



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

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, MARCH 31, 1892.

NUMBER 13.

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 cry of "anarchy" raised in Pittsburg, referred to elsewhere in this paper, is an ominous sign of the times. It indicates that we are entering upon an era in this country when, as never before in our history, the inquiry will not be, what is right? but, what is the law?

ANARCHY is defined to be "political confusion" and an anarchist is "one who seeks to overturn by violence all constituted forms and institutions of society and government, all law and order, and all rights of property, with no purpose of establishing any other system of order in the place of that destroyed." It is evident, therefore, that opposition to unjust laws is not anarchy, nor are those who disobey such laws anarchists in any proper sense of the word.

DANIEL and his three companions refused obedience to unjust and tyrannical laws; but they were not anarchists. Peter and John disobeyed the magistrates when commanded not to speak any more in the name of Jesus; but they were not anarchists. Time would fail even to mention the prominent martyrs that disobeyed law that they might obey God, and not one of them was an anarchist. John Bunyan resolutely refused to obey the law of England which required him to attend the services of the established Church; but he was not an anarchist. Neither were the Baptists and Quakers of New England anarchists though they persistently disobeyed law and suffered the most shameful indignities rather than surrender even to the civil law their God-given rights.

Bigotry and intolerance, entrenched in iniquitous laws, may shout, "anarchy," and talk loftily about the sacredness of law, and the duty to obey magistrates, but inalienable right justifies resistance when laws trespass upon the sacred domain of conscience, or exact recognition of those things which in their very nature and design are outside the jurisdiction of human government.

The Breckinridge Sunday Bill.

As previously noted in these columns, the Breckinridge Sunday Bill for the District of Columbia, introduced in the Fifty-first Congress, by Representative W. C. P. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, has been, by the same gentleman, re-introduced in the Fifty-second Congress. The bill is as follows:—

A BILL

TO PREVENT PERSONS FROM BEING FORCED TO
LABOR ON SUNDAY.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be unlawful for any person or corporation, or employe of any person or corporation, in the District of Columbia, to perform any secular labor or business, or to cause the same to be performed by any person in their employment on Sunday, except works of necessity or mercy; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or services performed or rendered in violation of this act.

Any person or corporation, or employe of any person or corporation, in the District of Columbia, who shall violate the provisions of this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than one hundred dollars for every such offense: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this act shall not be construed to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day of the week than Sunday as a day of rest.

It will be observed that the title of this bill is misleading. It is styled, "A bill to prevent persons from being forced to labor on Sunday in the District of Columbia," the body of the bill, however, says nothing on that subject, but only proposes to fine any one who labors on Sunday whether he wants to do so or not. It would be equally as appropriate to frame

"a bill to prevent kidnapping" and then provide, not for punishing the kidnappers, but, for fining any one who should be kidnapped.

The design of this bill is not to "prevent persons from being forced to labor on Sunday" but to prevent them from laboring on that day when they want to. At the hearing on this bill before the House Committee on the District of Columbia Feb. 18, 1890, an effort was made to show that it was demanded by organized labor; but one, Mr. Hobbs, Chief Officer of the Knights of Labor in the District of Columbia, appeared before the committee and said:—

I want to deny that the Knights of Labor have authorized anybody to speak for them in this particular matter. Mr. Crafts came before the Federation of Labor and argued this bill, and that body refused to indorse the bill. He came before the District Assembly of the Knights of Labor (which is made up of all the Knights of Labor of the Assemblies of the District of Columbia), and that body has refused to indorse it. There are parties in that body who believe in the bill as it is; others believe in a certain portion of it, and others are wholly opposed to it; and the Knights of Labor, as a whole, have thought best not to have anything to do with it. Every Knight of Labor is in favor of a day of rest—some of them believe that they ought to have two days of rest. . . . They do not believe in working on Sunday, but as for the other feature of the bill, they think it best not to appear here in favor of it; and I believe there is quite a lot of the members of the Order who believe that if they want rest on Sunday—or any other day—they can get it through their labor organizations, and that it is best not to try to get it through Congress by a sort of a church movement.

Nobody in the District of Columbia is forced to labor on a day that he regards as sacred—to be kept holy unto the Lord—any more than he is forced to steal, or do any other wrong act, that at the time might appear to be for his financial benefit. Men *may* lose employment* by refusing to work on Sunday, but they may also lose

*Rev. W. F. Crafts, the author of the "Sabbath for Man," "Addresses on the Civil Sabbath," etc., in the latter work says: "I have searched the world over in vain for an affirmative answer to the question, Did you ever know a man financially ruined by refusing to do Sunday work? I have found scores of instances where courageous conscientiousness in this matter led to promotion, none where it led to poverty." Thus, Mr. Crafts himself being the witness, it appears that no man is compelled even by circumstances to work on Sunday.

money by not helping themselves to it when they have an opportunity.

But nobody thinks of entitling a bill to punish theft, "A bill to prevent persons from being forced to steal." And why not?—Simply because it is perfectly proper to forbid and punish stealing, and it is not necessary to cover up the real design of a law for that purpose; but the doubt in the American mind, as to the propriety of bolstering up religious institutions by civil law, makes it necessary to disguise a law the purpose of which is to require of every individual, within its jurisdiction, a measure of religious observance.

Sunday is by many regarded as a holy day, and that is why laws are demanded forbidding secular labor and business upon it. This is stated as a truism by Hon. J. T. Ringgold of the Baltimore Bar in "Law of Sunday." He says:—

1. Sunday is a holy day. 2. The holiness of Sunday is to be recognized by remaining idle on that day; and not so to remain is to be immoral. 3. Sunday idleness is enforced as a religious [Christian] duty in the individual.

