

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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 13, 1891.

NUMBER 32.

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.

IN view of the demand that the State shall teach religion in the public schools, it is a pertinent question to ask, What kind of a religion? This question is not always fairly answered by those who make the proposition. It is generally answered in a vague indeterminate way that leaves the question as much unanswered as before. It is sometimes answered, "The Christian Religion." But then the question still recurs, What kind of Christian religion? Shall it be the Presbyterian Christian religion? or the Methodist Christian religion? or the Lutheran Christian religion? or the Roman Catholic Christian religion? Which of these is it that shall be taught in the public schools?

It is a general fact that the moment theology allies itself with the State and commands its power, it becomes persecuting in respect to all who dissent from it, and that, too, whether it be pagan or Christian, Catholic or Protestant. History paints this fact in lurid colors.

Nor is there anything strange or unnatural in such a fact. It results from the very nature of the case. The theology of the State is a part of its organic or statute law, and, of course, it should be sustained by its authority and power. Heresy is, hence, a *crime* as really as murder, and as such it should be punished. So the State reasons, and that, too, correctly, provided we accept the doctrine of State theology. Catholic States and Protestant States have reasoned in this way. What we call religious persecution State theology calls

punishment to prevent crime. What we call religious liberty it calls a dangerous exercise of private judgment. Saul of Tarsus was a conscientious persecutor, regarding himself as doing God service; and it is but just to say that State theologies have generally been conscientious in their deeds of murder and blood. They have not looked upon themselves as ruffians and outlaws, but rather as the conservators of the divine honor and the true interests of souls. The thoughts of an after and a wiser age were not their thoughts when they trampled the religious rights of men into the dust and shocked heaven, if not earth, with their cruelties. Religious zeal misdirected is a terrible passion: and all State theologies, because administered by men, are apt to have this zeal.—*Rev. Dr. Spear.*

The King Case Again.

As briefly noted on the last page of this paper last week, Judge Hammond, of the United States District Court, having dismissed the *habeas corpus* proceedings in behalf of R. M. King, of Obion County, Tennessee, and remanded him to the custody of the sheriff of Obion County, the case will now probably go to the Supreme Court of the United States. King's offense was plowing corn on Sunday, after having observed the seventh day according to the fourth commandment. And the ground of his appeal to the Federal courts is that he is, by the Tennessee Sunday law, deprived of rights guaranteed to citizens of the United States by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Federal Constitution.

If the First Amendment to the Constitution stood alone, there would be no ground of appeal on this point, because it simply forbids *Congress* to make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; but in that amendment there is no inhibition upon the States. The States are not forbidden to do what Congress is there forbidden to do. The powers not prohibited

to the States by the Constitution, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people, and as that amendment does not forbid the State to do thus, that power may be exercised by the State to any extent. So far as this amendment goes in itself, any State in the Union might establish any religion and forbid the exercise of any religion but that. But this amendment, taken in connection with the Fourteenth, assures perfect religious liberty to every citizen of the United States.

The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States established a new order of things under this Government. Before this amendment was adopted, there was primarily no such thing as a citizen of the United States. Every person was a citizen of a State first, and a citizen of the United States only because he was a citizen of a State; but the adoption of that amendment made all persons born or naturalized within the United States, citizens of the United States, and of the several States in which they reside; so that *now* every person is a citizen of the United States first of all, and after that is a citizen of whatever State it may be in which he resides. The Fourteenth Amendment further says that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." Citizenship of the United States, therefore, and the rights, privileges, and immunities of persons as such, under this amendment take precedence of all the powers of the States. Under the First Amendment there is secured to all citizens of the United States perfect immunity from any form of oppression on account of religious convictions; because the power of the United States is positively forbidden to be exercised in any such way. And as, by this amendment, every citizen has perfect immunity and privilege secured to him in the free exercise of his religious convictions, and as by this amendment every State is absolutely prohibited from either making or enforcing any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of

the United States, it therefore follows, logically and justly, that no State can make any law, or enforce any law that is already made, which would interfere in any way with the right of an observer of the seventh day, or any other, to be free from any interference whatever on the part of, or in behalf of, those who observe Sunday or any other day.

Legislation and laws in behalf of Sunday, being religious legislation solely, are clearly prohibited to Congress by the First Amendment to the Constitution. It therefore follows that so far as the power of the United States is concerned, every citizen of the United States has perfect immunity from any such legislation. And as the Fourteenth Amendment makes all persons born or naturalized in the United States citizens of the United States first of all, and then positively prohibits any State from making or enforcing any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, it follows that properly and logically the Constitution of the United States absolutely prohibits any State from making or enforcing any Sunday law. And much more does it prohibit the enforcement of the observance of Sunday upon those who religiously observe another day.

We know that this point has never before been raised under the Constitution, and consequently the Supreme Court has never yet passed upon this important question. But that this is the logic of the Constitution upon this point seems clear, even in the face of the adverse opinion of Judge Hammond; and that we have excellent authority for saying that this is the proper construction of the Constitution is equally clear. Hon. James G. Blaine was in Congress when the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted. He played a leading part in all the movements which secured the adoption of this amendment as a part of the Constitution. His opinion of the meaning of this clause of the amendment is therefore of great value. On pages 312-314, Vol. II. of his work, "Twenty Years of Congress," Mr. Blaine discusses the value and importance of the Fourteenth Amendment, and on page 314 are the following words:

The language of the Fourteenth Amendment is authoritative and mandatory: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Under the force of these weighty inhibitions, the citizen of foreign birth cannot be persecuted by discriminating statutes, nor can the citizen of dark complexion be deprived of a single privilege or immunity which belongs to the white man. Nor can the Catholic, or the Protestant, or the Jew be placed under ban or subjected to any deprivation of personal or religious right. The provision is comprehensive and absolute, and sweeps away at once every form of oppression and every denial of justice.

This clearly touches the point at issue in the case which is proposed to be carried

up from Tennessee. If the Catholic, or the Protestant, or the Jew can not be placed under ban, or subjected to any deprivation of personal or religious right, then certainly any one of these classes is free from religious subjection to the religious dictates or observances of any of the others. And as this is true as between Protestants and Catholics, and between Catholics and Jews, and between Protestants and Jews, it is equally true as between one class of Protestants and another; and therefore the Sunday-keeping people of Tennessee or of any other State, can not place under ban, or subject to their religious dictates, under penalties of law, a people who choose to observe another day than Sunday.

