



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 24, 1891.

NUMBER 38.

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.

A SUNDAY law makes a matter of conscience with the majority a matter of crime in the minority. And the man who observes another day than Sunday, whose labor disturbs the consciences of others, is compelled by such a law to render one-sixth of his income for the sake of the majority. That is, the State by a Sunday law exacts from the Sabbatarian one day in the week, which it does not from the Sunday-keeper.

I DENY the right of the law of the land to define how much, or just when, a man shall rest. I deny that it should say I shall and must rest one day in seven because it is good for me, as I would deny its right to say that I must bathe once a day, or once in every seven days; or that I should refrain from eating pork, or mixing pickles with my ice-cream, because thus to bathe or thus to refrain is good for me. I prefer to receive such instruction from my physician, and not from Congress nor the American Sabbath Union.—*Rev. H. B. Maurer.*

A CALIFORNIA minister, who seems to see in a Sunday law all the elements of necessary reform, is reported as saying:—

We do not wish to invoke any civil law to say that you shall worship here or that you shall worship there, or worship at all; but we do want to be able to invoke the civil law to say that this shall be a non-secular day.

“That,” says a Pacific Coast paper, “is simply asking for a civil law that will assume the prerogative of God. The Creator of days has never said Sunday shall

be a non-secular day, and he only can legitimately give character to a day. These Sunday-law preachers always boast that they do not want to say what men shall do on Sunday; but they are forward in demanding what they shall not do. Where is the difference in principle? Let them really succeed in getting the power to prescribe the acts of their fellows to the extent of limiting them, and the success will but whet the appetite for further power. The more of human power they acquire, the more they will depend upon that, and ‘deny the power of godliness.’ Then determining what men shall do, will follow as a natural consequence.”

The American Sentinel and the Churches.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL has occasion frequently to criticise the actions, political and otherwise, of the churches, yet this does not in any way spring from any disrespect for the churches as such, nor for the religion which the Protestant churches profess. THE SENTINEL is entirely Christian so far as we are able to understand Christianity from the Scriptures. As true Christianity is as far as the east is from the west from the principles and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, and we being to the best of our ability allied to true Christianity, it follows as a matter of course that we are decidedly Protestant.

We believe in one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. We believe in Jesus Christ as the Word of God, who is God, by whom “were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers,” who is before all things, and by whom all things consist; by whom alone there is salvation; and who “is able to save to the uttermost all who come unto God by him.” We believe in the Holy Spirit as the one who convinces the world of sin and of righteousness, and of judgment; and as the Comforter and the

Guide into all truth, of all who believe in Jesus. We believe that “except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God,” either here or hereafter; and that in order to this new birth, men must be “justified by faith without the deeds of the law.” We believe that it is by the obedience of Christ alone that men are made righteous; that this righteousness is the gift of God; that it is received by faith and kept by faith; and that there is no righteousness that will avail for any man, except this “righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” We believe the Bible to be the word of God.

We believe, according to the word of God, that the Church is utterly separated from the world, and bound to Christ in the love of God, as a chaste virgin to a lawful and loving husband. This being so, the members of the Church cannot be joined to the world without being counted by the word of God as adulterers against him to whom they profess to be joined in love. Says the Scripture, “Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God.” James 4:4.

As the individual members of the Church of Christ cannot be joined to the world without being counted by the word of God as adulterers against him, so also the Church as a body cannot be joined in any way to the powers of the world without likewise being declared by the word of God an adulteress and a harlot. When the professed Christian Church of the fourth century forsook her Lord and joined herself to the imperial power of Rome, she was fully committed to that corrupt course in which the word of God describes her as that great harlot, “with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication.” “And the wo-

man was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication." "And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Rev. 17:2, 4, 6. That is the Lord's description of the Church of Rome; and in the light of history no man can deny the truthfulness of the description. But everybody knows that she never could have committed fornication with the kings of the earth if she had maintained her allegiance to Christ. She never could have been made drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus, if she had not traded upon her lascivious charms for the control of the civil power, by which she could persecute to the death those who denied the authority which she had so adulterously gained.

Now the leaders of the Protestant churches of the United States are going in the same way in which the Church leaders of the fourth century went. They are seeking an alliance with the civil power. They are seeking for this alliance for the same purpose, in the same way, and by precisely the same means. And when they shall have secured the alliance and gained the control of the power, the same results will inevitably follow this in our day that followed that of the fourth century. And to make the surety of this success doubly sure, they are seeking an alliance with Rome herself. And when these professed churches of Christ shall have formed their illicit connection with worldly power, they will have thus turned themselves into a band of harlots committing fornication with the powers of earth, as did their harlot mother before them. And then the inspired description of Babylon the Great will be complete: "Upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." Rev. 17:5.

Let not the professed Protestant churches blame us for this application of the Scripture. They themselves have acknowledged the Church of Rome as their mother, and they need not blame us if we call attention to the Scripture description of the family. In the New York *Evangelist*, of February 9, 1888, Rev. Charles W. Shields, D.D., of Princeton College, in proving that it would never do, in the reunion of Christendom, to forbid a doctrine of Apostolic Succession, said:—

You would exclude the Roman Catholic Church, *the mother of us all*, the church of scholars and saints. . . . You would exclude also the Protestant Episcopal Church, the beautiful daughter of *a beautiful mother*.

This declaration, although made in one of the most influential religious papers in the country, has never yet, so far as we have read, been repudiated or even criti-

cised by any of the leading denominations, or by any paper of any of those denominations. We say again that when these churches declare, and admit, Rome to be their mother, and "a beautiful mother" at that, they cannot justly blame us for calling attention to the Scripture description of the family. The only things of which the Scriptures declare the Church of Rome to be the mother, are harlots. Therefore whatever church confesses Rome to be its mother, therein confesses itself to be a harlot. And the Protestant churches of the United States, by their religio-political workings, are doing their best to make Doctor Shields's apparently representative confession a fact.