And to a belief of these propositions is properly attributable every Sunday law that ever was enacted with the exception of that by Constantine, in 321 A. D., which edict seems to have been solely in honor of the sun god. Mr. Breckinridge's bill ought to be entitled, "A bill to require everybody to manifest some regard for Sunday as a religious institution whether they so regard it or not."

The original Sabbath is a memorial of the creation. Its intelligent observance is a recognition of God as the Creator of the heavens and the earth. It pertains solely to our recognition of God. 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, as Mr. Ringgold confesses, to require the observance of a religious institution. This, Congress has no right to do in the District of Columbia or anywhere else.

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." To make any law whatever requiring any measure of religious observance would abridge the free exercise of religion, for one is not free to do that which he must do. To be free to do, one must be equally free not to do. That conception of religious liberty which defines it as "freedom to worship God according to the dictates of a right conscience" is misleading and dangerous. The original American doctrine is, that in all matters of religion the individual

should be left absolutely free in the sense of being equally at liberty either to worship or to neglect to worship. This freedom is taken away when men are required to observe, in any measure, a religious institution. The Breckinridge Sunday bill would, therefore, be entirely out of place upon our statute books. C. P. B.

Are Tennessee Sunday Laws Religious?

In his "Law of Sunday," on page 84, Mr. Ringgold says:—

The historical fact is, of course, just as well known to the pundits of the bench as to other scholars, that the Sunday laws were intended by those who passed them as the assertion of a religious dogma, and designed to force an external compliance with a portion of their ritual upon those who did not believe in the dogma or approve the ceremonial; that the men who concocted such laws were religious enthusiasts, and not physiologists.

The original act of 1741, upon which the present Sunday law of Tennessee is based is, then, the assertion of a religious dogma and designed to enforce a compliance with some requirement of an ecclesiastical ritual upon those who protest against submitting to such requirement. This is well borne out by the language of the statute which says that "all and every person and persons whatsoever, shall on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, *carefully apply themselves to the duties of religion and piety.*"

The evident religious intent of this statute is also upheld by judicial opinion in one of the early recorded Tennessee cases brought under it, where the judge said, "*The professed object of this statute was to further the observance of the Sabbath day, pursuant to the spirit of its original institution.*"

The dogma to be enforced upon all, irrespective of difference of belief, or entire unbelief, is, then, that the day "commonly called Sunday" is the Lord's day, or "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," and the portion of the ritual to which compulsory observance is to be had is that of cessation from all labor and amusement upon that day, that it may be remembered "pursuant to the spirit of its original institution," which is, according to the statute, by application to the duties of religion and piety. In conformity with this Judge Green said, in the case of the State *vs.* Eskridge, in 1852, "The object of the Legislature was to prevent the *desecration* of a day, which, by our law, is *dedicated* to the duties of religion." Again, in 1857, Judge McKinney quoted the same expression as authority for a decision made by him. In 1872 Judge Nicholson says, in *Williams vs. the State*, "The statute under which the indictment was framed, was intended to prevent the *desecration* of the Sabbath. . . . It is intended to punish those who sell, . . . those who *desecrate* the Sabbath." In 1878 Judge Deaderick says that "flagrant vio-

lations of the Sabbath day do tend to debauch public morals." The same Judge in another decision in 1886 says further, "The statute makes it unlawful for anyone of the enumerated classes to follow his ordinary secular avocation on the Sabbath day, because it is immoral."

All these judicial expressions are unimpeachable witnesses to the truth of Mr. Ringgold's statement that Sunday laws were intended to be an assertion of a religious dogma and were framed for the purpose of enforcing an external compliance with the dogma and ceremonial of Sunday observance upon those who do not believe in it. More than this, they prove that the judicial expressions and decisions of the present time are inspired by the same spirit which dictated the ancient statute. Indeed, it is nowhere denied in any of these decisions that their purpose is to enforce a religious tenet, but rather affirmed. They go upon the assumption that cessation from all labor or amusement, unmitigated idleness in fact, must be enforced on Sunday. Why? Because idleness on Sunday is a tenet of Christianity, and Christianity is a part of the common law, which has been absorbed into our law, and being thus incorporated this part of the common law antedates the constitutional guarantees of religious liberty in these United States, and these guarantees must therefore be construed with reference to the more ancient principles of English law. Therefore, putting this construction upon the relation of the theory that Christianity was part of the law of England, and the constitutional limitations imposed in this country, the legislatures of the different States, and for that matter, the Congress of the United States, are not restrained from making all the laws any religionist desires for the enforcement of any religion which may make apparent to them its right to the title of Christianity, or which may commonly pass by that name.

The case of R. M. King, of Tennessee, with which the readers of THE SENTINEL are familiar, adds to this unanswerable evidence that the Sunday laws of Tennessee are religious laws, and never were intended for anything else than to enforce the observance of a religious dogma and ceremonial upon those who were unwilling to yield this obedience. Five more men of similar character and faith with R. M. King have been indicted in Henry County, Tennessee, upon a like charge. In none of these cases is there a shadow of reason for the course taken against them except that of difference of religious belief as to which day of the week should be observed as holy time. In view of these prosecutions, as well as those which are yet to come, the discussion of the religious laws of Tennessee, which has been running through these columns for some weeks, will be found particularly pertinent.

W. H. M.

Constantine's Sunday Law.

