



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

VOLUME 6.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 19, 1891.

NUMBER 45.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES,

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN,

W. H. McKEE.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL maintains the inalienable right of every man to profess any religion or none just as he chooses; and it denies the right of any association of religious people to compel those who are not religious to act as though they were, or to conform to any religious observance, or to recognize any religious institution. It likewise denies the right of the State to pronounce any religious or ecclesiastical institution a civil thing and by that means compel conformity to it.

SUNDAY is, and always was, a religious festival. It was originally sacred to the worship of the sun god, and is now very generally regarded as commemorating the resurrection of Christ, and is by many held to be the Sabbath. If it were not regarded as sacred there would be no demand for laws enforcing its observance. It is therefore a matter that the State has no right to touch. It is true that the friends of Sunday legislation have learned wisdom by past experience, and endeavor as much as possible to keep in the background the fact that their motive is religious, but they can never get away from the facts. They demand a "civil Sabbath;" but what they mean is a religious Sabbath enforced by civil law.

It has only been through the union of the secular and ecclesiastical powers that active religious persecution has ever been possible. Had there been no such unholy alliance, "Fox's Book of Martyrs" could never have been written. It was

always the ecclesiastical power which condemned, and the secular which executed the decree. This has been true in other countries and in past ages. It is to be no different in this country and at this time. The American Sabbath Union and the National Reform Association, with all their allied societies, conjointly with the Church influence, constitute the ecclesiastical force which, by means of the Law and Order League, joins itself with the secular power to enforce the forgotten religious laws on our statute books, which have survived the Reformation, and are now fermenting in the body politic, and the whole will be permeated with the Satanic leaven.

Judge Hammond and the Seventh-day Adventists.

ANOTHER very important, and what would seem a rather peculiar passage from Judge Hammond's *dictum* in the famous King case, is the following:—

The petitioner can not shelter himself just yet, behind the doctrine of religious freedom, in defying the existence of a law, and its application to him, which is distasteful to his own religious feeling or fanaticism, that the seventh day of the week, instead of the first, should be set apart by the public for the day of public rest and religious observances. That is what he really believes and wishes, he and his sect, and not that each individual should select his own day of public rest, and his own day of labor. His real complaint is, that his adversaries on this point have the advantage of usage and custom, and the laws founded on the usage and custom, and not that religious freedom has been denied to him. He does not belong to the class that would abrogate all law for a day of rest, because the day of rest is useful to religion, and aids in maintaining the churches, for none more than he professes the sanctifying influence of the fourth commandment, the literal observance of which by himself and all men, is the distinguishing demand of his own peculiar sect.

This is an important statement for more reasons than one, all of which we can not just now notice. It presumes to define for Mr. King, and the people with whom he is religiously connected, just what they really believe and wish. The thing is done, too, in such a way that it appears that the Judge considers himself capable of defining their beliefs and

wishes, according to his own views, more plainly and more authoritatively than they themselves are able to.

We say that his statement is the statement of *his own views*, and not theirs, because we personally know that as a matter of fact, the views attributed to them by Judge Hammond, are not, in any sense, the views held by themselves, and which are matters of public record. In other words, we know and are abundantly able to prove, and shall prove, that the statements made by Judge Hammond, as quoted above, are not true in any sense whatever.

As to the belief and wish of Mr. King as an individual, in this respect, we are able to present it in his own words over his own signature, as the following plainly shows:—

43 Bond St., New York City,
October 6, 1891.

MR. R. M. KING,
Lane, Dyer Co., Tenn.

Dear Sir:—His Honor, Judge E. S. Hammond, in his decision in your case, made certain statements in regard to your own personal faith, as to laws enforcing the observance of the Sabbath which you observe, which, from what I know of yourself and your people, seem certainly mistaken. I send you herewith these statements, numbered separately, with questions annexed, to which I wish you would write your own answers as to your own personal and individual belief.

Please answer, and return as soon as possible, and oblige,

Truly yours,
ALONZO T. JONES,
Editor AMERICAN SENTINEL.

The statements of Judge Hammond and the questions below, were sent to Mr. King, to which he replied as follows:—

Lane, Tenn.,
October 11, 1891.

MR. A. T. JONES,
Bond Street, New York City.

Dear Sir:—Your letter of the 6th to hand. I will now proceed to answer the questions in regard to the statements made by His Honor, Judge E. S. Hammond, in his decision on my case.

[The answers to questions below, are the words of Mr. King.—EDITOR SENTINEL.]

The Judge's statements are as follows:

1. "His own religious feeling or fanaticism [is] that the seventh day of the week, instead of the first, should be set apart by the public for the day of public rest and religious practices."

Question: Is this true, or was it ever true, in any sense?

Answer: "This is not true, and never was true in any sense."

2. "This is what he really believes and wishes, he and his sect, and not that each individual shall select his own day of public rest and his own day of labor."

Question: (1) Is this true in any sense? *That is,* Do you "really believe and wish" what he says you do?

Answer: "I never did believe or wish for such a thing."

(2). Do you really believe and wish what he says you do not, that is, that "each individual shall select his own day of public rest and his own day of labor"?

Answer: "I believe God has set apart the day; but so far as human government is concerned, each individual should be left free to rest or to work."

(3). To the best of your knowledge and belief, is that which the Judge here says, a true statement of the belief and wishes of your sect upon this point?

Answer: "I never knew of any of my sect believing or wishing for such a thing."

3. "His real complaint is that his adversaries on this point have the advantage of usage and custom, and the laws formed on that usage and custom, not that religious freedom has been denied to him."

Question: (1) Is it true in any sense that your real complaint is that the Sunday observers have the advantage?

Answer: "It is not."

(2). Is it your real and unqualified complaint that religious freedom has been denied you?

Answer: "That is the real complaint."

4. "He does not belong to the class that would abrogate all laws for a day of rest."

Question: It is presumed that human laws only are here referred to, therefore do you believe in the rightfulness of human laws enforcing a day of weekly rest? or do you indeed believe that all human laws enforcing a day of rest ought to be abrogated?

Answer: "I believe all laws enforcing a day of rest ought to be abolished."

5. "He professes the sanctifying influence of the fourth commandment, the literal observance of which by himself and all men is the distinguishing demand of his own peculiar sect."

Question: (1) Is it the distinguishing, or any other kind of, demand, of yourself, that the literal, or any other, observance of the fourth commandment shall be enforced upon yourself or anybody else by any form of human law?

Answer: "No, it is not."

(2). To the best of your knowledge and belief, is any such thing the distinguishing, or any other kind of, demand of your "own peculiar sect"?

Answer: "So far as my knowledge goes, it is not. And I don't believe it ever was in any case."

Yours truly,

(Signed,) R. M. KING.

As for the Seventh-day Adventists, as a denomination, or a "sect," or a "peculiar sect," there is something to be said also.