We recognize and maintain the *right* of every people who believe alike to organize themselves into a church on whatever order they choose, and to call themselves by whatever name they please; but we utterly deny the right of any church, or all of them together, to use the civil power for any religious purpose whatever. We maintain that any man has as much right to be a Methodist, or a Presbyterian, or a Congregationalist, as any other man has to be a Baptist, an Episcopalian, or a Lutheran; but we deny that any one of these denominations has any right to seize upon the civil power and compel all the others to act as that denomination shall dictate. We deny that all the others have any right to band together and compel any one denomination to conform to the dictates of the many. We maintain that any man in this Nation has just as much right to be a Catholic as any other man has to be a Protestant; but we deny the right of the Catholics to compel any Protestant to act as though he were a Catholic, as we deny the right of the Protestants to compel any Catholic to act as though he were a Protestant. We maintain that any man has just as much right not to be a Christian as any other man has to be a Christian; but we deny any right in those who are not Christians to compel any man who is a Christian to act as though he were not. *And we likewise deny that there is any shadow of right in those who are Christians to compel any man who is not a Christian to act as though he were.* Christians have no more right to compel any man to partake of Christian ordinances, or to observe Christian institutions, than those who are not Christians have to compel Christians not to partake of Christian ordinances nor to observe Christian institutions.

Let no one misconstrue our statement that any man has as much right to be a Catholic as any other man has to be a Protestant; and any man has as much right not to be a Christian as any other man has to be a Christian. This is not by any means an admission that the man who is not a Christian is as near right as is the Christian, nor that the Catholic is as near right as is the Protestant. This

is not a question of moral right, but of civil *rights*. Of course no man has any moral right to be anything else than perfect before God; and this perfection can only be attained through faith in Christ. But if any man chooses to despise the riches of God's goodness and grace, and refuses to believe in Christ, no power on earth has any right to call him to account. He is responsible alone to God, and whoever attempts to call him to account for neglect of the word or ordinances of God, thereby usurps the prerogative of God. And that is how it is that all men have the same equal and inalienable *rights*.

We are compelled, also, in the interests of truth and right, occasionally to criticise the political workings of professed ministers of the gospel. We have all the respect for ministers of the gospel that the Scriptures require men to have; but when professed ministers of the gospel set themselves up as ministers of the law, both civil and moral, and of politics, then we no longer respect those men as ministers of the gospel; for such they are not. Christ never sent any man forth as a minister of the law, either civil or moral, nor of politics; and whenever any professed minister of the gospel sets himself to work by political influence to secure the enactment and enforcement of statutes compelling religious observances, then he is doing what Christ never sent him to do, and he then ceases to be a minister of Christ or of his gospel.

This is the position of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, and because of it many who call themselves Christians are ready to call us Liberals, and do call us that; but we are Christians nevertheless. We are glad, however, to let all men know that there are Christians who are liberal enough to maintain that all other men inalienably possess all the rights, human, civil, and religious, that Christians possess.

A. T. J.

Prov. 15:2 (last part), Exemplified.

A VOTE of thanks should be tendered to Col. Elliott F. Shepard for pushing himself forward as an advocate of Sunday observance in all its moods and tenses, for whenever he opens his mouth he injures his own cause.

Before the National Columbian Commission the doughty Colonel in these words assumed, by way of a variety from that of an interpreter of providences, the prerogative of the prophet. Here is what he said:—

I believe firmly that if the Fair is not closed on Sundays the Lord will put his curse upon the enterprise and on the Nation. He will send plagues and pestilences as he did in the days of Pharaoh. If, on the contrary, the gates are closed on Sundays, the Lord will bless the Fair and make it the grandest success possible. You have no idea of the intense feeling of the Christian world on this subject. It is with us to a man, and should we

win it will rejoice as one man. Hence it is imperative that the question should be decided at once.

The promoters of the Sunday cause might well pray to be delivered from its friends.
H. B. MAURER.

Apropos of the foregoing is the following item from the *Christian at Work*, of the 17th inst. :—

If Sabbath closing of the Columbus Fair wins, as we believe it will, it will not be by reason of some pleas put up in its behalf. Here, for instance, is the utterance of a speaker at a recent meeting in Chicago :—

It is the custom now to follow the example of great men. Germans copy the manners and deeds of the Emperor. In England the Queen, a motherly Christian woman, molds the fashions. The Prince of Wales cannot wear a coat without its being copied by every one the next day. And now here are Jesus and God who rest upon the Sabbath day—let us follow their example.

The idea of commending Sunday closing on the basis of copying Jesus and God, because the public mind is so ready to ape the manners and dress of royalty, will scarcely have weight among the intelligent, if it does not bring the cause of Sunday closing into contempt.

It is only justice to the reading public to say that “a speaker at a recent meeting in Chicago” and “the prophet” are the same.

Simply Another Step.

A LITTLE school-boy once spoke :—

“One brick upon another,
And the highest wall is laid,
One step and then another,
And—and—you’ll get there.—”

he finally stammered, much to the amusement of the school. But oftentimes the blundering remarks of little folks on some such occasion express truths that have all the force of axioms. “Fools and children” have the reputation of telling the truth.

This idea of taking one step and then another, was the idea upon which the religious and civil powers were united in Rome. It has always been the plan pursued by governments in overstepping their legitimate powers and invading the rights of the people. It was the plan England adopted in attempting to subjugate the American colonists; but it did not succeed, for the simple reason that the colonists objected to the first step—and objected in a way that was felt throughout the world.

