

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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, MAY 21, 1891.

NUMBER 21.

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 *Mail and Express* remarks that "a great deal of twaddle is written about opening the Metropolitan Museum on Sunday." We have often thought as much while reading the inane editorials which appear in that paper upon this subject. We are glad that Editor Shepard sees it himself now; of course he will cease to offend in this respect much to the relief of the reading public.

WHEN Harriet Martineau wrote that she had awakened from a state of aristocratic prejudice to the clear conviction of the equality of human rights, she confessed to just such a mental and moral change as is needed by the ecclesiastical aristocracy which is now so enthusiastically urging legislation upon Sunday observance and other religious questions. Religious prejudice is dangerous enough, but the prejudice of a religious aristocracy is doubly to be feared.

NOTING the fact that the Rev. Mr. Penzotti, the agent of the American Bible Society, who has been in prison in Callao for eight months for holding religious services according to the Protestant order, has been released, the *Presbyterian* asks:—

How shall he be repaid for months of unjust incarceration in vile prisons and in the midst of vile associations?

Upon this, the *Christian at Work* says:

We can't say. Mr. Penzotti is not an American, never having taken out naturalization papers. But it would be well that every missionary of an American Missionary or Bible Society should be required

to do this. Then in the event of unjust imprisonment our Government would be heard from.

Yes, Mr. Penzotti ought by all means to have taken out naturalization papers either in this country or Russia, because either Government could have so consistently demanded redress from Peru seeing that they never allow persecution for conscience' sake in their own dominions! The grass should at least be green upon the grave of the last victim of religious persecution in this country before we talk of demanding compensation for sufferers from religious intolerance and hate in other lands.

Questions and Answers.

WE have received from a friend in Illinois, a series of questions called out seemingly by our discussion of Mr. Bierbower's book on "Ethics for Society and Schools," with the request that the questions be answered in THE SENTINEL for the benefit of the writer and others. We willingly comply:—

Question 1.—Tell us, please, is true morality based on the ten commandments? And if so on what was it based prior to the delivery of the law on Sinai?

Answer.—True morality is based on the ten commandments. Yet more properly speaking the ten commandments are the expression of the supreme moral rule. They are the summary of morality itself, because they are the expression of the will of God. For says Romans 2:18, thou "knowest his will being instructed out of the law;" and the law there referred to, as the context plainly shows, is the law which teaches that men should not steal, nor commit adultery, nor idolatry. Men delight to do the will of God only when his law is written in their hearts. Psalms 40:8. These texts, with many others which might be cited, show plainly that the law of God, the ten commandments, is the expression of the will of God in respect to character, and God's will is supreme morality, because it is the expression of the will of him who is supremely moral.

True morality was based upon the ten commandments before the delivery of the law on Sinai as well as afterward, because the ten commandments existed before Sinai as really as afterward. Abraham knew the will of God, and kept the commandments. Genesis 26:5. Sin is the transgression of the law of God, and by the law also is the knowledge of sin. 1 John 3:4., Romans 3:20. Sin is not imputed where there is no law, for where no law is, there is no transgression. Romans 5:13 and 4:15. The law of God, therefore, was known to man before he sinned, and his sin was the transgression of that law.

"All unrighteousness is sin" (1 John 5:17), and as sin is the transgression of the law of God, it follows that that law is the expression of the righteousness of God, that is, it is the expression of the supreme idea of right. Accordingly, it is written, "My tongue shall speak of thy words for all thy commandments are righteousness." Psalms 119:172. And "hearken unto me ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law." Isaiah 51:7. Therefore, as the law of God, the ten commandments, is the expression of the will of God, in respect to character, and is the expression of the supreme idea of right doing, it stands demonstrated that the ten commandments are the basis and the expression of all true morality or ethics.

The delivery of the law at Sinai, therefore, was not by any means the beginning of the existence of that law. It was there given upon the tables of stone to perform its part in the work of the gospel which was shadowed forth in the sanctuary and its services. For the tables of stone were placed in the Ark of the Covenant beneath the mercy seat in the most holy place, into which the high priest, as the representative of Christ in his priesthood, went alone once a year in the great day of atonement to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. Thus "the law entered that the offense might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound;

that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

The law of God, the ten commandments, existed before Sinai as really as afterward, for it is a truth well and eloquently expressed by Gibbon: "The God of nature has written his existence in all his works and his law in the heart of man."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 50, par. 14.*

Question 2.—If the principles of the moral law are implanted by the Creator in every person's heart, does it not follow then that every person has morality within himself?

Answer.—It does not follow, because all have sinned, transgressed the law, and come short of the glory of God. Morality does not consist in a *knowledge* of the law of God, but in *the doing of it*. He has written his law in the heart of man, but by transgression man has made himself unrighteous. God has planted in the heart of man a knowledge of morality, a knowledge of right, but by transgression man has made himself immoral, and by that also has obscured the knowledge of morality which was at the first planted there, and which would have ever remained had man remained moral.

More than this, by his transgression, by his immorality, man has robbed himself of the power to do fully according to the measure of right which even yet he knows. Every man on earth knows this is so, therefore we say again as we said in our notice of Mr. Bierbower's book that it is not enough for men in this world to know what is right to do, but they must have the power to do the right which they know. This power comes alone by faith in Jesus Christ for the Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.

This whole matter is clearly expressed in Romans 3: 19-26. "What things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified [accounted moral] in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin [immorality]. But now the righteousness [the morality] of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness [the morality] of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference: for all have sinned, [have become immoral] and come short of the glory of God; being justified [accounted moral] freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness [his morality] for the remission of sins [immorality] that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: [his morality] that he might be just, and the justifier of

him which believeth in Jesus." Therefore we have always said and always do say, that outside of a genuine abiding faith in Jesus Christ, there is no genuine morality in this world.

Question 3.—Did Demosthenes, Aristotle, Socrates, and many other Greek philosophers teach morality? And if not did they teach immorality?