This is a question of the deepest interest and of the greatest importance to every citizen of the United States. We are glad that the question is to be brought to the test. The Constitution, the logic, the justice, are all on the side of Mr. King and the National Religious Liberty Association, which has espoused his cause. Whether the law will be put there also, remains to be seen; for that depends now upon how the United States Supreme Court shall decide.

♦♦♦

The World's Fair and the Liquor Dealers.

I HAVE watched the Columbian Sunday closing movement with much interest, and am surprised to find that thus far there have been no indications of an alliance between the liquor dealers and the ministers in bringing about the desired result. It surely would be much to the liquor dealers' interest to have the Exposition closed on Sunday. Whether it be closed or opened on that day will make no difference to such as have a predilection for church services; such would attend church in either case. It would make a difference whether the Fair be closed or opened, to the other class, but this difference if it be closed would be entirely in the saloon keepers' favor. Thousands will be in Chicago during the Fair who do not care for religious institutions, or who are indifferent toward them. He who conscientiously observes Sunday will not be kept from church should the Exposition be opened on that day, and hence if it be closed it will effect the religiously indifferent and the unbeliever. It will alienate from Christianity the man who may have an indifferent leaning toward it, because if he be a just man he will be embittered by anything that is coercive. Thus, religion will be the loser and that from among the very class whom the Sunday closing movement is designed to effect. Besides this negative result there will be a positive result. The injustice and coercion of this movement will drive the religiously indifferent man, who might have attended church regularly during his stay in Chicago if

left to exercise the free will God has given him, over to the positively irreligious ranks, so far as Sunday observance is concerned, during the Fair, if indeed it does not render him entirely antagonistic to all religious institutions at all times. Having now joined the two classes, this fanatical Sunday closing movement will not stop there, for with no clean, healthful and elevating exhibition to go to, and with no desire to mingle with the Christians who thus have curtailed God-given liberties, it is easy to see who will receive these people and to whom the Sunday fanatics have driven them. A missionary approached a crowd of boys in one of our city slums, "Boys," he began, "when mother and father forsake you, who will take you up?" "Der perlice, sir, der perlice!" was the response. So, if you shut the doors of the World's Fair, who stands ready to receive those who are turned away?—Why the liquor dealer and saloon keeper of course. And does not the liquor dealer see this?—To be sure he does. How fanaticism will blind men! These zealots fail to see that religion has nothing to gain by their zeal, and the liquor interests will be far from losing by the success of the movement to close the Fair on Sunday.

There must be some reason why the saloon keeper has not joined hands with the Sunday advocate. It certainly cannot be because he is afraid that his offer of assistance will be spurned, since everybody ought to know that the advocate of the coercive measures to bring about a stricter observance of Sunday will pool issues with anybody. Liquor dealers ought not to be discouraged in attempts to bring about such an alliance, when it is well known that most of the Sunday-law advocates regard papists as the foes of all that is good, and concerning whom they read awful judgments in the Scriptures, and yet, when it comes to an alliance for the preservation of Sunday they are cordially welcomed. In one breath these reformers denounce Catholics as the Lord's enemies, and in the next they welcome them as helpers in support of the "Lord's day," so-called. The saloon keeper, it is safe to assume, knows, that, outside of the Sunday question, Catholics are objects of Protestant hatred, and yet, when this institution of Sunday observance needs help, the Catholic is a welcomed ally. So he may reason, that, although otherwise an object of attack, he would be welcomed as an aid to close the Fair on Sunday. He has also other reasons for believing that his help would be welcome. The Sunday reformer has his physical interests at heart. He has plead the saloon keepers' cause, by asserting that they need a rest day also. That saloons should be closed on Sunday to give the wasted energies of barkeepers a chance to recuperate. He does not use this as an argument, yet it is one, namely, that if the barkeeper and saloon keeper have their Sunday rest, they can better ply

their traffic the other six days. Therefore, to sum up, since it is in the saloon keeper's interest to have the Fair closed on Sundays, since he would be welcomed as an ally, and since the "Sabbath" reformers have manifested solicitude for his physical welfare, why has he not joined the Columbian Sunday closing movement?

H. B. MAURER.

"Traveling on the Sabbath."

RECENTLY, the California *Christian Advocate* published the following upon this subject:—

In most cases it is done out of entire indifference to the claims of the Sabbath. For Christians to travel on Sundays except on clear cases of necessity or mercy, is inexcusable. The Church in the West has often been disgraced by the worst kind of examples of Sabbath-breaking by ministers from the East. They come into towns on Sunday, or go on excursions on that holy day. In one case a minister came into a town on Saturday night, and was cordially invited to preach. He begged off from the morning service, but agreed to preach at night. All day Sunday he was out with a miscellaneous company on a grand excursion to the mountains. Such acts demoralize and disgust the Church. We plead for the sanctity of the Sabbath in vain when we desecrate it ourselves. It is a shame and a disgrace for Christians to violate the law of the Sabbath.

Oh, *Advocate*, now you've done it! You have gone and almost spoiled the last ditch plea for a Sunday law in California. The American Sabbath Union has planned a two years' crusade in behalf of "the only State in the Union without a Sunday law." One of its main pleas is that Sunday desecration is greatly demoralizing the people of the State. And prominent ministers of the leading denominations have taken up the strain, endeavoring to create the impression that Sunday laws form the great moral protectorate of the country. Ever and anon comes the wail about the State's lost condition, all because it has no Sunday law.

We are continually pointed to the good effect of the Sunday laws of other States, until any one who should only hear that side would naturally infer that Sunday in the East is one grand feast of morality. But here comes the *Advocate*,—the Pacific Coast organ of the very church in whose arms the infant American Sabbath Union was nursed, and whose ministers are loud in bemoaning California's isolated and deplorable condition—and upsets the kettle. It comes right out and says that even the ministers from those Sunday-law States come out here and set a very bad example in the matter of Sunday observance.

