaign, it will be well to take a glance at the field as it at this moment appears as related to religious legislation. How many measures are pending in Congress which propose to commit the Government to the guardianship and the teaching of religion?

1. The Blair Sunday Bill, which proposes to secure "the observance" of Sunday as a day of "rest and worship."

2. The Breckinridge Sunday Bill, which, like the Blair Sunday Bill, proposes to enforce a "conscientious belief in, and observance of," a day of rest.

These bills both propose by law to require everybody to conscientiously believe in and observe some day as a day of rest. But everybody has both the natural and constitutional right to observe or not to observe a day of rest, just as he pleases, whether he conscientiously believes in it or not. He has just as much right not to do it as he has to do it. The Legislature invades the freedom of religious worship when it assumes the power to compel a man conscientiously to do anything. The principle is the same whether the law compels us to do that which we wish to do, or whether it compels us to do that which we do *not* wish to do. The compulsory power does not exist in either case. In either case the State assumes control of the rights of conscience; and the freedom of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience is gone, and thenceforth all are required to worship according to the dictates of the State, *that is*, according to the caprice of majorities. But the American Constitution has forbidden the Federal Government to invade "the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul." Therefore these two Sunday bills do distinctly invade both the constitutional and the natural rights of the American people.

3. The Blair Educational Amendment. This measure proposes to amend the national Constitution so that it shall empower Congress to enforce upon all, the teaching of the Christian religion.

4. The Blair Educational Bill, the intent of which is to open the way for the easier adoption of the proposed amendment, and for the fuller exercise of the power of Congress in enforcing its provisions.

5. The Edmunds University Bill, which proposes to establish a national university, and provides for the teaching of "Christian theology" in said university. Theol-

ogy is the science concerning God. To establish a national theology is to create a national god; and the enforced service and worship of that god will logically and certainly follow. For as soon as that bill should become a law, then a contention would arise among all the leading sects in the land, to decide which of them should teach and represent the "Christian theology" required.

6. Several bills greatly enlarging the number of chaplains in the Army. It is true that, in defiance of the Constitution and of the principles of the Government, chaplains have been employed all these years. Yet in connection with all the other efforts to make religion an essential element in the Government, this is significant enough to deserve mention in this list. It is difficult to conceive how the Constitution could be more openly disregarded than it is and always has been in the appointment of chaplains. The Constitution declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the Government," while for the office of chaplain religion is the very qualification that is required, and specifically the Christian religion at that.

7. Appropriations of public money for religious uses. We have given in full the facts and the items which show that more than \$600,000 is given annually by the Government to certain churches, to be used by those churches in teaching their own church doctrines to their own church members and adherents. We have given the items which show that these appropriations, beginning with the fiscal year of 1885-86, with only a little more than \$227,000, grew so rapidly that for the fiscal year of 1890-91, the sum was more than \$604,000. Thus in five years, increasing by two and two-third times the amount with which the appropriations started. We have given the facts which show that by this means the church power has already secured such a hold upon the Government that it is found impossible to shake it off.

These are the measures that are now actually framed in legislative proposals, and are to-day pending in Congress—the last two of them actually in force. There is another measure, which, although not yet introduced in Congress, is so far on the way that it is proper to mention it in this list. That is, the Constitutional Amendment proposed by the National League for the Protection of American Institutions. This measure in its intent means all that any one of the others does; but it is so framed as to convey the impression that it is not only a safe but a necessary measure.

Now any one of these taken alone, in itself and in the intent with which it is proposed, means only a union of Church and State. How much more then do they mean this when they are all taken together. And yet how much more do they

mean it, when they must not only be all taken together, but in addition must be taken with the solid support of the National Reform Association, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the American Sabbath Union, the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, and the great majority of the churches as such.

All these are measures of *national* interest and import, to say nothing at all of the different movements in different States, in the same line. We have not space for more than the mere mention of the persecutions being carried on in Tennessee and Missouri; and of the anxious hope in other States that the like opportunity may soon be enjoyed there.

These are facts that ought to arouse to the most active opposition every one in the Nation who has any regard for the rights of conscience, or respect for the genuine principles of our Government. But will they? that is the question. Many times have we asked whether the American people will awake before it is too late; but we have now about come to the conclusion that they will not awake either before or after it is too late. This however is a matter of their own free choice. We would not compel them to awake if we could. Their freedom of choice is forever and sacredly their own. If they choose to see no danger in any or all of these things, that is their right.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, however, will continue to warn all of the danger there is in these things which have already arisen, and faithfully call attention to others as they arise. This is what THE SENTINEL lives for. This is what it was established for. It has had plenty of it to do so far, and will never have less.

Therefore, with implicit confidence in the justice, the righteousness, and the necessity of our cause, we enter with renewed courage upon the larger work that is before us in the year which begins with this New Year's number. A. T. J.

Sunday-Law Doctrine.

IF Col. Elliot F. Shepard were but himself alone, what he says would amount to no more than so much thin air, but when he speaks as President of the American Sabbath Union, an organization which is doing all within its power, and that is much, to secure the enactment and enforcement not only of Sunday laws but of all laws upon a religious basis, then his words mean a good deal and are worth bearing in mind, for in such a case words which in themselves might be counted as the height of absurdity, become the expression of most dangerous doctrine. Backed by the power which this organization is reaching the theory which is advocated, would create nothing short of a reign of terror. Some time ago, Mr. Shepard made a speech in Williamsburgh,

Long Island, as President of the American Sabbath Union, and in advocacy of Sunday laws. He denounced "the soul-destroying practice of riding to church on Sunday," and declared that worshippers ought to move to a place within walking distance rather than ride, and if they could not move near enough to the church to which they belong then they ought to walk to the church that is nearest to where they do live. But the worst part of his speech was the following:—

All our Legislatures should be instructed to base the law upon the ten commandments. Idolatry as well as stealing should be made a crime. That would make the Chinese go. The injunction, 'Thou shalt not kill' should be applicable to people who slowly kill themselves by not resting upon the Sabbath.

According to this theory, which is thoroughly believed by Mr. Shepard and the other workers for Sunday laws, whoever works on Sunday is guilty of the crime of murder, and should be punished as a murderer. According to the same theory, the enforcement of the commandment against idolatry would not only make the Chinese go but would punish the covetous man; for, says the Scripture, "covetousness is idolatry." But to detect covetousness it would be necessary to have an investigation of the condition of the mind and heart of the individual.

