



Equal and Exact Justice to all Men, of Whatever State or Persuasion, Religious or Political.—*Thomas Jefferson.*

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, MARCH 24, 1892.

NUMBER 12.

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 original Sabbath is a memorial of the creation. It was instituted for that purpose, and its intelligent observance is a recognition of God as the Creator of the heavens and the earth. It does not pertain to our duties to our fellow-men, but solely to our recognition of God; and a failure to observe it imposes no financial burden upon the State. Likewise, Sunday, the day now generally kept, is observed as a memorial of the resurrection of Christ. Its significance is, therefore, wholly religious. Thus, look at it either from the standpoint of the seventh or the first day, the keeping of a weekly rest, has reference to the recognition of God as the proper object of worship. Therefore, to require such observance under any pretext whatever, is to require the observance of a religious institution.

THE only ground on which restrictions on Sunday amusements can be defended must be that they are religiously wrong; a motive of legislation which can not be too earnestly protested against. It remains to be proved that society or any of its officers holds a commission from Heaven to avenge any supposed offense to Omnipotence which is not also a wrong to our fellow-creatures. The notion that it is one man's duty that another should be religious was the foundation of all the religious persecutions that have ever been perpetrated, and if admitted, would fully justify them. Though the feeling which breaks out in the repeated attempts to stop railway traveling on Sunday, and the resistance to the opening of museums, etc.,

has not the cruelty of the old persecutions, the state of mind indicated by it is fundamentally the same. It is a determination not to tolerate others in doing what is permitted by their religion, because it is not permitted by the persecutor's religion.—*John Stuart Mill.*

An Unconstitutional Measure.

IN the House of Representatives on January 5, of this year, Mr. Morse, of Massachusetts, introduced a bill entitled "A Bill to Prohibit the Opening of any Exhibition or Exposition where Appropriations of the United States are Expended," and reading as follows:—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no exhibition or exposition for which appropriation is made by Congress shall be opened on Sunday.

SECTION 2. That any violation of this act shall be punishable by a fine of not less than one hundred dollars nor more than one thousand dollars for every violation of the foregoing act.

This bill, expressed in precisely the same language, was introduced in the previous Congress by the same Representative, on December 19, 1890. It has been reintroduced and referred to the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial.

The resolution thus insistently brought before Congress and to the attention of this committee, is but one of a series, which, from different points of view, are intended to serve the same purpose,—that of committing Congress to unconstitutional legislation upon religious subjects. The passage of this resolution would commit Congress to the establishment of a religious test by which its advocates would hope forever after to govern the Congress of the United States in making similar appropriations, and would establish a precedent, which, in order to maintain consistency and remain in conformity with itself, would make it necessary for Congress to require Sunday closing and Sunday keeping as a prerequisite in many other cases not specified in the bill.

This measure is stated in concise terms;

there is no unnecessary verbiage. It is as arbitrary in its business-like brevity as it is in purpose. What is its purpose? The statement is clear,—“That no exhibition or exposition, for which appropriation is made by Congress, shall be opened on Sunday.” But this very conciseness of expression, where no particulars are specified, necessarily becomes, in interpretation, of the very broadest application, and of the very widest significance. What is the breadth of application of this bill, and what the width of its significance? That no *exhibition* shall be opened on Sunday for which Congress has appropriated money will cover every individual exhibit of the United States Government both in this and in foreign countries. It will also pertain to every exhibit in this country or elsewhere, to which the United States shall contribute in any measure, making it necessary in all such cases, where the United States may be a partner, either active or silent, for Congress to require all others interested to enter into a contract, and give bonds at least to the amount of the appropriation made, that the exhibit shall not be opened on Sunday, or accept simply one hundred to one thousand dollars fine in lieu of the broken contract. And this assumption of authority by Congress as to the matter of Sunday closing is irrespective of whether it holds the majority of the stock in the enterprise or but a minor share. Whatever its interest or however small its appropriation or insignificant its exhibit, still, by virtue of its governmental authority it arbitrarily requires, in defiance it may be of the vote of its fellow-stockholders or associate contributors, that such exhibition shall be closed on Sunday.

That no *exposition*, for which Congress appropriates money, shall be opened on Sunday, would mean that no exposition such as the Centennial Exposition, at Philadelphia, or the Columbian Exposition, at Chicago, toward defraying the expenses of which Congress makes appropriation, or which it assists in any degree with the money of the United States, can

be opened on Sunday. No reason is given. No cause for such action assigned. The fact is simply stated that all such enterprises and all the people connected with them and in attendance upon them, shall yield to the Government of the United States this portion of time. When Jehovah required of men that they should render to him the seventh day he gave a sufficient reason; but this bill would have the citizens of the United States, and incidentally the whole world, as it may be related to these expositions, render to it the first day of the week, a tribute of one-seventh of their time, without deigning to state any reason other than its own arbitrary will. In these cases this measure would be an indirect assumption of the right of exclusive legislation over one day in the week, in territory within the limits of a State and under the control of a municipality for which the Constitution gives no warrant. The powers of Congress are specified and that of direct legislative or municipal control restricted to the District of Columbia and "places purchased by the consent of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be." In order then to exercise this right of local control it would be necessary for Congress to purchase the site of all expositions in which it took part, subject to the permission of State Legislatures, therefore this indirect method of attaining the same end is undertaken, and by it Congress is enabled to exercise exclusive authority for one day of the week in territory outside of that over which the Constitution gives it control. The application of this bill is certainly broad.