Just think of it; a minister from a Sunday-law State begs off from preaching in order to go "with a miscellaneous company on a grand excursion to the mountains." Now the Sabbath Union will have to find a new plea for its pet scheme, and the Sunday-law ministers will have to advance some new theory for improved Sunday observance. Evidently the Sunday law is a failure in the other States,

when even the ministers come from under its influence to this Coast to "demoralize and disarm and disgust the Church" where there is no Sunday law.

W. N. GLENN.

Oakland, Cal.

Shall We Have "Church and State" or Church and State?

MAXIMS and traditional phrases are one of the safeguards of liberty. Trite sayings, in course of time gather unto themselves all the force of law. Take for instance the colonists who asserted the time-honored Anglican principle that "taxation without representation is tyranny." The patriotic colonists would no more hear a denial of that principle than they would hear to a decree making them slaves; in fact, they considered that a submission to any kind of tax by Parliament was a submission to slavery. Hence, the Revolution, and American liberty.

There is another political idea which the American mind holds just as dear—holds with just as great reverence—as it does the foregoing maxim; and that is the separation of "Church and State."

Knowing this to be true, and knowing that any one who would presume to agitate openly for any such thing, would not stand any chance whatever of success, some modern "reformers" who hold identically the same opinions, are working for identically the same kind of laws and form of government, and applauding identically the same acts—now assert that though they do not want "Church and State," are "totally opposed to Church and State," etc., yet they want a *religious State*, or a *Christian State*.

This is a specimen of Jesuitical casuistry, that American people, who for a century have enjoyed the unparalleled blessings of religious liberty, should see the absurdity of at once. They most assuredly will do so, and act accordingly, too, if they still have the spirit of liberty in them that was in the American people a century ago. The English Government attempted a similar deception upon the colonists by taxing them under another name. But the plan did not succeed then. Will it succeed now?

It is a mistake to suppose that the American revolt of the last century was against the term "Church and State;" in fact that term was comparatively little used; it was against the *institution*, against Government and religion being connected in any way or having anything to do with each other.

To show that the great American movement was to preserve religion in its purity and integrity, and to confine the State to civil affairs alone, and not simply to object to what some people call "Church and State," I have collected a few terms used by one of the early American statesmen—James Madison—the "father of the Amer-

ican Constitution." These are simply gathered-at random, and I do not suppose they begin to represent all of the terms of Madison himself, much less all of those of that most interesting period of our country's history.

Some of Madison's expressions are: "The veteran error of entwining the civil and ecclesiastical polity;" "distinction between what is due to Cæsar and what is due to God;" "mutual independence of the religious and civil polity;" "religious establishments;" "ecclesiastical establishments;" "established Christianity" (not established sects); "religion and politics;" "hierarchy;" "combination of the civil and ecclesiastical polity," etc. Fully as many terms were used in reference to our religious equality; such as, "enjoyment of the freedom of religious opinions and worship," "perfect equality of rights which it [the American secular political system] secures to every religious sect," etc.

Washington, Madison, and Jefferson declined as plainly as words could declare, that *Christianity as a religion* had no more claims whatever upon the Government than any other religion.

Washington's treaty with Tripoli declares: "The Government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion;" and asserted further that "it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquillity of Mussulmans."

And Madison in his speech in the Virginia Assembly against the establishment of Christianity pointedly asked:

"What is Christianity?"

And then answering his own question he declared to the listening Assembly—"The courts of law will have to decide."

And then again he asked,

"Is it trinitarianism, arianism, or socinianism?" etc., etc., etc.

And then he added—"It ends in what is orthodoxy? what heresy?"

This is what Madison was opposed to. "Who does not see," he subsequently wrote, "that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish, with the same ease, any particular sect of Christians, to the exclusion of all other sects?"

And Jefferson, who wrote the celebrated Virginia "Act for establishing religious freedom," tells how the Assembly supported him in his views, proving that in their eyes as well as his, "its protection was meant to be universal." "Where the preamble" says he "declares that coercion is a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, an amendment was proposed, by inserting the word "Jesus Christ," so that it should read, "a departure from the plan of Jesus Christ, the holy Author of our religion;" the insertion was rejected by a great majority, in proof that they meant to comprehend within the mantle of its protec-

tion the Jew and the Gentile, the Christian and Mohammedan, the Hindoo, and infidel, of every denomination." See "Works of Thomas Jefferson," volume I, page 45.

This uniformity of statement from the three great "fathers" of America—the father of the Declaration of Independence, the father of the Constitution, and the father of his country—is conclusive evidence that Christianity is not, nor was it ever intended to be, in any sense, the recognized religion of America; but that every man of whatever belief was to be on an absolute equality in the eyes of the American Government.

Any other view is diametrically opposed to the American political system, and any effort to reinstate enforced religious observances (whether they be the weekly Sabbath or other Church dogmas) into our governmental policy is directly opposed to the efforts on that question made by Washington, Jefferson, and Madison.

W. A. BLAKELY.

Some Boycotts.

At the annual meeting of the American Sabbath Union at Ocean Grove, July 27, the World's Columbian Commission was memorialized as follows:

The American Sabbath Union and affiliating Sabbath associations in convention assembled in Ocean Grove, New Jersey, July 27, 1891, respectfully present the following memorial:

"We do most earnestly protest against the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition at Chicago, in 1893, on the Lord's day, in the name of the Sabbath keeping people of the United States. We do this in the interest of public morals; in harmony with the convictions, memorials and remonstrances of many millions of our fellow-countrymen, and in obedience to the letter and the spirit of the laws of the land, which protect the rights of all classes of our population to the enjoyment of their weekly rest day.

"With supreme regard to the divine authority and perpetual obligation of the fourth commandment of the Decalogue and of all the statutes and ordinances, promises and threatenings, of the Word of God that guard the institution of the Sabbath for the benefit of individuals, communities and nations, we entreat the Local Directory and the National Commissioners not to alienate great multitudes of the Christian people of the United States who would gladly sustain the Exposition by their presence and patronage, which will certainly be withheld if their convictions on this subject are ignored and overridden.

"We also appeal to the Local Directory and the National Commission not to subordinate the high moral and religious considerations which should decide this question to the financial needs of the treasury. No amount of Sunday gate money can compensate this country for the loss of our national character and moral prestige that will follow the continuous desecration of the Lord's day during the half year of the Exposition.

"For these as well as other reasons that might be added we pray the authorities that have this matter in charge to settle this question without needless delay, and for the observance of the Sabbath rest throughout the great international Exposition."