Answer.—They taught what they called morality, but they taught and practiced what was really immorality. Solon and Zeno both practiced sodomy. The Greek worship of Venus like that of its Babylonian and Roman counterpart was but open prostitution. The celebration of the mysteries, which was the supreme rite of Greek worship, was but the practice of things unfit to be named, and of which the Scripture has well spoken that "it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret." Plato taught both the expediency and the lawfulness of exposing children to die in particular cases, and Aristotle counselled abortion. Both at Sparta and at Athens the exposure to die, or even the killing of infants, who were weak and imperfect in form, was practiced. Customary swearing was commended by the example of Socrates and Plato. Aristippus maintained that it is lawful for a wise man to steal, to commit adultery, and sacrilege when opportunity offered. Menander taught that a lie is better than a hurtful truth. Plato taught that "he may lie, who knows how to do it in a suitable time." And Socrates practiced such lewdness as is not fit to be named.

So far indeed were the Greek philosophers from teaching morality that they both taught and practiced what would not be allowed in the category of common civility in our day. In short, if the Greek philosophers could be set down in the United States to-day and should attempt to practice here what they both taught and practiced in Greece, and counted it morality too, the whole gang of them would be in the penitentiary inside of a week, and that would be the place for them too. Because American *civilization*, to say nothing at all of morality, would not countenance it for a day.

Question 4 and 6 we omit as they are covered by

Question 5.—If the teaching of what is called morality is destructive to both the public schools and the State, and should therefore be entirely excluded from the teachers' curriculum, is not the right to teach his pupils to be kind, truthful, honest, industrious, pure, etc., by precept and example, taken from every teacher in our public schools?

Answer.—Not by any means. On the contrary the way is opened for every teacher to do these very things in the way in which only it is proper to teach them, and according to the design of the public school. The public school is designed to accomplish two principal things in the youth of the country.

First, to give them such an education as shall fit them, as citizens or members of

the body politic, to take care of themselves. It therefore teaches them to read and write and apply the principles of arithmetic.

Second, to be good citizens. It *should* therefore teach the principles of citizenship. And this is but to say that they should be taught the principles of the government of which they are to be citizens. What then are the principles or elements of citizenship? Religion certainly is not one of them. The supreme law of the land declares that "the Government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion." If religion be an element of citizenship, it is but a logical step to a religious test as a qualification for office. But again, the supreme law declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this Government." If religion be an element of citizenship, it is only a logical and proper step that the Government should define and regulate it. But still the supreme law declares, "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Therefore as religion is not in any sense a requisite to citizenship, it can have no place in a course of instruction which is designed to teach the principles and elements of citizenship. And as morality is inseparable from religion, it falls in the same category.

Yet more than this, ethics is the science of right and wrong, but the State does not, and can not, know any such thing as moral right or wrong, but only civil *rights* and *wrongs*. When a man steals, the State does not punish him because he sinned, but because he disregarded and invaded the *rights* of his fellow citizen, and did him a civil wrong. Now as the Government of the United States, and as also that of the several States, is founded upon the rights of men, there is an ample field open before all the teachers in the public schools for the teaching of all that pertains to good citizenship under this Government without entering the field of ethics as such, nor touching the question of religion or morality.

The Declaration of Independence, the charter of American institutions and the foundation of the United States Government, plainly declares that "all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Here is the basis of what ought to be the teaching in all State schools, and the basis is broad enough for everything that is either necessary or proper to be taught in the public schools. It is the inalienable right of every individual in the Government to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Let all the public school teachers teach to the youth of this Nation,

and diligently inculcate upon their minds, respect for the rights of every other person.

This is the perfect principle of civil government, and if every person in the United States would recognize this principle and practice accordingly, this would be a perfect civil Government. The recognition of this principle and the intelligent understanding of it, ought to be made, not only the public school instruction upon citizenship, but the qualification for citizenship in the naturalization of all who make application for admission. When a person acts in anything, in such a way as to interfere with the free exercise, by any other person, of his right to life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, then he denies the principle upon which the Government itself rests, and thereby undermines his own civil safety and in effect forfeits his right to it. Because, as rights are equal, what one has the right to do, another has an equal right to do. If one claims the right to act in such a way as to interfere with the free exercise of another's right to life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, then all have an equal right to do the same thing, and if all should do that, then all government would be gone and only anarchy reign. Therefore, as the Government is established to secure the equal inalienable rights of men no one can invade the rights of another, to any degree, without at once striking at the foundation of the Government itself.

Let these principles be taught to the youth of the country, in the public schools, and there will be much more success in the effort to secure good citizens, than there is in the plans and the teaching now employed. As it is now, these principles are neglected if not ignored, and by an attempt to inculcate what is called morals, neither morality nor good citizenship is secured. As we have shown in the discussion of Mr. Bierbower's book, which we have since learned is used in the Chicago public schools, such teaching can never secure good citizenship. The basis of it all is selfishness only, and as we showed at the time is essentially pagan. But this is not the only instance. The same system of ethics is inculcated in other schools of the country. In the city of Greenville, Michigan, the youth are taught, just as Bierbower's book teaches, that whatever they think to be right that *is* right, and that when the Hindoo mother throws her child into the river Ganges, she does right. (This case was actually used in illustration in a class in that school.) Such teaching as that is open heathenism, and the more of it that is believed by men, the worse they will be.

Again, how can good citizenship be inculcated better, or in any other way in fact, than by teaching the principles of the government to which the citizen belongs? This is plain enough in itself. Therefore, as the principles of the United States

Government are the best on earth, the faithful teaching of these principles will secure the best citizenship. Let the principles of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States be taught in the public schools, and let questions and principles of morality and religion be considered and taught in and by the family and the Church.

Question 7.—When the teacher punishes a pupil for fighting, lying, swearing, or stealing, does he not employ the most emphatic method of teaching morality?

