



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 20, 1891.

NUMBER 33.

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.

If the Lord himself could have secured morality or righteousness by law, he never would have needed to send the gospel. Therefore, as the Sunday-law workers have wedded themselves to a scheme of making men moral by law, the proper and consistent thing for them to do, is to utterly repudiate the use of the gospel.

No man can ever of right make his religion the basis of any plea for governmental favor, nor the ground of any complaint of governmental discrimination. If there is not enough good in the religion to pay him for professing it then there is not enough to pay the government for taking any legal notice of it in any way whatever.

THAT which is the Lord's, rests solely between man and God; and if any man does not render it to God, he is responsible only to God, and not to any man, nor to any assembly or organization of men, for his failure or refusal to render it to God; and any power that undertakes to punish any man for his failure or refusal to render to God what is God's puts itself in the place of God.

A DAY of weekly rest is in itself an institution of God. Its basis is the rest of God, which was wholly spiritual. Its purpose is to cultivate the spiritual in man. Its authority is the commandment of God which is spiritual and religious, and which must be religiously and spiritually observed to be observed at all. As

says the seer of Patmos, "I was *in the Spirit* on the Lord's day." The whole subject, therefore, in all its bearings is entirely beyond the jurisdiction and even the reach of the power of civil government or of man. It rests wholly in the power and jurisdiction of God, and remains solely between the individual and God.

Sunday Petitions.

It seems that those who circulate Sunday-closing, and Sunday-law petitions dislike to have them dissected. That, upon the outset, is not a recommendation for them. Truth says, "Handle me carefully, turn me over, examine me." Error says, "Hide me, roll me up in a napkin and lay me away."

No man, except a criminal, is in this country compelled by law to work. All are free to shut up shop and take a vacation or a day of rest. Men of wealth can of course afford to take more time for rest and recreation. Those of thrift and mercenary tendencies may take less than they are able to take. The Sunday-closing petition contemplates the forcing of all, whether willing, able or not, to take one day of rest regularly each week, and upon a certain day of the week. And why? Oh, it is said that some will not close up on Sunday unless they are compelled to do so by law, and they should be made to do so, as there are others in the same line who wish to, and unless all are required to close, those who are open will get more trade than those who close up. So one man signs a petition to force his neighbor to close up when he wishes to close, so that he will lose no money by taking his vacation or day of rest. And what is that but supreme selfishness? What prompts to the act but a purely mercenary motive? The former could take his rest if he chooses to, but somebody who chooses to keep at his business would be making some money, and he can't stand that, so he petitions. Who can fail to see that love of money is the ruling principle underneath the Sunday-closing petition? that the business

man who signs it and says he will not close unless others are made to close also, virtually confesses that his love of money is stronger than his love for his religion and his Sabbath?

And what shall be said of those professors of the gospel of Jesus Christ who urge men on in this scheme of selfishness, and thus encourage them in that which in Holy Writ is declared to be "the root of all evil?" (1 Tim. 6, 10.) The religion of Christ teaches men not to set their affections on things on the earth, but to set their affections on things above; not to love the world nor the things that are in it, but to seek first the kingdom of heaven; not to seek for the gold which perisheth, but that inheritance which endureth; not to hoard up treasures below, but to sell what they have, give alms and lay up treasure in heaven. That religion teaches men to deny themselves, take up the crosses, and let their religion cost them something—the loss of property, the loss of friends, the loss of all things, even life itself, if need be, to win Christ and eternal life through him. But what kind of moral stamina can the circulation and advocacy of such petitions be creating? We leave it to the candid reader if it is not rather an incentive to worldliness and worldly gain, and an encouragement to men to think that they must "be carried to the skies on flowery beds of ease," or else decide that they will not go there at all.

The whole thing is wrong from first to last. It is not even civil to force men to stop their legitimate work, and much less religious. Idleness of itself is an evil, and that is all Sunday-closing petitions, Sunday ordinances and Sunday laws (at least those of to-day; they may be different by and by) teach—that is so far as their mere wording goes—simply idleness. They are simply negative. They do not say what you shall do, but simply what you shall not do. But that isn't all they imply. Say what you may, while they prohibit all secular employment and recreation, they intend that you shall go to church and act religious, whether you are or not, though

for a century or two that clause has been left out of them largely. But it is there in spirit if not in letter; for if after a man has been "forbidden to perform any worldly employment or business whatsoever," what under the sun is left for him to do but to be (or act) religious? There is absolutely nothing.

But the older Sunday laws didn't omit that feature. Charlemagne, who was Emperor of France, Spain, Italy, Germany and Hungary, in his Sunday law of A. D. 800, not only prohibited everything down to "needle-work," "shearing sheep" and "washing linen openly," but also said, "but that they all come to church to magnify the Lord their God." But those of more recent date, if they do not eliminate this, put it in a more refined and back-handed way; as, for instance, the Vermont Sunday law which prohibits any person from being "present at any public assembly except such as is held for social and religious worship and moral instruction." But the thing is there—this idea and intent of forcing men to be religious—whether it is concealed, kept in the background, travels about under sheep's clothing, or what not. It is there, and the people may as well learn it first as last, and while learning learn that that is not in accordance with the gospel of Jesus Christ, which says "Whosoever will," and not "You must." And the fact that about the only ones heard championing Sunday laws are ministers is strong presumptive proof that such laws are religious in their nature and intent. In kindness and in earnestness to all such we would say, To your pupils and your Bibles! Christ never sought the aid of civil power to enforce his religion, but to impetuous Peter said, "Put up thy sword."—*W. A. Colcord, in Bradford (Pa.) Era.*

Liberty versus Paternalism.

THERE is a contest coming. Governmentalism has been constantly encroaching on the rights of the people, and as a result those who support this encroachment must, in order to justify themselves, deny the existence of such rights. It is not surprising that they should deny rights so far as the encroachments go; that would be expected. But for the leading State organ of a political party to deny natural rights in toto is, indeed, a matter of surprise.

The occasion of the words was the following excerpt from the speech of Hon. Roger Q. Mills, of Texas, at Staten Island:—

The individual existed before society, and society has only such rights as the individual confers upon it; or, to state it differently, man existed before government, and the government only has such powers as man confers upon it. Man owes a duty to himself, but it is declared by his own reason and enforced by his own conscience. The government has neither reason nor conscience; these are attributes of the man. They are parts of his animal organism.

In the last thirty years paternalism has been extending its boundaries and liberty has been contracting hers. The Government has been prescribing the hours of labor. If it has the right to prescribe eight hours, it has the right to prescribe twenty-four. It has neither.

