



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

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, APRIL 21, 1892.

NUMBER 16.

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 Washington correspondent of the *Examiner* (Baptist), takes occasion, in noticing the late hearing on the Sunday closing of the World's Fair, to say, "On a former occasion, when the Sunday observance law was before our Commissioners and urged by many of our local pastors, the strongest kind of a protest against such legislation was made by men styling themselves Baptists."

And why should not Baptists protest against all such legislation? Why should a people who have for centuries resisted even to the death every encroachment of the civil power upon the domain of conscience, now that they have become powerful and popular, depart from their ancient principles and yield their consciences into the hands of the Government? Why should they now acknowledge that which for centuries they have denied, namely, that the civil power has a right to require of them any measure of religious observance whatever?

In their early history Baptists were persecuted on precisely the same grounds that seventh-day observers are now punished for refusing obedience to Sunday laws. Pedobaptist practices were entrenched in the civil laws, and it was not only heresy to practice otherwise but it was held to be destructive of social order as well, and so, not to be tolerated. The Baptists of those days were "anarchists" and "rebels" just as are those who now refuse to bow to the Sunday laws, which some Baptists advocate, and even help to make.

At the late Pittsburg Sunday Convention a good deal of capital was attempted to be made out of a statement that the so-called "Blue Laws" of Connecticut never had any existence except in the imagination of a "renegade preacher," who being forced to leave the Colony returned to England, and there wrote a caricature of the colonial laws, styling them "Blue Laws." There is probably some truth in this statement; yet it does not alter the case materially.

THE significant phrase, "Blue Laws," like "siren song," and other expressions derived from mythology, stands, not for an historical fact, but for an idea. And so far as the moral is concerned, it would make no difference if Connecticut, as well as the laws said to have governed it, were mythical. The term, "Blue Laws," stands for ultra paternalism in government, for unwarranted interference with personal liberty, and for laws having a Church and State cast of countenance; and hateful as the expression may be to the whole Sunday-law fraternity, they can not break its force by explaining that the story of the Blue Laws was overdrawn.

THE term, "Blue Laws," is very properly applied to statutes which interfere with the rights of conscience, and with legitimate personal liberty, whether in matters of conscience or not. All countries formerly had many such laws, and the American Colonies were no exception. The Colony of New Haven adopted the Scriptures as their code of law and government, and this was the basis of the "Blue Laws." When we come to consider the numerous regulations and restrictions which grew up among the Jews under a similar system, it is not strange that New Haven soon had interpretations and decisions regulating the most commonplace affairs of every day life.

WHETHER men were actually forbidden by the "Blue Laws" to kiss their wives on Sunday or not, does not affect the princi-

ple. Possibly they never had even in New Haven any regulation so silly as that, but they certainly had many just as unwarranted. They did banish Quakers under pain of death; they did forbid running or walking on Sunday except reverently to and from meeting; they did forbid the use of the Book of Common Prayer; they did prohibit hair cutting and shaving on Sunday; they did make church membership prerequisite to residence in the Colony; they did forbid the giving of food or lodging to a Quaker or other heretic; and these things were even more wicked, though as before intimated, less silly, than any of the fabled "Blue Laws" of which we have ever heard.

THE National Reformers may well wish to divert attention from their principles to a discussion of unimportant facts; but as shown in the preceding notes, in this case the facts do not affect the principle. The idea of extreme paternalism is expressed in the term, "Blue Laws;" and it is likewise inseparable from National Reform and Sunday-law theories. The Sunday-law forces may pooh-pooh "Blue Laws," but they can not escape from the fact that they are wedded to the principles so aptly caricatured by the "Blue Laws of Connecticut."

THE *Christian Inquirer*, a local Baptist paper, published in this city, says: "The time has come when it must be affirmed that no public moneys can be used for sectarian purposes." But why does the *Inquirer* use the term, "sectarian," rather than the word, "religious"? Would it be willing to see public money used in the promulgation of what is popularly known as, "unsectarian religious instruction"?—It certainly looks that way. But does it not know that from the standpoint of Roman Catholics and Jews, this so-called "unsectarian" religious instruction is most intensely sectarian? It is all well enough to denounce the efforts of Romanists to secure a share of the public funds to pay for teaching Romanism, but they

are no more to blame for it than are Protestants for doing the same thing in the interests of Protestantism, and that is just what this "unsectarian" religious instruction is. The only consistent and tenable position is, that no public funds shall be used either directly or indirectly for giving any kind of religious instruction.

To Prevent Involuntary Servitude.

THE title of the Sunday bill for the District of Columbia, "A bill to prevent persons from being forced to labor on Sunday," now before the House Committee on the District, is evidence of a remarkable state of affairs in the District of Columbia. If it means anything, it means that, under the direct jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States, and immediately within the view of the congressmen and senators there gathered, the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution is inoperative, and human slavery exists which this bill proposes to mitigate for one day in the week only. The proposition is preposterous, and the whole bill is no less preposterous than the *reductio ad absurdum* to which its title tends.