Answer.—Indeed he does not. Morality never can be secured by punishment. The Lord himself can not make men moral by punishment. To bring men to morality by punishment, is the Augustinian, the inquisitorial, the papal, the purgatorial theory. Augustine's doctrine is that often it is necessary to punish men until they reach the highest stage of religious development. That is the theory and the doctrine of the Inquisition. Therefore it was always from love of men's souls and to save their souls that the Inquisition tormented men's bodies. And as a good many people died in this world before the Inquisition could get hold of them, it was necessary to find a place, and invent a scheme of punishment after they were dead, so that they might reach this highest standard of religious development; in other words that they might attain to morality, and so purgatory, with its remedies for immorality, was established, and is still run as one of the institutions of papal morality. If men could have been made moral by punishment then Christ need never have died.

Our querist is probably correct in his idea that this is the most "*emphatic*" method of teaching morality, but it is certainly not the most efficient method. Nor is it in fact any method at all properly speaking. No, as we have before shown, men have lost morality by the transgression of the law of God, and there is no power in them to attain to it. Consequently, the only power by which they can attain to it, is the power of God which is manifested to men in the gospel of Jesus Christ. Morality is the gift of God through faith in Jesus Christ, and the writing of the law of God anew upon the heart by the Spirit of God which is received by faith in Christ, the shedding abroad of the love of God in the heart by the Holy Ghost, *is the only effectual means of bringing men to morality*, and the only proper method of teaching morality. Punishment is the penalty inflicted in vindication of the majesty of violated law, but punishment neither changes the disposition, nor bestows power. The love of God does both.

Even if it should be admitted, however, that punishment is an element of moral instruction and a means of inculcating morality, it would still remain a fact that the exercise of it is not the prerogative of

man. That would pertain to God alone as being the only one who is capable of truly knowing the measure of moral guilt and the proportion of punishment. Man's assumption of authority to punish for immorality, established the Inquisition, and that is the logic of every such claim wherever made.

Question 8.—Does not the teacher of necessity teach morality when he gives instruction from our text books on physiology, and hygiene, which includes the dire effect of alcohol on the human system, the necessity of cleanliness, bad effects of tight lacing, etc.?

Answer.—He does not. A man may study physiology and hygiene all his school days; he may never touch a drop of alcohol; he may bathe three times a day and put on clean clothes each time; he may never wear a corset; he may do all these things and yet be far from being a moral man. In fact, so far as men are concerned, tight lacing we apprehend is not a very important element in the immorality which attaches to them. Nor is it essential that women shall practice tight lacing in order to be immoral. It is true that if a person has the root and the elements of morality in him, the instruction referred to may be helpful in cultivating it; but if he has it not in him then none of these things nor all of them together, can give it to him, and a teacher is not teaching morality when he gives instruction on these points.

Question 9.—Does not the teacher of necessity teach morality when he teaches the principles of justice as connected with the republican form of Government which is framed on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States?

Answer.—He does not. He teaches only civility. Because the principle of justice connected with any government on earth is only such as is comprehended by men, and is therefore only human. And this principle, as connected with the form of government which is framed on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, the teaching of the principle, and the practice of the principle never can get beyond the grade of civility. It is the principle of justice comprehended by God which is alone divine and which is up to the standard of morality. God's justice is in itself morality; but civil government, which rests upon the natural basis which is conducted only on man's comprehension of the principle of justice, can never get beyond the civil. Therefore civil government is all any earthly government ever can be, and it should not attempt to be anything else. For in attempting to be more, it always becomes less.

We know that in many instances men use the term morality when they mean just what we mean by the term civility. When such is the meaning in their use of the term, we agree with all that they say about it; but we never can consent to call it morality. Morality is infinitely a deeper

and a broader term than is the term civility. The field of morality is much wider and in fact is essentially distinct from that of civility. Therefore, we always insist upon the distinction which there is between them, and which should always be made and recognized between them.

We know that the term morality has become, to a considerable extent, established in usage in a sense in which it means neither morality nor civility, but a sort of sentimental theoretical something that each theorist may have framed for himself, meaning much more than civility and infinitely less than morality. But such usage is wrong. It comes down to our time from the time when the Papacy was supreme and when accordingly there was utter confusion of all things pertaining to the Church and to the State, of the civil and the religious; when in short everything was held to be moral, according to the papal idea of morality. And everybody who has looked into the history of those times, knows full well that under the papal dominion and in the papal system there never was any such thing as either morality or civility.

Moral government is God's government. Morality is the realm of God. He is the Author and the conservator of it. Civil government is ordained of God, and its purpose is civil only. For these reasons we constantly insist upon a clear distinction in the terms morality and civility, and in so doing we occupy Protestant ground. The great confession made at Augsburg in 1530 declared as follows:—

The civil administration is occupied about other matters, than is the gospel. The magistracy does not defend the souls, but the bodies, and bodily things, against manifest injuries; and coerces men by the sword and corporal punishments, that it may uphold civil justice and peace, wherefore the ecclesiastical and the civil power are not to be confounded. . . . In this way ours distinguish between the duties of each power, one from the other, and admonish all men to honor both powers, and to acknowledge both to be the gifts and blessings of God.

This is Protestant truth. It is Christian truth. It is God's truth. And as we are Protestants and Christians and worshipers of the Most High God, we insist forever upon a distinction between the religious and the secular, the moral and the civil; rendering to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's and to God the things that are God's.

A. T. J.

The Design of National Reformers.

THEY are positive and persistent in the denial of any desire for the union of Church and State; but admit that they desire the union of religion with the State. In reply to this it may be asked, What religion? and the answer must be, The Christian religion; for they do not mean Mohammedanism, Buddhism, or any other religion but the Christian. But a union of the Christian religion with the State would be a union of the Christian Church

with the State, unless Christianity can exist without Christians.

That their real object is an alliance of the Christian Church with the civil Government is too plain to be doubted. They ask Congress to enact laws to enforce the observance of what they call the Christian Sabbath. The plea for a "civil Sabbath" for the benefit of over-worked laborers, does not come from the laboring men. It is only a disguise—a sugar-coating—to make the religious Sunday go down with legislators. But the disguise is too thin. And all may know, if they will, that a movement which calls fraud and hypocrisy to its aid, is not from above.