It is the plan adopted to-day by our religio-political agitators. They first ask for a law closing the World’s Fair on Sunday; then they will want a Sunday law with an exemption clause; then they will want a law without an exemption clause; then they will want a law forbidding Sabbatarians to keep Saturday, and so on. Of course, they will deny this; but that was the plan pursued a millenium ago, and that is simply the logical outcome of the first demand.

It is only in comparatively recent times that they had a law in New England forbidding the celebration of Christmas, with penalties attached; and now comes the news that the Jews must not only observe

Russia’s Sunday law, but must also work on Saturday: “Jews,” says a Boston journal, “have been forbidden to observe the Hebrew Sabbath (Saturday), and to close their shops on that day, and are compelled to shut up their shops on Sunday.”

How long will it be if the present demands of the Sunday-law advocates are granted before they will demand that the Sabbatarians of this country be forbidden to observe the seventh day of the week? “Civil Government and Religion” calls attention to steps already taken in their demands, and it would be well to look to see where we will light, before we take our leap. The work cited says :—

Nor are they going to be content with a little. Mr. Crafts, speaking before the United States Senate committee in April, 1888, in favor of the National Sunday law, said :—

The law allows the local postmaster, if he chooses (and some of them do choose), to open the mails at the very hour of church, and so make the post-office the competitor of the churches.

This same trouble was experienced in the fourth century also, between the circus or the theatre, and the church. The church could not stand competition; she would be content with nothing less than a monopoly, and she got it, precisely as these church managers are trying to get it. More than this, they want now, as they did then, the Government to secure them in the enjoyment of a perpetual monopoly. At another point in the same speech, Mr. Crafts referred to the proposed law as one for “protecting the church services from post-office competition.” And in explaining how this could be done, he said :—

A law forbidding the opening between ten and twelve, would accomplish this, and would be better than nothing; *but we want more.*

How much more? He continues :—

A law forbidding any handling of Sunday mail at such hours as would interfere with church attendance on the part of the employes, would be better than nothing; *but we want more than this.*

How much more? He continues :—

Local option in deciding whether a local post-office shall be open at all on Sunday, we should welcome as better than nothing; . . . *but we desire more than this.*

How much more? Still he continues :—

A law forbidding all carrier delivery of mail on Sunday, would be better than nothing; *but we want more than that.*

Then he says :—

What we ask is a law instructing the Postmaster-General to make no further contracts which shall include the carrying of mails on the Sabbath, and to provide that hereafter no mail matter shall be collected or distributed on that day.

But when they shall have secured the help of the Government in carrying out their monopolizing ambition thus far, will they be content?—Not at all. Nothing short of a complete and perpetual monopoly will satisfy them. This is proved by Dr. McAllister’s words at Lakeside, Ohio, July, 1887, as follows :—

Let a man be what he may—Jew, seventh-day observer of some other denomination, or those who do not believe in the Christian Sabbath—let the law apply to every one, that there shall be no public desecration of the first day of the week, the Christian Sabbath, the day of rest for the Nation. They may hold any other day of the week as sacred, and observe it; but that day which is the one day in seven for the Nation at large, let that not be publicly desecrated by any one, by officer in the Government, or by private citizen, high or low, rich or poor.

It was because the Presbyterian clergy of Virginia saw this universal human tendency that they withdrew their support from the religious legislation in that State in 1785. Speaking of this change of front, Madison says :—

The Presbyterian clergy, too, who were in general friends to the scheme [of levying a tax towards the support of teachers to give instruction in the Christian religion], are already in another tone, either compelled by the laity of that sect, or alarmed at the probability of further interferences of the Legislature, if they once begin to dictate in matters of religion.

It is the same, too, in the infliction of the penalty. Small fines have already failed to keep Sabbatarians from Sunday work. The prosecutors are exasperated and prosecute plowing on Sunday as a nuisance (in the case of the Seventh-day Adventists now pending in the United States courts) and a fine of seventy-five dollars is imposed. When this fails to accomplish its desired effect, as it most surely will, what will be done next? Gibbon makes the following observation :

It is incumbent on the authors of persecution previously to reflect whether they are determined to support it in the last extreme. They excite the flame which they strive to extinguish; and it soon becomes necessary to chastise the contumacy, as well as the crime, of the offender. The fine which he is unable or unwilling to discharge, exposes his person to the severities of the law; and his contempt of lighter penalties suggests the use and propriety of capital punishment.—*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. 37, par. 23.*

Perceiving this inclination in human nature, Herbert Spencer observes that “if the first step has been taken with seeming impunity, it will inevitably be followed by others. School-boy promises of ‘only this once,’ are not to be believed. Make a hole through the principle to admit a solitary exception, and, on one pretense or another, exceptions will by and by be thrust through after it so as to render the principle utterly good for nothing.”

W. A. BLAKELY.

Is This the Gospel?

THE doctrine of National Reformers is that this is a Christian Nation, and that therefore all our laws should be made in accordance with their ideas of the Christian religion, and none but professors of Christianity and conformers to such laws be tolerated here. In other words, it is the theory of intolerance.

A vice-president of the National Reform Association, Rev. E. B. Graham, in a speech delivered at York, Nebraska, May 21, 1885, said :—

If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, 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.

Rev. Dr. McAllister, one of the editors of the *Christian Statesman*, the official organ of this Association, at a convention held at Lakeside, Ohio, in August, 1887, likewise said :—

Those who oppose this work now, will discover when the religious amendment is made to the Constitution, that if they do not see fit to fall in with the majority, they must abide the consequences, or seek some more congenial clime.