The Seventh-day Adventists have a record upon this subject, which is plain and unmistakable. Nor is it merely a record in the common acceptance of the term. It is a public record: public, too, in the sense that it is a part of the record of the Senate of the United States. December 13, 1888, the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor held a hearing upon the bill for a national Sunday law, which had been introduced in the Senate by Senator Blair, chairman of this committee. At that hearing the Seventh-day Adventists were officially represented. In the argument that was there made by them in the person of their official representative, this very point was brought out clearly and distinctly more than once, and we here present their position as stated in that argument, and as since published by themselves, and which has thus been made open to all who have a mind to read upon the subject. We quote:—

Senator Blair.—Would it answer your objection in that regard, if, instead of saying "the Lord's day," we should say "Sunday"?

Mr. Jones.—No sir. Because the underlying principle, the sole basis, of Sunday, is ecclesiastical, and legislation in regard to it is ecclesiastical legislation. I shall come more fully to the question you ask presently.

Now, do not misunderstand us on this point. We are Seventh-day Adventists; but if this bill were in favor of enforcing the observance of the seventh day as the Lord's day, we would oppose it just as much as we oppose it as it is now, for the reason that civil government has nothing to do with what we owe to God, or whether we owe anything or not, or whether we pay it or not, . . . therefore, we say that if this bill were framed in behalf of the real Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, the day which we observe, if this bill proposed to promote its observance, or to compel men to do no work upon that day, we would oppose it just as strongly as we oppose it now; and I would stand here at this table and argue precisely as I am arguing against this, and upon the same principle,—the principle established by Jesus Christ,—that with that which is God's the civil government never can of right have anything to do. That duty 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 organization or assembly 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. Any government which attempts it, sets itself against the word of Christ, and is therefore antichristian. This Sunday bill proposes to have this Government do just that thing, and therefore, I say, without any reflection upon the author of the bill, this national Sunday bill which is under discussion here to-day is antichristian. But in saying this, I am not singling out this contemplated law as worse than all other Sunday laws in the world. There never was a Sunday law that was not antichristian, and there never can be one that will not be antichristian.

Senator Blair.—You oppose all the Sunday laws of the country, then?

Mr. Jones.—Yes, sir.

Senator Blair.—You are against all Sunday laws?

Mr. Jones.—Yes, sir; we are against every Sunday law that was ever made in this world, from the first enacted by Constantine to this one now proposed; and we would be equally against a Sabbath law if it were proposed; for that would be antichristian, too.

Senator Blair.—State and national, alike?

Mr. Jones.—State and national, sir.

Again:—

Senator Blair.—In other words, you take the ground that for the good of society, irrespective of the religious aspect of the question, society may not require abstinence from labor on the Sabbath, if it disturbs others?

Mr. Jones.—As to its disturbing others, I have proved that it does not. The body of your question states my position exactly.

Senator Blair.—You are logical all the way through that there shall be no Sabbath.

Again:—

Senator Blair.—I do not see from what you are stating, but that Christ recognized an existing law, and that it is continuing at the present time. You say that it is one day, and they say that it is another.

Mr. Jones.—But they are after a law to enforce the observance of the first day of the week as the Lord's day, when they confess that the Lord never gave any command in regard to it. The commandment which God gave says that the "seventh day is the Sabbath."

Senator Blair.—Is it still the Sabbath?

Mr. Jones.—Certainly, and we keep it; but we deny the right of any civil government to compel any man either to keep it or not to keep it.

Senator Blair.—The civil government of the Jews compelled its observance?

Mr. Jones.—That was a theocracy.

Again:—

Senator Blair.—You are entirely logical, because you say there should be no Sunday legislation by State or Nation either.

Mr. Jones.—Of course I am logical, all the way through. I want to show you the wicked principle upon which this whole system is founded, and the reason I do this is because the last step is involved in

the first one. If you allow this principle and this movement to take the first step, those who get the power will see in the end that they take the last step. That is the danger.

Again:—

Senator Blair.—Your proposition is to strike out the Sabbath from the Constitution and condition of society in these modern times?

Mr. Jones.—No sir.

Senator Blair.—Certainly, so far as its existence and enactment and enforcement by law are concerned.

Mr. Jones.—Yes, sir, by civil law.

Again:—

Senator Blair.—You would abolish the Sabbath, anyway?

Mr. Jones.—Yes, in the civil law.

Senator Blair.—You would abolish any Sabbath from human practice which shall be in the form of law, unless the individual here and there sees fit to observe it?

Mr. Jones.—Certainly; that is a matter between man and his God.

Again: There was a proposition made to insert an exemption clause, and upon this point we have the following words:—

Senator Blair.—You care not whether it is put in or not?

Mr. Jones.—There is no right whatever in the legislation; and we will never accept an exemption clause as an equivalent to our opposition to the law. It is not to obtain relief for ourselves that we oppose the law. It is the principle of the whole subject of the legislation to which we object; and an exemption clause would not modify our objection in the least.

Senator Blair.—You differ from Dr. Lewis?

Mr. Jones.—Yes, sir, we will never accept an exemption clause, as tending in the least to modify our opposition to the law. We as firmly and fully deny the right of the State to legislate upon the subject with an exemption clause as without it. . . .

Senator Blair.—You object to it?

Mr. Jones.—We object to the whole principle of the proposed legislation. We go to the root of the matter, and deny the right of Congress to enact it.

Senator Blair.—You say that the proposed exemption does not make it any better?

Mr. Jones.—Not a bit.

Nor is this the only record in the case. February 18, 1890, the House Committee on District of Columbia held a hearing on a Sunday bill introduced by Hon. W. C. P. Breckinridge, for the District of Columbia. The Seventh-day Adventists of the District of Columbia were heard before this committee. From the verbatim report of the speeches made by them that day, we quote again:—

Mr. Corliss.—Mr. Chairman: I have little time for preliminaries, and none for personalities, I have, however, some arguments to present against the bill under consideration, merely pausing to say that I thank the last speaker (Mr. Crafts) for his confession of lack of argument in support of the bill, which he has shown in the fact of his having indulged in personalities the most of the time allowed to him. I can use my time to better advantage. I will use only a half-hour, then yield a half-hour to Mr. Jones, of New York. Mr. McKee, also, has a brief, which he will present for consideration.

The Chairman.—We desire to know in whose behalf you appear?

Mr. Corliss.—I reside in this city, sir, with my family. I speak in behalf of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Washington, of which I am, at present, the Pastor; as a citizen of the United States; and as a resident of this District. I appear, not as has been affirmed before you, to speak in behalf of a Saturday Sabbath. Far from it, Gentlemen of the Committee. If this bill, No. 3,854, were to have incorporated into it, instead of "Sunday, or the first day of the week," the words, "Saturday, or the seventh day of the week," there is no one who would oppose it stronger than I. And I would oppose it just as strongly as I do in its present form, for the reason that it is not sectarianism that calls us here to-day; but we see in this bill a principle of religious legislation that is dangerous, not to our liberties in particular, but

to the liberties of the Nation. For, as you perceive, this bill has an exemption clause providing that "this act shall not be construed to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in, and observe, another day of the week than Sunday as a day of rest." *This fact gives us more courage to oppose the measure, because we know that all fair minded people will be able to see that our opposition arises from a broader and higher motive than that of self-interest.*

Again:—

Mr. Corliss.—Mr. Jones has been called here by myself as pastor of the Seventh-day Adventist Church here in Washington. I have called that church together, and, by a rising vote, they have requested Mr. Jones to appear here on their behalf. Mr. A. T. Jones, of New York City, Editor of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Mr. Jones.—Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee: I shall devote most of my remarks to the subject which was made so much of by the gentleman who spoke last on the other side (Mr. Crafts), namely, the Seventh-day Adventists, and their opposition to this legislation. . . .