The very name of their first and leading paper declares their object unmistakably. The *Christian Statesman!*—that means a union of Church and State.—"*A Christian party in politics,*" striving to get the Government under their control, so as to legislate for "Christian laws and usages." Of course, they do not ask that any one of their numerous sects should be established by law; but they want the Government to espouse the cause of Christianity and enforce a portion, at least, of their creed—such portion on which the leading denominations can agree. R. F. COTTRELL.

The Use of Civil Government.

IN an ideal state of existence, there would be no civil government, for there would be no need of it. Heaven has no civil government. The only law to which the angels are amenable is God's moral law, which is the basis of his government for all intelligent beings in his universe. Even this law exercises no arbitrary restraint over the angelic host, for it is all founded in love, and therefore requires only such service as love dictates. Supreme love for God, and love for their fellows, leads them of their own free will, to do just those things which the law requires, hence all consciousness of legal restraint is gone. Here is *perfect liberty*, and this is the only perfect liberty possible to intelligent beings anywhere in the universe of God. When each one, from the indwelling motive of love, pleases to do just what the law of love requires him to do, then the law and the government itself is lost in love, and each one does *just as he pleases*. If the law is a just one, there is one thing, and only one, that harmonizes the conflicting ideas of perfect obedience and liberty, and that one thing is perfect love. This is the love of God, "that ye keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous." "I delight to do thy will, oh my God," why? "yea, thy law is within my heart."

From this it is seen that all approach toward perfect love is a corresponding approach toward possible liberty, and toward the utter uselessness and needlessness of all governmental restraints. Thus in an ideal existence there would be no

need of government to protect the rights of individuals, for love would be their full protection. There would be no need for armies, or courts of justice, or police officers, or prisons, or any of the paraphernalia of government, and hence no need of taxes for their support. From this it will be seen that civil government is simply a necessity of an imperfect state of being. It is because men, and societies, and nations of men, are actuated by selfishness and hate, and not love, that civil government becomes necessary to protect the rights of the individual, and to maintain the rights of the nation.

In such a state of imperfection as this, the absence of government would be the presence of anarchy and confusion; and therefore God who is a God of order and not of confusion, has ordained civil government for a special purpose. That purpose is simply the maintaining of harmony and order by protecting the rights of each individual in the nation, and by protecting the rights of the nation against infringement from other nations.

As the rights of the nation are simply the combined and aggregated rights of the individuals that compose the nation, it follows that the sole object of civil government is simply to maintain and protect the rights of each individual in the government. But it may be asked, Why can not the individual protect his own rights? The answer is—he might do it against one individual at a time, provided that individual had no advantage of strength, or wealth, or influence. Such, however, is not often the case. The aggressive party has some such advantage, or imagines he has it, else he would not attempt such aggression. If he has no other advantage, he has that of knowing his own plans and intentions, and of these the party he conspires against is ignorant. Then it often happens that greed and lust cause different individuals to combine their power and influence to rob one individual of his rights. Against their combined aggression he alone would be powerless.

We have seen that from these facts arising out of human imperfection, comes the necessity and the sole necessity of civil government. The ideal civil government, then, is simply the pledge, expressed or understood, of each individual in the nation to unite with all others, if need be, for the maintenance of the rights of any one, and to unite with all others for the maintenance of the aggregated rights of the whole when such rights are menaced by other nations. Mark, all this is for the *maintaining* and *protecting* of rights. The rights already exist.

That is the sublime truth of the immortal Declaration of Independence. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

All the governments of the world could not create a single individual right, neither could they all combined take away a single right from a single soul, for these rights are inalienable. The right still remains, however much or long the individual is denied the exercise of it. The legislative function of the government is simply to state these rights in plain unmistakable language or law. The judicial function of the government is to investigate individual cases for the purpose of determining whether these rights as stated by the law have been infringed. The executive department of the government, with its prisons and police, and detectives and sheriffs and higher officers, is solely for the purpose of detecting, apprehending, and punishing criminals, *i. e.*, persons who disregard these rights in others. It may be added, that all this acts also as a preventive of crime, by furnishing to those who are morally weak, the additional motive of fear, to induce them to regard the rights of others.

From all this it will be seen that all the paraphernalia of government is solely for the purpose of maintaining the individual rights of its citizens. Not for the purpose of giving rights or taking them away, both of which are impossible, nor for the purpose of *restricting or directing* the individual in the exercise of these rights. The only restriction that can rightfully be made by any civil government, on the exercise of individual rights by each citizen, is such restriction as is implied in the pledge of each citizen to do his part in protecting the rights of each and all. On such restriction, the very existence of government depends. To illustrate, the government depends for its existence on the power to levy taxes for its support.

It may be argued that to compel a man to pay taxes is a restriction of his rights: but if so, it is only such a restriction as it is implied that he agreed to when he became a citizen of the government, and such restriction exists not for the purpose of taking away his rights, but solely for the purpose of securing them. It is the price charged by the government for the protection it guarantees. It can not fairly be said to be a restriction of a man's rights to compel him to pay the government for value received, any more than to compel him to pay the individual for value received. The same may be said of the power of the government to raise armies, and to compel men to serve in them. In the present imperfect state of human development, the very existence of the nation, as a nation, depends on this power.

It may be said that it is a restriction on individual liberty to draft a man, and compel him to serve in the army; and, indeed, the draft should never be resorted to till the call for volunteers fails to bring a sufficient supply of men for the emergency. When, however, the nation's existence, and consequently the rights of

every individual in the nation, are endangered, the government may then draft men, and compel them to fight to protect their own rights and the rights of their fellows. This is really no restriction of individual rights, for it is simply calling upon all the people to fight for their own rights. If all are not needed in the army, those who stay at home have to provide for the support of those who are needed; and there seems to be a natural law of equalization which in many other ways, compels them to bear their just part in the great struggle for the maintenance of the rights of each and all.

Moreover, it is not a restriction of human rights to compel a man to fulfill his contracts, and the very existence of a government implies the contract and the pledge of the individual to support it. The same may be said of the power of the government to subpoena witnesses. This power is necessary that the rights of each and all may be maintained, and it is therefore included in the implied pledge of each to maintain such rights, on which pledge the very existence of government depends.