These are the sentiments held, and this

the theory advocated by this Association, which was first started in this country in 1863, by the small denomination known as the Reformed Presbyterians, the descendants of the old Covenanters of Scotland. How rapidly these illiberal, un-American, unpatriotic, and unchristian ideas are gaining ground may be judged by the following from the pen of Rev. T. DeWitt Talmage, in the "Ladies' Home Journal" for September, 1891. Writing of the people of East Hampton, Long Island, from his summer home at that place, he says:—

Think of the high state of morals and religion which induced this people, at an early day, at a political town-meeting, to adopt this decree: "We do sojourn and conjoin ourselves and successors to be one town or corporation, and do for ourselves and our successors, and such as shall be adjoined to us at any time hereafter, enter into combination and confederation together to maintain and preserve the purity of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, which we now possess." The pledge of that day has been fully kept.

That document of two centuries ago reads strangely behind the times; but it will be some hundreds of years yet before other communities come up to the point where that document stops. All our laws and institutions are yet to be Christianized. The Puritans took possession of this land in the name of Christ, and it belongs to him; and if people do not like that religion let them go somewhere else. They can find many lands where there is no Christian religion to bother them. Let them emigrate to Greenland, and we will provide them with mittens; or to the South Sea Islands, and we will send them water-coolers. This land is for Christ. Our legislatures and congresses shall yet pass laws as radically evangelical as the venerable document above referred to.

Such sentiments are disloyal to the spirit of a free government, and to the gospel of Christ, it matters not who utters them. Think of Christ who associated with publicans and sinners, who came to seek and to save that which was lost, banishing men to Greenland, or to the South Sea Islands because he did not find them Christians, and of his condescending to promise to send them mittens and water-coolers in order to get rid of them! Is this the spirit of the gospel? Are such utterances calculated to convert anybody? Are infidels likely to be drawn toward the cross, or to behold the matchless charms of Jesus, by such statements? Christ is not lifted up, nor does he draw men, in this way. He never assumed a cold, seclusive, and repellant attitude. He did once, through zeal for the Lord's house, drive the money changers and the traffickers from the temple, and it would not have an unsalutary effect if the money changers and speculators were driven out of the churches calling themselves by his name to-day; but he never drove any one out of the Nation. Neither did he tell his disciples to colonize and banish to regions unknown all not of their faith, who sought their shores. On the contrary, he bade them, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

In the light of these facts the question is pertinent, What are we coming to?

No one can fail to see what will be the result of having all our laws and institutions "Christianized." Those who do not conform to the ideas of those who Christianize (?) them will be kindly told that they can go to Greenland, or the South Sea Islands, and, with the comforting assurance of having a pair of mittens or a water-cooler, stay there till they die, or if they see fit to remain here, "abide the consequences." Again we ask, Is this the gospel? W. A. COLCORD.

Too Sensitive.

Two Polish Hebrews were arraigned in Gates Avenue Police Court, in Brooklyn, recently, on complaint made by a Catholic priest charging that on Sunday they run sewing-machines in their house to the great annoyance of his congregation, and the serious disturbance of divine service in the church. The Jews answered that they kept Saturday as a religious day, and claimed the privilege of working on Sunday. The Court held that they were right, and dismissed the complaint. These facts are stated by the *Christian Advocate*, which comments upon them thus:—

One who from principle observes Saturday as a day of rest is certainly entitled to pursue his calling on Sunday, provided he does not molest the worship of others who observe Sunday as a day of religious service; but it is a strange interpretation and application of the law which permits a man to disturb the devotions of his neighbors. One has no right to conduct his religious observances in such a way as to interfere with the worship of his neighbor. A Court in Cincinnati granted an injunction against the ringing of a Catholic Church bell at a certain hour on Sunday, because it disturbed a neighboring Methodist congregation engaged in worship at that hour.

It is strange that it has not occurred to the *Advocate* that it is very unlikely that in this case there was any real disturbance. If sewing-machines were operated in the same building occupied by a worshiping congregation, and separated from them only by a thin partition, or single floor, the noise might constitute a real disturbance, but that such light machinery operated in another building disturbs a congregation is not at all likely, and seems scarcely possible.

The trouble with Sunday disturbance is that a great many people are too easily disturbed when others dissent from them in religious faith and practice. The writer was formerly acquainted with a minister of the gospel, now deceased, who quite early in life joined the regular Baptist Church. Afterwards he commenced the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath. At that time he was the publisher of a weekly paper somewhere in Wisconsin, and did part of the composition himself. After beginning to observe the seventh day, he very naturally devoted Sunday to setting type. His work was done in a back room on the second floor, but some people were very much disturbed

by it. The case of the two Polish Jews in Brooklyn is probably similar.

Worshiping congregations, and indeed all sorts of orderly gatherings, should be protected from all real disturbance, not only on Sunday but on all other days; but the protection should be to the peace of the whole congregation and not to the feelings of a few bigots in the congregation, nor of some priest who feels that the world was made for him, and that no one ought to sneeze except as he (the priest) takes snuff. People who are disturbed by the running of sewing-machines on Sunday are a little too sensitive, and the *Advocate* ought to be in better business than encouraging them in their intolerance.

We have never yet heard of the Jews asking anybody to suspend ordinary business in order that their worship may not be disturbed on Saturday, and they would only be laughed at if they made any such demand, and very properly so too. But if the large and influential bodies of religionists are entitled to such protection, the Jews and seventh-day Christians are also, for the theory of our political system is that all men are entitled to *equal* protection of the law. It is high time that people come to understand that dissenters do not exist in this country by tolerance, but by right; and that their rights are just as sacred, and ought to be just as jealously guarded by the Government, as the rights of the dominant sects.

C. P. B.

Legislation by Clamor.