The title is a misnomer; it should read, "A bill to secure and enforce by law the religious observance of Sunday." The purpose of the measure is to secure idleness on Sunday, and there are judicial decisions which define idleness as the requisite religious observance of Sunday required by the law. That, then, is the title which the bill should carry as an expression of its intent, and also that the title and the body of the bill may be consistent with each other. For, in the bill itself, there is no suggestion that any person or corporation is forced to labor on Sunday, and the heinousness of the offense does not consist in the compulsion exercised by which some fellow-being or corporation is enslaved and compelled to labor, but the criminality rests in the act of performing labor on that day, as well as, and to the same extent with, the employment of labor. The purpose of the act, then, is not to free the slave, and punish the slave-master, but to punish the slave for being a slave. The title of the bill virtually recites that there are persons in the District of Columbia who are slaves, "forced to labor," and the bill fixes a penalty of not more than one hundred dollars to be laid upon the slave because of his slavery, and upon due conviction of such a condition of servitude. The bill, then, is inconsistent with its title, and it is not its purpose to free any person or corporation from a condition of servitude. The title is a pretense, unworthy the professed character of those who framed the bill and are doing their best to promote its passage, and a slur upon the intelligence of the representative who introduced it. More than that, what can be the views of human justice held by those who can propose to the highest legislative body in the land a measure by which Jewish or Mohammedan slave-masters shall be empowered to enslave men and corporations within the District of Columbia. For any person, in fact, whether he professes the creed of the Jew, the Mohammedan, the Presbyterian, the Methodist, the Congregationalist, the Unitarian, or any denomination or religious sect, or none whatever,—only so long as he professes and practices the observance of some other day of the week than Sun-

day as a day of rest,—may, legally, without let or hindrance, enforce upon his fellow-men and corporations this condition of servitude which exists in the District of Columbia, and go scot free; because the bill recites "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 is not human slavery which this act proposes to do away with. The enslavement of man by his fellow-man is criminal. It is not criminality which it is proposed shall be dealt with in this measure. For if it were, would it be sound legislation to decree that one class of people may commit a certain crime, for the commission of which another class shall be mulcted in a heavy fine? That which is a crime as between B and A is also a crime as between B and A. If not, it is not a crime at all. And that is the solution of this whole bill, it deals with no crime whatever.

What, then, does it propose to deal with? It proposes to deal with an act which some religionists consider to be a sin against God, an infraction of his moral law, in laboring upon the first day of the week. Such being the case, by what right does any one ask the Congress of the United States to give its sanction to any individual interpretation of the law of God? And that being answered, it is not necessary to ask by what right the Congress of the United States shall attempt the enforcement of any interpretation of the moral law of God.

W. H. M.

What Is Proper Sabbath Observance?

SAYS the *Michigan Sabbath Watchman*:—

The Sabbath rightly observed would prove a source of great good to the people of this Nation.

Granted; and a blessing to the people of all other nations as well. But what is proper Sabbath observance? This statement of the *Watchman* can be of no practical value unless we can ascertain what proper observance of the Sabbath is. How must the Sabbath be kept in order to be "rightly observed," and thus prove a blessing to him who observes it? Only he who made it and gave character to the Sabbath day is competent to answer this question; and this he has done. God says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Only when the Sabbath is thus kept, only when it is observed as a day which is "sacred; reserved from profane or common use;" as a day "set apart to the service or worship of God,"—as the term holy is defined to mean,—is it rightly observed. The right observance of the day is, therefore, to devote it to God and to his worship. This and this only, is either proper or profitable Sabbath observance.

But this stamps both the institution and its proper observance as religious, and religious wholly; for religion is "the recognition of God as an object of worship, love, and obedience." Any law, therefore, looking toward the proper observance of the Sabbath is a religious law, and the enforcement of it is the enforcement of a religious observance. Sabbath laws are, therefore, religious laws, and nothing else; and the enforcement of them is simply an attempt to make men religious by law. These conclusions are unavoidable, allow-

ing, God to say what the right observance of the Sabbath is, and words to have their common and accepted meaning.

But, although the attempt can be made men can not be made religious by law, and the attempt is not only futile but wicked. The most that law can do toward making men religious is, in view of certain pains and penalties, to exact an outward conformity to certain religious rights and ceremonies. And this is all that any Sunday law, or any effort to secure Sunday laws, and enforce Sunday observance by law can ever accomplish.

The friends of such laws bear witness to the truthfulness of this fact themselves. A writer in the *Christian Statesman* of Dec. 25, 1891, refers to the work of the Pittsburg Law and Order League as having given "unmistakable signs of success in reducing crime and vice, and especially in procuring a better *outward observance* of the Sabbath." (Italics mine.)