Again I say it is no restriction of human rights to compel the fulfillment of such a pledge. The most that such an individual can demand is a fair remuneration for his time and trouble, and this the government grants. Under such circumstances, if he refuses to go and witness, it is not that he is trying to maintain his own rights, but that he is trying to infringe the rights of others, or is in sympathy with those who have infringed such rights. Such act becomes a criminal disregard of human rights, and may justly be punished.

From all this it is evident that, without exception, the sole legitimate use and function of government is to *maintain and protect rights*; never to give or take away rights, both of which are impossible; nor to restrict or direct people in the exercise of these rights. In so much as it attempts to restrict or direct the individual in the exercise of his rights, in just so much it exceeds its rightful limits of power, and in just so much it becomes a paternal government.

So much for the use of civil government. The evils of a paternal government will be considered next week, in an article on the abuse of civil government.

G. E. FIFIELD.

A SEA captain, trading regularly to the African coast, says an exchange, was invited to meet a committee of a society for the evangelization of Africa. After numerous questions touching the habits and religion of the African races, he was asked:

"Do the subjects of King Dahomey keep Sunday?"

"Keep Sunday?" he replied, "yes, and every other thing they can lay their hands on."

Religious Liberty.

CARDINAL GIBBONS, in a sermon on civil and religious liberty, delivered in the Baltimore Cathedral, March 8, and printed in the *Catholic Mirror*, of March 14, said:—

A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right of worshiping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practicing a form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God.

Speaking on the same subject, the *Minneapolis Ensign* (Baptist) says:—

Religious liberty is liberty for the wrong conscience as well as for the right conscience, for false worship or no worship at all as well as for true worship. That is to say, conscience and worship, as between the individual soul and God, are things with which the State has nothing whatever to do; and are also things over which no church has any control or authority, except in so far as the individual may freely and voluntarily accept its teachings. It is infinitely important that our conscience be right and our worship be right; our eternal destiny depends upon our being right in these matters, but no State and no church has the authority to say what is right for all men, and to compel men by force to obey their decisions. The State can define crimes, but can not define sins; and it can command what is necessary for good order, enforcing its commands by proper punishments, provided it does not seek to invade the sacred precincts of the individual conscience.

The church may say upon what terms it will receive persons to its membership and communion, but it can not touch with its little finger any one who does not freely receive its terms and enter its membership. Any man can leave any church as freely as he enters it, without physical or civil pains or penalties, or compulsion.

Religion is purely a matter between God and the soul, with which no outside person or power has anything to do, except in the way of advice and persuasion and accepted instruction. Freedom to worship God includes the freedom not to worship him, and the freedom to worship him rightly includes the freedom to worship wrongly, so far as any human power is concerned. To God alone every man must make his supreme answer.

Toleration is not liberty, though the two are often confounded, ignorantly or for some other sinister purpose. Toleration is the act of a power that claims the right to prohibit as well as permit. Liberty disclaims all right or power of prohibition or proscription in matters of religion, and leaves each one free to do as he pleases. England "tolerates" dissenters, but imposes upon them some civil or social disabilities. France, and even Italy, "tolerate" Protestants, with what restrictions those speedily know who attempt to exercise religious freedom. In Spain, according to the present Constitution, "a restricted liberty of worship is allowed to Protestants, but it has to be entirely in private, all public announcements of the same being strictly forbidden." Similar conditions prevail in the other countries of Europe and in South America.

In the United States we have religious liberty in the full sense of the word, guaranteed by the Constitution and the laws. It is a priceless heritage, the product of centuries of controversy and conflict, secured through the heroic endurance and suffering and martyrdom of many of the world's noblest benefactors. It can be maintained only by intelligence and virtue and pure religion. The chief agencies of true freedom are the home, the school, the free church, with the open Bible and the untrammelled proclamation of the gospel as Christ taught it. Among our highest duties to-day are the appreciation and the defense of religious liberty, against all enemies, open or disguised.

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. A. COLCORD, Secretary.

Seventh-Day Adventists and the National Religious Liberty Association.

THAT Seventh-day Adventists are the progenitors and prime movers of the National Religious Liberty Association should neither be concealed nor denied by any member of the Association or of the denomination. There could be no more use in denying this than there could be in denying that Methodists took the first step in the organization of the American Sabbath Union, or in denying that the Reformed Presbyterians are the originators of the National Reform Association. And what is more, when we come to examine the principles and objects of these different organizations, we find that so far as the denominations are concerned, there is no more cause for shame in the first case than in either of the latter two; while the principles and work of the latter two organizations named, are directly subversive of civil and religious liberty, and, though unintentionally so it may be, tend directly toward a union of Church and State, the objects of the National Religious Liberty Association are to call the attention of the people to the true principles of civil and religious liberty, and sound a note of warning against the uniting, in this country, of Church and State.

Rev. Z. R. Ward, a prominent Methodist minister, of South Dakota, attempted to criticize the National Religious Liberty Association, in the *Parker* (South Dakota) *Press*, of March 14, 1891, in the following manner. He said:—

It is simply the Seventh-day Adventists carrying on their controversies under different aliases, as the National Religious Liberty Association, *The American Sentinel*, etc.

To this we replied in the same paper, under date March 28, as follows:—

That Seventh-day Adventists are prime movers in this Association is true; but it is also true that members of other denominations are also connected with it, and advocate its principles. A letter just received from West Sunbury, Pennsylvania, dated March 12, 1891, says:—

Last October I sent you one dollar to have my name enrolled as a member of the National Religious Liberty Association, for which I have your receipt, dated October 28. Therefore, I hope you will entrust me with leaflets and literature for distribution. I think I could do a good work in the Presbyterian Church, of which I am a member. I was a subscriber to *The American Sentinel* in Oakland and ever since, and approve its teachings, all but its leaning toward the seventh-day Sabbath. I shall look for literature.