Although this is couched in the form of a memorial it will be seen that the pith of the whole resolution is contained in the

threat that the presence and patronage of great multitudes of the Christian people of the United States will certainly be withheld if their convictions on this subject are ignored.

This is a boycott. In commenting upon these resolutions Sam Small said in that inimitable way so peculiar to himself that he had "discussed this question with four Congressmen from Georgia and they will stand and rot on their feet before they will vote any more money from Congress until this question of Sunday closing is settled." This is the financial boycott to which Sam Small pledges the Congressmen from his State.

He also pledged himself, on pain of being "run off the Ocean Grove camp ground" if he failed, that the next Georgia Legislature would "instruct their delegation to declare Georgia out of the Exposition unless it is closed on Sunday." This is Sam Small's legislative boycott.

Further, referring to the decision of the Sunday-closing question being left to the Local Directory, composed entirely of citizens of the city of Chicago, he said,

Leave this question to be decided by those dirty rascals in Chicago and there isn't a yellow dog in Georgia that would go to the Exposition!

This is Sam Small's boycott for the whole State of Georgia. No one could possibly have expected, when the boycott was first introduced in this country as a persuasive measure in the settlement of differences of opinion between capital and labor, that it was destined, in the hands of the American Sabbath Union, to become one of the greatest missionary forces of the age, possibly one of the chief factors in converting this Nation to a National Reform Christianity.

But, as a stream can rise no higher than its source, the efforts of the "boycott" as an evangelist will result in conversion to the unrighteousness of Mammon rather than the righteousness of God.

W. H. M.

A Timely Criticism.

REV. MINOT J. SAVAGE, in the Boston *Arena* for August, criticises a paper which appeared in the July number of that magazine, written by Rev. Francis Bellamy, in which were advanced ideas favoring paternalism in government. In the course of his criticisms, Mr. Savage says:—

Whatever may be in the future, when men get to be something different from what they are, so far in the history of the world it has been true that all kinds of governments have oppressed the individual. And, so far, the only safety of the individual has been such guarantees of personal rights and liberties as have limited the governmental power. And until some one can give the world assurance that human nature is to be transformed, it will be just as well to maintain the guarantees, instead of putting still more power into the hands of the Government—whether it be called one thing or another. While even one wolf is abroad, the wise shepherd will not get rid of his dog.

Further along he says:—

The plain fact of the matter is, that all the per-

secutions of the past have grown out of just this idea, which Mr. Bellamy endorses, that an "intelligent public opinion" has the right to tell certain individuals what they shall believe and teach. And all the growth of human civilization thus far has been in the direction of the rise of the individual as over against the claim of the majority to control. And there is no safety for the individual, and no sure and swift promise of human advance, until "intelligent public opinion" is taught to mind its own business.

These are timely and well-deserved criticisms. In view of the fact that there are associations in the land organized for what, in the end, can be no other than the destruction of the safeguards of civil and religious liberty found in our national Constitution, every lover of such liberty may well not only plead for the maintenance of the guarantees to such liberty, but that these guarantees shall be cherished and respected.

Toronto, the Example of Sunday Quiet

TORONTO has often been cited as an illustrious example of a city where the Sunday laws were strictly enforced. Again and again has the picture been drawn, telling of the bliss of living in such a city. But a great change has just come over the "Sabbath hush" of that place. Certain ones have been using Queen's Park as a place for giving expression to some thoughts, very abusive and offensive to some of the religious customs and beliefs of her Majesty's subjects. Accordingly the City Council passed an ordinance forbidding such speeches in any of the parks or public squares of the city, and limited its application to Sunday. Sunday, July 26, was the first day to try its workings. The *Toronto Mail* says that about sixty thousand people visited the park during the day to see how the law would work. In an editorial it says:—

The excited, and in some instances, disorderly crowd, which assembled in Queen's Park yesterday was probably more the result of a widespread curiosity as to what would be the outcome of the recently passed park by-law, than of concerted action. It may be taken therefore as a spontaneous expression of public opinion of a very deep and determined character against the regulations in question. It is deeply to be regretted that it degenerated into violence, and the contemning of law and order. . . . The proceedings yesterday appear to have been of a sufficiently turbulent character to justify the reading of the Riot Act. They comprised various assaults upon persons, the hooting of the Chief Magistrate out of the park, and the tearing down of the placards containing the regulations of the obnoxious by-law.

The foregoing sentences would lead any one to think that Sunday laws had not raised Toronto above the average city. And when a by-law is passed that crosses the track of the "masses" in Toronto they raise a mob and howl about it, very much the same as they do in Chicago, New York, or any other large city. But the strangest part of it all is that such a thing could happen in Toronto on Sunday, and that, too, over a Sunday by-law. It might be supposed from what has been heard

that Toronto's Sunday ordinances had completely transformed its citizens into devout observers of the day. Mr. Crafts, in his "Sabbath for Man," says of Toronto that it is "the most perfect specimen of city Sabbath keeping that the world affords." He further adds:—

My own feeling was that Toronto—where I at least did not observe a single open shop, where the streets were still and quiet, save where reverent multitudes were going to the house of God, showing a city whose stalwart and beautiful sons and daughters were enjoying a Sabbath rest—might well put our Scottish cities in these latter days to shame.

But oh, Toronto! What have you done? Your fair name is tarnished, your record is gone.

There is no wish to convey the idea that the riotous actions of the mob are aimed directly at the Sunday by-law as such. What they are objecting to is the abridgment of their freedom of speech. But just one little episode like this is enough to show very clearly that Sunday is not much more thoroughly in the hearts of the people in Toronto than elsewhere, and such highly praised Sunday laws have not yet turned all in that city into saints. It is a forcible illustration of the fact that civil law, even enforced so strictly as in Toronto, at the time when Mr. Crafts wrote about it, will not put religious dogmas, no matter whether such dogma is right or wrong, into the hearts of the people. And one of the gravest questions of the day is the idea that some ministers are even leaving their pulpits to advocate in extended lecture tours the idea of securing civil law to enforce religious dogmas. It is true they claim only to desire law in favor of the *civil* side of such doctrine, but anything that is wholly religious has no civil side to it. And such is the character, when held up to plain view, of the institutions and ideas which these would-be reformers are seeking to enforce. With all the history of the past before us, we might regard such advocates of compulsory religion, if they were isolated individuals, as relics fit only for a museum of antiquities; but when Protestant ministers will seriously, and in large numbers, advocate the doctrine that the State should aid the Church in carrying out its designs, which was the motto of the Papacy while at the midnight of its reign of persecution, it is time for somebody to speak out.