And all this is to be done by the State out of a fatherly wish to save the souls of the people. This, as everybody knows, is the very doctrine of the Inquisition; as we have often shown the Inquisition is inseparable from the theory of Sunday laws and of religious legislation. A. T. J.

The Rights of Conscience.

THE *Truth Seeker* appears to misapprehend our position upon the rights of conscience. Some weeks ago, in answer to a question, we made the following statement concerning seventh-day Christians who oppose Sunday laws:—

They oppose, not rightful authority, but a most unwarranted usurpation by the State of power that belongs alone to God. They "render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's," and refuse to obey the State only when, like the magistrates referred to in Acts 4:5-19, it commands that which involves the violation of the law of God. We utterly repudiate the pagan theory that the State is supreme in all things.

This, the *Truth Seeker* thinks, is simply "the Catholic position of the Church above the State—the Pope above the President, the priest above the legislator. And it must necessarily be the position of any true Christian church, or of any church or religion founded upon alleged supernatural events or authority." This conclusion is, we think, an error. In the first place it should be clearly understood that the Church and the State occupy wholly different fields. There can properly be no conflict between them, for at no point do their domains touch. The one is wholly spiritual, the other wholly temporal; the one relates wholly to this

world, the other wholly to the world to come. The proper function of civil government is to protect the person, property, and reputation of its citizens; to preserve the equal rights of all without infringing upon the rights of any. To do this it must let religion alone. Nor are we dependent on the Bible for this knowledge; *it is self-evident*. Every man knows that he has, so far as his fellow-men are concerned, an inalienable right to worship when, where, and what he pleases. In discussing this question, Thomas Paine said:—

Who art thou, vain dust and ashes! by whatsoever name thou art called, whether a king, a bishop, a Church, or a State, a parliament or anything else, that obtrudest thine insignificance between the soul of man and his Maker? Mind thine own concerns! If he believest not as thou believest, it is a proof that thou believest not as he believest, and there is no earthly power that can determine between you.

And not only do we agree with the great deist, but we go beyond him, in this, that we learn from the Scriptures that it is our sacred duty; a duty enjoined by our divine Master, to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us; to freely award to others all the liberty that we claim for ourselves; therefore with us it becomes doubly a matter of conscientious conviction; to our inherent sense of justice is added the sacred obligations of religion.

But in all this there is nothing to destroy individual responsibility and liberty of action. The Christian instructed by the Bible is just as free as the infidel instructed by his philosophy. The Christian instructed by divine revelation refuses to obey a man-made law forbidding certain acts which he feels in duty bound to do, just as the unbeliever refuses to perform certain acts of worship required by the same law because he does not recognize the right of his fellow creatures to require them at his hands. To illustrate: Suppose the State of New York should enact a law requiring everybody to become members of the Roman Catholic Church, would the editor of the *Truth Seeker* obey it? Certainly not. But why not? Simply because such a requirement would be an infringement upon his rights as a man. And he would be fully justified in refusing to obey such a law; all right-thinking men would honor him for it whether they agreed with him in his belief or not. Why then should our unbelieving neighbor attempt to turn against religion the exercise of like discretion and like liberty on the part of the Christian? The *Truth Seeker's* view is too narrow; it should come to the point of conceding to others *all* that it claims for itself. In short, the whole question, instead of being one of the truth or falsity of Christianity, is one so broad that it covers every religion and every right growing out of the natural obligation resting upon all men to be true to themselves, to their own convictions of duty, to their own conceptions of Deity.

C. P. B.

What It Involves.

A LEGAL Sabbath involves, in a country where there are classes which disagree, a decision as to what day is the Sabbath. In so doing, it discriminates against religious classes on one side or the other. It involves the adoption of a religious institution held as sacred by more or less people. It thus places a religious dogma in the statute law, and therefore unites religion with the State. It elevates that branch of the Christian church which keeps Sunday, by establishing a religious tenet held by them, and it brings hardship upon those who disagree with them. Thus it would be with seventh-day keepers if Sunday were established. And this hardship would not come to the Jew by virtue of his relation as a *citizen*, but by virtue of his *religion*, which comes not in conflict with the *rights* of his fellow-citizens, but in conflict with a *religious dogma* enforced by civil law. No sophistry can evade this conclusion. Sunday legislation means religious legislation, religious tyranny, religious persecution.—*Signs of the Times*.

Archbishop Ireland's Two Proposals.

ARCHBISHOP IRELAND, in his now famous address before the school teachers at St. Paul, after protesting his love for the American public school, and his regret that certain peculiarities in it forbade Catholics to use it, offered two compromises one of which would, in his view, obviate the Catholic objections. Let us briefly consider the two:—

I would permeate the regular State school with the religion of the majority of the children of the land, be it as Protestant as Protestantism can be, and I would, as they do in England, pay for the secular instruction given in the denominational schools according to results. That is, each pupil passing the examination before State officials, and in full accordance with the State programme, would secure to his school the cost of the tuition of a pupil in the State school. This is not paying for the religious instruction given to the pupil, but for secular instruction demanded by the State, and given to the pupil as thoroughly as he could have received it in the State school.

It was a slip of the tongue by which the Archbishop says this would not be "paying for the religious instruction given to the pupil" in the denominational schools. If the State school is made "as Protestant as Protestantism can be," then the teacher is paid for making it so—that is, is paid for teaching religion; and by parity of reasoning, the teacher in the denominational school, is, and ought to be paid for his religious teaching.