And this is as good Sabbath observance as any Sunday law, or Law and Order League, can ever secure; simply an outward observance. But this without the inward grace is hypocrisy. Said Jesus, "God is a spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." No other kind of worship is acceptable to God, and no other form of Sabbath keeping than that holy, spiritual, religious observance of the day is Sabbath keeping in his sight. Therefore all such Sabbath observance as comes from the Pennsylvania Sunday law, backed up by the Pittsburg Law and Order League, makes the one who renders it no better, nor any more a Sabbath-keeper, in God's sight. In fact it would be better for him not to render it, for there is some reason for believing that God has more respect for an honest sinner than for a hypocritical saint.

The whole Sunday-law movement is therefore nothing more nor less than an effort to make men hypocrites, and persecute all who will not act the hypocrite and worship God after its hypocritical fashion. The promoters of it may secure millions of convictions under Sunday laws, but they can never by such means convert a soul. Away with the wicked and hypocritical thing! W. A. COLCORD.

Getting Very Strict in Atlanta.

A CORRESPONDENT from Marietta, Ga., writes that some trainmen on the Georgia Division of the East Tennessee, Virginia, and Georgia Railroad, were delayed, owing to a break-down on their train, and did not reach Atlanta until 8 A. M., Sunday morning. The great zeal in Atlanta for Sunday that is now becoming quite famous, could not countenance break-downs that would delay trains and cause them to come into their city on Sunday, and so the men were arrested, and the case is decided against them. The railroad officials are talking of carrying the case to the Supreme Court, to see if the decision will be sustained.

Some will say that such things as this can not be general; but arrests for the violation of Sunday laws quite as ridiculous are being made right along in Pennsylvania, and are being strongly urged in other portions of the country. These facts should open the eyes of those who are favoring legislation that makes it possible for such arrests to be made. A person

does not need much discernment to see in this a repetition of what was seen in Scotland, and in the New England States in the early history of this country, when men were compelled to attend church and appear very religious on Sunday. People have the right to attend church and to observe Sunday strictly if they desire, and they should be protected in that right, but there the matter should end. They should not be allowed to compel others to submit to their ideas of religion, and observe their tenets of faith, whether they have any conviction in the matter or not. The history of the past should be sufficient to prove to every candid individual that the interests of religion and morality can not be advanced by such legislation that will thus enable a few hypocritical bigots to annoy citizens who do not agree with them in all of their ideas.

A. O. TAIT.

Congressional Hearings.

THE World's Fair Committee of the House has lately granted three different hearings on the question of closing the World's Fair on Sunday. At the first hearing, on April 5, there were present eight members of the Committee; a delegation, representing the American Sabbath Union and National Reform Association, which desired to be heard in advocacy of some congressional action to secure the Sunday closing of the Exposition; and representatives of the National Religious Liberty Association, and THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, who asked the privilege of opposing any action by Congress looking to that end. The advocates of Sunday closing had a grievance to begin with in the presence of any opponents, and Elliott F. Shepard, who led the delegation, strenuously opposed the granting of any of the time of the Committee to the hearing of other views than those of himself and coadjutors. But, as Allen Moon, representing the National Religious Liberty Association, had previously arranged with the chairman of the Committee for an opportunity for the Association to be heard, Mr. Shepard's objection was overruled and the time was allotted to four speakers, three in favor of Sunday closing of the Exposition by some act of Congress, and one to oppose the recommendation of any such measure to Congress; fifteen minutes time was granted each speaker.

Mr. Shepard was displeased at the absence of some of the Committee, and so expressed himself, but Mr. Durborow, the chairman, reminded him that he was "addressing the whole country," and requested him to proceed. After introducing himself as representing the American Sabbath Union and dwelling upon the numbers and influence of that and kindred organizations, Mr. Shepard made a plea for Sunday observance in general, and its enforcement at the World's Fair in particular, on the ground that this is a "Christian Nation," and making extensive citations in support of this from the opinion of Mr. Justice Brewer, given in the case of the Rector, etc., of the Church of the Holy Trinity, New York, vs. the United States. Before Mr. Shepard seemed to have fairly begun, however, much to his apparent chagrin, time was called on him and he was obliged to give way to the next speaker.