But what is the purpose of this measure? A bill so forcibly arbitrary and with such a breadth of application must have been inspired by an intent to use the power that might be obtained by it for a purpose. Its purpose is the same as that of all other bills relating to Sunday, now, or at any other time, before Congress, and that is, that the Congress of the United States shall give its legislative sanction to the dogma of the sacredness of Sunday, the "American Sabbath." And however many other interpretations this measure might be subject to the religious question would be so inextricably commingled with them as to utterly vitiate its propriety as a matter of adjudication by the Congress of the United States. What would be said of a similar bill which should specify, instead of Sunday, Christmas day, Easter, or any or all the holy days upon the church calendar? No suggestion that Congress, or any civil authority, should so legislate would be listened to for a moment. It would be immediately seen that its purpose was to secure the enforcement of a man-made religious formality. But suppose the other horn of the dilemma is taken and its sanction is based upon the divine authority of the immutable moral law delivered from Sinai. It

then becomes confessedly without the pale of constitutionality. More, it becomes a blasphemous assumption of authority to change, interpret, and enforce a divine edict.

There is still another point of, apparently, intentional unconstitutionality involved in this measure. The very reference of this bill to the committee which has it in charge shows the general understanding that it is intended to have effect upon the coming World's Fair in Chicago. Legislation, however, has been had upon that, and appropriations made. Has any one then presumed to present for the consideration of Congress, a measure intended to be an *ex post facto* law,—one retroactive in character and impairing obligations previously entered into? Vitiating the value of previous contracts, after second and third parties have acted in good faith upon them? It is charitable to consider that this bill was presented without due forethought and without counsel, and yet its reintroduction in a second Congress, couched in precisely identical words would seem to preclude any such charitable construction.

This measure is hopelessly and doubly unconstitutional; its intent is to ask for the unconstitutional application of a law which would be in itself unconstitutional.

To require the observance of Sunday is to require obedience to a religious dogma, which is the distinguishing mark of a certain ecclesiastical hierarchy. It is to assert, by the authority of the Government, that that form of Christianity is part of the law of the land, which is the precept of an established church and religion, and inapplicable under the Constitution of the United States. There can not constitutionally be any United States statute for the purpose of enforcing Sunday keeping, or any other religious observance. This bill would enforce it by a discrimination and a penalty. It has no place upon the United States statute books.

Truly, the application of this bill is not limited, neither is it without significance.

W. H. M.

Dangerous Assumption.

A RECENTLY contributed article in the *Boston Traveller*, referred to in these columns last week, contains these two startling propositions:—

When the Bible was put into the hands of the people, they became the earthly sovereigns and executors of all it contains. Therefore, whether we consider morals and religion as within the jurisdiction of the Church or the State, the people are supreme in that jurisdiction.

The people, the State, are the final interpreters of all laws, religious or non-religious, in or out of the Bible.

The assumption that the people are the executors of all that the Bible contains is a most dangerous one, and fully justifies all the persecution for conscience' sake that the world has ever seen. Mr. Eaton probably

made the statement having in mind only a republic; but the proposition is not true even then. However, its fallacy is more apparent when we apply it to a government in which the power is in the hands of a few, or of a single man.

It can not be disputed that whatever powers the people, in their aggregate capacity, have of right, may, by them, be delegated to those whom they select as their rulers. It follows that if the people are the executors of all that the Bible contains, a single man might properly exercise that power, for it might be delegated to him by the people. Indeed, it is unquestionably the case that generally in the past a vast majority of the people have chosen to be ruled by a single man. It is evident that when such a choice is made by a majority of the people, the one whom they choose to reign over them has properly all the power that belongs of right to those who gave it to him.

THE people can not, in the very nature of the case be, in their aggregate capacity, the final interpreters of the divine law as Mr. Eaton asserts. Only as individuals are the people interpreters of the divine law; and even then the interpretation given by the individual is binding only on himself; he has no right to force it upon anybody else. Were this not true there could be no such thing as individual conscience or individual responsibility to God. The people, or rather a majority of the people, or those able to command the most votes, would decide what was right and what wrong, and all would be bound to abide the decision. And not only so, but if such were the divine plan, a thing would be right or wrong according to the number of votes in its favor!

SOME questions do belong absolutely to the people; in many cases their will is, and of right ought to be, final. For instance, it is the right of the people to decide, in their aggregate capacity, what shall be their form of government; what their system of money; their laws of trade; whether they will build macadamized turnpikes or only dirt roads; whether they will grant to private corporations charters to build railways and canals, or whether they will build and own these public highways themselves. But when it comes to the matter of individual moral duty, the whole people have no more right to decide for one than one has to decide for the whole people. In morals the individual is responsible to God and he must be left free to discharge that responsibility according to his own conscience. Any attempt, whether by one or by many, to do otherwise is a usurpation of divine prerogatives. C. P. B.

"You can not bring Utopia by force."

How, and by Whom, Was the Sabbath Changed?

In its issue of the 27th ult., the *Christian Statesman* has an article, written in the usual contemptuous style of the editor, in which is ridiculed the claim of seventh-day observers that the Sabbath was "changed" by the Roman Catholic Church, and not by the apostolic Church. The question is by no means vital, nor is it even pertinent, to the discussion of the right of the civil power to require cessation of all secular business on Sunday, or any other day; but inasmuch as the *Statesman's* denial is made in the interests of a State-bolstered religious institution, it may not be amiss to examine briefly the question, "How, and by Whom, Was the Sabbath 'Changed'?"

That the Sabbath was ever really changed, in the proper sense of that word, will be asserted only by those who believe that Sunday is now the true Sabbath; for God made the Sabbath, by resting upon, and by blessing and sanctifying the seventh day, and he alone could really change it. But that a change has been attempted, and that so far as the practice of a vast majority of the Christian world is concerned, it has been successful, is patent to all. That the Bible gives no hint of this change, and consequently no sanction to it, has been shown in a previous number of this paper. Therefore, the only remaining question is, "How, and by Whom, Was the Sabbath 'Changed'?"