But to begin with, this is not a modification, but a revolution. We Protestants cannot accept it. We do not want the State to make our public schools "as Protestant as Protestantism can be." We do not trust the State enough for that. We do not want the State to interfere with our religious matters. We cannot depend

on the State to provide the sort of teachers always to whose religious instruction we are willing to commit our children. We know too well what that means. If the State can see to it that in its schools the children are taught its own Protestant religion, then it can say that this is a Protestant country, and that we do not want any but Protestants to come here; that other religions are foreign and un-American, unpatriotic and seditious; that Catholic parochial schools are a menace to our Protestant institutions, and if Catholic schools, then Catholic churches; and the step is not a long one, and is a most logical one, to persecution. A State Church means persecution. There is always a quarrel until you have either an absolute persecuting State Church, or an absolutely free Church. The Protestant State Churches of Europe are rapidly becoming free Churches. So far as they are not free the religion of the minority is practiced under a disadvantage. Catholics and Dissenters even in England now suffer under serious disadvantages, which are not persecution simply because England is moving perceptibly toward complete disestablishment. Archbishop Ireland knows very well how the interference of the State works with the Church in Italy or France or Spain, three most Catholic countries, or in Mexico or Brazil or the Argentine Republic, three leading American-Catholic countries; and does he wonder that we Protestants do not care to trust the State to have any control of our religious matters? Does he not remember how he and his friends, at the late Catholic Jubilee in Baltimore, praised the Amendment to the Constitution which forever separates Church and State, as the *Magna Charta* of Catholic rights and the condition of Catholic prosperity in this country, which has made this the happiest country in the world for Catholics, as it is for Protestants? And now would he have us Protestants throw away our independence and make our public "schools as Protestant as Protestantism can make them"? For ourselves, in our own self-defense, we reject the proposition, and we refuse to let the State teach any religion, whether Protestant in the State schools or Catholic or Jewish in the religious schools.

The Archbishop's other proposition is this:—

I would do as Protestants and Catholics in Poughkeepsie, and other places in our country, have agreed to do, to the great satisfaction of all citizens and the great advancement of educational interests. In Poughkeepsie the city School Board rents the buildings formerly used as parish schools; and from the hour of 9 A. M. to that of 3 P. M. the school is in every particular a State school—teachers engaged and paid by the Board, teachers and pupils examined, State books used, the doors always open to the Superintendent and members of the Board. There is simply the tacit understanding that so long as the teachers in those schools, Catholic in faith, pass their examinations and do their work as cleverly and loyally as other teachers under the control of the Board, teachers of another faith shall not be put in their place. Nor are they allowed to teach posi-

tive religion during school hours. This is done outside the hours for which the buildings are leased to the Board. The State, it is plain, pays not one cent for the religious instruction of the pupils. In the other schools let Protestant devotional exercises take place, in fullest freedom, before the usual school hour.

This, on the face of it, is more plausible. It is based on the supposition that Protestants want their schools to begin with Protestant devotional exercises or instruction, and that Catholics ought to have the same privilege. That is right, so far. Just as long as Protestants insist against all their principles of separation of Church and State, that there shall be religious exercises in the public schools, they have no argument against the Catholics. The reading of the Bible or prayer in public schools is a relic of barbarism, such as we used to have; and the fear of dropping it lest religion should suffer, is the survival of the cowardice which used to make the Church think that it would perish if it lost the support of the State.

In further reply to the Archbishop's alternative proposition, we make, on one side the answer that we do not want the "Protestant devotional exercises." It opens the way for them to be required, at any rate required of the teacher if not of the pupil, and we do not trust the State to provide teachers of devotion. For our part we repudiate and reject the privilege which this allows us.

On the other side the State is asked to provide and pay for Catholic religious instruction. It is absurd to say that these Catholic teachers are not to be paid for teaching religion. They are paid full salary, more, probably, than the teachers in the Catholic parochial schools now receive; and, thus paid by the State, they are required by somebody, practically by the State, to teach religion. If they do not teach religion, and this particular religion, they are dismissed. Further, they are employed only on condition that they shall be Catholics and teach Catholicism. Now, if that is not going back on the fundamental principle of our American institutions, and of the First Amendment so much extolled at the Baltimore Jubilee, then we fail to understand what a contradiction is. How would the Archbishop like his own proposition in practice? Here is a Catholic school on the Poughkeepsie plan. Ten Catholics apply for examination to the School Board, five of them brothers of an order approved by himself and five of them admirers of Dr. McGlynn and members of the Anti-Poverty Society. The School Board decide that the latter are good enough Catholics and would make the better teachers. What a row would be immediately started! But that is just the infelicity constantly arising in a union of Church and State.

The fact is, there is no compromise possible. It is either free Church or enslaved Church. Our institutions are based on the free-Church system, and Catholics

like it, and we must defend them and ourselves against any other. It works well. Sir Charles Dilke says that Russia and the United States are the two most religious countries in the world, and for this reason the most dangerous in war. If we want to keep a people religious, we must trust the Church to teach them and not the State; and this is equally true for Catholics and Protestants.—*Independent*.

Special Object of Attack.

UNTIL within a few years past there has been little or no attempt to enforce the Sunday laws on the statute books of the States of the Union. Practically men have been free to labor if they chose, or travel on the first day of the week, as if there had been no Sunday law. But there has been a change practically in the Southern States; Tennessee, Georgia, and Arkansas, have inaugurated a persecuting enforcement of these laws against the Seventh-day Adventists, and now Missouri follows suit, and William Fritz and Robert Gibb, two Seventh-day Adventists, have been indicted and arrested for laboring on their farms on the first day of the week, after resting all day on the seventh, according to their understanding of the commandment. Who are the prime movers in this raid? and why are the Seventh-day Adventists singled out for attack?

The answer to these questions is this: A National Sabbath Union has been formed within a few years, with the object of revivifying and enforcing the old Sunday laws and securing the enactment of new ones. Most of the religious denominations, if they have not indorsed this Sabbath Union, have taken no ground against it. The Seventh-day Adventists are a notable exception. On the broad ground of a complete separation between Church and State, and not because they desire to have the observance of the seventh day (Saturday) enforced by law, they have vigorously opposed the National Sabbath Union. . . . The arrest of Seventh-day Adventists in four different States of the Union, not for dissipation, but for honest farm labor on Sunday, looks like an act of revenge, mean and contemptible beyond expression. The result to be hoped for is the repeal of these obnoxious laws.—*Oakland (Cal.), Daily Times*.

If a census could be taken of the Americans who will not sit in an untaxed church and listen to a gospel whose Founder ordered his followers to "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," and paid his taxes like an honest man to pagans, it might astonish many who think they are Christians, and do justice to an army of tax-payers who are compelled to pay increased taxes to make up the deficiency caused by exemption of religious property. We advise Christians to give this some attention.—*Loyal American*.

Congress and Sunday Legislation.

REPORT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SUNDAY MAILS.