This Toronto by-law was first framed so as to apply to all the days of the week alike, but certain councilmen who were not educated sufficiently in statesmanship to enable them to see that if anything was a public nuisance on Sunday it would be the same on any other day, secured an amendment confining the ordinance to Sunday. Failing to appreciate this important point in law they so framed the ordinance as also to seriously interfere with the freedom of speech. There was a respectable minority in the council, how-

ever, who favored making the law touch all days of the week, and also to have it restricted to the particular form of nuisance in question. But they were overruled, and a law was made to which many of the best citizens are much opposed. The interference of the civil law with religious questions always opens the way for oppression on the one hand or mob violence on the other.

A. O. TAIT.

"Sabbath Observance by Law."

UNDER the heading, "Sabbath Observance by Law," the *Herald*, Morrisburgh, Ontario, publishes the following able article:—

"One might reasonably infer from the number of petitions which are being sent up to Parliament, praying for a law to secure the better observance of the Lord's day, that these petitioners consider the members of Parliament to be possessed of omnipotence; that their office qualifies them to dictate in matters spiritual as well as temporal. In our simplicity we had supposed that the members of Parliament were statesmen, not ecclesiastics; M. P's, not D. D.'s or M. D.'s. Appeal to Parliament for a law to secure better Sabbath observance indeed! Why not appeal to them for a law prescribing the number and kind of pill to be taken in case of a bilious attack? Why not?—Because that isn't their business. They are not doctors of medicine, nor ministers of the gospel. They are simply statesmen, and their powers of office are limited to statesmanship—to things temporal, not spiritual. But Sabbath keeping is spiritual worship; Sabbath breaking is sin.

"We had supposed that the gospel of Jesus Christ, which is 'the power of God unto salvation,' is the only power in this world to which an appeal should be made for salvation from sin; and that God is the only being to whom we should pray in order to secure this power. But these petitioners appear to have confounded the temporal and human government with the spiritual and divine government of God. What has the Dominion Parliament to do with the divine law of God, which takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart? What power has this legislative body to determine whether the Sabbath day is observed as it should be? The Sabbath is a divine institution, and its observance or non-observance is a matter that should rest wholly between the individual and his God. It is a religious practice performed for the purpose of showing the performer's religious belief; but what has the Dominion Government to do with a man's religious belief? It is not the object of any earthly government to make men religious, nor to make them act as if they were religious. The object of government is

to make men civil; but Sabbath breaking is not uncivil, it is irreligious. Sabbath keeping is an act of religious worship, nothing else; and a law to secure better Sabbath observance would simply be a law to secure better religious worship.

"But we ask again, What has the Dominion Parliament to do with an individual's religious worship? The Parliament itself is composed of men who are as diverse in their religious practices and beliefs as it is possible for men to be. Now is it reasonable that they should enact laws to enforce upon one another, and upon the people at large, the forms and practices by which they show their religious belief?

"It seems to be a settled conviction of those who are petitioning for this law that a man can be made a good Christian, as well as a good citizen, by an Act of Parliament; for the only reason why any one should keep the Sabbath day is that he may be a good Christian. It may be objected that the intention of the proposed law is to regard the day as a civil institution; but even in that case, civil employment should not be prohibited, because civil employment on a civil day can never, by any process of sound reasoning, be made to appear as an incivility. But the Sabbath is not a civil institution in any sense of the word. It is religious, and wholly such. It is an institution that belongs entirely to the government of God, and no earthly government has any right whatever to say how, or when, it shall be observed, or whether it shall be observed at all or not. The Dominion Parliament has about as much right to pass a law to secure the better observance of the Lord's day as it has to pass a law with reference to the manner in which the Americans should observe the Fourth of July. It is an institution that is altogether and entirely outside of its jurisdiction.

"These petitioners appear to think that the field of the legislator is unlimited, and that for every evil that exists under the sun, a remedy must be sought by an appeal to civil authority. But this is a serious mistake. It is this mistake that instituted the Inquisition with all its horrid instruments of torture. It is this mistake that erected the altar of human sacrifice among the heathen nations of the earth. It is the mistake among civilized nations which murdered philosophers, and crucified the Son of God;—the mistake of permitting the legislator to invade the realm of conscience. And after all this experience, shall this mistake be made again? Shall the legislator be permitted to dictate to us the forms and practices of religious worship which we shall observe? God forbid! Let the legislator keep within the bounds of statesmanship, leaving religion and religious practices of every kind to the individual, the family, and the Church, and he will be doing all

that he can do for the Christian religion, and therefore all that he ought to do.

"No; the field of the legislator is limited, and though 'he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil,' and though Sabbath breaking is a very great evil, it is that kind of an evil which he has no power to remedy. It is an evil to be sick, but one does not go to a banker for a prescription. The banker may indeed be able to render valuable aid in case of financial difficulty, but in sickness he is as powerless as the poorest, and possibly more so. We would hardly think of taking our watches to the blacksmith for repairs. He isn't qualified to do such work; it is too fine for him. So of the statesman; he is not qualified to administer in spiritual matters; he has not the credentials.

"If it is desired to secure better Sabbath observance, (and it is very desirable), such means only should be used as are lawful; but the only lawful means that can be used to secure better Sabbath observance is a direct appeal to the power of God as shown in the gospel of Jesus Christ, and when that power fails to secure the desired result, everything fails; for there is no power greater than the power of God. Even God himself does not compel belief of the gospel. He does indeed threaten those with everlasting destruction that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, but he leaves it entirely to the individual to decide whether he will obey or not. An appeal may indeed be made to the civil power for assistance to secure the desired end, but what kind of Sabbath observance would be secured by such means? Would it be such Sabbath observance as is contemplated in the commandment, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy'? Nothing short of holy Sabbath observance can meet the requirements of this commandment. Now can one be made to keep the Sabbath holy by a civil law? The commandment does not say, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it civilly.' But the Sabbath can not be kept holy unless its observance is prompted by the love of God, and, therefore, such Sabbath observance as would be secured by a civil law would be a sin in itself, because it is not prompted by the love of God, but by the fear of man. One who observes the Sabbath in obedience to a civil law does it, not because God says, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,' but because he is afraid that some man will lay violent hands on him if he does not do it, and so he acts the hypocrite.