That neither Christ nor his apostles changed the Sabbath is admitted by many who regard the day as sacred. Thus the *Christian at Work*, of February 18, 1886, said:—

We hear less than we used to about the apostolic origin of the present Sunday observance, and for the reason that while the Sabbath and Sabbath rest is woven into the warp and woof of Scripture, it is now seen, as it is admitted, that we must go to later than apostolic times for the establishment of Sunday observance.

Just how Sunday observance was introduced is thus explained by the same paper, January 8, 1885:—

The selection of Sunday, thus changing the particular day designated in the fourth commandment, was brought about by the gradual concurrence of the early Christian Church; and on this basis, and on none other, does the Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week rest.

Neander, who "McClintock and Strong's Cyclopædia" says, is "universally conceded to be by far the greatest of ecclesiastical historians," gives this pointed and candid testimony in the first edition of his history:—

The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect; far from them and from the apostolic Church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered working on Sunday a sin.—*Rose's Neander, page 186.*

Representative Sunday keepers would not make such statements if the facts of history did not compel them to do so. The truth is, that self-respecting men, unless blinded by bigotry, do not care to hazard their reputation on utterances which can be so easily discredited as can the statement that the apostolic Church regarded Sunday as the Sabbath; and so all, except those polemic divines who care more for their particular creeds than for the truth, refuse to longer peddle the pious frauds by which Sunday sanctity has so long been sustained.

But who did "transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday"? The *Christian at Work* says that it was done "by the gradual concurrence of the early Christian Church," in "later than apostolic times." But what right had the "early Christian Church" to concur in setting aside the divinely appointed Sabbath and substituting another in its stead? Evidently none whatever. And if such concurrence could give sanctity to an institution and make it binding upon anybody, how comes it that the same concurrence did not give equal sanctity to other institutions of the "early Christian Church"? The truth is that the Church never had *at any period* any such authority; and the assumption was nothing short of blasphemy. By whatever name it may be called, whether the "early Christian Church," or the "Roman Catholic Church," the Sabbath could have been "changed" only by a church that had departed not a little from the simplicity of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

It may be *technically* inaccurate to assert, as some do, that "the Roman Catholic Church changed the Sabbath," or that "the Pope changed it;" but it is absolutely true, "as it is admitted," that the change was made *by the Church* after, as all Church history shows, numerous corruptions and abuses had crept into the Church. And it is also true that these corruptions and abuses continued to increase in number and influence until the apostasy which had begun even in Paul's day, developed into the full-grown man of sin. As well might we deny the identity of the boy and the man, or of the thirteen Colonies and the thirteen original States of the Union, as to deny that the apostasy of which the Roman Catholic Church is the embodiment is simply the perfect development of that to which the apostle referred in his second letter to the Thessalonians.

Like the apostasy which finally developed into the full-grown "man of sin," the change of the Sabbath was a growth. It is impossible for either friend or foe of Sunday keeping to say definitely just when it was introduced. As well might we attempt to locate definitely the origin of saint worship, prayers for the dead, etc., as to say just when Sunday began to be regarded as sacred; but like the other inheritances from paganism now found in

the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church, it should be enough for Protestants to know that it is without a shadow of divine authority; and that the very best that can be said truthfully for it, is that the observance of Sunday was "brought about by the gradual concurrence of the early Christian Church," in "later than apostolic times."

In his "History of Romanism," book 2, chap. 1, sec. 3, Dowling has well said:—

Protestantism, as opposed to Popery, has been defined by Isaac Taylor, in his *Ancient Christianity*, as "A REFUSAL TO ACKNOWLEDGE INNOVATIONS BEARING AN ASCERTAINED DATE," and to this definition we have no particular objection, inasmuch as the date of most, if not all of the Popish innovations, both doctrinal and ritual, can be ascertained with considerable accuracy. Still we must be allowed to add, that should innovations be discovered, either in that or any other communion the date of the admission of which is entirely unknown, if they are contrary to the doctrine and spirit of the Bible, if they are not found in God's word—that is to say, if they are innovations at all—then true Protestantism requires their unqualified rejection, just as much as if their date were as clearly ascertained as is the date of the Papal supremacy, or the absurd dogma of transubstantiation. "THE BIBLE I SAY, THE BIBLE ONLY, IS THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS!" Nor is it of any account in the estimation of the genuine Protestant, *how early* a doctrine originated, if it is not found in the Bible. He learns from the New Testament itself, that there were errors in the time of the apostles, and that their pens were frequently employed in combating those errors. Hence, if a doctrine be propounded for his acceptance, he asks, Is it to be found in the inspired word? was it taught by the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles?

Concerning the introduction of some of the Romish practices, Dowling says:—

There is scarcely anything which strikes the mind of the careful student of ancient ecclesiastical history with greater surprise, than the comparatively early period at which many of the corruptions of Christianity, which are embodied in the Romish system, took their rise; yet it is not to be supposed that when the first originators of many of these unscriptural notions and practices, planted those germs of corruption, they anticipated or even imagined that they would grow into such a vast and hideous system of superstition and error, as is that of Popery. Thus remarks a learned and sagacious writer: "Each of the great corruptions of later ages took its rise in a manner which it would be harsh to say was deserving of strong reprehension. . . . The worship of images, the invocation of saints, and the superstition of relics, were but the expansions of the natural feelings of veneration and affection cherished toward the memory of those who had suffered and died for the truth. . . . The very abuses which make the twelfth century abhorrent on the page of history, were, in the fourth, fragrant with the practice and suffrage of a blessed company of primitive confessors. The remembered saints who had given their bodies to the flames had also lent their voice and example to those unwise excesses which at length drove true religion from the earth. Untaught by experience the ancient Church surmised not of the occult tendencies of the course it pursued, nor should it be loaded with consequences which human sagacity could not well have foreseen."—*Id.*, book 2, chap. 1, sec. 1.