AN interesting question is raised in the *Christian Statesman*, of March 19, in reference to the nature of Constantine's Sunday edict of March 7, A. D. 321, which runs thus:—

Let all judges, inhabitants of the cities, and artificers, rest on the venerable day of the sun. But husbandmen may freely and at their pleasure apply to the business of agriculture, since it often happens that the sowing of grain and the planting of vines can not be so advantageously performed on any other day; lest, by neglecting the opportunity, they should lose the benefits which the divine bounty bestows upon us.

It will be observed that the term used to designate the day is, "The venerable day of the sun," a heathen title. It is said by some that Constantine issued the edict "to please the Church." It is positive, however, that the law itself furnishes no evidence of this. Indeed, it is very doubtful if at that time the day had come to be regarded as sacred in any higher sense than Christmas, Good Friday, and other days are now regarded. Many Christians at that time probably attached to it some such reverence, but making it a Sabbath, to say nothing of *the* Sabbath, was an afterthought.

It is assumption, pure and simple, that Constantine had in his edict any reference whatever to the regard entertained for the day by Christians. Bingham, in his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," book 20, chapter 2, testifies that "the old Roman laws exempted the festivals of the heathen from all judicial business." In his "History of Christianity," book 3, chapter 1, Millman says:—

The rescript, indeed, for the religious observance of the Sunday, which enjoined the suspension of all public business and private labor, except that of agriculture, was enacted, according to the apparent terms of the decree, for the whole Roman Empire. Yet, unless we had *direct proof* that the decree set forth the Christian reason of the sanctity of the day, it may be doubted whether the act would not be received by the greater part of the empire as merely *adding one more festival* to the festi of the empire, as proceeding entirely from the will of the emperor, or even grounded on his authority as supreme pontiff, by which he had the plenary power of appointing holy days. In fact, as we have before observed, the day of the sun would be willingly hallowed by almost all the pagan world, especially that part which had admitted any tendency toward the oriental theology.

To the same intent Edward V. Neal, in "Feasts and Fasts," page 6, says: "Before the age of Augustus the number of days upon which, out of reverence to the gods to whom they were consecrated, no trials could take place at Rome, had become a source upon which the wealthy criminal could speculate as a means of evading justice." This being true it is certainly not necessary to suppose that Constantine's edict had any reference whatever to anything except the fact that Sunday was dedicated to his protector, his tutelary deity, the sun. Of Constantine's devotion to the sun god, Gibbon says:—

The devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly

directed to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be represented with the symbols of the god of light and poetry. . . . The altars of Apollo were crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine; and the credulous multitude were taught to believe that the emperor was permitted to behold with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tutelary deity. . . . The sun was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine.

Again, the manner of observing days sacred to heathen deities was so very similar to that enjoined by Constantine's Sunday law that no one can fail to see that the edict was purely pagan. On this point Mr. Neal says:—

The practice of abstaining from various sorts of labor upon days consecrated by religious observance, like that of suspending at such seasons judicial proceedings, was familiar to the Roman world before the introduction of Christian ideas. Virgil enumerates the rural labors, which might on festal days be carried on, without entrenching upon the prohibitions of religion and right; and the enumeration shows that many works were considered as forbidden. Thus it appears that it was permitted to clean out the channels of an old water course, but not to make a new one; to wash the herd or flock, if such washing was needful for their health, but not otherwise; to guard the crop from injury by setting snares for birds, or fencing in the grain; and to burn unproductive thorns.

This likeness between these heathen regulations and our modern Sunday laws, with their numerous exceptions, is so striking as to be very suggestive of their derivation.

That Constantine was at the time of issuing his Sunday edict a pagan, pure and simple, there is little doubt. His law forbidding certain kinds of labor on the "venerable day of the sun," was issued on the 7th of March; on the following day, namely, the 8th of March, was issued his edict directing that in case of any public calamity the *haruspices* should be consulted. These were abominable fortune-tellers who professed to read in the entrails of beasts future events. The idea that any *Christian* emperor ever made such a law is absurd.

That arch flatterer and sycophant, Eusebius of Cæsarea, is almost wholly responsible for the false impression which obtains to a considerable extent that Constantine ever was a Christian. The facts are that he made no profession of Christianity until on his death bed, and that throughout his reign he was only a moral leper. Of Constantine's character Philip Schaff says:—

He was far from being so pure and so venerable as Eusebius, blinded by his favor of the Church, depicts him in his bombastic and almost dishonestly eulogistic biography, with the evident intention of setting him up as a model for all future Christian princes. It must with all regret be conceded that his progress in the knowledge of Christianity was not a progress in the practice of its virtues. His love of display and his prodigality, his suspiciousness and his despotism, increased with his power. The very brightest period of his reign is stained with gross crimes, which even the spirit of the age, and the policy of an absolute monarch, can not excuse. After having reached, upon the bloody path of war, the goal of his ambition, the sole possession of the

empire; yea, in the very year in which he summoned the great council of Nicæa, he ordered the execution of his conquered rival and brother-in-law, Licinius, in breach of solemn promise of mercy. (324) Not satisfied with this, he caused, soon afterward, on political suspicion, the death of young Licinius, his nephew, a boy of hardly eleven years. But the worst of all is the murder of his eldest son, Crispus, in 326, who had incurred suspicion of political conspiracy, and of adulterous and incestuous purposes toward his step-mother, Fausta, but is generally regarded as innocent.