Congress can make no law upon the subject of religion without interfering with the free exercise thereof. *Therefore the Seventh-day Adventists, while observing Saturday would most strenuously oppose any legislation proposing to enforce the observance of that day. That would be an interference with the free exercise of our right to keep that day as the Sabbath. Therefore we come to you to plead for protection. We do not ask you to protect us by legislation. We do not ask you to legislate in favor of Saturday,—not even to the extent of an exemption clause. We ask you to protect us by refusing to give to these men their coveted power to invade our rights. We appeal to you for protection in our constitutional rights as well as our rights of conscience. . . .*

Gentlemen: It is time for all the people to declare as the *Seventh-day Adventists decidedly do*, that this Nation is, and of right ought to be, FREE AND INDEPENDENT OF ALL ECCLESIASTICAL OR RELIGIOUS INFLUENCE, CONNECTION, OR CONTROL.

If any further evidence be required here it is:—

43 Bond Street, New York City,
October 6, 1891.

ELD. O. A. OLSEN,
Pres. Gen'l Conf. S. D. Adventists,
Battle Creek, Mich.

Dear Sir:—In his decision in the case of R. M. King, or rather in his *dictum* appended to that decision, his Honor, Judge E. S. Hammond, of the United States Circuit Court, makes certain statements in regard to the beliefs and wishes of the "peculiar sect" with which Mr. King is connected religiously, the Seventh-day Adventists. From my understanding of the views held by this people on this question, I doubt the correctness of the Judge's statements. Therefore, I send herewith a copy of the statements, with questions appended, to which I respectfully request that you would write an answer as fully as you may deem proper. By so doing, you will greatly oblige,
Truly yours,

ALONZO T. JONES,
Editor AMERICAN SENTINEL.

The statements of the Court are as follows:—

(1) His [King's] own religious feeling or fanaticism [is] that the seventh day of the week, instead of the first, should be set apart by the public for the day of public rest and religious practices. *This is what he really believes and wishes, he and his sect, and not that each individual shall select his own day of public rest and his own day of labor.*

Question: Is this true?

Answer: I have been personally connected with the Seventh-day Adventist denomination for more than thirty years, and I can freely say that no such belief or wish is entertained by this people. Our belief and wish is directly the opposite of that stated by the Judge:

(2) "He professes the sanctifying influence of the fourth commandment, the literal observance of which by himself and all men is the distinguishing demand of his own peculiar sect."

Question: Is it the distinguishing, or any other kind of, demand of the Seventh-day Adventist body, that the literal or any other observance of the fourth commandment shall be enforced upon themselves or anybody else, by any form of human laws?

Answer: It is not. We do *teach*, not *demand*, that ourselves and all men should observe the fourth commandment literally, as God gave it. But this observance must be the free choice of the individual, according to the dictates of his own conscience.

(Signed) O. A. OLSEN,

Pres. Gen. Conf. of the Seventh-day Adventists.
Austell, Georgia, October 12, 1891.

Thus by evidence which cannot be questioned, it is demonstrated that the statements of Judge Hammond as to the belief and wish of the Seventh-day Adventists are false in every particular. Indeed, if the points made in the argument before the United States Senate Committee, December 13, 1888, had never been made till this nineteenth day of November, 1891, and were now publicly made for the first time, in direct and intentional refutation of the statements of the Judge, it would not be possible to make them more flatly contradictory to those statements than they are.

But as these points have been matter of public national record, and matter of knowledge to thousands upon thousands of the people, for nearly three years before Judge Hammond set forth his *dictum*, this *fact* leaves him—a judge of a court of the United States—in the unenviable predicament of having upon a simple question of fact, officially published to the world a series of statements which are not only untrue in themselves, but which public and official records *show* to be untrue, and which thousands upon thousands of the people *know* to be untrue.

A. T. J.

Is This a Religious Test?

ARTICLE VI of the Constitution of the United States declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." A case has just arisen at Washington, which, if carried to the conclusion hinted at in the official report upon the question, would seem to require a definite interpretation of that clause in the Constitution.

The report, as published in the *Sun*, of the 8th inst., explains the nature of the case, and reads thus:

MR. SECRETARY: The accompanying communication, referred to you by Sixth Auditor Coulter and handed me for my consideration, presents a case where a clerk in his division has become somewhat entangled in the Department regulations and the laws of Moses. Believing that the thousands of clerks employed about him, and the world generally, are headed in the wrong direction in observing a day as Sabbath that they should not, he is moved by "conscientious convictions" and a regard for his "eternal welfare" to appeal to the Auditor for some assistance to enable him to follow conscience, which says he should not work on Saturday, and to abide by the regulations, which say he should. A solution of the question seems so obvious, and rests so wholly in Mr. Austin's hands by his simply resigning, that it must be the Auditor will not permit him to do so. If this be so, I think the Auditor is clearly wrong.

The blue book shows that this clerk has had his "conscientious convictions of duty" outraged for years, by being compelled to work six or seven

hours daily for six days of the week, Saturday included, all for \$1,600 a year, and but one month annually for vacation. This should continue no longer. It is not only violative of the Constitution of the United States, but of those fundamental principles which underlie our free institutions (*vide* Amendments to Constitution, Article II, and Mrs. Heman's "Landing of the Pilgrims.") It may occur to the Secretary that it is possible that while this clerk is strong on the fourth commandment he may be weak on the tenth; that, while his conscientious convictions lead him to rebel against working on Saturday, his covetousness inclines him to appropriate the \$1,600. This is barely possible, but I do not want to believe it.

Now, I can understand that so good a man as Auditor Coulter should desire to retain a man of so active a conscience in a service where there is supposed to be so little of it. Still, it would not do to make an exception in this case or undertake to revolutionize the service in his division by starting work on Sunday morning and ending on Friday evening. Neither would it do to permit two Sabbath days in every week. While I am satisfied such an arrangement would run counter to no conscientious convictions and would be generally agreeable, it would not be proper in view of the present condition of the Treasury.

In throwing out these few hasty suggestions on this religio-departmental question, I have not considered it as fully as it deserves. I would further suggest, however, that the whole matter be referred back to the Auditor, with direction that he associate with him the Chief of the Warrant Division, and the Director of the Mint, who together shall consider the matter and report. These gentlemen are distinguished for their piety as well as executive ability, and are fully competent to successfully wrestle with any or all the commandments of the Decalogue.

L. CROUNSE, Assistant Secretary.

THE epithets, dignified, judicial, scarcely seem to apply to this report; neither do the words, considerate, respectful, harmonize any better with the general tone of the document.

The gravity of the question, here so flippantly raised, certainly would have called from one who had any appreciation of its importance, at least, a respectful treatment, even if the thirty years of army and departmental service, and the unvarying record for worth and ability of the gentleman in the case, could not have commanded the kindly consideration of his superior officer. But although these claims be ignored, there is still farther a personal dignity of official position to maintain, and farther yet an individual *noblesse oblige* which should pertain to every officer of the United States Government in no less degree than to a private gentleman.