The same might be said of the observance of Sunday, that it was but natural that those who had before regarded it as a day sacred to the sun, should, upon becoming Christians, retain some of that reverence; nor is it strange that they

should seek to connect the observance of the first day, with their new religion, especially as the fact of the resurrection of Christ on that day afforded them an excellent pretext for so doing. And that is just what they did; and it is significant that the practice of keeping Sunday as a Christian festival originated among Gentile Christians—those who had as pagans worshiped the sun upon that day. Recognizing this fact, the *North British Review*, Vol. 13, p. 409, thus defends the change:—

That very day was the Sunday of their heathen neighbors and respective countrymen; and patriotism gladly united with expediency in making it their Lord's day and their Sabbath. . . . The primitive Church, in fact, was shut up to the adoption of Sunday, until it became established and supreme, when it was too late to make another alteration; and it was no irreverent or undelightful thing to adopt it, inasmuch as the first day of the week was their own high day at any rate.

It can not be claimed that this paragraph was written by an enemy to the first day, for it is a defense of the Sunday institution; and it is evident that had the writer known any better argument for the practice of Sunday-keeping than "expediency," or any higher authority for it than the practice and decree of a corrupt and time-serving church, he would never have made such humiliating and damaging admissions. And this lack of scriptural authority for Sunday-keeping, together with the plea of "expediency" marks it as a child of the Papacy; not that it was *begotten* by the man of sin, for, as we have seen, it was a heathen festival long before there was such a thing as the Papacy; but that it was early adopted by the mystery of iniquity, and given a place in the Christian Church which rightfully belonged to another day, namely, the seventh, the one specified in the fourth commandment.

But what especially marks the Sunday Sabbath as the child of the Roman Church, is the fact that it was a Roman Catholic Council that first decreed that it should be kept instead of the ancient Sabbath. Upon this point Rev. Mr. James, in addressing the University at Oxford, said:—

When the practice of keeping Saturday Sabbaths, which had become so general at the close of this [the third] century, was evidently gaining ground in the Eastern church, a decree was passed in the council held at Laodicea [A. D. 364] "that members of the church should not rest from work on the Sabbath, like Jews, but should labor on that day, and preferring in honor the Lord's day, then if it be in their power should rest from work as Christians."

William Prynne, famous in the history of English Puritanism, also says:—

It is certain that Christ himself, his apostles, and the primitive Christians, for some good space of time, did constantly observe the seventh-day Sabbath, . . . the evangelists and St. Luke in the Acts ever styling it the Sabbath day, . . . and making mention of its . . . solemnization by the apostles and other Christians, . . . it being still solemnized by many Christians after the apostles' times, even till the Council of Laodicea [A. D. 364], as ecclesiastical writers and the twenty-ninth canon of that council testify, which runs

thus: "Because Christians ought not to Judaize, and to rest in the Sabbath, but to work in that day [which many did refuse at that time to do]. But preferring in honor the Lord's day [there being then a great controversy among Christians which of these two days . . . should have precedency]; if they desired to rest they should do this as Christians. Wherefore if they shall be found to Judaize, let them be accused from Christ."

The seventh-day Sabbath was . . . solemnized by Christ, the apostles, and primitive Christians, till the Laodicean Council did in a manner quite abolish the observation of it. . . . The Council of Laodicea . . . first settled the observation of the Lord's day, and prohibited . . . the keeping of the Jewish Sabbath under an anathema.

Of the effects of the decree of this council, John Ley, another old English writer, speaks thus:—

From the apostles' time to the Council of Laodicea, which was about the year 364, the holy observation of the Jews' Sabbath continued, as may be proved out of many authors; yea, notwithstanding the decree of that council against it.

About the year 468 or 469 A. D., Pope Leo issued the following decree:—

WE ORDAIN, according to the true meaning of the Holy Ghost, and of the apostles as thereby directed, that on the sacred day [Sunday] wherein our own integrity was restored, all do rest and cease from labor.

It was thus that the voluntary custom of a *portion* of the Church was made universal and enforced upon the whole Church; and thus it was that what Neander calls a "transfer of the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday" was made, and a "divine command" for its observance established. So far, then, as giving it the authority of the Church, and by it displacing the seventh day, the man of sin, the Papacy, the Roman Catholic Church, while yet in its nonage, or minority, did change the Sabbath; and to assert this is no greater inaccuracy of language, even, than to say that the "Father of his country," while yet a child ruined his father's cherry tree. At the time of that occurrence he was not the "Father of his country," but his identity never changed; the incident was true of the individual and no change of name or title could separate the fact from him. C. P. B.

Put None too Strong.

THE fourth section of the pronouncement of the Society of Christian Endeavor of Oakland, California, is thus quoted by the *Times* of that city:—

The largest liberty that we can have is a product of personal restraint along certain lines. The State is an organic community, whose mission is wrought out under the moral Governor of the universe. It is responsible to him in the same sense as is the individual. God established the Sabbath day. The Nation as such, being responsible to him, must recognize that day. License is not liberty. True liberty gives us protection and the privilege of working out a moral mission. The Sabbath day is fundamental to the conditions which are essential to the highest citizenship. To do away with the Sabbath day does away with a sense of moral responsibility. To do away with moral responsibility does away with any consideration of the rights of others. And when our fellow-men no longer consider our rights we are surrounded by barbarism

and anarchy. Remember France and her Revolution.