Rev. Dr. Knowles, of New York City, followed, and while he disclaimed the intention of making a religious plea, and

expressed himself as desiring to ask legislation upon civil grounds entirely, the only civil basis upon which he relied was the many precedents, which he quoted, of religious legislation by the civil authorities in different States, and the expression of a wish by so many petitioners that the same course should be continued by the Congress of the United States. He said that while Mr. Shepard had been emphasizing the religious side of the question it still had the side of the citizen, and that what they wanted was the maintenance of the American Sabbath as the enforcement of its observance is provided for in the laws of the country. He asked the Committee to favor such measures as would tend to the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, because Sunday closing would be in harmony with the history in that regard of all previous expositions; also in harmony with our Sunday laws, and what he thought was the spirit of our Government from the beginning; also, because it would be in harmony with the world-wide movement now in progress to secure the enforcement of a rest day; and finally because it was in harmony with God's law.

Mr. Knowles spoke of having spent three weeks at Albany, in attendance upon the Legislature, and quoted the action taken there. In response to a query from Mr. Caruth, a member of the Committee, as to whether New York alone had directed the closing of its exhibit on Sunday, Mr. Knowles replied that while that was so, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Kentucky, and Ohio had passed resolutions favoring Sunday closing by the management. Out of seven Legislatures to which the question had been presented the past winter but one, that of Iowa, had refused to recommend Sunday closing. Mr. Knowles was asked if he thought the attaching of a provision conditioning an appropriation on Sunday-closing would be sufficient to attain this end; he answered that he thought any expression from Congress favoring closing on Sunday would cause the gates to be closed.

G. E. Fifield, of Massachusetts, then addressed the Committee in behalf of the National Religious Liberty Association, and said that he did not appear before them either to affirm or to deny that exhibits at the World's Fair should be closed on Sunday, but to deny the right of Congress to touch this as a religious question. He then showed from the statements of Mr. Shepard and Mr. Knowles that it was a question of religion, and being so he claimed that it was outside the jurisdiction of Congress. The measure was uncivil and unchristian as well.

Rev. H. H. George followed in behalf of the American Sabbath Union. He reasoned that this country can not exist without a rest day, and as no petitions have been presented against the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, therefore Congress must undertake to shut its gates on that day.

As the representatives of the American Sabbath Union felt that they had been unable to present their case, the Committee agreed to continue the hearing the following day. After the adjournment of the Committee meeting the American Sabbath Union held an impromptu executive session right there, and determined that they would not tolerate the presentation of any opposing views at the hearing of the next day.

At the assembling of the Committee, at

the appointed hour on the following day, Mr. Shepard made a positive demand for the entire time. Mr. Moon, in behalf of the representatives of the National Religious Liberty Association, and THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, present, and wishing to be heard, said that he merely desired to insist upon an equal right to a hearing, but that when that should be granted was entirely at the discretion and convenience of the Committee. It was decided that still another hearing should be had on the following day, at which the views of those who opposed congressional action on this subject might be presented.

Rev. Mr. Ramsdell, of the District of Columbia, then continued for the Sabbath Union, and presented the following provision for insertion in the appropriating clause of the World's Fair Appropriation bill:—

Provided, however, that no part of the sum appropriated by this section shall be paid until the corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, known as "The World's Exposition of Eighteen Hundred and Ninety-two," and said World's Columbian Commission, shall stipulate in writing that the said Exposition shall not be opened to the public on Sundays.

Mr. Ramsdell took the position that he, and some others, demanded that any exposition supported in the slightest degree from money taken from them by taxation should be closed on Sundays, forgetting that on no other plea than a religious conviction could such a stand as that be taken, and that therefore his own plea took the matter out of the jurisdiction of Congress.

The only other point presented by this gentleman was all that was asked in the case was the insertion of "Sundays excepted;" no more, no less, than in the Constitution. Forgetting again that "Sundays excepted" in the Constitution is a simple recognition of an inherent right of an individual, while the provision asked for is a positive prohibition of the exercise of inherent rights by many millions of individuals.

Rev. A. W. Pitzer, of Washington City, then poured the oil of a peaceful disposition on the troubled sea of discussion. He thought that controversy should be avoided. Whether the measure proposed was good or bad legislation, and whether it was constitutional the Committee could decide. But the petitions of of ten millions of people ought to be respected.

Rev. T. A. Fernley, of Philadelphia, followed. He thought this the greatest question ever brought before the American people, for in it rested the protection of American institutions. He assured the Committee that they, as congressmen, were sent to represent Christianity in the councils of the Nation.

Rev. Dr. Atherton continued the presentation of similar views, as a representative of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, containing seventy-two churches, with a membership of thirty-two thousand communicants. Elliott F. Shepard, of New York, then occupied the remainder of the time in the reading of a brief, with occasional comment. Mr. Shepard's brief began with the statement that "The Christian sentiment of the country desires to have introduced into H. R. Bill No. 6593, or any bill which may take its place, the proviso that the Columbian Exhibition shall not be opened to the public on Sundays." The different points offered were "1. Such a proviso is constitutional. 2. It is expedient for Con-

gress to adopt it. 3. It will contribute to the orderly conduct of the whole Exhibition, and to the health and morals of those attending. 4. It will aid to its financial success and bless the workman. 5. It is demanded by the Christian and the patriotic sentiment of the country. 6. It will honor God and preserve the faith of the Nation. 7. It will teach visiting nations the way of happiness." These different positions were supported by quotations, mainly of religious precedents, opinions, and statistics.