Should the suggestion of this report be followed by those to whom it is referred, in their final decision, a religious test will have been established as a qualification for admission to the departmental service, and from the time of the official delivery of such a decision every Israelite, Seventh-day Adventist, or Seventh-day Baptist, would be excluded from serving under the Government. If this conclusion should be reached where is the limit to which the "religious test" in Government affairs may not be applied?

W. H. M.

A New Criterion.

THE Synod of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, at Scranton, has passed a resolution recommending Congress to refuse the loan of \$5,000,000 asked for in aid of the World's Fair at Chicago, until the managers of that enterprise give a pledge that they will not permit the Fair to be opened on Sundays.

This carries the inference that if such a pledge is given the money is to be forthcoming. There would be no inducement for the pledge to be made to Congress unless the loan was to follow as a consideration. Besides the aspect which this assumes, of purchasing the strict observance of the Sabbath, which the Synod desires, it indicates that the clerical minds of the Synod do not recognize any other considerations with regard to that loan than the Sabbatarian question.

Now it happens that there are several other important considerations. The chief of them is the fact that Chicago was chosen as the site for the Fair under the positive pledge of its representative that it would ask for no aid from Congress except the appropriation for the Government exhibit. Whether that pledge shall be insisted upon or not may be an open question for Congress. But it might occur to the minds of our friends of the Synod to inquire, if Chicago has so soon violated the first pledge, what the exact value of the second pledge will be.

Finally, do our friends of the Synod really mean to take the attitude that if people will adopt their views of Sabbath observance they shall have all the money they want from the national Treasury?—*Pittsburg Dispatch*.

Philadelphia and Chicago Sundays.

Puck has seen "what fools these mortals be" on the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, and expresses some well defined views in the following trenchant paragraphs:—

THE Chicago World's Fair is likely to be the means of settling, once and for all, what is known as the Sunday Question. We do not in the least mean to say that the settlement of the question rests with the directors or commissioners who are now considering whether they shall or shall not keep the Fair open on Sundays. The ultimate judgment lies with the people, whatever the officials of the Fair may see fit to decide; and it needs only such an occasion as a great and widely attended public exhibition to bring the case before the people, and at the same time to present them with the evidence which they need, to pass judgment upon it.

It is possible—we trust it is not probable—that the managers of the Fair may attempt to close it to the public on Sundays. That wicked and cruel blunder was committed in 1876 at Philadelphia, and there may be among the exhibition officials men as weak and timorous as General Hawley showed himself at that time; as fearful of the clamor of the vindictive, bitter little crowd of professional Sabbatarians, and as willing to wrong the many to avoid incurring the wrath of a few. But we do not believe it. Whatever may be the faults

of Chicago, she does not grow that sort of man. Chicago is not likely to take the shrill voice of Hartford, Connecticut, for the roar of the whole world. We shall be much surprised if the men who have the World's Fair in charge will seriously and earnestly undertake to do the bidding of the preposterous fanatics who came from New York with Elliott F. Shepard at their head to demand the enforcement of the Puritan Blue Laws in 1893.

But whether Elliott F. Shepard or a man with brains gets possession of the Fair gates on the Sundays of the Summer of 1893, the question will settle itself in that time, and not by the "say so" of any one man or of any set of men, official or unofficial.

If the Fair is to be closed on Sundays, the blunder of Philadelphia will be repeated on a scale large enough to show its criminal folly. Now, let it be remembered, Philadelphia was, in 1876, an exceptionally quiet provincial city of seven or eight hundred thousand inhabitants. It was a "city of homes," with far less public life than most towns of half its size. Yet, when the hundreds of thousands of people who attended the Centennial Exposition were let loose on Philadelphia for long summer Sundays of aimless, hopeless, helpless idleness, with nothing to see, nothing to do, in the way of rational enjoyment, this quiet "city of homes" developed vice enough for a metropolis. People who can not go to a clean and wholesome place of amusement can always go to the devil, who is more constantly with us than even the poor; and the idle strangers in Philadelphia went promptly to the devil, who was imported from New York, and other places, for their special benefit.

And, be it further remembered, that Chicago is a city not only much larger than Philadelphia was in 1876, but as different in character from that dull old town as Denver, Colorado, is different from Salem, Massachusetts. Every large and active city has its vicious side, and must have, under any municipal system that has yet been devised, while vice exists and the willingness of the vicious to make money in evil ways. Chicago's vicious side is a side of all but unexampled magnitude. We believe that she lays claim to the distinction of ranking New York in this particular—but for the credit of both cities, let us avoid a futile and offensive comparison. It is enough to say that, in her ability to satisfy the appetites of those who seek for dissipation in any and every form, Chicago must be counted among the half-dozen great cities of the world which cherish within their bounds other cities of sin and iniquity, of a population alien to the mass of law-abiding folks; Alsatis of crime and intemperance and vile misuse of life.

There is no Sunday closing for these cities within cities. Their day is night; their hours of hardest work the holiday hours of honest folk. Their iniquitous show is ever open, and it is the business of their lives to drag people into it. There is no admission fee. It costs nothing to go in. But there is an exit fee. It costs something to come out. It is to the mercies of this world of tireless, ingenious persistent ubiquitous dealers in vice that the small but noisy handful of Sabbatarians would deliver the idle crowds which will throng Chicago's many streets two years hence. Young men and girls, inexperienced in the world's ways, eager for enjoyment, for adventure, for new experiences and for a wider knowledge of the world around them—these are the people whom the Sunday closers wish to expose to the manifold temptations of a great city for twenty-four hours of enforced idleness, inevitable dullness, unrelieved weariness and emptiness. And that is all these self-constituted defenders of religion care for Christian people. So long as their fellow-men are denied a rational and wholesome amusement on Sunday, these fellow-men may wreck their lives and smirch their souls whenever poor human nature yields to the temptation to exchange a maddening idleness for the illusive excitements of vice.

We have faith enough in the good faith and intelligence of the World's Fair officials

to feel sure that we shall see, every Sunday in the summer of 1893, American crowds enjoying themselves in a healthy American manner, decently, good naturedly and soberly, in the walks and aisles of the great Exposition, and proving their American capacity for behaving themselves like good folk and good citizens, on the first day of the week as well as on the other six.

Puck is a very bright boy, but he is n't well up in Revelation. For if he were, he would not say; "The Chicago World's Fair is likely to be the means of settling, once and for all, what is known as the Sunday Question." For so long as the devil lives, and until the poor in spirit are given possession of the mansions prepared for them, this Sunday question will remain unsettled.

Religious Legislation in the South Seas.

As pestilence and death cross the world in the darkness, and no man knows from whence they come, so this moral pestilence and spiritual death of religious legislation is making the circuit of the earth, fostered by the spirit of all evil. In confirmation of this, Elder A. J. Read, who is with the missionary schooner *Pitcairn*, writes the following letter from the Friendly Islands, to the *Signs of the Times*, Oakland, California.—

"The natives who inhabit the Tongan or Friendly group are by far the most intelligent and promising race which we have met on any of the South Sea islands.