Upon this our contemporary comments thus pertinently, and withal pungently:—

Herein is contained an excellent exposition of the Puritanical spirit that allowed the "largest liberty" to the witches, Quakers, and Baptists of Salem by compelling "personal restraint" by means of the gibbet, the pillory, and the ducking-stool. The bigots, who, when they landed at Plymouth Rock "first fell upon their knees and then upon the aborigines," also believed that "the State (as organized by themselves) is an organic community, whose mission is wrought under the moral Governor of the universe." Acting upon this idea they proceeded to the building of a jail in which to imprison all who did not acknowledge their "responsibility" to the particular God worshiped by the jail builders. Then these refugees from the persecutions of another sort of bigotry, built a church in which they preached that "God established the Sabbath day." Whereupon those who, searching for the truth, made inquiry, "Which God—which Sabbath?" were promptly landed in the jail, exposed in the pillory, ducked in the horse pond, or hanged by the neck. The same spirit prevails in the effort to close the gates of the World's Fair on Sunday, but the power to inflict injury upon those who oppose the "true liberty" which "gives us protection and the privilege of working out a moral mission" and which has never, when opportunity afforded, had "any consideration for the rights of others," is lacking. Their "fellow-men no longer consider their right" to jail, pillory, duck, and hang. They are surrounded by the "barbarism" of common sense and the "anarchy" which emanates from the principle that every man shall be allowed to worship his own god, in the way that best pleases him, on the day he sees fit to set apart for this purpose.

Intolerance and persecution are the necessary and legitimate fruit of the assumption that political parties and civil governments are charged with the responsibility of enforcing any part of the divine law. The *Times* has put it in none too strong a light.

Prayer and Petitions.

MRS. J. C. BATEHAM, National Superintendent of the Sabbath Observance Department of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, sends out the following:—

The week of prayer for Sabbath observance from April 4 to 11, should receive special attention, as it comes about the time the Exposition question is to be settled, and the World's Sabbath Prayer Union of all lands will join with us in putting this as the foremost topic. Make it as much a point to secure the church prayer meetings as the sermons. Get both in every church, if possible, and also introduce our leaflets in the Sabbath schools. Public meetings, prayer meetings in the Unions, private prayers, and a large use of literature should also emphasize the week.

In line with the same work the President of the Indiana Woman's Christian Temperance Union advises the local unions in that State thus:—

The circulation of petitions will be a very important part of our work, and I hope that every Union in the State will see to the circulation of the petitions in regard to the Sunday closing of the Columbian Exposition. Be sure to get the indorsement of every public assembly, if possible; and the names of all persons in your locality. As the question whether the Exposition is to be closed will be decided next April, we have no time to lose.

As these good women pray and petition,

it may be that God will open the eyes of some of them to see the great error of trying to secure the legal enforcement of Sunday, or any other religious observance.

A. O. TAIT.

Sunday at the World's Fair.

WHAT is the duty of the State in this matter? Clearly, to do whatever conserves the welfare of the majority of the people. The minority have the right to stay away from the Exposition on Sunday, but they have no right to throw obstacles in the way of a majority by influencing popular sentiment or securing legislative enactments to prevent them from enjoying that day in whatever way they may see fit, provided they do not infringe on the rights of the minority."—*Elizabeth Cady Stanton, in North American Review.*

The Exposition and Ideal Christianity.

It is claimed that there are over thirteen million Protestant church members in this country; and, professedly in their interest, National Reformers demand with the emphasis of a threatened boycott that the World's Exposition at Chicago be closed on Sundays. Such a threat unmasks the selfish persecuting spirit of this "civil Sabbath" fraud. It is a fraud because the spirit that animates it is, though professedly religious, antagonistic to the spirit of the gospel of Christ. It does not propose to "persuade men . . . by the meekness and gentleness of Christ" to obey what they believe to be a precept of the laws of God, but, by the lash of civil penalty to force the unwilling into a semblance of obedience. These zealots only lack the power of Nebuchadnezzar to resort to the stringent measures of that heathen ruler. See Dan. 3:19, 20.

Should the gates of the Exposition be closed on Sunday as the result of ecclesiastical interposition what will be gained to the cause of Christianity? Manifestly nothing; but, rather, an irreparable loss to the popular churches at least, for the multitudes of all nationalities gathered there will not be long in learning *why* the gates are closed against them, and *by whom*. Will such a consideration attract them to the churches to hear the gospel? Will it not rather create in them a hatred toward the churches and a determined purpose to avoid them? Such is human nature.

Turned away from the Exposition, and into the streets of the great city, the saloons and beer gardens will be filled to overflowing in spite of an army of police, and the city will soon be glad to open the Exposition and welcome excursion trains and boats on Sunday to absorb its surplus population and drain off its pent up social miasm. On the other hand, were the churches to adopt God's plan of winning by moral suasion and the power of example, how different the result might be.

In imagination I see a Hindu, a Chinaman, a Persian, and a Turk, walking through the Exposition buildings on Sunday, in company with an interpreter, when the following dialogue takes place:

Hindu.—"Why is it that we see less people here to-day than on other days, and many of the stalls closed?"

Interpreter.—"It is because there are millions of people in this country, and thousands of them in this city, who keep Sunday, thinking it to be the Sabbath, or holy time, and therefore not one of them is here to-day."

Turk.—"Allah is great! But what kind of people are they?"

Interpreter.—"They are a very good people. They are every one of them honest; they pay their meat bills, their grocery bills, their milk bills, their rent bills, and all other debts; and if one of their number is too poor to do it, his more fortunate brethren help him."

Chinaman.—"How much like the great Confucius. Tell some more."