Such was the character of the author of the first Sunday law known to history. In the face of these facts let those who wish regard it as a *Christian* edict issued in behalf of the sacred observance of a Christian institution. It is true that the edict was afterwards turned to account by the bishops to restrict the actions of the people upon the first day of the week; but that the law was made in honor of Sunday as a Christian institution is, to say the least, extremely doubtful. Just what influence this law had on the so-called change of the Sabbath it is impossible to say. As we have seen, it is probable that the emperor had no thought of effecting any change in any Christian institution by this law, so that whatever effect it may have had on the change was because of the use subsequently made of it by those who as pagans had formerly regarded Sunday as sacred, and who probably saw no harm in transferring it to another and more noble purpose.

C. P. B.

ACCORDING to the *Christian Statesman*, Rev. Dr. A. A. Miner asks this question concerning the Sunday newspaper:—

Why must we know on Sunday morning that such and such middle-weight whipped another?

THE SENTINEL gives it up. The Doctor's "we," like the editorial "we," must be plural only in form, at least it does not include all readers of Sunday newspapers. It may be necessary for Dr. Miner to read the sporting news in the Sunday paper, but it is not necessary for everybody to do so. "Rude fellows of the baser sort" can of course find some things adapted to their taste in the average Sunday paper, but others will pass such things by. Only those who wish to will read the sporting column. Indeed, reading the Sunday paper at all is only a matter of choice. Nobody is compelled either to buy or to read it. If the Doctor would only curb his own curiosity until Monday morning his difficulty with the Sunday paper would end at once.

BUT if Doctor Miner means to ask why anybody wants the Sunday paper, it should be sufficient to say that that is their business. Others have just as much right to demand why he wants certain articles for breakfast, or why he wants his Sunday dinner served in a certain way.

NOR does it follow that a thing to be

proper on Sunday must be necessary. The old Puritans may have demanded to know why it was necessary for a man to kiss his wife on the first day of the week, and as nobody could tell, or prove to a demonstration that the kissing could not be done just as well and effectively on Monday, made a law prohibiting kissing on Sunday. The same principle is involved in laws against Sunday newspapers.

The Golden Rule as Applied to the Question of Sunday and the World's Fair.

[This article is a synopsis of a sermon by Rev. G. W. Ballenger, Pastor of the First Evangelical Church, South Chicago, published in the *South Chicago Daily Republican*, of March 7.]

In discussing the question of Sunday closing at the World's Fair, I shall take for my text the Golden Rule: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." In this statement of Christ's is the embodiment of the principle which should govern all the relations of man to his fellow-men: for he immediately adds, "For this the law and the prophets." Believing this to be the basis of Christian action, I am led to consider the following petition, which is being quite generally circulated by those who favor Sunday closing:—

The United States Senate and House of Representatives, the Columbian Directory and Commission, the Commissioners and Lady Managers and their alternates: We earnestly petition you to do your part to close the World's Fair on the Sabbath, in accordance with the law of God, the rights of men, and the precedents of American history.

The Christian citizens of this country would universally oppose this petition, and rightly, too, if it asked that the Fair be closed on Saturday and was signed by Hebrew citizens. Has the Christian any more right to close the Fair against the Jew in the interests of the Christian religion than has the Jew to close it against the Christian in the interests of his religion?

The first basis given in the petition for Congress to act upon in closing the Fair on Sunday is the "law of God." Of the three reasons given in the petition, this is the one around which the contending forces in this discussion mass their arguments. On the one hand we have a class, full of religious fervor and zeal, demanding that the Fair be closed in accordance with their faith and practice. While on the other hand we have another class equally as numerous and fully as fervent, but differing in sentiment, asking that the Fair be opened according to their views and convictions.

Both classes are equal before the civil law; because as a Government we recognize neither sect nor creed, but maintain a total separation of Church and State. Hence, asking the Government to close the Fair in accordance with the law of God (or the petitioners' interpretation of the law), is asking the Government to

lend its aid in favor of one interpretation of the moral law. Asking Congress therefore to close the Fair on Sunday in accordance with the law of God, is asking it to do something which it is forbidden to do by the Constitution, the First Amendment of which reads, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The petitioners seem to have lost sight of the fact that it is not in the province or jurisdiction of the Government to legislate upon the law of God. That the petitioners are departing from the fundamental principles upon which our Government is based, in thus asking governmental aid in support of their views of the law of God is evident from the following: "We are teaching the world," said James Madison, "that religion flourishes in greater purity without than with the aid of Government."—*Letter of James Madison to Edward Livingston, July 10, 1822.*

Again he says: "Religion is not in the purview of human government. Religion is essentially distinct from government and exempt from its cognizance. A connection between them is injurious to both."

The United States Senate as early as 1829 was called upon to take action in a case similar to this. They were petitioned to discontinue Sunday mails, and the following are quotations from the Senate report on the petitions, which was submitted to the Senate and indorsed Jan. 19, 1829:—

We are aware that a variety of sentiment exists among the good citizens of this country on the subject of the Sabbath day, and our Government is designed for the protection of one as much as another. . . . With these views Congress can not interfere. It is not the legitimate sphere of the Legislature to determine what religion is true and what is false. Our Government is a civil and not a religious institution. . . .

Among all the religious persecutions with which modern history is stained, no victim has ever suffered but for violation of what government denominated the law of God. To prevent a similar train of evils in this country the Constitution has wisely withheld from our Government the power of defining the law of God.