It is already evident that one feature of the "new time" into which we are hastening will be the subjection of legislatures to the pressure of groups of persons who are capable of controlling newspapers or combining votes. Under the old notions of legislation, the duty of legislators was to study carefully the details of proposed legislation, to debate and discuss measures, and so, by deliberation, to arrive at decisions as to what should be enacted. The notion was that the statesman should know what he intended to do, and should consider the proper means of reaching the desired result. This theory of legislation never has been very thoroughly put in practice anywhere, but now the idea seems to be that it is antiquated, that we do not intend to seek a more complete realization of it as a reform in legislation, but that we abandon it altogether.

At the same time, therefore, that there is a vast extension of the field of legislation, we abandon all sound traditions as to the method of legislative activity. Legislative bodies not only lay themselves open to be acted upon by outside influences, but they submit to clamor more than to any other influence. The tendency can be traced through the legislation of France, England, and the United States, during the last twenty years. If

a faction of any kind assails the Legislature with sufficient determination, they carry their point, although the sincere opinion of nearly all who vote for the measure may be that it is foolish, or idle, or mischievous, or crude, or irrational, or extravagant, or otherwise improper to be passed.

Opinions differ greatly as to what it is which is "falling" or "going to decay" just at present. These phenomena support the notion that it is "the State" which is passing away. On the one hand, the highest wisdom of those who want anything now is to practice terrorism, to make themselves as disagreeable as possible, so that it shall be necessary to conciliate them, and those who appeal to reason find themselves disregarded. On the other hand, the public men seek peace and quiet by sacrificing any one who can not or does not know enough to make a great clamor, in order to appease a clamorous faction. It is thought to be the triumph of practical statesmanship to give the clamorous something which will quiet them, and a new and special kind of legislative *finesse* has been developed, viz., to devise projects which shall seem to the clamorous petitioners to meet their demands, yet shall not really do it.—*Prof. William G. Sumner, in Independent, 1887.*

If these words had been written concerning the Sunday-law crusade, the situation could not have been better described. It is proposed to deluge Congress with petitions and personal letters until a Sunday law is secured; not because the law makers are convinced that such a measure is wise or just, but in order to silence the clamor of those who are demanding it.

Not Dependent upon Men.

COLONEL INGERSOLL is reported as saying, concerning the Sunday-closing question, "We have got to destroy the Sabbath."

The Colonel could scarcely have said a more unfortunate thing; nor one that would have better pleased the Sunday-law advocates. A fight *for* personal liberty is one thing, and a fight *against* a cherished institution is quite another. A great many men who would quite agree with Mr. Ingersoll were he to insist that personally he has a perfect right to rest, play, or work on Sunday, just as he sees fit, will have no sympathy with his expressed determination to destroy "the Sabbath."

As a matter of fact, however, aside from the question of what day is the true Sabbath, it is impossible for any man or for any number of men to destroy it. The Sabbath is not dependent upon the will of men, the wicked Colonel and the presumptuous Sunday-law advocates to the contrary notwithstanding.

Probably those who insist that "Sun-

day laws are necessary for the preservation of the Sabbath," do not realize that their words are a confession that their so-called Sabbath is only a man-made institution. That which man has instituted he may annul; but God's institutions are not dependent upon the will of men. The Sabbath was made a sign between God and his people (Eze. 20:20), and so long as there remains upon the earth a single soul, loyal to his Maker, the Sabbath will serve the purpose for which it was instituted; yea, and of the new earth (2 Peter, 3:13) God has declared, that "from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come up to worship before" him. Isa. 66:23. The Sabbath will survive all the attacks of both presuming and wicked men. The former may blasphemously assume that the Sabbath is dependent upon them, and the latter may endeavor to destroy it, but the event will prove them equally helpless. The Sabbath lives in the hearts and lives of God's people, and in the facts set forth in the fourth commandment, namely, that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." It is, therefore, equally foolish to talk of preserving or of destroying it. C. P. B.

THE Texas Methodists have, according to the *Texas Christian Advocate*, adopted the following resolution expressive of their views of the necessity of enforced Sunday observance:—

Resolved, That we record with deep sorrow the earnest effort of our late State Senate to allow saloons and almost every other business to be run more than half of the Christian Sabbath, thus to abolish the Sabbath, which is the great bulwark of our holy Christianity and high civilization.

Think of it; the "Christian Sabbath" dependent upon the action of the Texas Legislature! How is it that whereas Christianity once flourished in spite of the civil power, and in the face of bitter persecution, it is now dependent on the favor of that power? Is there not some mistake about this matter?

THE danger of having upon the statute books of any State, an unjust law, even though it may have become a dead letter, is well illustrated by the present persecution of the Jews in Russia. During the latter part of the reign of Emperor Nicholas, the harsh laws relative to the Jews were permitted to fall into disuse to a considerable extent. Alexander II., the father of the present Czar, carried out in a general way the policy inaugurated by his father, Nicholas; and the opinion is expressed that had Alexander lived a few years longer, the Jewish question in Russia would have been permanently settled in a wise and humane way.

But both Nicholas and his son Alexander

II. made a fatal mistake in not repealing utterly the anti-Jewish laws enacted by their predecessors; and so when the present Czar came to the throne, he found ready to his hand all the tyrannical anti-Jewish laws that his narrow, bigoted soul could desire; hence in the present persecution of one class of his subjects, Alexander III. is "only enforcing the laws." Unjust laws, even though slumbering in harmless disuse, should be promptly repealed, for though nominally "dead letters" they retain their venom, and may at any time be warmed into life by petty spite or sectarian bigotry.