Interpreter.—"Yes, I can tell you more. They do not smoke nor chew tobacco nor opium, nor take snuff. They do not drink whiskey, nor use intoxicating wine even at the communion table. Their women dress plainly, do not 'bang' their hair, nor wear earrings or finger rings. I can tell you they are a marvel of sweetness, of grace, and of beauty. When you go into their mosques, or Joss houses, which they call churches, you will observe that 'the rich and the poor meet together,' and no caste is observable."

Persian.—"And where do they learn all these excellent things? They must have a sacred book, more excellent than the zend."

Interpreter.—"Yes, they have; it is called the Bible."

All.—"We remember to have seen it offered to the people in our own country and in our own languages, but we spurned it. Now, however, we are resolved as soon as we reach home to procure a copy of the wonderful book and read it. But are these Christian people the same that send missionaries into our countries?"

Interpreter.—"Yes, the very same."

All.—"Please conduct us at once to one of their temples where we can learn more of this wonderful people."

But I have drawn a pen picture of an ideal Christianity in the popular churches. Ministers and people committed to the scheme of National Reform, so-called, do not, in a general sense, possess the power of a godly example, the fruit of a holy life, as their practices and confessions show, of sufficient potency to win the respect of intelligent observers, or to attract the masses to the sanctuary; and they must needs arm themselves with civil power to supply the deficiency, and to silence the reprover.

The closing of the Exposition is only a means to such an end. The animus of the scheme is too poorly concealed to deceive the observing.

A. SMITH.

Grandville, Mich.

Wrongly Educated.

THE German Emperor is credited with using these words in a recent speech:—

The people need not care for party squabbling and chattering; I go my way, and that is the right way. We are in a state of transition and destined for great things. I'll conduct you into splendid times; and those who will not help me may as well shake German dust from their feet. I ask you to confide in me and help me.

"That," comments the *Catholic Review*, is the land where compulsory education has been in force for more than a century, where every man and woman can read and write, and where very many thousands—more thousands than there are hundreds in other lands—have taken degrees at the universities. And yet the sum and substance of all this is a system of government in which a comparatively young man without much political experience of the world other than that gained in the officers' quarters of a German military post, is able to tell the German people that they must confide in him, and follow him, or else quit their fatherland and go into exile.

The trouble is not that the people of Germany are educated, but that they are educated upon wrong principles. The religion in which they are instructed is State made and State taught. The result is a generation of practical infidels. The German Emperor should make men of his subjects by throwing them upon their own resources, instead of teaching them to look to the State for everything, including their religion, State made, and ready to be put on like a coat or a pair of gloves.

Emulate Only Their Virtues.

THE venerable Dr. Cuyler has this to say for the Puritans:—

"In these degenerate days, when many a church member commences God's day by wading through twenty pages of politics and sporting news and scandals from the 'Satanic press,' and goes to church to grumble if a sermon is over twenty-five minutes, and if the quartette music is not up to opera pitch, and then comes home to his big dinner and his sofa; in these days of self-indulgence and luxury, we are tempted to cry out, Oh, for a revival of the grand old spirit of the Puritans! With all its rigors, life to them was full of honest enjoyment. Their simple tastes were easily gratified. Their stern virtues were sweetened by domestic love. Their grace grew by hard toil and close companionship with God, and on the rugged, storm-swept hills of New England was produced the most significant manhood our country has ever seen."

Certainly there was much to be admired in Puritan character, and it would be well if there were in the world to-day more of the sturdy Puritan spirit so far as a recognition of personal obligation to God is concerned; but spare us the Puritan disposition to coerce others in matters of religious faith and practice. The more religion a man has for himself the better; but the less he attempts to compel others to have, the greater will the influence of his own be. Let us emulate the virtues but avoid the errors of the Puritans.

ANARCHY is opposition to all law; not resistance to an unjust law.

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.

WHAT is the meaning of a bill in the Legislature, at Albany, to make "Good Friday" a legal holiday?

LAW and Order Agent McClure, of Pittsburg is still busy filing informations against news dealers and news agents for the Sunday selling of newspapers in Pittsburg. His list for Sunday, March 13, contained twelve names.

THE New Jersey State Legislature has passed a concurrent resolution asking the World's Fair Commissioners to close the Fair on Sunday. Senator Hinchcliffe of Passaic seemed to be the only New Jersey legislator who appreciated the impropriety of any such legislative expression.

MARY T. LATHRAP, President, and Emma A. Wheeler, Secretary, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Michigan, have addressed Mrs. Palmer, Superintendent of the Woman's Department at the World's Fair, "in behalf of twelve thousand white-ribbon women of Michigan," urging that the Exposition should be closed on Sunday. The petition was referred to the Director General of the Exposition with Mrs. Palmer's "official indorsement;" which means, of course, that the head of the Woman's department expresses her official approval of Sunday closing by authority.

IN the New York Legislature Senator O'Connor, who is a Roman Catholic, and the only one on the Republican side of the Senate, took part in the discussion of the resolution for the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, and expressed just and unprejudiced views in showing that it was inconsistent to demand that the Fair should be kept closed on Sunday, while no respect was shown to Saturday which was to some the sacred day of the week. He thought the Hebrews of this country were as much entitled to be considered in this question as the Christians. To pass the resolution would be to inject religion into legislation and to this he strongly objected. The day seems to have come when the Protestants are more pronounced Papists than the Roman Catholics themselves.

AN incident in Burlington, New Jersey, lately reported to the *Union Signal*, marks the progress of ecclesiastical influence in municipal affairs. The correspondent says:—

The acting mayor gave permission to hold a Sun-

day concert in the opera house. The ministers, by telegram ordered the mayor-elect home, and entered their protest. The mayor after looking up the law, found such concerts to be a "willful misdemeanor," and consequently prohibited the sale of tickets. This is a point we should "make note of," that, *law can be enforced if there is power behind the law to enforce it.*

The calm way in which it is said the ministers by telegram "ordered" the actual mayor home, shows an assumption of authority over municipal officers and municipal affairs as a ministerial prerogative which is quite startling.