As to aliases, we might inquire why Mr. Ward does not come with his full name, and tell us that he is Rev. Z. R. Ward, of the Methodist Episcopal Church [to his articles he signed himself simply "Z. R. W."], and that that church, in 1888, took the initiatory steps in organizing an association called the American Sabbath Union, the object of which, according to article 3 of its Constitution, is "to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship," and to seek to preserve it thus by law? Is he ashamed of any of these things? He seems anxious to bring the controversy into denominational lines. But when he does this, he should not forget that he has a denomination of his own to defend. Have not Seventh-day Adventists as much right to form an association to oppose religious legislation as have the Methodists to form one to favor such legislation?

If the principles are sound, the originators and advocates of them need not be ashamed to show their colors. And of the Declaration of Principles of the National Religious Liberty Association, Mr. Ward, in the *Parker Press* of April 11, is forced to say:—

This Declaration of Principles is quite unobjectionable. . . . They are very good. They are just such as all evangelical churches of Christendom believe in. It is just what the Methodist Episcopal Church believes in, and what the American Sabbath Union is organized to protect and defend.

To this we replied:—

Well, we wonder! Then, where is the cause for disagreement? But let us see. Let us read the fourth Principle: "We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions." Does Mr. Ward and the Methodist Church indorse this? If so, why is it they are demanding the civil government to enact a national Sunday law, and clamoring for stricter State Sunday laws, when such laws are legislation upon a religious question?

We think from the above it will be seen that whether the controversy comes between the different organizations as such, or between the religious denominations which gave birth to them, the question simply narrows itself down to the principles and objects of each association, and must, after all, be settled upon its merits. If the objects of the American Sabbath Union and the National Reform Association are bad, they cast just so much reflection upon the denominations which originated them; and if, on the other hand, the objects of the National Religious Liberty Association are good, by so much has the denomination which gave it birth whereof to be proud. And the fact that members of other denominations can indorse the principles of the National Religious Liberty Association, become members of it, and engage in the distribution of its literature, and that even its avowed enemies are forced to confess that those principles are good, speaks volumes in its behalf. W. A. COLCORD.

THE Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has decided that Sunday shaving is illegal in that State.

THIRTEEN barbers of Philadelphia have been fined four dollars and costs, each, for shaving customers contrary to the Sunday ordinance.

A MOVEMENT is on foot to open the Public Library in Portsmouth, Ohio, on Sunday, and the entire ministry of the place are opposing it with all their might.

THE police authorities in Buenos Ayres have closed the Salvation Army hall in that city, asserting that the army is not recognized by the Church. The Salvationists have appealed to President Pellegrini, on the ground that the action of the police is a violation of religious liberty.

THE ministers of Cincinnati are waging quite a war on Sunday baseball. The *Enquirer* states that it looks as though there will be no baseball Sundays. Is it possible for a purely civil law to make anything a crime when done one day in the week, that when done on another day ministers and all can enjoy as perfectly harmless? This civil Sunday farce is so thin that it can be seen through from all sides.

DURING the first month of his summer lecturing tour for the Sunday Union, Mr. Crafts reports twenty places visited, and says:—

Without an exception, a local Sabbath committee or rest day league has been organized in each place visited.

He outlines the remainder of his route, "with variations, somewhat as follows: May, eastern Iowa, northern Illinois, and Wisconsin; first half of June, Minnesota; last half of June, South Dakota, Nebraska, western Iowa, and northeastern Kansas; July, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and northern Illinois; August, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, western New York and northwestern Pennsylvania; September, New England and New Brunswick; October, western Pennsylvania and New York."

THE editor of the "Pearl of Days" says he asked a distinguished citizen of another State

What are some of the chief causes of the non-enforcement of Sunday laws?

And the answer returned was:—

No law will enforce itself, therefore somebody must see that it is enforced. It is unnecessary to say that this obligation is on the executors of the law. But what if they are remiss in their duty? Then somebody must see to it that the officers of the law do their duty, else step down and out. Who will do this? The transgressors of the law? No. The disbelievers in the sanctity of the Sabbath? No. The careless and indifferent? No. Hence to my mind the chief cause of the non-enforcement of our Sabbath laws is found in the indisposition of Christian people to demand their rights and to give the politicians to understand that the only use we have for them is to see first that good laws are enacted, and, second, that these laws are enforced.

This continual insistence upon the idea that it is the duty of those who would be considered Christians to pray and prosecute is sure to bear fruit sooner or later.

"In the Heart of the Sierras."
The GRANDEST BOOK
ON THE
GRANDEST SUBJECT
The Yosemite Valley


Over 500 Pages.
 160 Illustrations - Many Artistic Full-page Illustrations.
 Fine Paper - Elegant Bindings.
 Written by Col. J. M. HUTCHINGS Formerly a Guardian of the Valley.

Active Agents Wanted!
 Send NOW for Terms to Territory. We give **BIG DISCOUNTS** and **Pay the Freight.** Send \$1.50 for Prospectus & Outfit **AT ONCE**

TOURISTS EDITION No Artotypes. Thinner Paper, flexible Cloth, post-paid for \$1.50. Everybody Wants it.

Address: **PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,**
 43 Bond St., New York, N.Y.

DO YOU WANT THE BEST ATLAS PUBLISHED?
 IF SO SEND TO US FOR



This Atlas contains thirty-three imperial quarto maps, 12 x 14 inches, and an index of 20,000 geographical names, so arranged as to show the latitude and longitude of each place named and the number of the map on which it will be found.

This Atlas is a most attractive volume, and is by far the cheapest fine Atlas ever published. Dr. A. T. Pierson, in *Missionary Review*, says of it:—

"In convenient folio form at the amazingly low price of one dollar. We recommend all students to procure a copy to place on their tables for constant reference. We have found it invaluable. It has a copious index by which easily and rapidly to find any city or town or district."

We will send this Atlas prepaid to any address in the United States or Canada for \$1.25.

Address, **PACIFIC PRESS,**
 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Evening Line by the Picturesque Hudson.

STEAMERS BALDWIN AND ROMER.