THE SENTINEL has heretofore (June, 1888, volume 3, number 6), published the report of the Senate of the United States, made January 19, 1829, to which reference has been made in some of the memorials recently printed in these columns. The report was made by Colonel Johnson, of Kentucky, subsequently Vice-President of the United States, who was then chairman of the Senate Committee on Post-offices and Post-roads. The report was adopted by the Senate, and received the approbation of both press and people. Thus, in the session of 1829, the Twentieth Congress, the Sunday-law agitators, in the words of one of the memorials, met with "a most signal defeat." So, early the next session, with a "vigor increased by disappointment," they renewed their petitioning, and were more importunate than before. Daily the petitions, representing all parts of the country, came into Congress. According to Mr. Crafts, in the "Sabbath for Man," "four hundred and sixty-seven petitions were sent in from twenty-one States."

But this expression of zeal on the part of the religious "reformers," aroused their Christian brethren who preferred to have the Government keep its hands off of religion, and consequently they, too, sent in a few memorials, some of which have been appearing in THE SENTINEL. Another peculiar political event happened about this time that completed the discomfiture of the Sunday-rest advocates. The senatorial term of Colonel Johnson had expired, and, instead of the Legislature returning him to the Senate the people sent him to represent them in the House of Representatives. He was immediately appointed chairman of the House Committee on Post-offices and Post-roads, and, as such, received these petitions on the Sunday-mail question. The valiant Colonel was happy to receive them, and perfectly willing to present another "Sunday mail report," which he accordingly did at his first opportunity. This report, which was communicated to the House of Representatives, March 4 and 5, 1830, reads as follows:—

Mr. Johnson, of Kentucky, from the Committee on Post-offices and Post-roads, to whom had been referred memorials from various parts of the United States, praying for a repeal of so much of the post-office law as authorizes the mail to be transported and opened on Sunday, and to whom had also been referred memorials from other inhabitants of various parts of the United States remonstrating against such repeal, made the following report:

That the memorialists regard the first day of the week as a day set apart by the Creator for religious exercises, and consider the transportation of the mail and the opening of the post-offices on that day the violation of a religious duty, and call for a suppression of the practice.

Others, by counter-memorials, are known to entertain a different sentiment, believing that no one day of the week is holier than another. Others, holding the "universality and immutability of the Jewish Decalogue, believe in the sanctity of the

seventh day of the week as a day of religious devotion, and, by their memorial now before the Committee, they also request that it may be set apart for religious purposes. *Each has hitherto been left to the exercise of his own opinion, and it has been regarded as the proper business of Government to protect all and determine for none.* But the attempt is now made to bring about a greater uniformity, at least in practice; and, *as argument has failed,* the Government has been called upon to interpose its authority to settle the controversy.

Congress acts under a Constitution of delegated and limited powers. The Committee look in vain to that instrument for a delegation of power authorizing this body to inquire and determine what part of time, or whether any, has been set apart by the Almighty for religious exercises. *On the contrary, among the few prohibitions which it contains, is one that prohibits a religious test, and another that declares that Congress shall pass no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*

The Committee might here rest the argument upon the ground that the question referred to them does not come within the cognizance of Congress; but the perseverance and zeal with which the memorialists pursue their object seems to require a further elucidation of the subject; and, as the opposers of Sunday mails disclaim all intention to unite Church and State, the Committee do not feel disposed to impugn their motives; and whatever may be advanced in opposition to the measure will arise from the fears entertained of its fatal tendency to the peace and happiness of the Nation. The catastrophe of other nations furnished the framers of the Constitution a beacon of awful warning, and they have evinced the greatest possible care in guarding against the same evil.

The law, as it now exists, makes no distinction as to the days of the week, but is imperative that the postmasters shall attend at all reasonable hours in every day to perform the duties of their offices; and the Postmaster General has given his instructions to all postmasters that, at post-offices where the mail arrives on Sunday, the office is to be kept open one hour or more after the arrival and assorting of the mail; but in case that would interfere with the hours of public worship, the office is to be kept open for one hour after the usual time of dissolving the meeting. This liberal construction of the law does not satisfy the memorialists; but the Committee believe that there is no just ground of complaint, unless it be conceded that they have a controlling power over the consciences of others.

If Congress shall, by the authority of law, sanction the measure recommended, it would constitute a legislative decision of a religious controversy, in which even Christians themselves are at issue. However suited such a decision may be to an ecclesiastical council, it is incompatible with a republican Legislature, which is purely for political, and not for religious, purposes.

In our individual character we all entertain opinions, and pursue a corresponding practice, upon the subject of religion. However diversified these may be, we all harmonize as citizens *while each is willing that the other shall enjoy the same liberty which he claims for himself.* But in our representative character our individual character is lost. The individual acts for himself, the representative for his constituents. He is chosen to represent their *political*, and not their, *religious*, views; to guard the rights of man, not to restrict the rights of conscience.

Despots may regard their subjects as their property, and usurp the divine prerogative of prescribing their religious faith; but the history of the world furnishes the melancholy demonstration that the disposition of one man to coerce the religious homage of another, springs from an unchastened ambition, rather than [from] a sincere devotion to any religion. The principles of our Government do not recognize in the majority any authority over the minority, except in matters which regard the conduct of man to his fellow-man.

A Jewish monarch, by grasping the holy censer, lost both his scepter and his freedom. A destiny as little to be envied may be the lot of the American people who hold the sovereignty of power, if they, in the person of their representatives, shall attempt to unite, *in the remotest degree,* Church and State.

From the earliest period of time, religious teachers have attained great ascendancy over the minds of the people, and in every nation, ancient or modern, whether pagan, Mahomedan, or Christian, have succeeded in the incorporation of their religious tenets with the political institutions of their country. The Persian idols, the Grecian oracles, the Roman auguries, and the modern priesthood of Europe, have all, in their turn, been the subject of popular adulation, and the agents of political deception. *If the measure recommended should be adopted, it would be difficult for human sagacity to foresee how rapid would be the succession, or how numerous the train of measures which would follow, involving the dearest rights of all—the rights of conscience.*

It is perhaps fortunate for our country that the proposition should have been made at this early period while the spirit of the Revolution yet exists in full vigor. Religious zeal enlists the strongest prejudices of the human mind; and, when misdirected, excites the worst passions of our nature, under the delusive pretext of doing God service. Nothing so infuriates the heart to deeds of rapine and blood, nothing is so incessant in its toils, so persevering in its determination, so appalling in its course, or so dangerous in its consequences. The equality of rights secured by the Constitution, may bid defiance to mere political tyrants; but the robe of sanctity too often glitters to deceive. *The Constitution regards the conscience of the Jew as sacred as that of the Christian, and gives no more authority to adopt a measure affecting the conscience of a solitary individual than that of a whole community.* That representative who would violate this principle would lose his delegated character, and forfeit the confidence of his constituents.