THE question of a Sunday law is being agitated in California in connection with the political campaign, and voters are urged to take this matter into consideration in deciding how to vote. It is not known just how much work is being done by the friends of a Sunday law, as they are working quietly securing the pledges of candidates for the Legislature. But some active work is being done by the opponents of Sunday laws. The following is a paragraph from a circular which has been scattered in some portions of the State:—

Will you vote for a Sunday law, or for men pledged to enact a Sunday law? Should not the State guarantee to every man the right to keep *any day* or *no day* just as he chooses? The Sunday law is simply a relic of the Dark Ages; and such a law, if enacted, would be used as an engine of religious despotism. Sunday laws formed an important part of the penal code in the "*good old days*" when religious bigotry thrived, when witches were hanged, and heretics burned at the stake.

It is not thought that the Sunday-law sentiment is sufficiently strong in California to sustain such a law if it were enacted, of which, however, there seems to be little probability.

THE *Christian Advocate*, of this city, remarks that "when people are off for a summer vacation they usually have less regard for the Sabbath than at any other time. They forget that their influence travels with them, and in their forgetfulness they frequently set a bad example." "During these summer months," says the *Advocate*, "crowds of Americans will sail for Europe. Before returning they will have learned by personal experience what the continental Sunday is. Many of them will talk eloquently against it with their friends at home; but how many of them will hold to their Christian Sabbath while abroad?"

The question is not a hard one to answer. Those who are really conscientious in the observance of the day at home will keep it just the same when abroad, but those who keep it at home simply because others do, will not keep it when among strangers.

"THE less religion people have the more they insist upon others having."

NATIONAL

Religious Liberty Association.

Lecture Bureau of the National Religious Liberty Association.

THE Lecture Bureau of the National Religious Liberty Association is composed of competent lecturers in various parts of the United States, and any one desiring lectures upon the subject of religious liberty and the relation of Church and State, may secure a lecturer by corresponding with Allen Moon, the Secretary of the Bureau, 28 College Place, Chicago, Illinois.

Press Comments on Sunday Closing of the Columbian Exposition.

THE following is a brief list of extracts from newspapers all over the United States, on the subject of Sunday closing of the World's Fair. Most of them were evidently called out by the recent decision of the Lady Managers of the Fair, by a vote of fifty-six to thirty-six, to use their influence to secure the closing of its gates on Sundays:—

Louisville Times: The Board of Lady Managers say the World's Fair should be closed on Sunday, thus indorsing the Rev. Mr. Patton's unfeeling remark that if the laboring poor had no other day to devote to the Fair, so much the worse for them. Fortunately, in this one instance, the ladies will not have the last word.

Lawrence Journal: The Board of Lady Managers of the World's Fair have decided, as far as they may decide, that the Fair shall be closed Sundays. The American Sunday is safe in the hands of the women.

St. Joseph Herald: The day of fanaticism is past, and the people are fast tiring of allowing a set of old women to prescribe their moral pabulum. If the Fair is too wicked to be open on Sundays it is too wicked to be open on Saturdays, and if the Puritans are to be consulted the Hebrews and Adventists will want to be heard next.

New York World: Bigotry and crankism have combined in an effort to cripple its educational capacity by securing the closing of its gates on the only day of the week when the great multitude of workingmen and their families have leisure to visit it. This effort should be met now with a protest that will defeat it. If the Fair is not to be open Sunday it will lose half its value and half its interest to enlightened minds.

Kansas City Star: Col. Elliott F. Shepard declares that if the World's Fair is kept open Sunday the Lord will send a curse upon Chicago, and he is determined that the prophecy shall be fulfilled, even if he is compelled to remove to that city.

Washington Post: Perhaps the World's Fair managers will agree to close the show Sunday, if Col. Shepard will agree to remain closed the other six days of the week.

Terre Haute Express: The workingmen of Chicago and near-by cities can see the great exhibition Sunday without entailing the double cost of the admission and loss of wages that would be the case on a week day.

Knoxville Journal: The *Journal* believes that every reading-room, every library, every museum, every art gallery, every institution which teaches right and civilization, the world over, ought to be open Sundays, the only day when the honest and industrious poor can attend and gather a breath of the inspiration of such institutions. The world would be better for it.

Portland Oregonian: There will doubtless be churches enough open in Chicago to accommodate those who prefer to attend them on the Sabbath, and the ministers, ushers, and janitors will do the necessary work in them, so that those who attend can enjoy themselves. There are others who would prefer to attend the Fair on that day, who cannot well afford to go on any other, and they should have the privilege of doing so.

New York Sun: If the question as to the Sunday opening of the Fair were put to popular vote, undoubtedly it would be decided in the affirmative in a very emphatic way. If the gates are opened on Sunday more visitors will enter than on any other day of the week.

Kansas City Journal: More harm would be done by closing it than by keeping it open. If it is open there will be a place for the crowds to go, that will keep them out of mischief, and crowds without the restraint of home to keep them steady, generally

find worse places than the Fair in which to spend Sunday.

San Francisco Examiner: It is only proper that the World's Fair managers should give respectful attention to the appeals of the many excellent people who have asked them to close the Fair Sundays, but it is to be hoped that the resolution pledging the National Commission to take up and consider the question as soon as it shall properly come before it, does not imply anything more. Sunday closing would probably deprive at least a million people of the privilege—to which, as taxpayers they have a right—of visiting the Fair.

Springfield Journal: It is a queer fact that the Chicago saloonkeepers join hands with the Sabbath Union people in desiring that the World's Fair shall be closed Sunday. The Chicago saloons are open Sunday as well as the churches, and the saloonkeepers realize that the man who is attending the Fair will not toss any coin on his bar. Religion, self-interest, and politics are something alike, in that they make strange bed-fellows.