AGAIN, the next day, the Committee came together to hear the views of those who denied the propriety of any legislation which should have for its purpose the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday. The committee room was filled, though but one of the representatives of the affirmative was present. A larger number of congressmen were in attendance than on either of the previous days. Those who addressed the Committee were Allen Moon, of Chicago; W. H. McKee, of New York; G. E. Fifield, of Massachusetts, and Lewis Abrahams, a lawyer of the city of Washington. The points made, and the positions taken, either have been, or will be, so fully presented in THE SENTINEL that it is not necessary to make any statement of them here; it would be unavoidably imperfect because of the required brevity.

At the same hour in which this hearing was held, the same matter was under discussion in the meeting of the World's Columbian Commission, in session in the city of Chicago. At this meeting it was determined to lay aside the discussion and decision of this question until the second day of the next session of the National Commission, in October. The number of separate petitions received for Sunday closing was given as two thousand, seven hundred and twenty-five, but the number of individual petitioners was not stated. They came from every State in the Union. The Secretary was instructed to have printed, for distribution at the next session of the Commission, a list of the petitions, both for and against Sunday closing, with a statement of the number of petitions on each separate list, and the name of the organization from which the petition comes.

The evidences are that the settlement of this question will be left with the local management, where it properly belongs.

W. H. M.

Another Congressional Hearing.

ON Tuesday, April 12, the House Committee on the Judiciary granted a hearing to representatives of the National League for the Preservation of American Institutions upon petitions and a memorial presented, in behalf of the League, in the House, by Mr. Springer of Illinois. The petitions pray "for the passage of a constitutional amendment forbidding the use of public money, or credit, for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly or in part under sectarian or ecclesiastical control." The constitutional amendment offered proposes to extend to each State the terms of restriction as to laws respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the

free exercise thereof, in the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and applicable to Congress, coupling with that the specifications of the petition.

Rev. J. M. King, Secretary of the League, first addressed the Committee. Mr. King discussed the standing of the League as comprising within its membership the intellect, wealth, and influence of the country, and said that it had already two hundred local secretaries throughout the United States. Twenty-one States, Mr. King said, have already clauses in their Constitutions forbidding appropriations for sectarian purposes. It was claimed that the purpose of the League, was to eliminate religious questions from politics; and secure the complete separation of Church and State; that it was neither anti-Roman Catholic, anti-Protestant, nor anti-Judaic, but that these all were with them; yet a question from Mr. Oates, of Alabama, drew out that the great danger feared was apparent only in the encroachments of the Roman Catholics in New York and Minnesota.

Wm. Allen Butler, of the law committee of the League, followed Mr. King; he said that what was asked was but a logical expression of the First Amendment to the Constitution applied to the States. The division between Church and State is one of the first and fundamental principles of this American Government. Yet he defended the exemption of ministers, churches, and religious charities from taxation. Mr. Culberson asked if Congress did not make appropriations every year for church charities in the District of Columbia, and for church schools among the Indians. Mr. Butler replied that if they did it was contrary to the First Amendment to the Constitution. Several questions were then asked tending to show that members of the Committee looked upon the amendment, asked for, as being calculated to inaugurate a restrictive constitutional policy instead of leaving each State to be governed only by the general principles of the Constitution and free to establish its own special restrictions.

After the close of the hearing Mr. King was asked that if the intent of the restriction of the First Amendment upon the Congress of the United States was extended to the different States why the principle embodied would not require the repeal of all laws bearing on religion, such as the requirement of the belief in a God as a qualification to testify as a witness, laws against blasphemy, and laws requiring Sunday observance. He replied that it would not do that because it was specialized entirely upon the matter of the appropriation of money for sectarian purposes.

The purpose of this League is then not the separation of Church and State but the concentration of the forces of a religion into a more complete union with the centralized power of the State and an elimination of disturbing elements.

W. H. M.

Wherein Is the Difference?

THE Ohio Legislature has passed a law prohibiting shaving on Sunday, and the penalty for its violation is very severe. During the debate on the bill, according to the correspondent of the *Commercial Gazette*:

Mr. Marshall excited much laughter by offering

an amendment proposing to make it unlawful to shine shoes on Sunday. This, of course, was lost.

Why, "of course"? Shaving requires manual labor done for a consideration, and so does the work of the bootblack. A shave is as necessary to comfort and decency as polished shoes. Verily, let Legislatures be commended for fine spun distinctions where there is no difference! *Kentucky Journal*.