One year later, 1830, the House of Representatives was petitioned to take action with a view to discontinue the transportation and the opening of mails on the Sabbath. The following quotations are taken from the committee's report, communicated to the House of Representatives, March 4 and 5, 1830:—

Congress acts under a Constitution of delegated and limited power. The committee look in vain to that instrument for a delegation of power, authorizing this body to inquire and determine what part of time, or whether any, has been set apart by the Almighty for religious exercises.

Speaking of the dangers involved in legislative action, looking to the enforcement of any part of the law of God, the report further says:—

The line can not be too strongly drawn between Church and State. If a solemn act of legislation shall, in one point, define the law of God, or point out to the citizens one religious duty, it may, with

equal propriety, proceed to define every part of the divine revelation and enforce every religious obligation, even to the forms and ceremonies of worship, the endowment of the Church and the support of the clergy.

The second and, in the minds of the authors of the petition, the secondary reason given for Congress and the Commissioners to act upon the closing of the Fair on Sunday, is "the rights of men." This is interpreted both by speakers and writers in favor of the petition, to refer particularly to workingmen. Touching this point, I believe that the workingmen themselves are as well able to determine what are their rights in this matter as are their self-constituted guardians. Thus far labor organizations have been almost unanimous in asking that the Fair be open on Sunday. The American Federation of Labor, in annual convention of 1891, and the Knights of Labor, in 1890, passed resolutions in favor of Sunday opening. These two organizations represent eight hundred thousand workingmen.

I pass this point by saying that it looks a little inconsistent for clergymen to place their interpretation upon the rights of workingmen, and then ask Congress, State legislatures, and World's Fair Commissioners to force that interpretation upon workingmen by legislative enactments.

The last reason given in the petition, which, in the minds of the petitioners, furnishes a sufficient cause of action for Congress and the Commission, is, "the precedent of American history." Precedents are of value only so far as they are based on correct principles. Our Government, now the wonder and pride of the world, was founded on principles, one of which is the entire separation of Church and State, and at a period when time-honored and Church-cherished precedents were almost unanimously opposed to this principle. No reform is ever accomplished except at the cost of some long-standing precedent. Had all the "precedents of American history" been followed up to the present time, we would still be flogging non-attendants at church, banishing Baptists, and hanging Quakers.

That my position may not be misunderstood, let me say in closing that, personally, I wish there were no opposition to closing the Fair on Sunday, but the fact remains that there is, and also that my wishes in the matter count no more than those of men who wish there were no opposition to an open Fair. Since I am left free to remain away from the Fair on Sunday, I do not consider that my rights are invaded, and I shall not invade the rights of others by asking that Congress, State legislatures, or national commissioners compel them to act in harmony with my view of Sabbath sacredness.

Personally, I wish that all men were consistent Christians and that the Sabbath were universally observed; but all are not Christians and all do not observe the Sabbath. Under these circumstances it is the

duty of the Church to use the God-appointed means to accomplish these reforms. When these fail, the responsibility rests with the individual. Christians have no right to appeal to civil law to compel men to conform to their ideas of worship.

The following recommendation, found in the report of Sunday mails referred to, points out to my mind the only legitimate power with which Christianity is clothed in dealing with this Sunday observance question:—

If the Almighty has set apart the first day of the week as a time that man is bound to keep holy, and devote exclusively to his worship would it not be more congenial to the precepts of Christianity to appeal exclusively to the Lawgiver of the universe to aid them in making men better—in correcting their practices by purifying their hearts? Government will protect them in their efforts. When they shall have so instructed the public mind and awakened the consciences of individuals as to make them believe that it is a violation of God's law to carry the mail, open post-offices, or receive letters on Sunday, [and I will add attend the World's Fair on Sunday], the evil of which they complain will cease of itself, without any exertion of the strong arm of civil power.

The German Emperor and Public Schools.

At the beginning of his reign William II. declared that he would overmaster the Social Democrats. In May, 1889, he issued an edict accordingly, and laid bare therein one of his ideas as to what means should be made use of to achieve this:—

That the school may be made serviceable, throughout its various grades, in working against the spread of socialistic and communistic doctrines, is a thought with which I have been long occupied. . . . The school must endeavor to impress the conviction on young minds that the teachings of Social Democratism are not only contrary to the law of God and Christian principle, but are unpractical, and dangerous in the sequences to which they lead, both as regards the individual and society.

The year after, in 1890, he spoke again to the members of the school conference, in the spirit of this edict; expressing his belief that teachers find their way into the public schools who are secret Democrats, and gave utterance to his royal expectation that "the fear of God" would be ordered more insisted upon in the public training of youth.

The Minister of Public Worship, therefore, has only fulfilled the orders of the sovereign in bringing in his bill granting the Church a powerful influence over the school. Hitherto in Prussia, schools have been sectarian, and both the Church and the school have been united under the control of the State, having one and the same minister in the King's Cabinet. But sectarianism was a principle more or less loosely adhered to; and 66 per cent. of all schools, 19,627 in number, were one class, with one teacher for pupils of various religious denominations, save in religion—this branch was given over to Catholic priests in Lutheran schools; while in

districts where Catholics abound, Protestant clergymen were privileged to instruct the children of Lutheran parents.