How long a man shall work and at what business is a question for his own determination. The Government loads down one kind of butter with a heavy tax to decrease its production and give higher profits to another kind. The Government taxes people to raise money to appropriate to fairs, to buy grain for those who have lost theirs by drought or insects. It regulates the practice of medicine and law, and it is being urged by some to prescribe rates of pay for its practitioners, and now it is demanded by a great number of good people that the Government shall lend people money and help them to live. Folly could hardly go further. The answer of democracy to all these demands is that *just government must stop at the boundary of natural right; that it must secure that against every invasion, and then leave every man free to fight out the battle of life in his own way.* This is the creed declared by its great founder, who saw clearly that *liberty could only be preserved, enjoyed, and transmitted by adhering faithfully and courageously to the principles of self government.*

These are sound principles. They lie at the foundation of the American political system, and should be the guide in all governmental action. But the assertion of such anti-paternal ideas was too much for the paternalistic *Detroit Tribune*, so under the heading, "A Modern Jefferson," in its issue of August 3, it took Mr. Mills and the principles asserted by him to task, in the following style:—

Here is the doctrine of natural liberty, the pet theory of eighteenth century doctrinaires, the favorite mental idol of Thomas Jefferson, seriously enunciated as a party creed in the last decade of the nineteenth. The anachronism is painful. Natural liberty is an exploded dogma. Few believe in it nowadays, and nobody expects governmental policy to conform to it. Liberty is an artificial product. It is a gift of society or the State to man. Its limits are defined by the State; its blessings are conserved by the same agency. This is the doctrine upon which modern governments are based; this is the doctrine by which modern legislation is guided. Mr. Mills can not now retroverse the current of events by the interposition of the doctrine of natural liberty. . . . The theories of modern publicists and the experience of modern legislators alike contravene the revamped Jeffersonianism of Mr. Mills.

Here the principles of liberty and the principles of paternalism (or a better term would be despotism) are contrasted.

Mr. Mills (following the founders of our Government) says that government is the people's agent and "only has such powers as man confers upon it."

The paternalistic *Tribune* replies: "Liberty is an artificial product. It is the gift of society, or the State, to man."

Mr. Mills says: The agent or employed must get its powers from the employer—"society has only such rights as the individual confers upon it."

The *Tribune* replies: "Natural liberty is an exploded dogma."

Mr. Mills says: "Just government must stop at the boundary of natural right; it must secure that against every invasion."

The *Tribune* replies: "Few believe in

it [natural liberty] nowadays, and nobody expects governmental policy to conform to it."

Mr. Mills says: "In the last thirty years paternalism has been extending her boundaries and liberty has been contracting hers."

The *Tribune* replies: "Mr. Mills can not now retroverse the current of events by the interposition of the doctrine of natural liberty."

And then as an unanswerable argument the *Tribune* contemptuously calls human liberty "revamped Jeffersonianism."

Nevertheless, be it called "revamped" or by whatever term, it is a liberty of which the American people are proud. There are undoubtedly to-day many paternalists and nationalists like the *Tribune*, that would, if they could, trample the immortal Declaration of Independence in the dust, that would consign its grand principles of natural liberty to oblivion; that would, if they could, overthrow the American Constitution, which was formulated to "establish" natural justice, and construct a despotism, like that of the Czar of Russia, parcelling out liberty in small quantities as it saw fit; but fortunately for the American people they can not. All they can do is to call the principles therein enunciated "exploded dogmas," "pet theories of eighteenth century doctrinaires," etc., but the grand political system, the superstructure erected upon those foundation principles will ever command the admiration of all lovers of liberty and humanity.

W. A. BLAKELY.

W. F. Crafts as a "Judaizer."

W. F. CRAFTS, whose friends denominate him as the "leader" in Sabbath reform, has issued an "Open Letter to the Postmaster-General: Is it legal to sell postage stamps and deliver mail on the Sabbath except in 'original packages'?" As a specimen of sophomoric logic, of the "*Argumentum ad hominem*" sort, it is quite successful in placing the Postmaster-General in various apparently unfavorable attitudes as to consistency. But if consistency be the standard, Mr. Crafts would suffer most notably were the tables to be turned against him and his methods. Such things are but unworthy by-play when a great theme is under consideration. As an effort to sustain Sunday observance, Mr. Crafts's letter is "Judaistic" to the last degree. It "chops logic and splits hairs" equal to the Talmud. Under Judaism, when it had grown formal and powerless, the observance of the Sabbath was burdened with countless negative restrictions, which were like tithing "mint, anise and cummin," but which did not touch the "weightier matters of the law." Such are Mr. Crafts's charges against Postmaster-General Wanamaker. The main issue raised by Mr. Crafts is

that he may sell postage stamps and deliver mail in the "original packages" on Sunday, but not otherwise.

Whenever one considers Mr. Crafts's theory of "Sabbath reform" he must begin by noting its double-faced contradictoriness. In one breath he claims that the civil law deals with Sunday as a "civil institution" only, and does not aim to enforce any religious observance. Considering it as a civil institution, we find that two of the definitions given by Worcester may be applied to Sunday. The first and fourth are as follows:

1. "Relating to a city or to a community as governed by laws: municipal; as opposed to military; political."

4. "Lay, as opposed to ecclesiastical."

If the Postmaster-General should be compelled by the fierceness of Mr. Crafts's "open" attack to fall back for repairs, he will undoubtedly seek the aid of the ablest legal and judicial talent in the land in order to decide how the civil interests of the Nation are endangered by selling stamps or delivering mail on Sunday, otherwise than in the "original package." And since the case is one for definitions, we think that it would be well for Mr. Crafts to inform the Post-office Department just what is an "original package." We are not wise in the more than Judaistic casuistry of Mr. Crafts, but we venture to suggest that a letter addressed to John Doe is an "original package" which the writer commits to the care of the Post-office Department for transmission to him, and if it can deliver "original packages," it can deliver any single letter without infringing upon the national Constitution, or endangering the public welfare. Since each man's mail is an "original package," consigned to him, Mr. Crafts gives away his case, and the Postmaster-General is not yet convicted of doing anything "uncivil" on the "civil Sabbath." As to stamps, each one is an "original package" designed for use by itself, as a specific unit of value. But if this be questioned, surely a "sheet of stamps" would meet all demands, and it will take a casuist more technical than the average Talmudist to discover the "uncivil" and nationally injurious character of a business transaction which is civil and right if one hundred stamps are sold at once, and wrong if one be sold. When does the sale of stamps cease to be civilly right on Sunday? At seventy-five, at fifty, at twenty-five, at ten, at five? Where? Such questions are the essence of folly.