"Thus these petitioners pray to man to have the fear of man put into the heart of man, instead of praying to God to have his love put in their hearts. 'All enlightened minds agree to what the Bible confirms, and what reason can clearly perceive without argument, that love for God is essential for every act of religious

duty. To tender obedience or homage to God, while we have no love for him in our hearts, would be dishonorable to the Maker, and doing violence to our own nature.' But Sabbath observance is a religious duty, and therefore in obeying a civil law for Sabbath observance, one is sinning not only against his Maker, but he is sinning against himself. And those who are instrumental in securing and enforcing such a law are guilty, not simply of sinning against God, but of exalting themselves above God. For, first, they take upon themselves to dictate for the people the form of religious worship which they shall observe; and secondly they prescribe the punishment which shall be inflicted upon them for a failure to conform to that practice. But both these things belong alone to God.

"And, further, the Sabbath observance which is secured by such a law as is contemplated by these petitioners, is not directed to God at all, but to man instead; because, 'his servants ye are to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey,' and obedience is the highest form of worship. And therefore this law, instead of securing better Sabbath observance, would establish idolatry; for it does require the worship of a creature instead of the Creator. Instead of securing better observance of the fourth commandment, it requires a direct violation of the first. Instead of being in harmony with the gospel of Jesus Christ, it is directly opposed to it; for Christ himself said, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve.' Hence it is true that those who are instrumental in securing this law do indeed 'exalt themselves above God' by directing to themselves that worship which belongs alone to God.

"The forms and practices of the Christian religion were not instituted by the aid of civil power, but in spite of it, and in direct opposition to it. The Author of this religion was crucified by the civil power, and all his disciples save one was persecuted to the death; yet in spite of all this persecution, the gospel prevailed, and won its way into the hearts of the people. But in its exaltation lay its greatest danger; for the discernment of an ambitious monarch saw the power which this new religion was exerting in the earth, and with the object of strengthening his own power, he made Christianity the religion of the State, enforcing its forms and ceremonies by the pains and penalties of civil law. Oh, the blight it brought! As well might he have thought to aid the Almighty in causing the earth to bring forth grass and herbs and animate creatures, as to think of rendering assistance by civil power to the propagation of the gospel in the hearts of men. But in spite of this withering curse that caused the pall of darkness to settle over the age that followed; in spite of the rivers of blood which this unhallowed union caused to

flow from millions of bleeding martyrs; in spite of the clouds of smoke that ascended to heaven from myriad consuming bodies of saints, the gospel prevailed, and to-day—a happy people—we enjoy the liberty which the gospel has secured to us; thus showing that the power of God is mightier than the mightiest power of earth, and that it is to prevail, 'not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit saith the Lord of Hosts,' and that is the only power in this world that can save a human soul from sin.

"But instead of profiting by these fearful lessons of the past, instead of directing their prayers to God for more of his spirit and power to convert sinners, we find thousands of the professed ministers of Christ in this fair Dominion putting up their petitions to Parliament instead of to God, for a law to save themselves and the rest of the people from the sin of Sabbath breaking! Seeking the assistance of the civil power to enforce the principles of Christianity! In the name of all that is good, has the gospel of Jesus Christ lost its saving power? or have these petitioners lost the power of the gospel? When any form of religious worship has been so sadly neglected that it is about to die a natural death, it can never be brought to life by the power of civil law. 'Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar!' Let them cry mightily to God for salvation from the sin of Sabbath breaking! Let them be clothed with the righteousness of Christ and armed with the weapons of spiritual warfare; and with the law of God for their guide, and the gospel of Christ for their salvation, they would go forth conquering and to conquer. And the cowardly call for assistance from civil authority would give place to thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might, unto our God forever and ever. Amen."

—*Eugene Leland.*

"THE bishop and the rector of the Latin school at Viborg, Jutland," says the *Recorder*, "are calling each other names and setting a bad example. The bishop intimates that the rector is a heathen, while the rector retorts in effect that the distinguished divine is a Pharisee and a nincompoop. It is all about the school gymnasium, which the rector had allowed a club of young men to use for two hours on Sunday forenoons. This, says the bishop, is paganism; according to the rector, it is simple justice to the young men, who are clerks with no other holiday, and, if not allowed the use of the dumb-bells, would certainly prefer the public bars to the bishop's pulpit as by far the more exhilarating. The bishop appeals to the king, and the rector is sat upon. In his turn he publishes the whole correspondence, and public sentiment reviles the bishop and provides for the shut-out clerks a private gymnasium."

NATIONAL Religious Liberty Association.

REV. W. F. CRAFTS has found another name for the first day of the week. In those cities where the barbers have organized to secure Sunday closing of their shops, he calls it the "barbers Sunday."

ALREADY the American Sabbath Union is talking about the prospects for securing national Sunday legislation for the District of Columbia, at the next session of Congress.

THE Supreme Court of Virginia has decided that the Virginia law forbidding the running of Sunday freight trains is unconstitutional because it interferes with inter-state commerce.

AT the beginning of the baseball season the citizens of Irondequoit, New York, threatened Sunday ball players with arrest, and forced the discontinuance of Sunday games. They have lately been resumed, and the Monroe County Sunday Union has begun action with the expressed determination of bringing about a strict enforcement of the Sunday law in reference to ball playing.

A DISPATCH from St. Paul, Minnesota, dated July 25, published in the *Inter-Ocean*, states that "War is to be declared at once on the Sunday saloon, Sunday amusements, houses of ill-fame, and all other vices, by the new Law and Order Society." One citizen states in this connection, "We shall begin next spring's campaign on Monday next, and will not cease until victory has crowned our efforts."

THE Watertown, (Wisconsin) *Republican*, of July 8, contains a list of fifty-three business men who have agreed together to close their business places on Sundays, on and after August 16, 1891. It is the undeniable right of these gentlemen to close their business, and no one could object if every business man in the United States would decide of his own choice to discontinue work on Sunday. But it is subversive of all the correct principles of civil law to compel men by statute to rest on Sunday, or any other day.