IN reference to the Pittsburg Law and Order suits the evening *Leader* of that city says:—

Judge Porter this morning rendered a decision affirming the finding of Alderman Rohe in the law and Order suits against Sunday newspapers, and thereby laying down the law that the Sunday press is not even a "reasonable necessity," as counsel for the appellants ably sought to demonstrate.

We presume that Judge Porter has acted according to his lights, such as they are, and we have no criticism to offer concerning the type of judicial acumen that can recognize the limited enactment of 1794 as totally obliterating the reasonable privileges of half a million of citizens in 1892.

Suffice it to say that the Sunday newspapers, relying on the justice of their cause, will appeal to the Supreme Court of the State for a decision that will be conclusive. If it should appear from the fiat of that tribunal that the application of the Blue Laws has expanded on the principle of progressive harassment so as to include the needs of later generations in the same category with the things which were not necessities a hundred years ago, it will then remain only to apply to the Legislature and prove by the repeal of the act of 1794 the folly of its oppressive enforcement.

The courts of Pennsylvania have so far held strictly to the spirit of the colonial church and State laws on these questions. It will be a laying aside of precedent, out of respect to principle, scarcely to be expected, if the Supreme Court of the State should declare the law of 1794 unconstitutional, as it is, in that it gives preference by law to certain religious establishments and modes of worship.

WHILE the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia was being discussed in the House on March 2, and the item of five hundred dollars towards the support of St. Joseph's Asylum was under consideration, Mr. Cate, of Arkansas, expressed these convictions:—

In my political and religious education I have been taught to believe that the Church and the State should be kept entirely apart. I do not know that this particular institution belongs to any church, nor do I care, but I am told that in this bill there are numerous institutions provided for, which are under the care of different religious denominations and are here asking aid of the Government under the guise of charity. Now, Mr. Chairman, my idea is that we ought to have charitable institutions. No gentleman goes beyond me in a disposition to provide for the poor and needy and the suffering, but if the Government must do that work, let it do it through the instrumentality of government officers, and not through the agency of the churches. For that reason, sir, I oppose not only this item, but every provision in this bill which recognizes any church or seeks to aid any institution that is not under the control of the Government. Charity does not and should not percolate through the walls of the public treasury. Then let the churches and the private charitable institutions of the country go on in their noble work, blessing those that give and those that receive, while the Government, aiding none, protecting all, should return to its primitive and proper mission of extending "equal and exact justice to all and special privileges to none."

Such views as these are wholesome, they are satisfactory evidence that the political salt of this country has not yet entirely lost its savor. The continued introduction of religious questions into congressional debates, shows, however, a greater need for its saving qualities than ever before.

DURING the discussion upon the item in the Indian Appropriation bill of an allowance to Captain R. H. Pratt, for services as Superintendent of the Carlisle Indian school, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Mansur, of Missouri, said:—

I think, sir, the Catholic Church can not do anything better, in the way of exercising its great political power in this Nation, than to demand the absolute removal of Captain Pratt. The insult is greater to that church than it is to myself.

This refers to a published interview in the *Washington Post*, in which Captain Pratt was made to say of the attacks in the House upon the Indian appropriations that,—

They were made through the Catholic Church, in paying congressmen to attack the national schools, because they are detrimental to their parochial schools, which are given three times the amount by the Government that other denominations receive.

Mr. Mansur's estimate of the comparative worth of congressional and Catholic honor is too modest. To say that a congressman has received bribes from the Catholic Church is not a less insult to him than to that church in which Jesuitical methods have always been practiced. But the item of interest in this is the unqualified statement by a representative in Congress that the Catholic Church has "great political power in this Nation," and his advice to that church to use it "to demand the absolute removal" of a Government officer of acknowledged ability from a responsible position. The reading between the lines of this discussion is that ecclesiasticism is already the power behind the congressman's chair in the halls of Government, and that to maintain its place there it does not need to use a money bribe.

AGAIN upon the following day the discussion of the statements made by Captain Pratt was resumed. Telegrams were read from Captain Pratt, disclaiming any personal attack upon Congressmen, but reiterating the charges as to political manipulation by the lobby of the Catholic Church. Mr. Beltzhoover, of Pennsylvania, said in reference to the reply received by himself to telegraphic questions put to the Captain,—

It expressly disclaims all intention of impeaching the integrity of any member of Congress or attributing to him any improper motives for his conduct. It states as a fact that the Catholics receive a disproportionate share of public school appropriations, and that they maintain a powerful lobby at the national capitol, and manipulate politics to accomplish their purposes. . . . I can see very plainly that as a matter of expediency, and also, perhaps, of propriety, Captain Pratt was unwise and unfortunate in indulging in such public and emphatic expressions of these opinions on a question that must of necessity excite bitter feeling and discussion. *This country guarantees freedom of speech, but it is unprofitable for a public servant to indulge in the luxury.*

I have known Captain Pratt for many years as an earnest, enthusiastic, and scholarly gentleman, who has given a large portion of his life to the education and civilization of the Indians. He is an ardent, honest, and untiring official, and has been largely instrumental in building up the school at Carlisle.

Mr. Dickerson.—But does not the gentleman think that he ought to be turned out for his aspersions on the church without regard to what he may have said as to any individual?

The appropriation of one thousand dollars for the Superintendent of the Indian school at Carlisle was stricken from the bill; and that is what it cost Captain Pratt to say what might have been verified by every member of the House by referring to the records, and consulting any unprejudiced person conversant with the congressional lobbies. Certainly the exercise of his right of freedom of speech was unprofitable to this public servant. Why?