If we turn to the religious side of the question, and consider what Mr. Crafts is wont to call the "religious Sabbath," the case becomes more than Judaistic. If it be sinful to sell one stamp or to deliver one letter, how does it become non-sinful to deliver one hundred letters or sell one hundred stamps? Does God graduate guilt on the "original package" system? But since the Post-office Department is

not a religious organization, we suppose that the "religious Sabbath" can have no place in the consideration of that side of the question.

The ultimate truth of the matter can be told in a few words. The civil law has no province in the case, even of a "rest-day," except to provide for the general good, comfort and safety of the citizens of the commonwealth. When the combined facts show that Postmaster Wanamaker's policy injures the citizens as citizens, or the Nation as a Nation, the civil law may be invoked. What men shall do with Sunday, or any other day as to religious duty, is entirely beyond the reach of civil law.—*The Outlook*.

A Christian Country.

NOTWITHSTANDING the barbarous persecutions inflicted by the Russian Government upon those who do not agree with the Czar's definition of Christianity, the *Christian Statesman* still continues to call Russia "a Christian country." Let the devil label himself "Christian," and there will doubtless be found those who are ready to recognize him under that title.

But, after all, why should not the National Reformers recognize Russia as a Christian country, since Russia is simply carrying out those principles which they claim are essential to so-called National Christianity? They hold that a government is a "moral person," and that it "must have a religion of its own, and exercise itself about religious affairs." They claim further, that it is the duty of government to compel all the people to submit to the national religion. In the issue of the *Christian Statesman* of October 2, 1884, it said:—

Give all men to understand that this is a Christian Nation; and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain by all right means our Christian character.

Every week the *Statesman* prints the Constitution of the National Reform Association, in which it is proposed "to place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

And what do the Reformers propose to do with those who refuse to accept what the Government shall officially declare to be the institutions and usages of Christianity? The following from the *Christian Statesman* of May 21, 1885, answers the question:—

We might add, in all justice, if the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas; and then, if they can stand it, stay there till they die.

This programme laid down by the National Reformers is precisely the one

which the Russian Government is following to-day. That country has adopted "a religion of its own," and is exercising itself "about religious affairs." This is what the *Statesman* declares every nation must do. The Czar is giving "all men to understand" that Russia is a "Christian nation," and that he is determined to "maintain by all right means" its "Christian character." He has placed "all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of the government on an undeniable, legal basis;" and whoever denies his right to do this is pretty sure to be sent to the "wild, desolate land" of Siberia, to stay until he dies.

The Czar and the National Reformers are exactly agreed as to what constitutes the right means by which the Christian character of a nation should be maintained. Banishment "to some wild, desolate land" is the penalty for all those who refuse to worship the government instead of God. This is the way they are made to "feel the inconvenience of dissent."

The *Christian Statesman* complains bitterly of the religious persecution in Russia, while, at the same time, it exists for the sole purpose of securing the introduction of a like system in our own Government. Let not its editors say that the reason Russia persecutes is, that the government has adopted a false religion; for when they call Russia a Christian country, they thereby assert that it has the true religion—the Christian religion. Russia claims to have the Christian religion, and the National Reformers admit that the claim is just.

But further: if, as they affirm, it is the duty of every government to officially define Christianity for its subjects, it necessarily follows that the definition given must be right for that country. If there was any doubt about it, then the subjects could not be blamed for refusing to accept it, and the official decision would be without effect. If the subjects are to criticise the decision of the government, and do as they please about accepting it, then there is no use for the government to make a decision; and if the government has a right to decide, then no citizen has a right to question the decision.

Russia has made an official decision that true Christianity is embodied in the doctrines of the Greek Church; and as the National Reformers assert the right of governments to decide in such matters, they ought to be the last ones to find fault with the decision.

This official definition of Christianity, which Russia has made for the benefit (?) of her citizens, is undoubtedly in harmony with the ideas of the majority. It is only the Jews, the Lutherans, and others who are in the minority, that get persecuted. Russia legislates on the principle of "the greatest good to the greatest number," and of course she cannot afford to have a half dozen different and

conflicting standards of religion. If the Lutherans and Jews do not like Russia "and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land . . . and set up a government of their own, and then, if they can stand it, stay there till they die." As it is with National Reformers, so it is with the Czar—any one is an atheist who does not accept his definition of Christianity.

All the persecution in Russia arises from the enforcement of what the Czar calls "Christian laws;" that is, laws for the protection and enforcement of Christianity, as officially defined by the government. And these laws are said to be enforced for the good of the State, in order that Russia may maintain her "Christian character."

Reader, beware of a so-called Christian government. Beware of a government that has concluded to have a religion, and to "exercise itself about religious affairs." Beware of a government that officially defines Christianity for its citizens. Beware of a government which commands the people to do a thing because it would be pleasing to God. Beware of a government which defines the will of God for its subjects. Beware of a government that passes laws favoring Christianity, for in so doing it defines Christianity. Beware of a government which asks the people to look to it for their religion, instead of looking to God. Beware of a government that puts itself in the place of God to rule the consciences of men. Beware of a government which substitutes the power of civil law for the power of God. Beware of a government which calls religious institutions "civil," that it may assume jurisdiction over them. Beware of a government which enforces a recognition of religious institutions "for the good of the State," or "for the benefit of the public health." Beware of a church or of an individual that asks the government to do any of these things.

A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

Causes Which Led to the French Revolution.

INFIDELITY, the change of the week and weekly rest-day, the suppression of the Bible and religious rites, are sometimes referred to by those who favor an establishment of religion by law, as the causes of the French Revolution, or "Reign of Terror." But such is not the case. These are simply incidents of that awful epoch, and not causes. Ridpath, in his candid and impartial "History of the World," thus states the causes which led to the French Revolution:—

There were 23,000 monks in France; there were 60,000 curates and vicars; there were 37,000 nuns; there were 2,500 monasteries, 1,500 convents, and 60,000 churches and chapels. In all of these there were 130,000 persons who enjoyed themselves in the work of saving France from her sins. But they did not begin with themselves. There were

140,000 nobles in France. They put on regalia, and stuck feathers in their hats. The noble families numbered 30,000. On each square league of territory, and for each thousand of the inhabitants, there was a castle and one noble family. France was not only saved, but she was ennobled. It required a great deal of land to support properly the dignity and office of one of her saviours. The Abbey of St. Germain-en-Laye owned about 900,000 acres. One-fifth of all the land of France belonged to the clergy, one-fifth to the nobility, one-fifth to the communes and kings. . . . It is impossible to describe in adequate terms the system of government and of social despotism established over the French nation in the eighteenth century. . . . The theory, reduced to a formula, ran thus: It is the duty—the business—of the State to teach men what things to do, and of the Church to teach them what things to believe. As for man, it is his business to be governed.