THE Grand Jury has made a presentment touching the excise laws of New York. The *Press* quotes Mayor Grant as saying upon the subject:—

"A law should be passed which can be enforced. The present law the people do not indorse and do not believe in. I have drafted no bill, but I would favor a measure which permitted sales in certain hours on Sunday."

Thus is the cause of temperance lost—treasonably sold out,—to further, even in so slight a degree, the enforcement of a religious formalism.

THE *Grand Republic* and the *General Slocum* are two excursion boats which carry seven thousand persons, and more, to and from Rockaway Beach every pleasant Sunday during the heated term, and are principally owned by influential Brooklyn church members.

These conscientious men have used their Sunday leisure in devising some plan by which to serve God and Mammon and signify their deep religious reverence for Sunday as a sacred institution while at the same time pocketing the Sunday revenues from their boats.

That they have discovered just the way to accomplish this is shown by what an official of one of the boats said to a reporter of the *Sun*: "You can bet that Sabbath-breaking on these

boats will never be permitted! It was only three weeks ago that one of our best directors heard that dancing was permitted on the *Grand Republic* and the *General Slocum*, on Sunday. He stopped it pretty quick, and it will be stopped for all summer."

Both of these boats have a bar, and liquors are sold on Sundays as well as other days, so the service of Mammon is not in the least interfered with. If the wise man were alive now he would number another class among those whose ways were past finding out—the Sunday reformers.

AN ordinance was introduced in the council of the city of Toronto, on July 20, which reads, "No person shall in any public park, garden or place for exhibition in the city of Toronto, publicly preach, lecture or declaim." The bill was amended so as to apply only to Sundays, and to include public squares, and passed.

The ordinance is aimed at certain persons who have taken occasion to speak very disgracefully in the parks, against some of the established ideas of religion, to those congregating there on Sundays.

Why confine such legislation to Sunday? If it is a public nuisance for a man to thus speak disgracefully on Sunday, why would it not equally apply to other days of the week?

PRIVATE detectives, it is said, have been employed by the Barbers' Association of Philadelphia, to gather evidence against the barbers who have been planning to keep open on Sunday and pay from a general fund all fines and costs which might ensue.

Ten have been arrested charged with conspiring to defeat the operation of the Pennsylvania Act of Assembly of 1794, which requires all worldly business to be suspended on Sunday. Others are to be arrested and all the cases prosecuted unless there is a general submission to Sunday closing.

The Hair-dressers' Association of Dundee has taken quite a different method to attain the same end. Outsiders having opened shops on Sunday, sixteen members of the Association volunteered to serve customers who desired Sunday shaving, gratuitously, thus depriving competitors of their profits and all incentive for Sunday opening.

There is a strong contrast between the methods of the barbarous barber of Philadelphia and the merciful hair-dresser of Dundee, but comparisons of course are invidious.

Sunday in Arkansas.

THE criminal docket of the Boone County, Arkansas, Circuit Court gives the names of James Walker, Jule Killebrew, and Sam Mitchell as being indicted for "Sabbath-breaking." The court, which convened on July 20, has continued the case of James Walker, and fined the other two men \$25.00 each.

The Sunday law of Arkansas imposes a fine on any person who shall labor or compel his employes to labor on that day; forbids the opening of any kind of business, including the saloon, on Sunday; prohibits Sunday horse-racing, card-playing, hunting, and baseball games; and if any minor commits any of these offenses and it "shall be made to appear that the offense was committed by or with the consent or approbation of the parent or guardian of said minor," then the parent or guardian will have to pay the fine. Nearly everything is included in this law for which any National Reformer could ask.

The advocates of these Sunday laws keep ringing it in our ears, and if we could only have Sunday laws, and well enforced in every State the world would be converted right off. That Arkansas has the Sunday law no one can doubt. She has made herself notorious by executing that law.

Now for the conclusion. Arkansas has of course entered upon the millennial reign. And while it cannot be strictly true that Satan is bound, for his nefarious workings are to be seen in other parts of the country, yet it must be that there is an impassible barrier around the borders of Arkansas, and when his Satanic majesty, in his roaming about seeking whom he may devour, reaches the border line of this favored spot he is required to content himself with viewing in maddened rage these walls too solid to break through and too high to scale. No such good things have been heard about Arkansas, yet if the theory of Sunday laws be true that State ought to contain all these millennial blessings.

To those who are not blind to facts, Arkansas alone presents enough evidence to overthrow the whole civil Sunday law millennial theory. Men in Arkansas are given to all the wickedness common to humanity in other States, notwithstanding the fact that she is so well provided with Sunday laws and is so zealous in enforcing them. A. O. TAIT.

SUNDAY, July 26, has come to be known in newspaper headings as the "Blue Sunday in Hartford," from the measure of success attained on that day in enforcing the Connecticut laws on the observance of Sunday.

Section 1569 of the Connecticut Statutes reads:—

"Every person who shall do any secular business or labor, except works of necessity or mercy, or keep open any shop, warehouse, or manufacturing or mechanical establishment, or expose any property for sale, or engage in any sport or recreation on Sunday, between sunrise and sunset, shall be fined not more than four dollars nor less than one dollar."


It seems that the movement for the enforcement of this law began by a petition to the authorities to close the Italian fruit stands. The Italians retaliated with another petition for the enforcement of the law against all business on Sunday. The Chief of Police complied, but exercised his own discretion in permitting the sale of soda water and Sunday newspapers as necessities.

A combination is threatened which will compel the authorities to close all stores, drug stores included, and deny the people of Hartford livery and street-car service on Sunday.

The vendetta of the Italian seems to be the strongest and most immediately effective that Mr. Crafts has yet succeeded in joining to himself in his crusade for the religio-civil Sunday.