"We spoke of their thrift and industry as manifested on Vavau and Haabi, which places we had visited at our last writing. The same thing was also noticeable at Tonga-tabu, the principal island and seat of the government.

"The government is well ordered, generally speaking, and is in the hands of the natives, King George Tubou, whose picture graces the postage stamp, being the ruling sovereign. The legislative government is modeled after the English form, having a Parliament composed of a House of Lords and a House of Commons. It is said that when any measure is pending which the king fears is going contrary to his wishes, his old head, gray with ninety-five years of service, appears in the Parliament, and, with a voice which strikes consternation to lords and commons alike, he begins to quote to them passages of Scripture, then tells them what his opinion is in the matter before them, and states that that is what must be done, and this puts an end to all controversy; his wishes are carried out to the letter.

"A fearful religious persecution has been sweeping these fair islands, and one has only to visit the scene and talk with the survivors to know how tragical and cruel the logic of toleration and State religion is when worked out in the hands of simple natives.

"Whatever may have been the aggravating cause, surely no excuse can be

offered for the cruel persecutions which King George has allowed to be carried on in his realm. It is said to have started in this way: The Wesleyan body has operated in these islands since the days of heathenism. They had great influence with the natives, the king himself being a strong adherent to the faith, and placing great faith in the missionaries, whose advice was always highly esteemed in all matters, religious or political. One of these ministers, a Mr. Baker, became estranged in some way from the Wesleyan body and his fellow-laborers, and, holding a strong political influence, he accepted a position as premier under the Tongan Government.

"As the differences became greater, the king was persuaded that a continuance of the Wesleyan Church in his islands would mean annexation to the British Government.

"Accordingly, he was persuaded to start a church of his own, which he did, making a few changes in the form of service, and calling it the "Free Church of Tonga," or as it is generally called, the "King's Church."

"The meeting-houses of this new church were built in close proximity to the Wesleyan buildings, and a law passed that the Wesleyans should not hold service during the hours that service was going on in the "King's" or "Free Church." The appointments were then made so as to take up all the established hours of worship in the new church service, and thus compel the Wesleyans to meet whenever the Free Church dismissed, and dismiss whenever the Free Church chose to meet.

"The chiefs were instructed to do all in their power to get the people to join the new church on the ground of loyalty to their king. It is stated by people living in the Friendly or Tongan islands that any chiefs who refused to change were deposed; thus, out of mere policy, many went over, but of course there were some who would not change, because they felt conscientiously bound to the church which brought the gospel to them. These, it is stated, were mustered out in their different villages, and asked whether they would be loyal to their king and join his church; if they assented they were considered changed; if they said they would be loyal to the king, but would not change their connection with the Wesleyans, then "persuasive measures" were used. They were placed under guard, and their houses watched, every movement was hindered, and even life itself was made burdensome by the omnipresence of the king's officials. Of course these officials made free use of any eatables they could find on Wesleyan premises. Pigs, fowls, yams, taro, breadfruit, etc., vanished with astonishing rapidity; their plantations also suffered from these depredations, until the poor Wesleyans

were pauperized. Any resistance was severely punished.

"They were prevented from holding services, a law being made that unless there were a certain number of persons present, no religious meetings could be held aside from the established or Free Church.

"As a result of these and other unjust measures, some of the Wesleyans suffered all sorts of indignities; some had their teeth knocked down their throats, others were pricked with bayonets, some were banished to a desolate volcanic island, where they were pretty sure to die of starvation unless the eruptions from the active crater should chance to burst forth in time to prevent starvation, by a more merciful but not less horrible death. A few were killed outright. Redress was impossible, as the courts were all controlled by the king's people, who could manage to evade the statutes.

"The European settlers here are quite indignant, though quite helpless to prevent the persecution.

"Many claim that Mr. Baker, the premier, was responsible for it all, working by intrigue to get revenge on the Wesleyans and make money out of those who were opposed to him. However this may be, Mr. Baker is now deported, and these religious laws are still enacted, religious distinctions are still retained in the statute books and in all the towns, save one, the restrictions on Wesleyan services are still maintained. There are laws governing the use that shall be made of God's Sabbath, and also even controlling the use that shall be made of God's name; thus most sacred things are made matters of human legislation, paving the way for still greater persecutions in this fair kingdom should these laws be retained."

A Respectable Minority.

THE Duluth *Herald* publishes a letter from G. H. McClelland, in which some wholesome principles are stated so clearly that he who runs may read. Speaking of the action of the Baptist Convention at St. Cloud, Minnesota, he says:—

They not only protested against the use of State moneys for the advancement of Roman Catholicism, but also against the use of public money in the interests of "any denomination whatsoever."

Second, we would have it understood that this is distinctly a Baptist principle; and therefore, true to this, you will search in vain for a line of history to show that they have ever received a cent from the State for their schools, though in repeated instances it has been offered. We are opposed to any alliance whatsoever between the Church and State. We believe in taxation of all church property by the State. The First Baptist Church of Toronto has but recently appealed to the State authorities to take their property from the exemption list. Again, the Baptists make no demand for Bible reading and prayer in the schools. The denomination at large repudiates such a charge. Anything you can do, Mr. Editor, to keep Church and State apart in all lines, will be appreciated by your "immersion friends" to the number of 3,000,000, in the United States.

As R. Heber Newton says, "every thinking Presbyterian is a heretic" so every thoughtful professing Christian holds what the National Reform Association would consider heretical views as regards Church and State, and the interference of either in the affairs of the other. This contingent, which is by no means small, from all denominations, together with these three millions of Baptists, the Seventh-day Baptists, the Seventh-day Adventists, the Jews, ought to constitute a sufficiently respectable minority among religious people to command the attention, and the respectful consideration of the "National Reformers."

Pertinent Questions.

THE *Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Michigan, publishes the following series of questions, addressed to Rev. W. F. Crafts, and taken from a leaflet which has been largely distributed in Michigan, of late:—

1. Is there not less Sunday work done on a Sunday morning newspaper than on a Monday morning newspaper?
2. Are not the large Saturday editions issued largely for Sunday reading?
3. Will any newspaper hurt anybody on Sunday, who does not read it?
4. Cannot all refuse to read it who choose to do so?
5. Has a minister or any one else a right to take any forceful means to compel those to stop reading newspapers on Sunday, who choose to do so?
6. Is there anything uncivil about reading a newspaper on Sunday? How can it interfere with a "civil Sabbath"?
7. In your "Sabbath for Man" pages 442, 443, you say: "Neither Sunday newspapers, nor Sunday trains, nor any other Sunday business, except trades of vice could live if all Christians withheld their patronage." Are not Christians then responsible for their continued existence? and is not the proper remedy a regeneration of the Church, and not a resorting to the forceful requirements of law?
8. Is not the only way to make this a truly Christian Nation, to make the *people* Christians?
9. Can men be made Christians by law?
10. Is not the best way for each individual to preserve the Sabbath, for him to keep it?
11. Do those who keep the seventh day keep the fourth commandment of the Decalogue? and if so why do you wage war against them, unless it is that both their keeping of it and the commandment itself condemn your theory and practice in this respect?
12. When did Christ, as carpenter, lay down his saw after six days of toil? Was it every Saturday night or every Friday night? What day did he keep as Sabbath,—Sunday or Saturday?
13. In your "Sabbath for Man," page 258, you say: "It is not sufficiently emphasized that the Jew is left absolutely free to observe the seventh day. He can close his shop; he can refuse to work." Is not every other man just as free to observe the first day? Cannot every person who desires to keep Sunday, close his shop and refuse to work? Where, then, is the need of Sunday laws? What more can consistently be asked than absolute freedom?