Of the Revolution itself, Ridpath says:

It was simply a revolt, an insurrection of the emancipated mind of France against the tyranny of her social, civil, and religious institutions, a rebellion of man against his masters, a struggle of the human spirit to break an intolerable thralldom which had been imposed upon it by the past. . . . The day of pleasant things had passed. No more could the fiery spirit of roused-up France be soothed with royal cordials or put to sleep with a lullaby. The new king's ancestors for two hundred years had sown to the wind, and now their princely and good natured offspring must reap the whirlwind.

Man's Law versus God's Law.

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL: In the recent decision of Judge Hammond in the celebrated King case, I find it laid down that man's law must be obeyed even though it commands that which God has never commanded, and, it may be, has never sanctioned. The Judge says:—

It may be harmless in itself (because as petitioner believes, God has not set apart that day for rest and holiness), to work on Sunday; and yet, if man has set it apart in due form by his law, for rest, it must be obeyed as man's law if not as God's law; and it is just as evil to violate such a law in the eyes of the world, as one sanctioned by God—I mean just as criminal in law.

In another part of his decision Judge Hammond affirms that a law like the Tennessee Sunday law, which would compel Mr. King to rest on the first day of the week, does not invade the latter's conscience, since it is not any part of his creed, or of that of his denomination, that the fourth commandment enjoins labor during six days in the week. Now, what Mr. King's conscience tells him upon this point I do not know; but I think every candid person must admit that such a law, if not in conflict with what the fourth commandment enjoins, is in direct conflict with what the commandment allows, and therefore equally void and out of place upon the statute books of any State. The fourth commandment says:—

Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," etc.

Now, if this language has any meaning it is a direct *permission* to man from the Almighty himself to perform work upon six days of the week; and to say, in the

face of this, that Sunday laws must be obeyed by the seventh-day keeper on the plea that they do not require him to violate his conscience, is to ignore God's relation to man, and invade a right which the latter's conscience tells him is as sacred and well established as any which could possibly belong to the individual.

Man's law is no less in conflict with God's law when it forbids that which God's law permits, than when it permits or enjoins that which God's law forbids. When the Almighty has with his own voice said, "six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work," where is the man or combination of men that have the authority to say, thou shalt not labor six days? Mr. King ought to be at once released.

Yours for the right,

L. A. SMITH.

Intolerance in Illinois.

FROM a letter received from Brother T. B. Bolton, of Illinois, we learn that the dragon spirit is being manifested in that State against those who "keep the commandments of God."

Brother David Longnecker, of that State, has been arrested on the following charge:—

Jacob Tidmore complains that David Longnecker, of the county of Macon, and State of Illinois, on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, to wit, on the 19th day of July, A. D. 1891, was guilty of making a great noise, screaming, and talking with a loud voice, whereby the peace of the affiant and his family was then and there disturbed.

The arrest was based on section 262, of the Statutes of Illinois, which provides for a fine of not more than twenty-five dollars for disturbing the peace of any private family, "by any noise, rout, or amusement, on the first day of the week, called Sunday."

The complainant failed to prove the charge, he himself admitting that Brother Longnecker was heard to speak to his horses, to start and stop them, and not louder than was necessary, nor louder than he would on any other day.

Illinois has another Sunday law (section 261) which forbids common labor on Sunday, but exempts "whomsoever thinks proper to keep any other day as a Sabbath."

Failing to convict under section 262, Brother Longnecker was found "guilty in that he had labored on the Sabbath," and ordered to pay a fine and costs amounting to \$17.80. The decision was based on section 261, not referred to in the complaint, and which contains an exemption clause as quoted.

Mr. Tidmore had a visitor at the time he was disturbed, who was also disturbed by Brother Longnecker's working, and as Brother Longnecker came past, called to him with a blasphemous oath, and asked if he was a heathen. One of the witnesses for the plaintiff declared that he should

not be disturbed by swearing, for he swore himself, but he would be disturbed by any one doing near his house as Brother Longnecker had done near Mr. Tidmore's house. All the prosecutions against Seventh-day Adventists have demonstrated that honest labor by a man who conscientiously keeps the seventh-day Sabbath is more disturbing than blasphemy or Sunday Saloons.

We would respectfully refer this case to the advocates of Sunday laws who tell us that intolerance is confined to the South, and would not manifest itself in the North. Brother Longnecker has appealed his case.—*Review and Herald*.

Say It as It Is.

THE *Christian Nation*, of June 15, 1891, prints a summary of a recent address on "The Sabbath Rest," by Dr. H. H. George, in Rochester, New York, in which he says, "Are we to be allowed to have a Sabbath in this country?" One would gather from such a wail that a terrible pressure was being brought to bear upon him to take away from him his Sunday. But does he have any fears that the time will ever come when he will not be allowed to keep Sunday?—Nothing of the kind. Then what does he mean, and what does he want?—He wants matters so arranged in this country that religionists of his stamp can compel everybody to keep the day he calls the Sabbath; and his question should have been worded as follows: "Are we to be allowed to have a law in this country so that we can bring all the people to our terms, and oblige them to observe the day we call the Sabbath, whether they regard it so and wish to keep it or not?" This is the intent of the outcry in behalf of Sunday; then why not state it as it is?—*Review and Herald*.

Christianity and Education.

THE question is whether Christianity shall be taught in the public schools, and, if so, what Christianity and how much. Toward the answer to this question the assertion that Christianity is part of the law of the land takes us a very little way. In England, from which our courts have borrowed the expression, it has a definite meaning. It means Christianity as formulated by the Established Church of the country, even including the denunciation in the Articles of the "vain talk" of "certain Anabaptists." Where the Church and the State are one, the doctrine taught in the State schools is the doctrine of the Church. But how does it help us in considering whether the common schools shall give religious instruction to be told that Christianity is part of the law of the land? No law book lays down what the Christian doctrines are in which courts have a judicial belief, or what doctrines are essential and what unessential. The judges

who have delivered the doctrine have been compelled to generalize it. One of the most impressive statements of it, that quoted by Mr. Jay from Daniel Webster, is also one of the vaguest: "Christianity, Christianity independent of sects and parties, general, tolerant Christianity, is the law of the land."