If Congress shall declare the first day of the week holy, it will not convince the Jew nor the Sabbatarian. It will dissatisfy both, and, consequently, convert neither. Human power may extort vain sacrifices, but the Deity alone can command the affections of the heart.

It must be recollected that in the earliest settlement of this country, the spirit of persecution which drove the Pilgrims from their native home was brought with them to their new habitations, and that some Christians were scourged, and others put to death, for no other crime than dissenting from the dogmas of their rulers.

With these facts before us, it must be a subject of deep regret that a question should be brought before Congress which involves the dearest privileges of the Constitution, and even by those who enjoy its choicest blessings. *We should all recollect that Cataline, a professed patriot, was a traitor to Rome, Arnold, a professed Whig, was a traitor to America; and Judas, a professed disciple, was a traitor to his divine Master.*

With the exception of the United States, the whole human race, consisting, it is supposed, of eight hundred millions of rational beings, is in religious bondage; and, in reviewing the scenes of persecution which history everywhere presents, unless the Committee could believe that the cries of the burning victim, and the flames by which he is consumed, bear to heaven a grateful incense, the conclusion is inevitable that the line cannot be too strongly drawn between Church and State. If a solemn act of legislation shall, in *one* point, define the law of God, or point out to the citizen *one* religious duty, it may, with equal propriety, proceed to define *every* part of divine revelation, and enforce *every* religious obligation, even to the forms and ceremonies of worship, the endowment of the Church, and the support of the clergy.

It was with a kiss that Judas betrayed his divine Master; and we should all be admonished, no matter what our faith may be, that the rights of conscience cannot be so successfully assailed as under

the pretext of holiness. The Christian religion made its way into the world in opposition to all human governments. Banishment, tortures, and death were inflicted in vain to stop its progress. But many of its professors, as soon as clothed with political power, lost the meek spirit which their creed inculcated, and began to inflict on other religions, and on dissenting sects of their own religion, persecutions more aggravated than those which their own apostles had endured.

The ten persecutions of the pagan emperors were exceeded in atrocity by the massacres and murders perpetuated by Christian hands; and in vain shall we examine the records of imperial tyranny for an engine of tyranny equal to the holy Inquisition. *Every religious sect, however meek in its origin, commenced the work of persecution, as soon as it acquired political power.*

The framers of the Constitution recognized the eternal principle that man's relation with his God is above human legislation, and his rights of conscience inalienable. Reasoning was not necessary to establish this truth; we are conscious of it in our bosoms. It is the consciousness which in defiance of human laws, has sustained so many martyrs in tortures and in flames. They *felt* that their duty to God was superior to human enactments, and that man could exercise no authority over their consciences. *It is an inborn principle which nothing can eradicate.* The bigot in the pride of his authority, may lose sight of it, but, strip him of his power, prescribe a faith to him which his conscience rejects, threaten him in turn with the dungeon and the fagot, and this spirit which God has implanted in him rises up in rebellion and defies you.

Did the primitive Christians ask that Government should recognize and observe their religious institutions? All they asked was toleration; all they complained of was persecution. What did the Protestants of Germany, or the Huguenots of France, ask of their Catholic superiors? Toleration. What do the persecuted Catholics of Ireland ask of their oppressors? Toleration. Do not all men in this country enjoy every religious right which martyrs and saints ever asked? Whence, then, the voice of complaint? Who is it that, in the full enjoyment of every principle which human laws can secure, wishes to wrest a portion of these principles from his neighbor?

Do the petitioners allege that they cannot conscientiously participate in the profits of the mail contracts and post-offices, because the mail is carried on Sunday? If this be their motive, then it is worldly gain which stimulates to action, and not virtue and religion. Do they complain that men less conscientious in relation to the Sabbath obtain advantages over them by receiving their letters and attending to their contents? Still their motive is worldly and selfish. But if their motive be to induce Congress to sanction, by law, *their religious opinions and observances,* then their efforts ought to be resisted, as in their tendency *fatal both to religious and political freedom.*

Why have the petitioners confined their prayer to the mails? Why have they not requested that the Government be required to suspend *all* its executive functions on that day? Why do they not require us to enact that our ships shall not sail; that our armies shall not march; that officers of justice shall not sieze the suspected or guard the convicted? They seem to forget that Government is as necessary on Sunday as on any other day of the week. The spirit of evil does not rest on that day. It is the Government, ever active in its functions, which enables us all, even the petitioners, to worship in our churches in peace.

Our Government furnishes very few blessings like our mails. They bear from the center of our Republic to its distant extremes the acts of our legislative bodies, the decisions of the judiciary, and the orders of the executive. Their speed is often essential to the defense of the country, the suppression of crime, and the dearest interests of the people. Were they suppressed one day of the week, their

absence must be often supplied by public expresses; and, besides, while the mail-bags might rest, the mail-coaches would pursue their journey with their passengers. The mail bears, from one extreme of the Union to the other, letters of relatives and friends, preserving a communion of heart between those far separated, and increasing the most pure and refined pleasures of our existence; also, the letters of commercial men convey the state of the markets, prevent ruinous speculations, and promote general as well as individual interest; they bear innumerable religious letters, newspapers, magazines, and tracts, which reach almost every house throughout this wide Republic. Is the conveyance of these a violation of the Sabbath?

The advance of the human race in intelligence, in virtue, and religion itself, depends in part upon the speed with which a knowledge of the past is disseminated. Without an interchange between one country and another, and between different sections of the same country, every improvement in moral and political science, and the arts of life, would be confined to the neighborhood where it originated. The more rapid and the more frequent this interchange, the more rapid will be the march of intellect and the progress of improvement. The mail is the chief means by which intellectual light irradiates to the extremes of the Republic. Stop it one day in seven, and you would retard one-seventh of the advancement of our country.