Yet even this looser connection between Church and school, and this minor insistence upon sectarian differences, proved none too adequate for the task of freeing the minds of young citizens from the old infirmity, prejudice. Prussia, on the contrary, has been the scene of intolerant persecution against Jews and Catholics, and is still, against Jews. Nor has the union between Church and school, even in its slacker form, been conclusively beneficial. Manners and morals are no better than they are in countries where no such a union exists; faith is not more ingrained in citizens' hearts, nor church-going more in their habits. The truth is rather that Germans are comparatively infrequent church-goers (government officials are obliged to attend service), and the reason for the fact has been found more than once in the custom of mixing school instruction and church instruction into a single discipline during youth, within the same secular walls and with the same associations. Nearly all those pupils who find their school lessons irksome, find their religious lessons irksome also, for these are a part of the routine of the school. When freed from the compulsory attendance at the one, they feel freed from further attendance at religious instruction likewise; and religious instruction is the chief thing that evangelical pulpits offer; officially, indeed, it is the only thing. . . .

Whatever success has been achieved by re-enforcing the authority of the school with that of the Church, has been a success strictly and purely political. Neither religion nor morality has been conclusively advanced by the plan. Morality is no higher than in countries where the Church is independent of the State; and all lay interest in Church affairs is even sunk below that which is found in States with secularized schools.

But the government is modest, and is satisfied with political success. Its eye is single, and being bent on one certain aim—the political extinction of a party—all else is treated as accessory. Sectarian strifes, such as the Xanthian outbreaks against Jews, the Berlin outbreaks against Catholics, the Pozeń outbreaks against Lutherans, are of subordinate import, if only a Democratic outbreak can be prevented against monarchy! Hence, the . . . sections of the new law, which make sectarianism in public schools compulsory; which force every child to receive religious instruction, so far as practicable, from a teacher of his own denomination; and which cede the right of deciding which teachers are fit for instructing children in religion to the clergy. Normal schools, in which teachers are trained, are directed to be established upon a sectarian basis; and Section 110 allows priests and clergymen to inspect such seminaries at any

time, as functionaries of their religious orders, without any other restriction than a notice sent beforehand of their proposed visitation. Such clerical functionaries are granted the privilege of attending the religious lessons in public schools, and of commenting upon them to the teacher, when the pupils leave the schoolroom. Children of "dissenters" (non-Lutherans, non-Catholics, or non-Hebrews), if few in number (less than fifteen), shall be detailed to hear instruction in one or the other schools of the "recognized sects," at the discretion of the superior magistrate.

The idea is to enforce the injunctions of His Majesty, to purify the school of unacceptable teachers, and to impress upon every child born in the kingdom the fear of God (*Gottes furcht*; "fear," mind you; these military statesmen say nothing of love). And if we keep in mind the fact that there are 66 per cent. of schools in the State with only one teacher, and set to it the new right of priests and clergymen of withholding from teachers the privilege of giving religious instruction, remembering, at the same time, that a teacher publicly branded as unfit for giving such instruction becomes "done for;" then we see that the ministry has, indeed, created an efficient instrument for the king's will.

The influence and power which is lent to the two chief churches of the country is lent upon the assumption that both are inimical to Democratism. . . . Prussia calculates that Evangelicals and Catholics will march divided, but strike united. The Emperor, a pupil of Moltke, views them as two army corps made mobile by this Public Schools law, and sent on different routes to heave a single blow for monarchy against Socialism.—*The Countess Von Krockow, in the Independent.*

Georgia Sunday Laws and Sunday Advertising.

"A BILL for Sunday advertising against the Walter Taylor Drug Company brought by the advertising firm of George P. Rowell & Co., of No. 10 Spruce Street, New York," says the *Mail and Express*, "has been disallowed by Judge Clark, of Atlanta, on the ground that advertising on that day was not legal and could not be sued for." It is further stated that "the attorney for Rowell & Co., said that he had not met with a similar case in any other State, and regarded the case as a particularly nice one, that might be pertinent in several States where the Sunday laws were drastic."

"DRASTIC," in its worst sense, is a good word to describe Sunday laws in general, and the Georgia Sunday law in particular. The nature and design of the Georgia Sunday law may be judged from the fact that it provides that "all money arising from

finer imposed for offenses, the gist of which consists in their being committed on the Sabbath day shall be paid to the Ordinary of the county, to be by him distributed for the purpose of establishing and promoting Sabbath schools in the country." Even Mr. Crafts would scarcely have the hardihood to claim that such a law is designed merely for the protection of the "civil Sabbath."

THE *Mail and Express* is so delighted with the Georgia decision that a man need not be honest, that he need not pay bills contracted for Sunday service, that it says:—

In New York State, unfortunately, no such laws are on the statute books, but the increasing nuisance of the sensational Sunday papers may arouse in time a sufficiently widespread public protest as to make such a law possible. With Sunday advertising made illegal, the issue of newspapers on that day would be made financially impossible.

Very "unfortunately" indeed—for bigotry and intolerance? Is the *Mail and Express* troubled by the competition of the Sunday papers? It looks like it.

THE Legislature of Massachusetts is asked by the ministers of Boston to pass a law providing that on Sunday the number of trains on any railroad, or cars on any street railway, shall not exceed one-seventh of the daily average run on other days of the week, and prohibiting entirely excursion trains and boats. The reason for this request is not far to seek; compelled to remain in the city on Sunday and with every other variety of entertainment prohibited the people will naturally gravitate toward the churches. The same scheme was worked early in the fifth century, when the Emperor Honorius was petitioned, by the Council of Carthage "that the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday, and from feast days, to some other days of the week," because "the people congregate more to the circus than to the church."