This is doubtless impressive, but it scarcely affords the material for a curriculum of religious instruction in the secular schools. Where is "Christianity independent of sects and parties" to be found? Suppose we admit that general, tolerant Christianity should be taught in the common schools, though no other part of the law of the land is so taught, where is unsectarian Christianity to be found? Is there any Christian authority which is not also a sectarian authority? The Methodist pastor and the Catholic priest might admit each other to be Christians, though each of them would probably have so many qualifications to make that the Christianity of the other would appear to be as unimportant as it was general. Each of them, at any rate, professes and calls himself a Christian, and each would have as good a right as the other to say how much Christianity and what Christianity the common schools should teach. Everybody knows that they would not in the least agree about it, even though they professed to make it as "general" as possible. The Roman Catholic would insist that "the simple reading of the Scripture without note or comment," which seems to be the ultimatum of the evangelical Protestants, was either too much or too little, and certainly was not a proper teaching of general Christianity. We can imagine the horror, on the other hand, with which the Methodist would recoil from any scheme of religious instruction that the Roman Catholics would propound.

As there is, practically speaking, no unsectarian Christianity, the only resource would be to invite all the Christian sects to unite in preparing a suitable course of religious instruction, and this it is certain that they could not agree upon. Yet their rights as citizens are precisely the same. Anglican Christianity is part of the law of England, but no American court has yet decided that either Protestantism or Catholicism is part of the law of this country, any more than any court has denied that both Protestantism and Catholicism are entitled to be considered forms of Christianity. Yet no religious instruction can be given in the schools upon which Catholics and Protestants will agree, although all Catholics and a limited number of Protestants agree that some religious instruction should be given. If the majority of the voters could be brought to this opinion, the division of the school fund which the Roman Catholics desire would be the natural solution of the difficulty. We believe, and we

believe that a majority of the voters believe, that this would be a grievous public calamity. The only way to avert it is to hold that the instruction of the common schools should be exclusively secular, and that anybody who insists upon the necessity or desirableness of adding religious instruction to it shall be at liberty to add it in his own way and at his own cost, but not in the common schools nor at the cost of the taxpayers. A man whose money is taken from him by the State to administer religious instruction which he disapproves is certainly not in the enjoyment of the religious liberty guaranteed to him by the Constitution. To quote, in justification of this abstraction, that Christianity is part of the law of the land is idle, meaningless, and exasperating.—*New York Times*.

The "American Sabbath."

ROMEO'S celebrated query, "What's in a name?" is often echoed and re-echoed at different times and on all sorts of occasions. But some people think there is more in a name than there is in the substance. They have no objection to the union of Church and State if it can only be called something else. They have no objection to compulsory Sunday laws—the direct heritage of Church and State of the Old World—if you only call the day the "civil" Sunday or the "American Sabbath." Although all our Sabbath traditions came down from an exclusively religious idea, and although anciently Sunday itself was named after the sun-god, whose festival it was, yet to-day we are told that if we only enforce these ideas and call them "American" or "civil" that changes the whole case at once.

It seems that these modern Sunday-law advocates are as much mixed as to facts, as was good old "Uncle Mose," of Detroit, not long since. The *Free Press* relates the following anecdote:

"Well, Uncle Mose," said a lady, "I hear you have another pair of twins at your house."

"Yaas, Missus, yaas we has,—bress dey little h'arts!"

"Have you named them yet?"

"Yaas'm; done named 'em aftah two ob de fust pres'dents ob dis kentry."

"Indeed! What two?"

"Ole Christofi C'lumbus an' Juleyus Cæsar, ma'am. We'se grate on namin' de chil'ens fo' de presidents 't our house."

THE ecclesiastical world has so long forced man into a false position that it has become almost hereditary with us to concede them some sort of authority in such matters. There is no authority in this world older or superior to the people themselves—and the people derive authority of the individual himself. Society is only the delegated authority of the individual.—*Kansas City Journal*

THE *Union Signal*, "official organ of the World's and National Woman's Christian Temperance Union," in a paragraph enumerating the feminine rulers in the governmental affairs of the world, closes its final sentence with these words, "And the great Republic has twelve million queens potential—to be queens actual soon, in Church and State."

These words, "queens in Church and State," were no slip of the pen. They are an open and ingenuous expression of an achievement to which the Woman's Christian Temperance Union confidently looks. It fully corresponds with the teachings of Miss Willard and Mrs. Bateham and other prominent women of the Union, both in their published writings and in their discourses at conventions and other public meetings.

That insignificant body of denominational aliens which really constitutes the National Reform Association, and from which its working force is drawn, furnishes the principles and lays out the line of work, but in the accomplishment of the final result the Woman's Christian Temperance Union will be a factor infinitely more efficient and successful. As Satan first approached Eve in the Garden of Eden with the lying assertion, "Ye shall not surely die," and the blasphemous assurance of the attainment of wisdom like to the divine; so now in his last struggle for supremacy over mankind, appealing to her religious nature to accept for Christ that temporal power which he refused for himself, "all the kingdoms of the world" "and the glory of them,"—and for herself the queenship of Church and State, he deceives her again with the glamour of false religious hopes and flattering promises of the ascendancy of her sex.

THE *Voice* notes the fact that Mayor Grant, of this city, has declared in favor of Sunday liquor selling, and says:—

This is done, evidently, to reconcile the liquor dealers who are exasperated with the President of the Excise Board, appointed by the Mayor. *If prohibition is wrong in theory, and impossible to enforce six days out of the week, as we are so often told, we fail to see why it should not be equally wrong and impossible on the seventh day.* The Sunday-open saloon is the logical result of the anti prohibition argument.

We have italicized a portion of this paragraph to call attention to a truth for which THE SENTINEL has always contended, namely, that Sunday prohibition is in the interests not of temperance but of Sunday as a sacred day. If the saloon business is legitimate six days in the week there is no civil reason in the world why it should be prohibited on the one remaining day. On the other hand if it is a civil evil on Sunday it is certainly just as great an evil on every other day, and ought to be prohibited on every day. The *Voice* is quite right on this point.

NATIONAL

Religious Liberty Association.

Religious Persecution.

THE persecution of a Seventh-day Adventist in Tennessee because he worked in his field on Sunday is a singular proceeding for an American State. Nobody pretends that this victim of religious intolerance was disturbing his neighbors. He was plowing on his own land at a distance from any place of worship, but under a mediæval law such as certain misguided Californians have sought to introduce here he was arrested, fined, and from present appearances will be compelled to consort with criminals in jail.