They Are "Instructed" to Close the Fair.

It begins to look as though the work of no association, convention or general public gathering of any sort was considered complete without a resolution favoring the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday. About every possible reason that the mind of man could invent has been assigned as an excuse for the proposed step, even to the fact that the hogs on exhibition should have one day of rest in seven so that they may show to better advantage. It can hardly be believed that a resolution of this nature would be seriously entertained by any body of men. Yet such an one was actually passed by the American Swine Breeders' Association, and a similar one finds itself in company with others passed by a stock breeders' meeting in Illinois.

The latest comes from the Southeast Nebraska Teachers' Association, held at Tecumseh, Neb., a week since, and reads as follows:—

WHEREAS, We as educators should represent and reflect the highest moral sentiment of the country, and

WHEREAS, There exists a discussion relating to the Sunday-closing of the World's Fair in 1893; therefore, be it

Resolved, That we instruct the Commissioners to close the World's Fair on Sunday.

Why is it that these would-be legal guardians of Sunday sacredness do not know that what they ask is wholly outside the jurisdiction of the Columbian Commission and contrary to the spirit of the National Constitution? So also are the memorials from the various State Legislatures to the Commission to close the gates of the Exposition on Sunday, without jurisdiction. So clearly was this point brought out in the late hearing by Mr. Jones, before the Iowa Legislative Committee, that several who had been avowedly in favor of the memorial confessed their change of sentiment. But aside from the authority vested in the commission to act according to the various instructions, wherein is the Southeast Nebraska Teachers' Association clothed with power to "instruct the Commissioners to close the World's Fair on Sunday?" To say the least, the resolution displays a monumental exhibition of ignorance—an ignorance that clearly demonstrates that the "power behind the throne" is not the teachers themselves, but an outside influence that has led them to commit themselves to a question whose real nature they do not understand.

The question of closing the gates of the Fair on Sunday is a religious question. It is confessedly in the interests of religion; was first introduced by religionists, and its agitation is backed by religious people, who in their blind zeal can see nothing before our Republic but utter ruin unless it incorporates in the body of its Constitution a recognition of Christ as the ruler of nations.

W. E. CORNELL.

Des Moines, Iowa.

The Christian Religion Not a Part of the Common Law of the Land.

THE Sunday closing of the Kentucky exhibit at the World's Fair, by the Legislature, seems to have become an accepted fact, and it does not seem to have occurred to the honorable legislators that this matter is one not within their province.

The writer would respectfully suggest that the Legislature of Kentucky can not, *constitutionally*, make any law upon any religious matter whatever, the Constitution of the State declaring that "no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious societies or modes of worship." Now, the keeping of Sunday as the Christian Sabbath is a part of the mode of worship of Christians, in contradistinction to the modes of worship of the Jews, of the Seventh-day Baptists and Adventists, of the Mohammedans, and of the Chinese, who worship their God in Chinese fashion. Any law, therefore, made to enforce the observance of the Christian Sabbath, is a law made to "give preference" to the Christian mode of worship, and must of necessity be unconstitutional.

"But," some may say, "the Christian religion is a part of the common law of the land. Learned judges have so decided; and by their decision we must abide."

If this were so, of course, the Legislature could properly pass any laws it pleased in regard to religion. But if the learned judges had taken the trouble to look a little beyond the narrow groove of their statute books, they would have found this idea all a mistake, and that it grew out of the fact that the old English laws were engrafted upon her Colonies, and the old common law of England remained the common law of most of the States after their independence had been achieved. And Blackstone says that "the Christian religion is part of the common law of England." But America is not England. We do not live under a monarchy, nor have we an established church; but on the contrary we repudiated kings, queens, and nobility, and founded our Republic distinctly on the idea of the total separation of Church and State.

The first impulse given to the American Revolution was by the electric eloquence of Patrick Henry in his defense of the people of Virginia against the payment of the tax to support the clergy of the Church of England. And not only Henry, but Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Adams, Franklin, and every other true American concerned in the formation of the American Government, advocated total separation of Church and State; and many of them have left on record, in their writings, evidence of the same. In the Federal Constitution, the instrument of their making, they say:

"No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

And, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

And nearly every State in the Union has the same provision against religious legislation as has the State of Kentucky, their Constitutions all being in accord with the Federal Constitution, in that matter.

Doubtless the reason the States failed to erase the old laws from their statute books, was, simply, that all laws in conflict with the Constitutions of the several

States and of the United States became null and void and of no effect, and it was never dreamed that they could, a century later, be revived, and used as an engine of oppression for a free people. So dear, then, was Liberty, it was supposed the American people would always cherish her and adore her very footprints.