So far from stopping the mail on Sunday, the Committee would recommend the use of all reasonable means to give it a greater expedition and a greater extension. What would be the elevation of our country if every new conception could be made to strike every mind in the Union at the same time? It is not the distance of a Province or State from the seat of Government which endangers its separation; but it is the difficulty and infrequency of intercourse between them. Our mails reach Missouri and Arkansas in less time than they reached Kentucky and Ohio in the infancy of their settlements; and now, when there are three millions of people extending a thousand miles west of the Alleghany, we hear less of discontent than when there were a few thousands scattered along their western base. To stop the mails one day in seven would be to thrust the whole Western country, and other distant parts of this Republic, one day's journey from the seat of Government.

But, were it expedient to put an end to the transmission of letters and newspapers on Sunday because it violates the law of God, have not the petitioners begun wrong in their efforts? If the arm of Government be necessary to compel men to respect and obey the laws of God, do not the State Governments possess infinitely more power in this respect? Let the petitioners turn to *them*, and see if they can induce the passage of laws to respect the observance of the Sabbath; for, if it be sinful for the mail to carry letters on Sunday, it must be equally sinful for individuals to write, carry, receive, or read them. It would seem to require that these acts should be made penal to complete the system. Traveling on business or recreation, except to and from church; all printing, carrying, receiving, and reading of newspapers; all conversations and social intercourse, except upon religious subjects, must necessarily be punished to suppress the evil. Would it not also follow, as an inevitable consequence, that every man, woman, and child should be compelled to attend meeting? And, as only one sect, in the opinion of some, can be deemed orthodox, must it not be determined by law which *that* is, and compel all to hear those teachers, and contribute to their support?

If minor punishments would not restrain the Jew, or the Sabbatarian, or the infidel, who believes Saturday to be the Sabbath, or disbelieves the whole, would not the same system require that we should resort to imprisonment, banishment, the rack, or the fagot, to force men to violate their own consciences, or compel them to listen to doctrines which they abhor? When the State Governments shall have yielded to these measures, it will be time enough for Congress to declare that the rattling of the mail coaches shall no longer break the silence of this despotism.

It is the duty of this Government to afford *all*—to Jew or Gentile, Pagan or Christian—the protection

or advantages of our benignant institutions on *Sunday* as well as every day of the week. Although this Government will not convert itself into an ecclesiastical tribunal, it will practise upon the maxim laid down by the Founder of Christianity—that it is lawful to do *good* on the Sabbath day.

If the Almighty has set apart the first day of the week as time which man is bound to keep holy, and devote exclusively to his worship, would it not be more congenial to the precepts of Christians to appeal exclusively to the great Lawgiver of the universe to aid them in making men better—in correcting their practices by purifying their hearts? Government will protect them in their efforts. When they shall have so instructed the public mind, and awakened the consciences of individuals as to make them believe that it is a violation of God's law to carry the mail, open post-offices, or receive letters on Sunday, the evil of which they complain will cease of itself, without any exertion of the strong arm of the civil power. When man undertakes to become God's avenger, he becomes a demon. Driven by the frenzy of a religious zeal, he loses every gentle feeling, forgets the most sacred precepts of his creed, and becomes ferocious and unrelenting.

Our fathers did not wait to be oppressed when the mother country asserted and exercised an unconstitutional power over them. To have acquiesced in the tax of three pence upon a pound of tea would have led the way to the most cruel exactions; they took a bold stand against the principle, and liberty and independence was the result. The petitioners have not requested Congress to suppress Sunday mails upon the ground of political expediency, but because they violate the sanctity of the first day of the week.

This being the fact, the petitioners having indignantly disclaimed even the wish to unite politics and religion, may not the Committee reasonably cherish the hope that they will feel reconciled to its decision in the case; especially as it is also a fact that the counter-memorials, equally respectable, oppose the interference of Congress upon the ground that it would be legislating upon a religious subject, and therefore unconstitutional?

Resolved, That the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

Thus stands the last recorded report of the national Congress upon Sunday legislation, a monument of our early liberality, statesmanship, and Christianity; and may those grand principles, which were then valued so highly, and which have made America the most liberal Government in the world, ever be cherished by the citizens of this Nation.

W. A. BLAKELY.

AN English paper says that the "Roman Catholic priests near Warsaw have been exiled to Siberia for the crime of 'Catholic propaganda.' The Russian authorities have also forbidden the erection of new Roman Catholic Churches, or the repairing of old ones. Our Roman Catholic contemporaries very properly denounce this as religious persecution. What would they have to say, however, about Protestant propaganda in Spain or Mexico, which has been attended with similarly anti-Christian intolerance on the part of Romanists? After all, the rule of Rome is that every one should tolerate her, and that she should tolerate no one. Only when she is herself persecuted does she feel the iniquity of this policy. So, too, many who call themselves Protestants exhibit the spirit of rendering to Romanists and others what they have themselves received at the hands of Rome in the past. The Golden Rule, and not the Roman rule, is the Christian's line of action."

Sunday-Law Consistency.

THE American Sabbath Union, whose chief aim is a national Sunday law, is just now giving special attention to California. Every effort is to be made to secure a State Sunday law for "poor California" this winter. The Union displays on its publications this threefold motto: "Arouse the people; educate the people; combine the people."

The great concern for California is due to the fact that it is the only State in the Union that has no Sunday law. The Territories of Alaska, Idaho, and Arizona, have no Sunday laws, but California is the only State that is delinquent in this respect. It is not claimed that Sunday is more respected in most of the States than in California, in fact, it leaks out once in a while that there is a greater degree of Sunday reverence in this State than in many places where laws exist for the compulsory observance of the day.

But it would seem from some of the arguments advanced that it is the idea of not having a law, a legal backing for the worship common to the day, that is so much to be regretted. We are confronted with the impression, somehow, that the worship on that day falls short of the mark because it is not compelled by the State. Yet these people who want a Sunday law stoutly deny any desire for a Church and State Government. But every species of worship under provision of law is a Church and State principle just as far as it goes. And it is a principle that never says, "It is enough." It is bred of an appetite that is never satisfied,—the more it is fed the more it craves its favorite food.

We are told that a Sunday law is not intended to compel people to worship on that day, but only to compel them to close their places of business and stop secular work. The people are not so much concerned about what is intended as they are about what is accomplished by such legislation. All closing of business or cessation of labor on Sunday is *worship*. If it be not worship of God, it is worship of Sunday, which is idolatry. It may be compulsory; those who are thus compelled to observe the day may not desire to do so; then it becomes compulsory legal worship.