A local contemporary thinks that Tennesseans have a right to wreak religious bigotry on minorities in this fashion, and that if the members of the minority do not like it they can do as the Jews are doing in Russia—give up their homes and leave. That is not the common idea of American liberty. The principle at the root of our Government is that every man has a right to do as he pleases so long as he does not infringe the rights of anybody else. The attempt to confine a Seventh-day Adventist to five days' work a week when other people are allowed to work six is a discrimination so unjust that it ought to make a Tennessean ashamed to acknowledge his State.

At this moment there are probably hundreds of murderers in Tennessee who have never been molested. It is safe to say that among the ultra-pious neighbors who have insisted upon imprisoning an otherwise blameless man because he kept his Sabbath instead of theirs, there are some who have taken their guns to church and can look back upon feuds maintained by assassination. The State itself, whose laws make criminals of those who divide the week in the way laid down on Sinai, is guilty of keeping up the infamous convict lease system, which has been simply a scheme of wholesale murder for gain, and now has brought the commonwealth to the verge of civil war.

Californians have much to be thankful for, but nothing more than that they live in a community in which people mind their own business, each disposing of his time as he sees fit and allowing his neighbors to do the same.—*San Francisco Examiner*.

The "Adventist" Case.

THE decision of the Federal District Court in the now celebrated Tennessee Seventh-day Adventist case is that it has no jurisdiction to construe the Constitution of Tennessee. Those who have followed the progress of this highly interesting case in the courts may remember, perhaps, that the *Republic* asserted on the appeal to the Federal courts that they had no jurisdiction, and that the person who is being so grossly persecuted has no remedy under the Federal Constitution.

Briefly stated, the history of the case is that R. M. King, a respectable and hard-working farmer of Obion County, was prosecuted and fined for being a Seventh-day Adventist. The members of this sect of Christians have peculiar but perfectly harmless theories concerning the second advent, in conformity with which they "keep holy" the Sabbath or seventh day of the week instead of Sunday, the holiday observed by other denominations, and made legal by the act of Charles II., which survives as a Sunday law in Tennessee and in most of the other States. Not being able to leave his crops unworked for two days in the week, Mr. King plowed them on Sunday, after having kept the Sabbath, the day before. He was arrested under the Sunday law, and in order to make it effective against him it was alleged that his work on his own farm on Sunday created a public nuisance. On this entirely untenable ground he has been harassed from court to court. He was a poor

man, but he has been supported by the friends of religious liberty from other denominations of Christians in and out of Tennessee.

The Tennessee Sunday law was inherited from North Carolina, where it existed before the Revolution as a Colonial statute. It had been in "innocuous desuetude" for many years until neighborhood prejudice revived it in this case. Judge Hammond of the Federal Court holds that as far as his court is concerned the action of the State courts must be accepted as due process of law. The decision is sound from the standpoint of the Federal Constitution. The Constitution of Tennessee guarantees religious liberty and prohibits an establishment of religion, but the State is not restricted on this point by the Federal Constitution. If Seventh day Adventism were made the established religion of the State by State enactment compelling all citizens to support it, the Federal courts could not interfere, as the clause of the Federal Constitution on this point applies expressly to the Federal Government and to that only.

Mr. King has been grossly wronged, but his only remedy at law is under the law and Constitution of Tennessee. It appears that for the present his remedy is denied him, and this being the case he has no better recourse than to submit to the oppression and go to prison—to the convict camp, if it suits the convenience of his persecutors to send him there. One such appeal as that to the sense of justice of a free people is worth more than all the law on the side of oppression.—*St. Louis Republic*.

Poplar Bluff, Mo., August 6.

EDITOR SENTINEL:—There is a man here by the name of John Harbin, *alias* William V. Harbin, who has been convicted of murder in the first degree, and is sentenced to be hanged on the 21st day of this present month. John L. Kennedy, a prominent attorney of Nashville, Tennessee, a former acquaintance of Harbin's, is here circulating a petition to have Harbin's sentence commuted to life imprisonment. After Attorney Kennedy had stated his business to the writer, he was told that it was altogether right for him to intercede for executive clemency for the man that he had known under more favorable circumstances, and as a law abiding citizen. He said, "I always do it at home." The writer called his attention to the recent oppressive decision rendered in his State in the R. M. King case; at the same time took up the *St. Louis Republic* and read the account of the decision recently handed down by Judge Hammond, of United States District Court of Memphis, Tennessee. Mr. Kennedy said: "I would not think of interceding for executive clemency in such a case as *that*; that man broke the Sabbath which is the foundation of our Government or at least, the Christian religion is the groundwork of our civil institutions."

This shows the extent to which this religious prejudice and persecuting spirit has obtained in Tennessee. Harbin is a murderer, he intercedes for him, he always does it at home, but King plowed on Sunday, he would not think of interceding for a man like that. THOMAS M. LANE.

REV. W. J. BUCHANAN, of Xenia, Ohio, complains in a letter to the *United Presbyterian* of July 23, that the railroads in the State are doing all they can to contribute to Sunday excursions. He says:—

"Railroad officials sometimes claim that trains are run on Sabbath only to satisfy the demands of the public. In many cases, however, these officials seem to be doing all they can to create a demand for "Sunday" trains. At different times during the summer the "C. H. & D." has scattered flaring hand-bills in the towns along its lines announcing special "Sunday" excursions to the National Soldiers' Home at Dayton, to Woodsdale Island Park, near Hamilton, and elsewhere. In large capitals the attractions are announced: Drum corps, boat races, boat riding by steam yacht, sail, or row boat, toboggan slides, merry-go-rounds,

puzzle gardens, razzle-dazzle, swings, pony rides, carriage drives, donkey races, and "many other amusements for young folks." These posters are signed by officers of the road, the first name being that of the central passenger agent, who, no doubt, arranges the excursions for the money that is in them.

"To such an extent has Sabbath desecration been carried in our sister city of Dayton, that the best citizens there have recently organized a Law and Order society. Of their three hundred and sixty-two saloons, three hundred and forty were open either by front door or back, on the Sabbath. Of three hundred groceries, one hundred and fifty did business on that day. Of eighty seven meat markets, eighty supplied customers. All of the drug stores were open, and fourteen out of the nineteen photograph galleries. Eleven thousand "Sunday" newspapers were sold or distributed in the city."

Thus from every quarter comes the news of increasing agitation of the Sunday question in all its phases, of growing disregard of the day on the part of some, and of louder and more persistent demands for Sunday laws and their enforcement on the part of others.