If the learned judges aforesaid had looked into the history of their country, they would have found in the treaty of Tripoli, made in 1796, when General Washington was President, and signed by him, this declaration:—

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES IS NOT, IN ANY SENSE FOUNDED ON THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

This shows plainly that the Christian religion was not then "a part of the common law of the land." And by what process it has since become so would be difficult to define.

If the learned judges had looked into the writings of Madison they would have found ample proof of repudiation of anything looking to the establishment of it by law in the remotest manner. Space forbids quotations, but this one sentence is so striking it will be its own excuse:—

Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish, with the same ease, any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects?

And the ideas of Madison, of Washington, of Jefferson, and of all good and true men, prevailed over the few relics of monarchy left in the country, and the new dispensation abolished the old laws of tyranny and proclaimed freedom to man everywhere in this broad land—freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of action—entire freedom so long as he did not trespass on his neighbor's rights.

Now, which shall prevail? which is most valid? the separation of Church and State, as decreed by the our American lawgivers, or the union of Church and State derived from the English monarchy where the Christian religion was "a part of the common law of the land"—handed down through the ages from Constantine, who first forced the early Christians into the giving up of their rightful Sabbath, and who first corrupted the early Church by uniting it to the State—making religion a part of the law of the land and forsaking the teachings of Jesus Christ, the first great expounder of separation of that which is God's from that which is Cæsar's?

Shall General Washington or Constantine be our prototype? Shall Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and the Constitution remain our authorities in this matter, or must we bow down to the verdict of the "learned judges," and meekly accept their antiquated opinions derived from musty old English monarchical laws as our rule of action?

The truth is, religion is a matter of faith, law a matter of reason; religion is between man and his God, law is between man and man; religion is purely spiritual, and belongs to the individual; law is actual and belongs to the community; religion looks to the preservation of man's happiness in the next world, law looks to the protection of his rights in this world. They are entirely separate and should be kept so, in the interest of the purity of each.

The Legislature has no right to make any law in respect to any religious observance. It is a matter of comparatively

small importance whether the exhibit be open or closed on Sunday; that might well be left to the Commissioners to decide; but it is of paramount and vital importance that there should be no legislation at all upon such a subject—that the Constitution be not violated, oaths of office not broken, a dangerous precedent not established.

Those men who disregard, or are ignorant of, the plain teachings of the history of their own country, are taking upon themselves a fearful responsibility in acting as lawgivers and advisers, and would best pause lest they aid in casting the most precious jewel of liberty, freedom of opinion, out upon the raging waves of passion and prejudice never to be again restored. For there is no tyranny like religious tyranny, and once admit that religion can be controlled by law, or that it can control law, and freedom is gone—freedom of religion is gone if law can control it, and freedom of the citizen is gone if religion is to control the law.—"*Kaintuckee*," in *Henderson (Ky.) Sun*: day Reporter.

How Many Things Can Be the Chief Cause of the Evils of Our Day?

IN listening to the lectures and reading the statements of reformers, and those who would have us believe that they are reformers, we are often told of certain things that they positively affirm are the causes of all the evils in the land. For instance, the temperance reformer says that intemperance is at the bottom of every evil, and that if the whiskey curse were blotted from the land, sin and wickedness would be reduced to a minimum. For this statement there is a large amount of evidence, and the writer is not disposed to doubt it in the least. In fact the history of our race shows that the first sin ever committed was upon the point of intemperance, or what is the same, indulging the appetite in things that were forbidden, and wrong. And statistics are not wanting to show that much of the misery recorded on the pages of this world's history can be traced, either directly or indirectly, to intemperance.

But another, who would have us believe that he has an important reform movement to look after, tells us that all the crime and misery in the world is because men do not observe the Sabbath, and therefore we should have strict Sunday laws, compelling them to observe it. In a recent lecture upon this point, Rev. C. S. Royse, Field Secretary of the American Sabbath Union, in Minnesota, stated that the large number of divorces in Iowa was because the men didn't keep the Sabbath, and hence were not at home with their wives a sufficient amount of time to get acquainted with them to rightly love them and remain loyal to their marriage contract. He said that in Paris, men die very young because they don't keep the Sabbath.

Now, it would seem that before men make such statements they should fortify themselves with statistics that would show conclusively that such is the case. Missionaries tell us that the marriage contract is observed more sacredly among heathens who know nothing about Christianity, or the observance of any day as a Sabbath, than it is in the most refined community of Christian society. Now if the heathen adheres to the marriage vow without any Sabbath at all, why is it that a disregard of the Sabbath in more

enlightened countries would cause the men to seek divorces from their wives? And again, many of these heathen nations that observe no day as the Sabbath, are among the strongest men physically, and live to a good old age. Then why is it that men in France who, like the heathens, observe no Sabbath, should be short-lived, and physically weak, when the heathens, under the same conditions with respect to Sabbath rest, are physically strong?