There is no denying the fact that all Sunday observance and all Sunday laws are based on the religious idea that Sunday is a sacred day. But for that idea, there would be no Sunday observance of any kind, and no Sunday laws. Men who care nothing for the day personally, close business or stop work out of respect for the custom which a religious influence has brought about; or it may be on account of the religious impressions which they received in youth; and some seem to suppose that that much show of religion will, in a measure, make up for other religious short-comings. In either event, the act is a religious concession, at least, that *the day is sacred*.

Sunday-law champions may talk around the point all they can in public; they may appeal as loudly as they can in behalf of the workingman, or they may attempt to cover up their effort with temperance or sanitary plasters, ever so thick; in their own councils, or before religious audiences, it is always the desecration of the sacred day that is specially bemoaned. And everywhere and all the time it is on Sunday that the saloon is a curse; it is on Sunday that the laborer needs rest; it is on Sunday that men should be with their families; and if men are so obtuse that they cannot see that Sunday is the day of all others on which to worship God, they must be made to see it by the law of the land.

We are told in one breath that the Sunday law does not say what men shall do, or shall not do, on Sunday, only that they shall not work or keep open any place of business,—all that is wanted is a day of rest and recuperation. But in the next breath the sanctity of the "American Sabbath" must be sustained, and the "continental holiday" must be kept down. We must have such Sunday laws as will keep out the German Sunday, when only two per cent. go to church and the remainder to the picnic. In one breath, we are told that the grand effort is for a "civil holiday," that men may have their liberty on that day; in the next breath, it is because of the holiday customs in some places that a Sunday law is so strongly urged.

If the people would but compare and duly weigh the many-sided arguments in favor of Sunday laws, they could not fail to see the aim and the logical end of such legislation. We are pointed to the liberties of the people in States where Sunday laws exist, to show that there is no danger of the consequences which we predict; but it must be remembered that there is great complaint, on the part of the Sunday-law abettors, of the inefficiency of many of such statutes. These must be made stronger in their provisions and penalties. And there is also complaint that the Sunday laws of the States cannot be properly enforced because the general Government does not sustain them. Herein lies the ground of appeal for a national Sunday law, in order that the State laws may be more rigidly enforced. That secured, then will follow the matter of strengthening the weaker State laws until they come up to the ideal of the most ardent National Reformer.

It is well to consider these inevitable results before they are fastened upon us.—*W. N. Glenn, in Signs of the Times.*

EVERY man is entitled to freedom, until he begins to abuse or encroach on the freedom of others, then it is proper and right to curtail his freedom.—*Loyal American.*

ONE of the absurd uses to which an absurd law may be put was illustrated in the Westminster County Court last week. A dentist sought to recover fees for professional work, which, it transpired, was largely done on Sundays. The defendant contended that this brought the dentist within the Sunday Observance Act. The judge said the defense was a shabby one, and laid down that a dentist did not come within the Act. The man who has highest regard for the Sunday should be first to protest against a law making such contentions possible. Would any believer in the Lord's Supper desire to see that ordinance bandied about the courts again as it was in the olden time? The loudest protest would come from those who truly regarded Christ's last institution as sacred.—*Present Truth, London, England.*

An Interesting Letter.

A WELL-KNOWN minister and professor in an academy in Washington County, Pennsylvania, writes thus to a friend who sent him some copies of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL:—

I have to thank you for copies of the paper sent me. I have read it with interest. I am glad to see my sentiments so well expressed in some of the articles. . . . I had so little time at my disposal in the address I made at the County Institute that I could only touch upon the subject of religion in our public schools. I take it that you were present when I spoke. I would like to have an opportunity to discuss that subject sometime, I could then give it the attention it deserves. As I said, there is a strong movement on foot now by different organizations, to force the teaching of religion in our public schools. In my opinion this is greatly to be deplored, not that I do not think that religion is important, but because I don't believe that the various sects can agree on that subject. It would be to introduce sectarianism into our schools, and so soon as that is done, it overthrows our public school system. . . . Besides, the State has nothing to do with religion, further than to allow all citizens freedom before the law to have such religion as they may choose. The State has no soul, and it cannot have a religion. It cannot have a choice between the different religious theories that divide Christendom; and further, if one religion were admitted into our schools, common fairness would demand that all forms have a hearing, for the public schools are supported by all shades of beliefs. The only safe and fair position to assume is that the State must not teach any religion.

A Knock-down Argument.

SUNDAY afternoon, December 7, Rev. Mr. Crafts, well known to our readers, spoke to a Philadelphia Sunday school, upon his favorite theme, giving seven reasons for Sunday keeping. Of course Mr. Crafts has a perfect right to have seven reasons, or seventy reasons, for keeping Sunday or any other day. He also has a perfect right to tell those reasons to any number of Sunday schools. But his manner of doing it upon this occasion was not such as to commend him to the esteem of people generally. He had spoken only a few minutes when his remarks degenerated into a tirade against observers of the sev-

enth day. He complained that these people could not be silenced unless they were "knocked on the head with a club," and then transported while unconscious to some uninhabited island, where they would be compelled to remain, cut off from all intercourse with others for the remainder of their natural lives. This idea, however, is too nearly akin to the National Reform scheme for disposing of infidels, namely, to banish them to some wild, desolate island, and compel them to remain there as long as they live, to be considered original. This plan may appear to some to be scarcely practicable in this enlightened age, but it may fittingly be termed, though in the worst sense, "a knock-down argument."

THERE are, it is said, signs that France is slowly but surely returning to the observance of Sunday. "In the Chamber of Deputies recently, during a debate upon the bill regulating the hours of labor for children and women, the Deputies decided that one day in seven should be a rest day, and a section of the Chamber nearly succeeded in getting a clause passed to make that day of rest Sunday, two hundred and ten Deputies voting in favor of it. Although this result was not attained by legislation, it is thought that most employers will select Sunday as the 'one day in seven.'" But even this consummation would come very far short of the desires of the Sunday-law advocates in this country; here they demand not only that the people *may* rest but that they *must* rest. No advocate of a Sunday law in this country would be satisfied with such a law as that passed by the French Deputies. That is practically the present status of Sunday in California; in that State Sunday is a holiday, factories and shops are closed, and mechanics and laborers are free from toil. But this does not satisfy those who want Sunday laws; they demand the prohibition of Sunday excursions and everything of that kind. In short, they propose to restrict people to choose between spending Sunday at home or going to church.