"THAT was a funny compromise with righteousness," remarks the *Republican Standard*, of Bedford, Massachusetts, which was proposed by a clergyman before a legislative committee at Boston the other day. "It was that street railway cars shall not run on Sundays more than one-seventh the number of trips they do on week days. We do not recollect anything in the fourth commandment which says six days thou shalt labor and shall rest six-sevenths of the seventh day. If that commandment is literally binding at the present day, it is binding for the whole of the seventh day."

And the "funniest" thing about it all is that anybody who has given it the second thought should suppose that the fourth commandment has anything to do with Sunday.

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.
267 WEST MAIN ST., BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

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

THE New York State exhibit at the World's Fair is to be kept closed on Sunday. The vote in the Senate on the House amendment, providing for Sunday closing, was twenty-two to four. The American Sabbath Union claims the "credit" for this action.

THE reckless and extravagant religio-political enthusiasm of the editor of the *Christian Statesman*, is shown most characteristically in a first page editorial item in that paper, of the issue of March 19. Every college, every community, every person, all the people, are urged to form themselves into a "Government of the People League," to write personal letters to congressmen, resolve, petition, protest, in reference to a mixed series of measures, all bearing the stamp, "For the protection of the public morals," and many of which can properly have no civil standing whatever.

UNDER an impartial application of the same regulations by which those who take part in "Sunday concerts" are forbidden to wear costumes or wigs, why would not the priests and pastors and choir boys of the different churches be restricted from wearing their robes, and all the paraphernalia of ceremonial be done away with in the churches? There may be some clergymen who even wear wigs while in their pulpits; let them direct their ushers to seat all suspicious looking strangers in the rear of the church, or some zealous detective may discover the fact and bring them to trial.

A PHILADELPHIA lawyer has found a circumscribed district within the State of Pennsylvania, where, as he claims, the old religious laws of 1794 are inoperative. If true, and the position can be maintained, the population of this district, described as being "all north of the Cohocksink Creek to Gunner's Run, and all east of Sixth Street to the Delaware River," is likely to become very dense within a few years, as the ancient statute of 1794 is more and more strictly enforced elsewhere. This remarkable alleged discovery of a sanctuary for the persecuted, was brought about through opposition to a general order to close all business on Sunday, issued by the authorities in response to a notification to them by the Retail Grocers' Association, "that nearly all the stores along South Street were kept open on Sunday, and business carried on the same as during the week." The authorities made an exception, however, in favor of cigar stores, because, as the "Director of Public Safety" said,

"cigar stores have always been open and I see no reason why they should be closed." When the attention of this public official, having in charge the safety of Philadelphia, was called to the case which was claimed as an exemption of this especial district he said: "If there is such a law the store keepers may continue their business on Sunday the same as any other day, and we can not close their places." The maze of ludicrous religious and legal situations and inconsistencies is such that to enumerate and comment on them would fill a pamphlet.

THE Secretary of the International Law and Order League has seen fit to publish a pamphlet defending "the use of detectives." This espionage upon the moral and religious life of the community which the Law and Order League has begun can not be successfully defended, although it will, no doubt, continue to be practiced. Both the purpose and the methods of this League are dangerous in the extreme. It is the civil arm of the Sabbath Union, and the sword arm too, of which the Sabbath Union organ says, in reference to "detectives," "It is a good thing to have a sharp sword at hand, ready for use."

A PROPOSAL was lately made in the House of Representatives to hold Sunday sessions of Congress for the purpose of delivering eulogies to the memory of deceased members. A short discussion ensued upon its introduction, in which it was stated that in the Fifty-first Congress the time occupied for this purpose amounted to twenty-four days; and in opposition, the measure was characterized as an "effort to invade the sacredness of Sunday" in which "the people of this country are much interested," as shown by the fact that "we are all constantly receiving petitions that this body should, by its enactments, respect the day." The resolution was lost by a vote of one hundred and sixty to eighty-one.

THE recent legislative course in France in reference to religious questions draws out widely different editorial comment from various sources. The *Mail and Express* and *Christian Union* seem to see great advancement to the cause of religion in that religion is coming to the front in French politics; while the *St. Paul Dispatch* says, "Perhaps the most remarkable incident in the recent life of the French republic is the introduction of the measure looking toward the regulation of religious associations. Never before was the utter absence of popular liberty, as Americans understand the term, so plainly manifested under a republican form of government."

It may be that to the *Mail and Express* and *Christian Union* the "absence of popular liberty" and the advancement of religion are not incompatible, but rather are necessary concomitants. That certainly is true of the political religion professed and advanced by the *Mail and Express*, but the time is scarcely ripe to acknowledge it as yet.

UNDER the title, "Pennsylvania's Peril," the *Christian Statesman* says, "Through one of the newsdealers we learn that \$50,000 has been raised which will be increased to \$100,000, to carry the appeal of the Sunday papers of Pittsburg, first to the Supreme Court and then to the Legislature. There is not the shadow of a chance that Judge Porter's decision that Sunday papers are a 'convenience,' not a 'necessity,' will be reversed by the Supreme Court, which has invariably sustained the Sabbath laws. But the Legislature, which is even now being selected, is not so sure to be right. What can friends of the Sabbath do to prevent the Sabbath law from being nullified by unjust 'special legislation' in the interests of newspaper proprietors and their readers?":

"1. Let the right men be selected for the Legislature, and, to avoid any doubt, let them be pledged before election to defend the law.



NEW YORK, MARCH 31, 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 editor of the *Christian Statesman* reports that even in the United Presbyterian city of Monmouth, Illinois, he found open, on Sunday, "an ice-cream saloon, butcher shop, bakery, news room, grocery, tobacco shop, gent's furnishing store, fruit store, etc." What wicked Presbyterians, to be sure! Why did not Mr. Crafts prosecute them under the Illinois Sunday law?