Representatives of the American Sabbath Union and National Reform Association are holding meetings in Michigan, and putting forth earnest efforts for the

enforcement of the religious laws of that State. W. F. Crafts is among the number, and copies of these "Questions" have been presented to him on different occasions, but as yet have elicited no reply.

Who Preserves the Sabbath?

THE *Christian Advocate*, under the heading "Critical Situation of the Sabbath" has this to say:—

If the Sabbath is to be preserved from desecration under the authority of the Government, and the whole world is not to be advertised that the American Sunday has given place to a European continental Sunday, much more interest must be aroused and energy exerted. Local, political, and financial interests are combining in favor of opening the Fair, and the politicians know that Christians seldom bolt when trodden upon, and sinners are sure to do it. Every minister, Protestant and Catholic, and every lover of the Sabbath even from a patriotic point of view, should arouse himself and all whom he can reach. Chicago Christians should be a unit. Christian exhibitors likely to occupy large space should address personal letters to the members of the Exposition.

In a partisan contest for civil supremacy between the American and continental Sundays the language of the *Christian Advocate* in this item is apt and congruous, but the word Sabbath, twice used, is as much out of keeping with the thought of the paragraph as it is inconsistent with the word Sunday, with which it is erroneously paired as synonymous.

The Sabbath never has been, is not, and never can be, in a "critical situation." It is under the protection of the omnipotent Jehovah, and needs no other preserving hand.

Let those who would think to preserve the Sabbath by the authority of Government remember Uzzah, and let those who would institute by law a "civil Sunday" consider well the stern reference of Christ to the prophecy of Isaiah, "in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

THERE is no such thing as a "civil Sabbath," and nobody wants such a thing. A "civil Sabbath" could be nothing else than a weekly holiday, when public business would be suspended and the people be left free to do as they please so long as they are civil, just as they are upon any holiday. But that would be the "continental Sunday" with a vengeance; and that the Sunday-law advocates do not want.

A SPEAKER at the Ecumenical Conference in Washington said, "The law which authorized Louisiana lotteries made men immoral by law." By parity of reasoning, The law which enforces Sunday observance makes men Christian by law. Are men made either moral or immoral, Christian, or unchristian, by law? The cases are parallel. The absurdity of the one is the absurdity of the other.

NATIONAL Religious Liberty Association



DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ.
We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.
We believe in supporting the civil government, and submitting to its authority.
We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.
We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.
We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation by the civil government that we and our fellow-citizens may enjoy the inestimable blessings of both religious and civil liberty.

OFFICES:

43 BOND ST., NEW YORK CITY.
1225 T ST., N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.
28 COLLEGE PLACE, CHICAGO, ILL.
12TH AND CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.
207 WEST MAIN ST., BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

R. C. PORTER - - - - - PRESIDENT.
A. F. BALLENGER - - - - - SECRETARY.

"Remand the Prisoner."

R. M. KING BEYOND THE JURISDICTION OF
HUMAN COURTS.

AN almost tragic interest accrues to the positive words of R. M. King, published in the review of the decision in his case on another page, in view of his unexpected death, notice of which has been received at the last moment before going to press. The *Sun* publishes the following in its obituary column.—

R. M. King, the Seventh-day Adventist, who acquired inter-State fame through being arrested for plowing on Sunday, died suddenly near Dyersburg, Tennessee, on Tuesday. It is a year and a half since King was arrested and fined for Sunday work. The trivial case has been in the State and Federal courts ever since, and is now pending in the United States Supreme Court. The original sentence was affirmed by the Supreme Court of Tennessee. Then the defense was undertaken by the National Religious Liberty Association, which employed Don M. Dickinson and carried the case to the United States Circuit Court on a writ of *habeas corpus*. Judge Hammond, in an elaborate opinion, ruled that States had a right to make Sunday laws, and that the Federal Government had no right to review the State's decisions. The case was thereupon appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, and it is not unlikely the Adventists will still push the case to a conclusion notwithstanding King's death.

Two National Associations.

THE reader will remember that last week, in an article under this head, was presented the testimony of history upon the practical application of the principles of two national associations, namely, the National Reform Association, and the National Religious Liberty Association. The purpose of this article is to answer the question, "What does the Bible teach upon the subject of religious legislation?"

Since the Bible is the revelation of the will of God to man, and is the Christian's final appeal in the settlement of every question with which he has to do, we come to it with the full assurance of faith that in it we will find the needed instruction to lead us to correct conclusions on this subject.

Let us first inquire, What is the nature of the work of becoming a Christian, and living the Christian life? Jesus says it is a birth from above, and a life of loving service. John 3:3, margin, 14:16. While John and Paul speak of it as falling in love with Christ, and living in love with him as a man does with his wife. 1 John 4:19. Rom. 7:4. Eph. 5:31, 32.

Then how can the State make men Christians by law? Can the law make a man fall in love with a

woman in whom he sees nothing to love and admire? We all agree that it would be absurd to attempt such a thing. Is it any less absurd to attempt to compel men, by law, to fall in love with Christ, and be born from above, when they see in him nothing that calls out their love and admiration?

The whole plan of the gospel of Christ is opposed to religious legislation. The prophet Isaiah, speaking of the nature of the mission of Christ, says it was to preach "liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." Isa. 61:1. And Christ himself says the plan of saving men is not *driving* them to be religious by law, but *drawing* them by love. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." "No man can come unto me except the Father which sent me draw him." "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "My sheep hear my voice, and they follow me." Christ well knew that when men saw him to be "the chiefest among ten thousand," and the one "altogether lovely," they would so fall in love with him that it would be more than their meat and their drink to do the will of his Father. And if they did not so fall in love with him, all the laws of all the governments on earth could not make a single soul render acceptable service to God. In view of this, Christ plainly declares that the extent of the just claims of civil governments upon citizens are that they render to the State only those things which belong to it, and that they then be free to render to God the service that belongs to him.

"Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." While in this passage Christ does plainly say we are under moral obligation to render certain things to Cæsar, or the civil government, he expressly states that the things we are to render to God are wholly outside of Cæsar's claim; hence Cæsar has no right to compel any religious service.

What commission did Christ give to his disciples when he sent them out to carry his gospel to a perishing world? "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them," etc. But who were they to baptize?—Believers only. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved."

Was not the Church commissioned to demand that all the "Christian laws, institutions, and usages" be placed upon "an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land," in order to give them power and influence in their work?—No; Christ said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and earth," and "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." His presence and power was to be to them all needed help. So he told them to tarry at Jerusalem until they were "endued with power from on high." Thus equipped, without delaying to demand the State to place their "Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis," they were prepared to enter upon their work with the assurance that "My word shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." Does not Paul afterward say that he could do everything through the power of the State? Far from it. His words are, "I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me." And Paul's view was exactly that expressed by Christ in the gospel commission.