To Kingston, and the Catskill Mountains, leaving New York daily, except Sundays, at 4:00 p. m., from pier 46, foot of West 10th street; and Rondout, daily, except Saturday, at 6:00 p. m. Saturday steamer leaves New York at 1:00 p. m. These Steamers are under the management of, and sailed by, their owners. Comfort and safety assured, comfortable staterooms, excellent meals, and an opportunity to view the grandest river scenery in the world, in the setting sun, and by moonlight.

Illustrated Curiosity List

With box of Ornamental Minerals, Indian Relics Curiosities, 10c. "Companion," Illustrated, describing curiosities, 25c. year; Advertisements, 1c. a word. [Mention this paper.]

E. A. BROWNE, FLORENCE, ARIZONA.

HAVE YOU SUBSCRIBED For the YOUNG PEOPLE'S LIBRARY?

Others appreciate the value of the books issued in the "YOUNG PEOPLE'S LIBRARY" series. Have YOU secured its issues for your children to read?

THE FIRST SERIES,

Our set of six books, bound in cloth, and put up in a neat box, is now ready. This set should be in every Sabbath school library in the land. Can you not do something to assist in the circulation of good reading for the young? Read

What Prominent Religious Papers Say of These Books.

FIJI AND SAMOA.

The book is full of interest from the first page to the last, and one that will amply repay perusal. It is handsomely printed and bound, and the illustrations, fifteen in number, are very good and add to the interest of the book, which is creditable both to the author and to the publishers, as well as a specimen of good book making.—*Christian at Work.*

JACK THE CONQUEROR.

It is a good little book to put into the hands of boys. The spirit and pluck of a right-minded lad battling successfully against difficulties are well depicted.—*The Independent.*

SAVONAROLA.

It is a pleasant, popularly written account of the career of the great revivalist and martyr. There always is a public for such a book as this, dealing, as it does, with events as historically fateful as they were romantic, and it will do good.—*The Congregationalist.*

Every volume contains choice, wholesome, instructive reading, and, while designed for the young, it will be equally interesting to every member of the family. Each volume has 160 pages, is fully illustrated and substantially bound in fine colored cloth, handsomely embossed in jet and gold.

The following numbers comprise the first series:—

1. **Jottings From the Pacific, No. 1.—Fiji and Samoa.**
2. **Jack the Conqueror.**
3. **Savonarola, the Florentine Martyr.**
4. **Jottings From the Pacific, No. 2.—The Tonga Islands and other Groups.**
5. **Letters From the Holy Land.**
6. **Among the Northern Icebergs.**

The set of six volumes, in cloth, in a neat box, sent post-paid, for \$3.00.

Address **PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,**
 Or, Oakland, Cal. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

The Nonsuch Professor, IN HIS MERIDIAN SPLendor.

By WILLIAM SECKER (Puritan).

With an introduction by THEO. L. CUYLER, D. D. Price, post-paid, \$1.00.

TESTIMONIALS.

- "It is a mine of sparkling gems."—*Presbyterian Observer.*
- "A sheaf of golden grain, ripened by grace, and sweet with the flavor of rare simplicity and holy wisdom."—*New York Observer.*
- "It is a searching book."—*Christian Intelligencer.*
- "This is a wonderful book. At whatever page you open it, your eye lights upon pithy aphorisms that combine the sententiousness of Benjamin Franklin, with the sweet, holy savor of Samuel Rutherford. It contains hundreds of bright seed thoughts."—*Rev. T. L. Cuyler, D. D.*

Address, **PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,**
 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

GOOD HEALTH,

The popular health journal conducted by

J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Contains the following departments: **General Articles**, devoted to practical hygiene and popular medical papers; **The Home Gymnasium**, an illustrated department of physical culture; **Dress**, which opposes extreme notions, but advocates rational dress-reform; **Social Purity**, conducted in the interest of all that pertains to the moral purity of the individual, the home, and society; **Medical Frauds**, containing reports of the results of recent and original investigations of the nature and composition of secret nostrums, and the methods of secret systems of medical treatment. **Editorial**, and **A Doctor's Chats with His Patients**, combine a rich variety of hygienic tidbits representing latest scientific thought and racy discussions of live medical topics, new ideas in medical philosophy, new theories of disease, etc.; and **Household Science**, wherein Mrs. J. H. Kellogg gives the readers of **GOOD HEALTH** the benefit of her years of experience in **Hygienic Cookery**. The publishers offer the following premium to new subscribers:

The Household Monitor of Health,

A new and valuable work of 400 pages. Price of **GOOD HEALTH**, \$1.00 a year. With Premium Book, \$1.37. Address,

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

PENSIONS

The Disability Bill is a Law.

SOLDIERS DISABLED SINCE THE WAR ARE ENTITLED. Dependent widows and parents now dependent whose sons died from effects of army service are included. If you wish your claim speedily and successfully prosecuted, address **JAMES TANNER,** Late Commissioner of Pensions, WASHINGTON D. C.

GENERAL AGENT WANTED

AGENTS are making FROM \$75 to \$150 PER MONTH. **FARMERS MAKE \$200 to \$500 DURING THE WINTER**

LADIES have great success selling this Washer. Retail price only \$5. Sample to those desiring an agency \$2. Also the Celebrated **KEYSTONE WRENCHERS** at manufacturers' lowest prices. We invite the strictest investigation. Send your address on a postal card for further particulars. **LOVELL WASHER CO.,** 251 Huron St. ERIE, PA.

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.





NEW YORK, MAY 21, 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.

IN answer to inquiries we would say that no decision has been handed down in the case of R. M. King, the Tennessee farmer, imprisoned for hoeing potatoes on Sunday in his own field.

AN Omaha religious paper, devoted to National Reform, has the following item:

An able but skeptical lawyer, in referring to the answer which Jesus gave to the entangling question of the Pharisees and Herodians: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things which are God's," said, "That is the most brilliant reply I have ever heard."