"NEARLY every Sabbath for three years and a quarter," says the *Christian Statesman*, "the editor has investigated some town and made a tally of Sunday work." If the editor of the *Statesman* believes that Sunday is a sacred day, the strict observance of which is enjoined by the fourth commandment, what right has he to spend it in any such manner? Has he a special dispensation from the Author of that law permitting him to disregard it—to do evil that good may come? to act the wholesale spy and informer?

BUT what has the editor of the *Statesman* learned in three years and a quarter by what in others he would call Sunday desecration? First, in farming districts Sunday "observance has fallen below their former standard, partly because of the Sunday newspaper the cities send out to them, partly because of the milk and fruits the cities ask to have sent in, but chiefly because the farmers themselves, many of them, have been brought up on the continental Sunday." In the West he "heard" of Sunday harvesting. In Centralia, Illinois, the Sunday schools "are depleted in strawberry time to send Sunday picked strawberries on Sunday trains to the Chicago market." In Ohio cheese factories are in operation on Sunday.

IN California Mr. Crafts saw a saw-mill in operation, and in San Francisco men were at work on buildings. "At Cheyenne, Sunday work was done shamelessly on the roof of the capitol." In Des Moines he saw Sunday work on a dam; in Allegheny City, just across the river from the home of the *Statesman*, men were at work on rail-road tracks—and it does not appear that anybody was shocked; but of Atlanta he remarks, "street-car corporations shocked the citizens by laying track on

the Sabbath, and in New York by similar work on Broadway." Pittsburg, the editor remarks, is the only considerable city which prohibits the Sunday sale of tobacco, confectionary, and soda water. As Mr. Crafts lives in Pittsburg, he probably boils his Allegheny River water on Saturday for his Sunday drinking—but no, he is not at home on Sunday; he is out at work gathering material for the columns of his paper, and points for his twenty-dollar Sunday evening lectures on "Sabbath reform"—for other people.

MARCH 3, Judge Porter, of Pittsburg, rendered his decision in the appealed newspaper cases sustaining the Pennsylvania Sunday law of 1794, and holding that the sale of newspapers upon the first day of the week is not a work of necessity.

BUT notwithstanding this adverse decision, Henry A. Schafer of the Paper Carriers' Union, says: "Although Judge Porter's ruling states that selling or delivering a Sunday newspaper on Sunday is an open violation of the law, we will deliver papers just the same." According to the *Christian Statesman*, the Mayor of the city, who is opposed to the law, responds, "Them's my sentiments;" while the *Leader*, *Dispatch*, and *Press* exclaim, "We, too;" this disregard of the law the *Statesman* characterizes as "anarchy."

Anarchy is not, however, opposition to unjust law; but opposition to all law. It was not anarchy when our forefathers threw the tea overboard in Boston harbor, nor was it anarchy when they refused to use the stamped paper prescribed for deeds and other legal documents. The British Government had no right to tax the Colonies, and resistance was in the interest of wholesome laws and good government.

ASIDE from the merits of this particular case, in Pittsburg, it is certain that the cry of "anarchy" always marks a morally weak cause. "It is the law," has in the past excused in the minds of the mass of the people the commission of most horrid cruelties inflicted in the name of justice. The Christian martyrs, of both pagan and papal times, all suffered according to law, and for violation of law. These were to a man "anarchists," in that they refused obedience to unjust laws.

SUPPOSE the Legislature of Pennsylvania were to pass a law, identical with the Sunday law of 1794, only substituting, "the seventeenth of March, commonly called St. Patrick's day," for "the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday;" and suppose the courts and "public sentiment" sustained the law, would the editor of the *Christian Statesman* obey it? And if not, why not? Would a refusal to obey be anarchy?

UNJUST laws have been the bulwark of

oppression in every age. Witness the "Fugitive Slave law" in our own land, resisted to the bitter end by a law abiding but outraged people. Was that anarchy? It was "theft" in law for a slave to "steal" himself, that is to assert his God-given right to freedom by running away; but was it morally wrong? Was it anarchy?

SUPPOSE the law of Pennsylvania required all business houses and offices to be open all or a part of Sunday, would it be anarchy for the *Statesman* to close its office on that day? Certainly not; and for the reason that such a law would be an unjust interference with the inalienable rights of individuals. But is it any better for a law to require part of the community to suspend all labor and business on one day of the week because of the religious ideas of the other part of the people? Certainly not. The law, under which the Roman emperors required Christians to offer incense to Jupiter was no more unjust than is the law of Pennsylvania, which requires all men to pay a like tribute to Sunday by resting upon it. The cry of "anarchy" is the refuge of the tyrant and of the moral coward.

THE *Independent* quotes Bishop Henry W. Warren as saying:—

Freedom in religion must not mean freedom from religion.

In like manner Cardinal Gibbons defines religious liberty thus:—

A man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right to worship God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practicing a form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God.

And this is as much as very many people mean by religious liberty and freedom of conscience; they mean simply liberty for themselves and for those who measurably agree with them; more than this is in their view destructive of social order, and not to be admitted for a moment. Such utterances show that the spirit of intolerance formerly supposed to be dead has lost none of its vitality. Warmed into new life by numerous proposed measures of religious legislation, it is already giving evidence of its old time venom. Human nature has not changed, nor is it likely to change sufficiently to make it safe to trust men with the consciences of their fellow-men.

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.