"FEARFUL strides toward the overthrow of the last vestiges of regard for the Sabbath are being made before our eyes," says the *Christian Advocate* of this city. "At Weehawken a great Sunday performance is conspicuously advertised in the New York papers, and thousands go to see it. It is in direct violation of law. There is no solid reason why theaters should not be open on Sunday if such a performance as this can be allowed. Will the Christian citizens of New Jersey permit it? We appeal to our ministers and members in the vicinity. Look closely into the law; ascertain what methods to take to put a stop to it; move courageously. The Sabbath-breakers will be against you; the management who care nothing for God's day, but are simply after money, will cry, 'Pharisees;' but there is still law in the State. Talking will do nothing; that is for an hour, while these daughters of the horse-leech cry 'Give, give,' continually. Other violations of law in the same direction are going on. If some of the cream of New York and Philadelphia settles upon the territory of New Jersey, the scum in great billows rolls across the Hudson and the Delaware every Sabbath, and the residents must contend earnestly or their fair heritage will become as bad as the slums of the cities."

It is thus that in every quarter Christians are looking to the civil law to preserve the "Christian Sabbath."



NEW YORK, AUGUST 13, 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.

It is said that reports from "Sabbath observance" societies in France and Italy show a change in the conduct of English travelers in regard to Sabbath observance. They are beginning to adopt the lax Continental customs, and to regard with indifference the character and claims of the day.

"GOVERNMENTS must be liberal enough," says Judge Zane, "to tolerate all religions." The Judge forgets that "what other nations call religious toleration we call religious rights." Government has nothing to do in tolerating religion. That which government merely tolerates it may prohibit. Governments should keep their hands off religion because of the fact that they can properly have nothing whatever to do with it.

THE following from the *Catholic Review* is significant:—

Commissioner Morgan has so successfully fought Catholic public opinion during the last two years as to feel strong enough to break openly with the Catholic body in America. His refusal to deal with the Indian bureau can be taken this way. President Harrison and his party are no doubt prepared to suffer the odium which this commissioner's policy has won for them among Catholics; still we are not certain of this. At the banquet tendered to Mr. Clarkson a few days ago, that gentleman spoke with enthusiasm of the Irish-Americans who were naturally Republicans, and of the necessity of bringing them into the Republican fold. Mr. Clarkson will find Morgan in his way. No Catholic vote should be placed for an administration and a party which put Morgan and Dorchester in office, and so favored the bigotry of these two worthies as to let their anti-Catholic policy not only have a beginning, but reach a sort of maturity. We can understand the difficulty which the President might have in completely extinguishing these worthy evangelical officials; but we can not see what difficulty he meets in restraining their ardor and snuffing out their bigoted policy. And, by the way, where have been all this time the worthy Catholics of Republican politics, who are always so eager to show that their party is not hostile to Catholicity? Perhaps the great Archbishop of St Paul can tell us.

Just how the Catholic vote will relate itself to the present administration or to the party now in power, is a matter of small moment. The words of the *Review* are significant because they reveal a growing disposition to unite religion and politics, and that not in the sense that the Christian voter should act honestly because he is a Christian, but in the sense

that he will support only that party which will show favors to his particular church, or to his particular religion.

Nor is this tendency confined to the Roman Catholic Church. Protestants are adopting the same tactics, and are threatening with political death every man in public life who refuses to do the bidding of certain organizations which have assumed to themselves the responsibility of dictating the morals of their neighbors.

THE new Spanish labor bill provides that all contracts for labor must be understood to contain prohibition of work not only on Sundays, but on all feast days as well. This makes about ninety holidays a year. The bill provides penalties for employers and employes alike for violations of the law. Exemptions are however provided for persons declaring that they do not belong to the State religion. Its framers must have been studying the Blair Sunday rest bill. Their provisions are quite similar.

CHIEF JUSTICE CHASE once said: "The wicked men are not in the penitentiaries; they are in the churches." And indeed it does seem so when we stop to consider the spirit manifested by some of the leading spirits in some of the so-called moral reforms of the day. With National Reformers and Woman's Christian Temperance Union speakers, and American Sabbath Union orators breathing out cruelty and threatening bloodshed if their demands are not speedily crystallized into law, it does seem that the modern Church has apostatized from Christ, and has become, as foretold in Rev. 18:2, "the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird." Certain it is that the spirit of National Reform and American Sabbath Unionism is the very opposite of the spirit of Jesus Christ, for it is the spirit of force while his is the spirit of love and persuasion.

THE *Christian Advocate*, of this city, in common with most of the religious press of the country, is ashamed of the persecution of R. M. King, by means of the iniquitous Sunday law of Tennessee; but instead of coming out boldly and denouncing the outrage, the *Advocate* says:

King, a Seventh-day Adventist, ostentatiously plowed on Sunday, in Tennessee. He was convicted of Sabbath-breaking.

This is unworthy of the *Advocate*. The fact is that King's Sunday work was done as quietly and as privately as it was possible to do it, and all the circumstances surrounding the case show that it was a case of religious persecution pure and simple. King's offense was not that he plowed on Sunday, but that he did not plow or do any work on Saturday. Nu-

merous other persons in the same neighborhood have always worked on Sunday when they chose so to do, and nothing has ever been said or done about it; nor was King molested until he commenced to observe another day. The *Advocate* should have respect unto the ninth commandment and not add to the injury already done Mr. King by bearing false witness against him for the purpose of depriving him of the sympathy which is justly his.

FORGETTING for the moment that the Protestant churches, under the leadership of the American Sabbath Union and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, have virtually gone into politics, the *Christian Advocate* says;—

Churches make bad work for the cause of Christ when they go into politics. The *Catholic Review* strenuously advocates the formation of a Catholic party to operate in political affairs in the interests of that denomination. What argument can be produced in favor of a Catholic party which might not also be used in favor of a Methodist party? The church which can afford to organize its members for political purposes has low aims, and is likely to reach them.

This is just what THE SENTINEL has been saying for years, but the organization for political purposes has gone on just the same in all the great Protestant bodies of this country, and even bloodshed is threatened in case the legislation of the country is not modeled according to the demands of the great party of "Christian voters."

"It is remarkable news in our cable dispatch," says the *Sun*, "that the British Wesleyan Conference had passed a full hour in praying for the conversion of the Prince of Wales. Among all the criticisms that have yet been made upon the Prince, this is the criticism that he will be likely to feel the most keenly." That which above all things else makes this remarkable is the fact that there is nothing but a life, which already exceeds the three score and ten years, between the Prince of Wales and the throne of Great Britain and the headship of two great Protestant churches, namely, the established Churches of England and Scotland. But such incongruities are inherent in Church and State unions.

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.