THE Protestants and Roman Catholics of a fashionable suburb of Montreal are at loggerheads regarding the proper observance of Sunday. According to their custom from time immemorial and in consonance with the teaching of their religious advisers Roman Catholics do not think it improper to indulge in dancing, ball playing, or other similar amusements in the afternoon of Sunday. But their Protestant neighbors, in this case, have determined that they will not tolerate any sacrilegious frivolity of this kind.

The expression of religious fervor on the part of the Protestants became so intense that the presence of the Mayor was necessary to prevent a social riot. These Protestants forget that Sunday is a Roman Catholic institution and as they established it there can be no higher authority than they as to what shall constitute its proper religious observance.

THE New York *Independent*, of August 6, thus states the facts in the King case and comments upon the decision and the law:—

"A case of which we have more than once spoken was decided last week by the United States District Court at Memphis, Tennessee. A Seventh-day Adventist, R. M. King, was convicted of Sab-

bath-breaking in plowing a field on Sunday. He appealed to the Supreme Court of the State, and the sentence was affirmed. The case was then taken up by the Adventists and the National Secular Association, and appealed to the Federal Court, and argued on the ground that the conviction was contrary to the Bill of Rights of the State of Tennessee and the Constitution of the United States. The decision does not so much traverse the subject of the constitutionality of the law against Sabbath breaking, but it says it is not the province of the Federal Court to review the case of a conviction under process of the State law. The decision may be right, but the law which does not allow a man who rests on Saturday to work Sunday in such a way as not to interfere with the rest of others is bad law, and bad morals, and bad religion."

This is in marked contrast with the comments made by some of the religious press, and does credit to the *Independent*. Our contemporary errs however in saying that the National Secular Association has anything to do with the case, it should have said the National Religious Liberty Association.

ACCORDING to the Boston *Herald*, of the 5th inst., a committee representing the several Young People's Christian Endeavor societies in Lynn has decided to adopt decisive measures regarding the enforcement of law on Sundays. The action, the *Herald* says, will be independent of the police authorities.

The committee, so it is reported, proposes to secure warrants for two or three storekeepers who open their places on Sunday, and make test cases of them. Members of the committee refuse to state what plan of action has been determined upon.

The city government was petitioned by the societies to take action in the premises, but refused. The condition of affairs in Lynn on Sundays, its citizens claim, is no worse than in other cities in Massachusetts.

THE *Christian at Work*, of August 6, has the following:

"Some little time ago we directed attention to some obsolete laws which were on the statute books of this State until the adoption of the present Codes swept them away. One of these laws allowed any householder to stretch a chain across a highway in front of his house, and stop all Sunday traffic, though the parson's horse and the doctor's one-horse shay must be allowed to pass. And naturally the same features are met with on the other

side, as in England where probably very few persons are aware that the Lord's-Day Observance Act of Charles II. is still in force. But it is, and a Hair-dressers' Association tried to take advantage of it at Oldham the other day. It appears that a barber in that town refused either to join the union or close his shop on Sunday morning, and it occurred to some of the union officials that the old statute might be used to bring him to terms. A warrant was procured against him, and he was arrested; but the magistrates saw through the trick and dismissed the case on the ground that the prosecution was malicious and prompted by a desire to help the Association, rather than by any anxiety about the proper observance of the Sabbath. Whether they would refuse to enforce the law in a case where the motive was less suspicious they did not say, but it appears that some barbers were fined at Derby not long ago for shaving on Sunday. Probably the Derby judiciary do not consider shaving to be a work of necessity. It very clearly is not to a good many."

THE Junior Order of United American Mechanics of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, passed at a late meeting the following resolutions:

"Whereas it has been customary for foreign societies to hold public parades, celebrating foreign events, upon the Sabbath, commonly called Sunday, thereby desecrating the American Sabbath and casting reflections upon our free institutions, founded upon principles advocated by our forefathers and upheld by us, one of which is to keep the Sabbath holy, and to remain a day of rest; Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Council condemns all such parades and demonstrations as being un-American and dangerous, both to the sanctity of the Sabbath and to the spirit of our free institutions, and that these resolutions be brought before the Advisory Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics for action by the representatives of that body, and that we hereby commend the Mayor of our city for refusing to address such bodies on that day."

It is worthy of notice that these resolutions do not openly ask the suppression of the Sunday parades of foreign societies by law, but the supposition is that such action would meet the approbation of this order. The phraseology employed bears unmistakable evidence to the parentage of the resolution, and shows how generally the "National Reform" spirit is permeating all classes and finding expression through organizations which are not professedly religious in their purposes.

SACRED CHRONOLOGY.

BY SYLVESTER BLISS.

THIS work treats of the Elements of Chronology, the different systems, and the various eras, and gives the chronology of the principal events recorded in sacred history from the creation till the death of St. John. It also contains a vindication of the numbers of the Hebrew Scriptures. As an aid to investigation it is invaluable. The book has been thoroughly revised, and an entire chapter added, on the

PEOPLING OF THE EARTH.

This chapter is an exposition of the tenth chapter of Genesis, and gives an outline of the beginning of history and

THE ORIGIN OF NATIONS.

New and valuable notes have been added to the original text of the book, making it the most valuable work on the subject of sacred chronology extant. No student of history can well do without it. It contains a vast amount of information in small space, and so far from being dry it is as interesting as a story, which it really is. 300 pages, cloth binding, with side stamp, \$1.00.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK. OR, OAKLAND, CAL.

JUST ISSUED!

CONTAINING

- 60 New Hymns,
- 50 New Songs,
- 40 Old Favorites,
- 10 National Songs.

Songs of Freedom

A PATRIOTIC COLLECTION

BY F. E. BELDEN.

THE ORIGINAL SONGS were written by DANKS, BUTTERFIELD, BARNES, EMERSON, HERBERT, HAKES, TOWNE, RUSSELL, OGDEN, TENNEY, DAVIS, SWENEY, BELDEN, and others.

Selected Musical Compositions by HAYDN, MENDELSSOHN, VERDI, SULLIVAN, GROOS, WILHELM, MASON, CLARIBEL, etc.

THE ORIGINAL HYMNS were written by D. W. McCOURT, REV. DWIGHT WILLIAMS, MRS. L. B. PRICE, M. B. DUFFIE, T. R. WILLIAMSON, MRS. L. D. A. STUTTLE, JOHN TALMAN, FANNIE BOLTON, EMMA L. PARDON, ALBION F. BALLENGER, MARY L. LA FORGE, ELIZABETH ROSSER, J. J. ELLYSON, VICTORIA A. BUCK, R. F. COTTRELL, WM. BRICKEY, S. B. WHITNEY, F. E. BELDEN, etc.