There is, then, not only no necessity for religious legislation in the plan of the gospel, but there is no place for it, and it is directly opposed to the gospel. The Saviour wants his disciples to render him willing service. His own words of invitation are, "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come."

Note the contrast between this invitation and that of the National Reformers. They would compel all to come, regardless of their *will* in the matter. They go just that much farther than Christ authorizes them to go.

But suppose some are not willing to heed the invitation, and come of their own accord, after you have said to them "Come"? Christ says, further, "Whosoever will, let him come and take of the water of life freely." He would not force the will, but still entreat. "He that thirsteth let him come." So it is plain that he desired only those for his followers who voluntarily chose to accept his teachings.

The Religious Liberty Association says that this is in every way just and right. But the National Reform Association says that we want to "place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis." That is, we want the State to compel all to accept our views of religion. But would the National Reformers think it was right for the State to compel all to accept the Jewish faith? I think if the State should do such a thing I would hear them crying, "Tyranny! Despotism! The State has no right to legislate in any such way!" And they would be right in this claim. But now what about *their* demand that all Christian usages, as they view them, should be enforced, by law, upon others. Are they the only ones whom God has intrusted with the right to choose in matters of religion? Or have all the same right of choice in matters of religious belief? And is it the right of each, as far as civil government is concerned, to be religious or not, as they choose, as long as they act civilly? Is that the right of each member of the National Reform Association?—Certainly. Is it my right?—Yes. Then have we a right to deprive others of the free exercise of rights which we claim for ourselves? Let Christ answer: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets."

We can not fulfill the requirements of the gospel without granting to all others the same right of choice to be religious or not, or to choose their religious belief the same as we claim for ourselves. Hence, as I believe, we all agree that no civil government has a right to legislate us individually into, or out of, any religious belief; and acknowledging that, we admit in principle the whole question of the right of civil governments to legislate on religious subjects. So long as we follow the teachings of Christ, and do to others as we would have them do to us, we will all cease to advocate religious legislation.

In the days of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, he made a golden image and set it up in the plain of Dura, and commanded all the rulers in the kingdom to come and worship it; and he decreed that if any should not worship, according to the edict which he had issued as king in behalf of the State, they should be cast into the fiery furnace. There were three faithful men there who refused to be legislated out of their rights of religious worship. They were speedily cast into the furnace of fire. This was but the next step which must always follow the enactment of religious laws. There must be a penalty, and to make the laws operative the penalty must be enforced. But no sooner had these men reached the flames than four were plainly seen, and the form of the fourth was "like the son of God."

Upon the invitation of the king they came out of the furnace, unharmed and without even the smell of fire upon their garments.

God had stepped in and openly expressed his disapproval, by rebuking those who would compel religious observances. His disapprobation of religious legislation was again manifested when Daniel was cast into the den of lions because he was unwilling to renounce his faith, to be in harmony with the unjust laws of the State which demanded control of his worship.

Stephen, dying a martyr to his principles that every man had a right to teach and worship according to the dictates of his conscience, was greatly encouraged by the Lord's giving him a view of scenes in Heaven. He saw "Jesus standing on the right hand of God." "And all that sat in the council, looking steadfastly on him, saw his face as

it had been the face of an angel." Paul was there at the time, and those who stoned Stephen laid their clothes at his feet. He at that time believed in religious legislation, and he afterwards says, "I imprisoned and beat in every synagogues them that believed on thee." "And when the blood of thy martyr Stephen was shed, I also was standing by and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him."

That he was honest in what he was doing, and thought it was the best way to advance religion, I do not doubt, for he declares, "I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day." The trouble with Paul was, that he had been deceived into false ideas of religion, and, through this deception, led to believe it was right to legislate people into being religious, and to persecute those who opposed his faith; but when he became acquainted with Christ, and accepted the Christian religion, we see a radical change in his principles on this subject.

He makes a full and open confession in this respect, and obtained forgiveness. 1 Tim. 1:13. No one ever hears him advocating religious legislation after he became a Christian. Though he himself was whipped, imprisoned, and finally beheaded on account of his faith, he faithfully instructs the brethren, "being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed," we legislate? No, "we entreat." It was an easy thing to persecute Christians in those days, because they were few in number and their influence small. Paul continues, "We are made as the filth of the world, and are the offscouring of all things unto this day." 1 Cor. 5:12, 13. Thus it has ever been, and ever will be, when the truly pious are persecuted for their faith. Even Christ was so regarded; and being falsely accused was arrested, tried, condemned, and executed as a criminal, for daring to teach a religion not recognized by the State. The Saviour here plainly takes his stand on the principles since adopted by the Religious Liberty Association, that every man who acts civilly should be protected by the State in his right to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.

When the disciples were about to enter upon their work, they were instructed that, "If they persecuted me, they will also persecute you." "Yea, the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think he doeth God service." When they went out they found it so. Peter and John were commanded not to *teach* in the name of Jesus; but they calmly said, "We can not but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

Was not God displeased with them for refusing to obey the "powers that be," which "are ordained of God" in this thing?—No. Why? Because when the civil government legislates on religion it has gone beyond its legitimate province, and ceases to meet the purpose of God in ordaining it. So when the apostles were preaching Jesus, in disobedience to the command of the State, God sent an angel with this plain message, "Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life." This settles the whole question of religious legislation. If the authority to decide between true and false religions had been committed to the civil government, then the disciples should have submitted to the council, and ceased to preach Jesus. Since the civil government can not legislate on religious questions without acting as judge of what are true and what are false doctrines, and since God here taught the disciples to disregard such decisions rendered by the State, the conclusion is unquestionable that the teaching of the gospel of Christ is against all religious legislation.

In the light of the foregoing facts, the conclusion is:

1. That the application of the principles of the National Reform Association has always resulted in religious intolerance and persecution, and seriously against the prosperity of both the Church and the State.

2. That the application of the principles of the Religious Liberty Association has resulted in the

greatest prosperity of both the Church and the State.

3. That the principles of the National Reform Association are in direct conflict with the teaching of the gospel on the subject of religious legislation.

4. That the position taken by the Religious Liberty Association against religious legislation is in harmony with the gospel of Christ.

5. That religious persecution is always the sure result of compelling religious observances, and that all the religious persecutions of the past are chargeable to false views of God and religion, and not to true Christianity. "And these things will they do unto you, because they have not known the Father, nor me."

In the present conflict, may both reader and writer be found on the gospel side of this question.

R. C. PORTER.

The Sunday Movement in Italy.