Baltimore American: From the recent action of the World's Fair Commissioners on certain phases of the Sunday question, it is quite certain that the ultimate decision will be that the Exposition shall be opened on Sunday, but that the machinery shall be stopped—the idea being to allow the people the opportunity of sight seeing and at the same time to get rid of actual work on that day as much as possible. This will be a compromise, and, like all compromises, it will probably be attacked by the advocates of both sides of the controversy.

New Orleans Times-Democrat: The people who do not live in Chicago, and on whom the success of the Exposition mainly depends, have also some rights in the matter, and it would be well for them to speak out on the subject. They do not propose to visit Chicago during the Exposition for the purpose of going to church there Sunday, but to the Exposition; and they will naturally be disgusted if they are shut out. The Exposition is given for the benefit of the whole world, whatever its religious belief, and not for the very small group of Sabbatarians who insist that everybody else should be incommoded because they do not care to go to the World's Fair Sunday.

Detroit Free Press: It is well for the great Exposition and for the people of Chicago who wish to visit it that the decision of the Lady Managers is not final in the matter of Sunday closing. "The horrid men" have still something to say on the subject, and their decision is likely to be less sentimental and more practical than that of the ladies. The "Sabbath" will not be desecrated by opening the Fair on Sunday. But the great Exposition would find its usefulness greatly impaired if it were not opened the day of all others upon which the poor people will find it most convenient to visit the Fair.

The last writer but one has fallen into the error of calling those who insist on Sunday closing, "Sabbatarians." While Sabbatarians do insist that they shall be unmolested in their right to rest on the day of their choice, and to attend the Fair on any other day they please, they likewise insist that everybody else shall also be left free to enjoy the same privilege. That is exactly what THE SENTINEL contends for.

F. W. HOWE.

Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Must Keep Sunday.

A CORRESPONDENT has just sent us the following from Du Quoin, Illinois, in regard to the Law and Order League in that place:—

Brief mention was made in last night's *News* about the organization here by a large number of our best citizens for the purpose of suppressing all desecrations of the Sabbath within the corporate limits of this city. Investigation has developed the fact that the organization is being perfected and is ready for action now. Able counsel has been retained, and the society proposes to prosecute, with vigor, all violations of our ordinances, regarding the Sabbath day in Du Quoin. And where the laws are violated near to the city limits, the violators will be prosecuted under the laws of this State. Baseball, picnics, ratifications, etc., cannot be held with impunity in Du Quoin upon Sunday, without having to answer before our courts for it on Monday morning. Each and every case will be prosecuted without fear or favor. The matter is not only generally being talked about, but very warmly and seriously considered openly and above board.

Our correspondent also informs us that the mayor stopped the playing of baseball inside the

corporation of Du Quoin, but granted a special permit to the Germans to hold a picnic on Sunday in the same park where they had been playing baseball. The Sunday-law advocates have sworn vengeance on him for allowing such a thing to be done.

It may be that the Law and Order League has only the "civil Sabbath" in view, but it is a little difficult to understand just how a "civil Sabbath" could be desecrated. In order for anything to be desecrated, it must first be consecrated; and we have not yet learned that the State or any incorporated town has power to consecrate a Sabbath and punish for non-observance of a man-made institution. Such a procedure is not in harmony with the institutions of a free Republic like ours, and the danger to freedom concealed in such a movement should be made apparent to all lovers of liberty.

It will be noticed that they propose to "prosecute with vigor, all violations of our ordinance, regarding the Sabbath-day in Du Quoin." The ordinance referred to, reads as follows:—

No person shall on Sunday keep open or permit to be kept open, his or her place of business, or shall pursue his or her daily labor or occupation within the city; provided, this section shall not be applicable to persons who conscientiously observe some other day of the week as Sabbath; nor in cases of necessity or charity; nor to hotels, eating houses, drug stores, butcher shops, tobacco stores, livery stables or street cars. Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall be subject to a fine of not less than five dollars and not more than one hundred dollars.

It will be noticed that tobacco stores are among the things allowed to remain open on Sunday. Thus their ordinance would fine a man for doing honorable labor on Sunday, and yet would allow another to keep a tobacco store open, dignifying the sale of the "filthy weed" with a place above honest toil.

O. A. TAIT.

Remarkable Statistics.

THE *Boston Traveler*, in its issue of September 10, referring to the recent effort made by Colonel Shepard and his associates to influence the Commissioners of the World's Fair to close its gates on Sunday, presents the most overwhelming (?) argument in favor of such a closing that we have seen yet. The *Traveler* says:—

The Christian churches of the United States, with their communicants, families, and affiliations are said to number over fifty-five millions.

That is to say, if we get the idea correctly, all whose names are on the various church books, including the wolves in sheep's clothing, the back-slidden professor, the business man who has joined the most popular church for business and social interests, all the babies in the Catholic Church that have arrived at the age of a few short weeks and have been christened, etc., would amount to, say, twenty millions. Then the "affiliations," such as all the uncles, aunts, cousins, on to the tenth generation, friends and acquaintances of church members and of those who are in the families of church members, would make up the rest of the "fifty-five millions." It is not intended to be rash, but in the light of facts what else could the *Traveler* mean? Certainly a great literary center like the "Hub" would not be without some statistical reports, and the *Traveler* would not want it understood that actual statistics show fifty-five millions of church members.

The Saviour said, "Fear not little flock," and "Narrow is the way that leadeth unto life and few there be that find it," and "broad is the way that leadeth to destruction and many there be that go in thereat." Has this order been reversed? No, by no means. It is as true to-day as when the Master first uttered it. And to show that it will be so till the end of time, we need only quote his words, "Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" There is plenty of show and parade in matters of religion, but the genuine article that will lead men to love their neighbor as themselves is not so manifest.



NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 24, 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.

No Sentinel Next Week!

IN order to give those employed on THE AMERICAN SENTINEL an opportunity to attend an important camp-meeting, at Mount Holly, New Jersey, September 24 to October 4, there will be no paper issued from this office next week. Number 39 of THE SENTINEL will therefore be issued October 8, instead of October 1. Our subscribers will lose nothing by this omission, as there will still remain thirteen publication days in which to issue the twelve papers necessary to complete the volume of fifty numbers.

THE *Christian at Work*, of September 10, in an article on "The Roman Catholic Church in the United States," thus declares for complete secularism: "The utter separation of Church and State, and the complete freedom of the people from taxation to propagate sectarianism in any form, is become a necessity."

THE Post-master at Oakland, California, has decided to open the post-office from 10 to 11 A. M., instead of from 12 M. to 1 P. M., as formerly, much to the disgust of the church-goers who say that they want to get their mail after attending meeting and not before. The *Tribune* of that city proposes that the office be closed all day Sunday. The Sunday people have not been heard from on this proposition.

THE following dispatch, received the other day in Chicago presents a new phase of the Sunday-closing question:—

Weatherford, Texas, September 9.—*Board of Control Columbian Exposition*: One hundred thousand Texans protest against the Sunday closing of the World's Fair. The day of fanaticism is past. NORTHWEST TEXAS FAIR ASSOCIATION.

"This," remarks the *Chicago Journal* "will probably prove a starter for hundreds of such protests. So far but one side of the question has been heard, the advocates against the opening. Now the other side has its inning."

"WORKMEN," says the *Sun*, of the 15th inst., "are laying the foundation of the Grant monument, at Riverside Park. Work goes on day and night and on Sunday." Why does the *Mail and Express*, which has long stood as sponsor for the

monument enterprise, not cry out against this "desecration of Sunday"? Is it possible that those in charge of the work took a mean advantage of Colonel Shepard's absence in Chicago, to get in their Sunday work in Riverside Park? Evidently New York and Chicago are too far apart, even in these days of rapid transit, for one man to manage two such important enterprises as the World's Fair and the Grant monument.

A RECENT count made in Boston by a religious journal revealed the fact that "the morning and afternoon attendance at 102 churches was only 71,069, while nearly 400,000 took trains or boats out of town, or rode in the horse cars, on recreation bent." Noting this fact in its relation to the demand for the closing of the Chicago Fair, a New York daily asks: "Are not the convictions and the wishes of the great majority of the people entitled to consideration in this democratic country?"

THE *Era*, of Bradford, Pennsylvania, remarks, that "Mr. Crafts's idea is that men who can rest on the Sabbath and won't, must be made to. That idea seems to have been uppermost in the minds of the Legislature which framed the law of 1794. But, in the march upward and onward since that date, that law has been so completely forgotten that it was in danger of utter oblivion until Crafts and his followers brought it once more to the light of day. Luckily we are not going backward in the direction of 1794, but are headed forward toward the twentieth century."

THE Rev. Henry Blanchard, one of the most prominent ministers of Portland, Maine, refuses to sign a petition against Sunday concerts, and says that he is willing to have the experiment tried, and then judge the result. Of the argument made by those who oppose the concerts, he says:

I can not agree with these brethren in their view of the Sunday. I regard it as a day of worship and rational recreation. I have advocated the use of music in public parks under wise control.

Upon this an evening paper, of this city, says:—

It will be remembered that many leading ministers of this city advocated the opening of the Metropolitan Museum on Sunday, and a similar division of sentiment among the clergy is perceptible throughout the country.

THE *Independent*, of this city, is not at all confident that the World's Fair will be closed on Sunday. Of the recent hearing granted to representatives of the American Sabbath Union and other bodies, by the World's Fair Commission, concerning the question of Sunday closing, the *Independent* says:—

It does not indicate what the probable outcome will be. . . . We wish that we could believe with Colonel Shepard that the matter is practically

settled, and that it is "almost certain that the gates of the Exposition will be closed on Sunday."

The *Independent* further remarks that "so much is involved in the right decision of this question that every possible argument and influence should be used to secure it." The threatened Christian (?) boycott is one of the "possible arguments," and there are some possible "influences" that are not generally considered legitimate. Is there so much involved that these "arguments" and "influences" should be used? Does the *Independent* really mean "every possible argument and influence"? If our contemporary means this, and the end would really justify the means, it should at once call upon the *Mail and Express* to open a subscription list to a gigantic corruption fund in the interest of Sunday closing.

THE *Albion, Nebraska, News* thinks that any effort to make political capital out of a candidate's religion is un-American. Of a certain candidate for a local office, it says:—

The *News* has always been a strong advocate of the entire separation of Church and State, and the present attempt to catch votes for Mr. Pelly on account of his religion, instead of his qualifications for the office, should be rebuked, and we believe it will be. The fact that Mr. Pelly may be a Catholic or a Presbyterian cuts no figure whatever. The free American air is not conducive to religious persecution.

The *News* is quite right as to the principle. The fact, however, is that religious bigotry is pretty active in this country, and were it not for liberal laws and constitutional guarantees, it would be seen that the "free air" we are wont to boast of, has somehow or other acquired a taint of intolerance that bodes evil for the "good time coming," which looms up in the vision of National Reformers and American Sabbath Unionists.

"It is high time to sound the alarm, when a comparatively small, but influential and well-organized body of ambitious and unrestful Protestants, backed by the Jesuits of the Catholic hierarchy, boldly and openly seek to change the character, if not the form, of our Government, from a purely secular to an ecclesiastical or priestly rule, which experience has proved to be, of all forms of government, the most tyrannical, the most cruel, and the most oppressive."

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.