Selected Patriotic Hymns by BRYANT, WHITTIER, DWIGHT, DRAKE, JOAQUIN MILLER, FELICIA HEMANS, THEODORE TILTON, REV. HENRY ALFORD, REV. LEONARD BACON, etc.

120 pages, embracing a large number of songs in the interests of

Religious Liberty,
Soldier's Reunions,
Independence Day,
Memorial Day,
Washington's Birthday, Etc.,

Arranged as SOLOS, DUETS, TRIOS, QUARTETS for both Male and Female Voices, CHORUSES for both Male and Mixed Voices, PATRIOTIC SONGS FOR CHILDREN, etc.

The principal object of the book is to oppose efforts tending toward a union of Church and State.

PRICES, Postpaid:

Heavy Manila Covers, cloth joints, 35 Cents.
Strong, Flexible Cloth, cloth joints, 50 Cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO., 43 Bond St., New York City,



NEW YORK, AUGUST 20, 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.

MR. CRAFTS says in his "Sabbath for Man" that "at first thought," Sunday laws "would seem to be religious laws." The *Home Missionary* suggests that "first impressions are usually correct." They certainly are in this instance.

EDUCATION alone makes men neither moral nor religious. The remedy is to be found in the family and in the denominational school. Fathers and mothers, in the early years of childhood, must do the work of religious instruction and training.

THE official order to close the Barge Office—the present landing place for immigrants in this city—on Sundays, was received from Washington on the 12th inst., and went into effect on the 16th. Immigrants arriving too late to land on Saturday must now remain on shipboard till Monday.

"THE Russian Government," it is said, "now consents to allow Baron Hirsch and his committee to act as agents for the colonization of the Jews, conjointly with a committee for the same purpose formed in Russia." That is to say, since the Russian Government has robbed the Jews of all their possessions, and refuses to allow them to live in Russia outside of prison walls, it graciously permits Baron Hirsch to assist them to leave the country. The Czar and his minions are, it is to be presumed, surprised at their own moderation!

"THERE is war among the church members of Atlanta," says an Atlanta, Georgia, dispatch of the 10th inst., "because Mayor Hemphill allowed a gang of men to finish up some street work yesterday, which was necessary because the engine houses of the Fire Department were blockaded. Mr. Hemphill was elected Mayor by the influence of the church element. These people were shocked when they saw the men at work, and more so when they saw the written permission which the foreman held.

"The pastor of Trinity Church, of which the Mayor is an official, grew red in the face while denouncing the act, and had resolutions of censure passed. The

most rampant of the resolutions, however, were those of the Walker Street Methodist Church which read: 'The action of Mayor Hemphill in granting permission to citizens of Atlanta under such circumstances to violate a State statute as well as disgrace a law of the Church of which he is an official member, is inexcusable, unwarranted, and criminal before God and man.'

"Mayor Hemphill says that under the same circumstances he would again grant the order."

Freethought asks: "What does the *Merced Express* mean by saying, 'One day out of seven should be observed as a day of worship or recreation, according to the dictates of a person's own conscience, and that day should be Sunday?'"

It means this, that the *Express* doesn't care a cent what day is observed only so it is Sunday.

IN answering questions at Chautauqua, the other day, on woman suffrage, Dr. Buckley, editor of the *Christian Advocate* of this city, said:—

The majority of the advocates of modern spiritualism are women. Nine out of ten mediums are women. The same is true concerning Christian science. In all the false religions of the world women are in the ascendancy. The biggest political mistake ever made in the world was the endorsement of a third or Prohibition party by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The Mormons were the first to grant woman suffrage, for they knew that women would stand up for polygamy. There's a great similarity between women and music. Both will help a circus, a cathedral, or an army. Women are always in sympathy with the prevailing spirit. Women mobbed John Wesley in Ireland, while others were willing to die for him.

The Doctor might have added that women are doing more than men to further religious legislation in this country.

REV. J. P. MILLS, District Secretary of the American Sabbath Union, has been lecturing in Iowa; at Des Moines he said that he was asking for a *civil* and not a *religious* Sabbath; and claimed that all Sabbath laws are civil because the courts have so decreed.

The eighth annual report of the Kings County Sunday Observance Association urges upon individuals the duty of requiring public officials to execute the Sunday laws of the State for the protection of Sunday, not as a *religious* but a *civil* institution.

At the last annual conference of the National Reform Association in Washington a resolution was publicly passed to expunge the expression "civil Sunday" from their vocabulary. It would naturally follow, of course, that the line of thought and argument for which that expression stands must also go with it.

It is evident that the American Sabbath Union, with its different branches, is still at variance with the mother association on this as a matter of policy, although their close affiliation proves that they

have no difference in principle. In this the National Reform Association, like its ancient prototype of the Old World, is certainly consistent.

IN his address before the late Temperance Congress, Archbishop Ireland said:—

Make laws for the observance of Sunday—the one day of the week which we have striven to hold sacred for God, one of the last vestiges of religion in the land—and the saloon-keeper opens wide his doors and defies you.

THE SENTINEL has no sympathy for the liquor traffic and no apology to make for the saloon-keeper. It does say, however, that prohibition to be effective must not be limited to one day in the week. Such limitation places prohibition upon a religious basis; it honors a religious institution more than it restricts a civil evil; but as is clearly indicated by the Archbishop's words the whole purpose of Sunday-closing laws is to enforce the observance of Sunday as a religious institution. The Archbishop is not as careful to conceal the real motive underlying the demand for Sunday laws as are his American Sabbath Union friends.

Their purpose is to exalt Sunday more than it is to promote temperance and he is not afraid to let it be known. Whether the Archbishop is more candid or less wise than some other Sunday law advocates is not for us to decide; possibly he is both.

ON Sunday, July 26, while a congregation were worshipping in a country church near Osborne, Georgia, lightning struck the building and very seriously shocked a number of the congregation. If they had been playing baseball instead of worshipping on Sunday, doubtless the editor of the *Christian Statesman* would have been out by this time with a vociferous editorial, prefaced with bold type headlines, "A most striking visitation of Divine wrath on bold desecrators of the Sabbath day." We record these lines with the hope that they may come to mind when the ardent advocates for Sunday laws are tempted to write on such subjects.

COTTAGE CITY, Dukes County, Massachusetts, is another summer resort that is suffering from the rigid enforcement of a Sunday law. The small dealers of the place complain bitterly, but the authorities are inexorable.

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.