THE Sunday movement, which for the last few years has been a matter of increasing interest in England and in various places upon the continent, has reached Italy, where it has assumed phases peculiar to the condition of religion in that country. Of widely different character than in other countries, the movement is agitating all classes in Italy, especially the operatives. Not long ago there was a large and orderly meeting in Naples to promote the objects of an association in favor of Sunday reform, and those who attended were principally operatives, one of their number being in the chair. The aim of the movement is to secure another day's relaxation from labor. The curious feature of the movement is that it is urged as a necessity on purely physical grounds; almost nothing is said in favor of securing a day for devotion. The latter view of the question could not have well been taken by the Italians, to whom the churches are always open, and who, as a rule, never neglect to perform certain offices of religion. While living in an atmosphere of devotion, as far as traditional practices are concerned, there is no reason for regarding the Sunday movement as it is looked upon in other countries. At dawn of each day the "Angelus-Domini" sounds, calling to prayer. At mid-day, so it is, when most people uncover and repeat a devotion; while every evening the "Ave Maria" is announced by every church bell, and longer prayers are said. The great desire of the association is to obtain another day's exemption from labor. Relaxation is obtained in Italy in many holidays. Every Sunday is a holiday where every one amuses himself as he may think best, but crowds attend mass and the benediction. In view of these facts the ground of the Sunday movement in Italy is considered unsubstantial, and it is felt that if the Italian should put it on any other ground he will have the sympathy of a larger number of supporters. An effort has been made to diminish the number of saints' days in Italy, but without much success. The government has already made the experiment, but the people will have their holiday. If Sunday should be made a day of rest, the problem would be simplified, for saints' days would decrease in number.—*Boston Journal*.

THE *Christian Union*, October 31, says: "The experiment of opening the Metropolitan Museum on Sunday has now been tried over four months, and the success has been so great that all opposition has been done away with, and the trustees who at first objected have yielded frankly and fully, deciding to make the Sunday opening a permanent thing if the necessary money can be raised. In the first eighteen Sundays over one hundred thousand people came. Some damage was done, but not much. To the majority of the great crowds who went in it was a new experience, and a few did not know how to behave themselves, or to appreciate the opportunity. But they will learn this, together with much other valuable knowledge, and the public and press will probably never have to regret their efforts to force open those tightly closed doors."



NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 19, 1891.

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

THE question of Sabbath reform has been agitated so much during past years, that the work of the future will be largely between the two opposing elements,—Sunday-law advocates, and the defenders of religious liberty.

WHILE the American Sabbath Union has been attempting to close barber-shops on Sunday, the Wesleyans, in Conference at Grand Rapids, Mich., have solved the whole problem by deciding that the "mutilation of Nature's handiwork by trimming the whiskers is against the law of God," and instructing the revision committee to "report a resolution against shaving."

THE *Christian Advocate*, of this city, in its issue of the 12th inst., remarks that "defenders of the Sabbath are waking up to the magnitude and importance of the work before them. A convention of the representatives of different Sabbath organizations of the State of New York will be held in South Methodist Episcopal Church, Utica, November, 17, 18, to complete the organization of a State committee, to devise plans for future work, and to discuss various phases of the Sunday question."

A SOUTHERN paper gives publicity to a case of indolent conscience, with a very apt critical remark, as follows:—

Though my sale of cigarettes, I guess, is more than all the other dealers of the city put together, yet I am opposed to the sale, and wish some means could be taken to wipe out the sale completely. They are a curse to the people.—*W. H. Silverman, of Atlanta.*

Well, why don't you quit the business, Mr. Silverman? Are you a good citizen to carry on "a curse to the people" by selling cigarettes to them?

So also, it may be said to those who want a law to compel themselves to stop "desecrating" the Sunday, and so to save the Nation from this "curse."

HENRY GEORGE has an ally from an unexpected quarter. The "Church Society for the Advancement of the Interests of Labor" has recently been organized, in this city, and immediately decided by resolution that as "God is the Father of all men and has created the earth for his children," therefore "the land of these United States belongs to all the members

of this American Nation, and land monopoly is contrary to the will of God." There seems to be an unnoticed inconsistency between the premise "all men" and the conclusion "American Nation." If the Father of all has created the earth for his children it does not follow that the United States belongs to the American Nation, alone, but each of his children owns a proportionate undivided share, and every individual holds a title-deed to the earth, as tenant in common with all the children of God.

This "Church Society" would do well to review its logic and its law before it brings suit to evict all but "members of this American Nation" from the soil of the United States.

THE *Christian Statesman* catalogues the vices and accompanying scandals attached to the name of the heir apparent to the throne of England, and exclaims with the *National Baptist*—"And this is not only the heir to the throne, but the future head of the Church of England, who will theoretically have the appointing of the bishops and the control of a great amount of patronage!" The *Statesman* forgets, for the moment, its theories of Christian nationalism. Baptist principles are sound on these questions, and the *Statesman* must be a little chary of quoting them unreservedly or its own heresy hunters may find a field for activity still nearer home.

A PITTSBURG dispatch to the *Sun*, of this city, concerning the late annual convention of the Pennsylvania Woman's Christian Temperance Union which was held at Bradford, gives the following as from Mrs. W. B. Rhoades, State and County Superintendent of Young Women's Work:—

We have given up the idea of ever gaining anything by politics, and are now confining ourselves to individual work. We expect nothing, or very little from legislation. It has been shown that the law cannot make a sober man out of a drunkard, or turn a bad parent into a good one. We must go from house to house to sow the seeds of temperance if we wish to harvest a higher standard of morality, and a better understanding of the duty of a Christian.

This is sound sense. We wish all the women of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions, both old and young, would learn as much and would practice accordingly. Then they could do some good.

THE number of centennials, expositions, and commemorative exhibitions of one kind and another, in these days, is suggestive of a desire to wind up the world's affairs in a display of human glorification. The last proposition of this kind comes from the *Chicago Evening Journal* and recommends "the celebration of the nineteenth century of Christianity in 1896, as that would be the real anniversary of the birth of Christ." The *Journal's* comment on the participation of the

Israelitish people in such an event marks the spirit of the whole thought,—"There is no view of Jesus that a Jew could take that is not flattering to his national pride"; and the relation which his race has to the Christian religion should "make every Jew hold his head a little higher to the end of time." This is like the voice of Nebuchadnezzar saying again in arrogance; "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?"

THIS issue of THE SENTINEL contains very valuable matter and should have an extensive circulation. The Corresponding Secretary of the National Religious Liberty Association writes,— "The discussion of the King case is attracting a great deal of attention everywhere, and by circulating this number of THE SENTINEL a great influence will be cast in favor of truth and many hundreds may also be interested who will become subscribers to this journal later on. Reports are coming to us from all parts of the field in regard to the good results from the careful distribution of literature, especially THE AMERICAN SENTINEL; and if this number can be circulated widely, particularly among the professional and business men of cities and large towns, a vast amount of good can be accomplished."

Since the commencement of the articles in review of Judge Hammond's decision in the King case, many subscriptions have been received asking for the full series; this will be furnished to all these, and also to all others who, in sending their subscriptions, call for the full series in reference to this important decision.

IN an article in the *Nineteenth Century* intended to be laudatory of Church disestablishment in this country, Professor Goldwin Smith says of American communities: "In no reputable society would anything offensive to religious feeling be endured." The unconscious expression of religious intolerance in this sentence is significant.

WHAT this world wants is not so much an increase of gospel preaching as of gospel practice.—*Theodore L. Cuyler.*

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.