THE *Nebraska State Journal* says that "the Bellamy boarding houses that have been started in different parts of the country since the appearance of 'Looking Backward,' do not flourish more than a few months as a rule. . . . The cost of living was actually reduced by co-operation, but gradually the people drifted back to their own little tables at home and a profitable membership could not be maintained. If there is anything that is prized in these days it is personal freedom. No saving in expense will quite reconcile a man to the obliteration of his individuality. No family will be content to live under rules not made by itself for its own convenience. And so these co-operative bubbles are pricked as fast as they rise."



NEW YORK, JANUARY 1, 1891

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

THE Philadelphia Sabbath Association has taken formal action requesting President Harrison to send to Congress a special message, recommending legislation that will secure the closing of the Columbian Exposition on Sunday.

WE have repeatedly stated—but say it again for the benefit of some who seem not to know it—that we answer no anonymous communication. Questions signed only, "Inquirer," "Subscriber," "Constant Reader," and the like, are promptly consigned to the waste basket.

A LETTER from Burden, Kansas, informs us that Rev. G. F. Colvin, pastor of the Baptist Church at that place, preached a sermon recently, in which he took strong ground against the Blair Educational Amendment, as also against teaching religion in the public schools. He declared that such measures savor strongly of a union of Church and State.

THE President outraged the feelings of the National Reformers by omitting from his recent Thanksgiving proclamation all recognition of the Lord Jesus Christ. Even the familiar words, "In the year of our Lord," were omitted from the date line. The *Christian Statesman* calls it not only "an unchristian," but an anti-Christian document, and Secretary Wylie says, in derision, that its author was evidently profoundly ignorant of the Christian religion.

THE *Evangel of Rest*, the official organ of the Sabbath Association of Iowa, has, in its December number, the following misrepresentation of the position of this paper:—

The self-styled *American Sentinel*, a very inappropriately named little sheet of sadly warped and squinted view, which condemns the use of the Bible in schools, the protection of the wage-worker's right to rest on the Sabbath, the prevention of polygamy or of any crime by law because it would unite Church and State, shows its intellectual grasp in the following review.

We can regard this statement only as a malicious attempt to excite prejudice against THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, for the reason that we spoke in no uncertain tone upon the question of the prohibition of

polygamy, no longer ago than September 4, 1890. At that time we said: "The State must forbid polygamy in every case, or else fail of the very object for which governments are instituted among men, namely, to preserve rights." Again, we said in the same article: "Polygamy does necessarily invade natural rights; therefore the State cannot sanction it, but is in duty bound to prohibit it." The editorial article from which we quote these two sentences contained nearly six columns strongly condemnatory of polygamy, and justifying its suppression by law. Subsequently we printed two contributed articles, both of considerable length, and both defending the right of the State to forbid plural marriages. In view of these facts we think it is putting it very mildly to say that the *Evangel's* statement is a most unwarranted misrepresentation.

Now that Congress is again in session the Sunday-law advocates are hard at work trying to secure from that body some substantial recognition of Sunday sacredness. The Breckinridge Sunday bill for the District of Columbia is, we are informed, to be pushed through if possible. In addition to this, Congress will be asked to take some action in regard to closing the Columbian Exposition, Sunday. Past failures have in nowise discouraged the National Reform cohorts.

MR. CRAFTS is actively at work organizing local Sunday associations in this State. December 14, he was at Rome, New York, where he secured donations to the amount of \$275.67 to be devoted to the distribution of Sunday literature, etc. A temporary organization was effected, and according to the published report, "a committee of pastors and laymen was appointed to report a Constitution and list of officers to a future meeting of the newly enrolled members. The society is not as yet allied to any State or national organization, but is independent and will probably devote itself wholly to local Sabbath reform."

IN a recent Sunday-law case on trial before a Spokane Falls, Washington, Court, an effort was made by the prosecuting attorney to exclude all Jews from the jury. To this the attorney for the defendant objected, as follow:—

The suggestion of the attorney would come to this: they would summon all Presbyterians or all Methodists and exclude all Jews. This is what the Constitution expressly prohibits. It provides that no religious test whatever shall be made in this country, and Colonel Moore wants to challenge a man because he is a Jew. Is not that a religious test? It seems to me outrageous to exclude a man because he is a Hebrew. We might as well exclude a man because he is an Irishman, or an American, or because he believes in nothing.

It is simply impossible to separate religion and religious tests from Sunday laws and their enforcement.

AN exchange remarks that "it has been the rule that unless one member of a Jewish family in Russia belong to the State Church, none of the family may either do business or work for pay. Now a new ukase has been issued ordering that the whole family must join the church or all starve together. As might be expected, under this pressure many Jewish converts to Christianity are reported." This is a sample of law-made Christians!

CAPTAIN MICHAEL BRENNAN, of Company A, Sixty-ninth regiment, has been arrested in this city on the charge of parading his company to music on Sunday, while returning from a funeral. The arresting officer testified to ordering the Captain to stop the band, but was driven off at the point of the bayonet by the members of the company. The arrest was made the next day, and the Captain was held in one hundred dollars bail for trial at General Sessions. This case will be a test of the rights of the militia to parade with music on Sundays.

WE have been criticised by an exchange for saying "dormant religious sects," and it has been suggested that "dominant" would have been the better word. So we thought when we wrote the note in which the word occurred, but the compositor had a different idea of the fitness of things, and the error was overlooked in proof-reading. We admit that, as our critic says, the sects are very wide awake and active in some directions. They have scented National Reform, and though dormant spiritually, politically they are as lively as the proverbial cricket.

THE Farmers' Alliance, in session at Ocala, Florida, unanimously passed this resolution: "We, the national Farmers' Alliance of America, believing that obedience and veneration for the laws of God are the conserving and saving force of human government, do hereby respectfully request that the directors of the great national Fair, to be held in 1892, do not desecrate the American Sabbath by keeping open the gates to the same on the Lord's day."

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,

DEVOTED TO

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

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

SINGLE COPY, PER YEAR, POST-PAID, . . . \$1.00.
In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, . . . 75c.

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

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.