The skeptical lawyer spoke none too highly of Christ's answer, and one beauty of it is that it is just as apt when applied to National Reformers as to the Pharisees. It is utterly crushing in either case.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *Observer*, says:

The sects which have broken from the Russian Church number between one and two hundred. An American missionary, who is familiar with Russia, assured me that there were even now as many as one hundred and seventy-five of these dissenting bodies, and they contain three million members. They arose at the time of Peter the Great, and were one manifestation of the objection of the people to the arbitrary and sweeping reforms which he inaugurated and enforced.

Which is another evidence of the impossibility of effecting moral and religious reforms by law.

ONE of the reasons (?) urged by the *Mail and Express* for the Sunday closing of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, is that some of the paintings are demoralizing. "There are," says that journal, with a most reckless disregard of truth, "in the Museum representations of almost every crime." But why in the name of common sense, if this were true, would the influence of such paintings be any worse upon Sunday than upon any other day? It seems, however, that an overmastering desire for "civil" Sunday regulations robs those who have it of even the commonest kind of common sense, in regard to Sunday and all that pertains to it.

SPEAKING of some who make a plea in behalf of the workingmen for the opening of museums on Sunday, the *Catholic Review* says:—

They are hypocrites in their pretense of consult-

ing the workingmen's comfort and pleasure, for were not Christianity an element in the problem the poor workingman might work half the night and live on grass for all they cared.

This could be said much more truthfully of those who, in the name of the workingmen, demand rigid Sunday closing of everything but the churches, in order, professedly, that the toiling masses may rest; in reality, that those same masses may be constrained to resort to the churches. Political demagoguery is bad enough but religious hypocrisy is doubly despicable.

WE are pleased to acknowledge from Ignaz Fischer the following new sheet music—"Come unto Me;" words by D. R. Locke, music by Osgood; easy melody, and beautiful words; also a choice instrumental piece, a reverie, entitled, "Lost in Sorrow." Mr. Fischer has a fine collection of sacred music, consisting of solos, duets, choruses, etc. Catalogues will be sent on application to J. Fischer & Bro., New York City, or to Ignaz Fischer, 229 Summit St., Toledo, Ohio.

A PITTSBURG dispatch of the 11th inst. says:—

Col. Robert G. Ingersoll may not lecture in Pittsburg. Mr. J. O. Brown, Chief of the Department of Public Safety, has set his foot down on Sunday lectures where an admission fee is charged. The Chief received a letter from David Henderson, manager of the Duquesne Theater in Chicago, asking whether it would be in accordance with the law of Pittsburg to have Mr. Ingersoll deliver one of his lectures on Sunday night at the theater. Chief Brown replied as follows:—

"In answer to yours of the 8th inst. I would reply that it would be directly contrary to law for Mr. Ingersoll to lecture upon the Sabbath day or evening where an admission is charged. I hope you will not attempt to have such a lecture delivered, for it would be my imperative duty to prevent the same. This letter is written after consultation with the attorney of this department with reference to the law."

Chief Brown, in speaking on the subject, said: "I am unalterably opposed to opening the doors any wider on the Sunday question. We have freedom enough, and lectures of this kind are only gotten up for money, and I think we might as well open the theaters for theatrical performances as a lecture of the kind Mr. Ingersoll would naturally give."

Fine Sunday law that! Great possibilities are certainly bound up in it.

UNDER a decision of the Supreme Court of Rhode Island a bequest based upon the religious belief of the beneficiaries falls to the ground. One, Joseph Greene, a Quaker, was greatly disturbed during his latter years by members of his family marrying outside the pale of the Society, and he attempted by his will to bestow his estate for the benefit of those persons whom he considered Orthodox Friends or Wilberites, as distinguished from the schismatic branches of the Society. The argument of the contestants of the will was that while it might be possible to ascertain one's religious professions, it is not within capabilities of human determination to ascertain belief, that being a sub-

jective state which has no unerring external marks which may be passed upon. This position was sustained. "So that," remarks the *Christian at Work*, "whether Quaker or of 'the world's people,' if you would have your money go only into the hands of orthodoxy—that is, *your doxy*—you must place it there during your lifetime, for the courts will not undertake to place it there when your tombstone is set up."

THE *Sun* has the following note which is significant in view of the changes which have been rung by certain unscrupulous Sunday-law advocates upon the demand of certain barbers for only six days' work with seven days' pay:—

Every humane man must sympathize with the barbers employed in the up-town shops, when it is known that they get no more pay than the down-town barbers and yet have to work until 9 o'clock at night, and on Sundays until 1 o'clock in the afternoon. The down-town barbers get the same pay, \$12 or \$13 a week, and are free at night and on Sundays. But now comes the strangest news. The down-town barbers consider themselves very ill used by Fate if they can not find an up-town shop in which to work on Sunday for an extra \$2.

We believe that we have before remarked that there is a good deal of humbug about the demand for Sunday laws in the interest of barbers and others accustomed to do more or less Sunday work.

IN the report of the Grand Jury for the January term of the criminal court of Baltimore there are two paragraphs devoted to Sunday laws, the one in reference to the Sunday closing of saloons, and the other a recommendation in regard to Sunday laws in general. The latter is as follows:—

There is a class of laws which might be called "Sunday laws," and which are undoubtedly in the best interests of the mass of the people, and which are violated, with seeming impunity by a certain class, to the serious detriment of any one in a similar business, and who keeps the law. This is neither legal, nor is it treating the better citizens with any common fairness. No evil could be much greater to all citizens than that each place of business should be in full operation on Sunday.

The Sunday laws are, in many of their features, police laws, and ought to be more rigidly enforced, and we would recommend that the Legislature, at the next session, be requested to appoint a special committee of the Senate and House to make a thorough examination of all laws relating to Sunday restrictions, with a view of determining what laws are obsolete or of impracticable enforcement, and to recommend to their respective bodies the repeal of such laws and the enactment of new statutes relating to the same subject. These laws should be drawn with special reference to their enforcement in large cities.

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 2 to 100 copies, per year, each, - - - 90c.

In clubs of 100 or more copies, per year, each, - - 75c.

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

Address AMERICAN SENTINEL,
43 Bond Street, New York.