UNDER the head "Abolition of Sunday Shaving," the *Sun*, of March 16, has the following editorial item:—

"There is a man in the Legislature of this State named Listman—Adam C. Listman, of Syracuse—a Republican Assemblyman of the Third Assembly district of Onondaga County. This gentleman has introduced a bill which has been sent to us from Albany in its printed form, and we copy it exactly as it is printed:—

"An act making it a misdemeanor for any person to carry on the business of barbering on Sunday in the State of New York.



NEW YORK, MARCH 24, 1892

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 Russian Government seems to hesitate to go to absolute extremes in its warfare on the Protestants of the Baltic provinces. In the matter of reducing the theological school at Dorpot to a mere academy, or of transferring it to some smaller town, the ministry committee has advised delay.

"THE time has come," says the *Christian Nation*, "when the people of this land can bear to have loyalty to Christ preached to them, even to the point of being urged to protest against, and dissent from, a Constitution that does not own Christ's authority and law. That is a sign that it is now time for us to preach the principle with its practical application."

How the National Reformers, who have always refused to own allegiance to this Government, can make their "protest against, and their dissent from," the Constitution any more practical than it has been in the past is hard to imagine, unless they appeal to the bullets which they long ago threatened; or possibly, they propose voluntary exile. They have in the past suggested that course to all atheists—including Seventh-day Baptists. But it seems improbable that the National Reformers have come to the point of being willing to take their own medicine. They want more room; but their instincts lead them to seek it not by getting out, but by crowding out. Therefore, in all probability, God will suffer National Reformers to dwell in the land until sin and sinners are together blotted out by his almighty power, to make way for the everlasting kingdom of Christ, which the Lord, and not men, will establish.

THE plea that Sunday laws are not religious, and that they are designed only to preserve the "Civil Sabbath," that is to guarantee to all men the right to rest one day in seven, is disproved not only by the decision of courts, as shown in these columns last week, but by their practical workings as well.

THE cases of the five men recently indicted in Henry County, Tennessee, whose names we published last week, corrobo-

rates the evidence of the Supreme Courts of several of the States that Sunday laws are religious and that such is their purpose.

THE writer is personally acquainted with all of these men and knows them to be not only honest, industrious citizens but pious men, members of a Christian Church; whose lives are above reproach where they are known, except as concerning the law of God, which they understand differently from the majority of their neighbors.

THE men referred to are members of the Springville Seventh-day Adventist Church. Three of them hold official positions in the church, two being elders and one a deacon; and each of the five is a man whose "word is as good as his bond." The writer has it directly from a member of the Presbyterian Church, a business man who knows all these men, that any of them would be trusted by any merchant who knows them to any amount that they might ask; for they are known to be scrupulously honest.

ANOTHER circumstance which has a bearing upon the merits of this case is that these men are all farmers, all living where they could not possibly disturb anybody by their Sunday work, except mentally; and all but one living where such work would not be likely to be observed, unless people went out of their way to note it and be annoyed by it.

THE indictment against these men is for maintaining a nuisance by their Sunday work. The facts stated show that this could not be true in any proper or reasonable sense of that term. If the work complained of had been done in a village and had been of a noisy character, such as to really disturb people who desired quiet, there might be some excuse for calling it a nuisance; but in this case there is none. The only possible annoyance is a disturbed state of mind such as might be occasioned in a Protestant by seeing his Catholic neighbor going to mass or confession; or to a pedo-baptist by hearing a Baptist deny the validity of sprinkling. These indictments are clearly inspired only by religious intolerance. So far as known the men indicted are without personal enemies; they are hated only because of their religion; and their prosecution is simply persecution for conscience' sake.

C. P. B.

APROPOS of the article on another page on the change of the Sabbath, is the following letter from Cardinal Gibbons, kindly furnished to us by a friend:—

Cardinal's Residence.
Baltimore.

Feb. 25, 1892.

JNO. R. ASHLEY, Esq.—*Dear Sir*: In answer to your first question, directed by the Cardinal to reply to your letter, I will say—"Who Changed the

Sabbath?" *Answer*—The Holy Catholic Church. 2nd. "Are Protestants following the Bible or the Holy Catholic Church, in keeping Sunday?" *Answer*—The Protestants are following the custom introduced by the Holy Catholic Church. 3rd. The Protestants do contradict themselves by keeping the Sunday and at the same time professing to be guided by the Bible only. I am,

Faithfully yours,

C. F. THOMAS, Chancellor.

This letter from the Cardinal, which, however, contains nothing new, is simply a plea of "guilty" to the prophetic charge made in Dan. 7:25:—

And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws.

Prophecy foretold that the Papacy would do these things; history testifies that it has done them; and now that power pleads guilty to that part of the charge that relates to thinking to change the law of God. What is yet lacking to secure a conviction in any candid mind?

THE *Voice* complains that copies of that paper, paid for from a fund provided for that purpose, and sent to farmers who are desirous of receiving it, are not delivered but are held by the postmasters who send the publishers the usual notification cards, marked, "fail to receive it," "do not want it," "refuse to take it out of the office," etc, and that consequently the paper remains "dead" in the offices. The *Voice* claims to have letters from over one hundred different men whom postmasters have reported as refusing the paper, saying that they never refused it, but on the contrary, wish it continued. These letters are from twenty-five different offices, thus involving twenty-five postmasters in serious difficulty if justice is done. Such a censorship of the mails ought not to be tolerated in this country.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has introduced a bill into the House of Lords authorizing Church courts to dismiss from their livings clergymen who are convicted of drunkenness, felony, or other immoralities. What a commentary is such a bill on a Church and State system!

I CONSIDER the Government of the United States as interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions.—*Thomas Jefferson*.

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 City.