The writer would not be understood, to argue that Sabbath rest is not beneficial. I believe in observing the Sabbath, and have carefully regarded it all through life, and have found it an incalculable blessing. But the fact that it is such a blessing to those who observe it religiously, is no reason why it should be enforced upon those who do not wish to regard it, and the evidence is still wanting to show that the individual who works seven days in the week will not live as long, and be as healthy as the man who only works six days, provided the individual who works all the week does not abuse himself by any form of dissipation, such as is quite common in France, and will take the amount of rest that nature requires every night. Night is the time which God gave men in which to rest, and while wrapped in slumber, the tissues of the body are built up and strengthened for the labors of the following day.

But it is a noticeable fact that when a man has a theory to uphold, and especially when that theory is one not well grounded in principle, what he lacks in argument, he endeavors to make up in strong assertions which, however, do not bear close scrutiny.

A. O. TAIT.

Which the Dying Cause?

MR. F. W. WARE, Secretary of the American Sabbath Union for the State of Michigan, in his paper for February and March, says:—

The Seventh-day Adventist papers are guilty of shamelessly and continuously insulting public intelligence by saying that those who are laboring to enforce laws enacted for the protection of the Sabbath from ordinary labor and noisy sports are trying to make men religious by law. . . . The Seventh-day Adventists ought to be ashamed of their course in this matter. . . . It is a poor and dying cause that is compelled to resort to such things.

One of two things must be true: this religious organization known as the American Sabbath Union, in its efforts to secure and enforce Sunday laws is either trying to make men religious by law, or it is not trying to make them religious at all, for this is its sole work, aim, and object, the enforcement of Sunday observance by law. If it, a religious organization, is not trying to make men religious, we would advise it to turn its attention to its legitimate and consistent line of work. There is little question, however, as to what it is trying to do. The *modus operandi* is the questionable feature in the case. It may be observed further that it must be a poor and dying Sabbath that is compelled to resort to law for protection and existence. In a lecture delivered in Battle Creek, Michigan, March 6, 1892, Mr. Ware attested this fact by saying:—

It was recognized about twenty-five or thirty years ago by the church that the American Sabbath was very fast passing out of our hands. . . . The churches which generally take the lead in moral reforms . . . saw as far back as that time that unless something was done more than ordinary, the American Sabbath, our Christian

Sabbath, would soon with us be a thing of the past.

The "dying cause" is on the other side of the question from that which Mr. Ware would endeavor to make it appear.

W. A. COLCORD.

They Mistake It for Christianity.

THE *Sun* has received copies of the Chinese cartoons, ridiculing Europeans and Christian missionaries, which are now circulated in great quantities throughout China. Of these it is said:—

They are distributed freely among the people, as religious tracts are distributed with us, and the money for the purpose is furnished by individuals and associations, animated by a spirit of patriotism as they regard it. . . . The movement is a veritable Chinese propaganda with the purpose of preserving the native religion and customs and protecting them against the invasion of Christianity and all European influences. . . . A totally vicious character is ascribed throughout to the Christians. They are represented as guilty of the grossest immorality and the most horrible and revolting crimes, gouging out eyes and inflicting the most cruel tortures. . . . This atrocious assault upon Christianity is the more remarkable because it is made by the representatives of everything that stands for civilization and high intellectual cultivation in China. It is the work of men of letters, men of a really lofty scholarship, measured by any standard we may apply. That such men, whose ordinary concern in life is with philosophical speculations, high political economy, statesmanship, should stoop to expedients not only absolutely depraved but of childlike imbecility, is something that does not readily explain itself.

On the contrary it does quite readily explain itself. These educated Chinamen know Christianity from the same point of view from which such men as Thomas Paine, Robert Ingersoll and the scores of writers for various infidel, atheistic, and "free thought" journals know it. Much of the published thought of these men of intellect and learning is as grossly repugnant to the religious sense of the experimental Christian, in proportion to the civilization from which it emanates, as the vulgarities of these Chinamen. Not only is this not surprising, but on the contrary it would indeed be surprising if just this use were not made of the terrible facts in the history of professed Christianity. The history of Christianity as it is now written, read, and understood throughout the world, is not the history of the gospel of Jesus Christ, but quite the contrary. The saddest, bitterest, most utterly hopeless fact, that the true Christian has to deal with in this world, is, that Christianity, so-called, as, led by the great deception, it has made itself known to men, is in reality the most deadly enemy and dangerous foe of the Christianity of the gospel pure and undefiled.

W. H. M.

A Greater (?) than Joshua.

THE *Mail and Express*, of April 9, contains a sermon by Rev. David Gregg, of the Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, from Ex. 23:12: "Six days thou shalt do all thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest," etc. In its personal comment the *Mail and Express* says of Dr. Gregg, "His sermons always show that scholarship which is so prominent a characteristic of the man," and in the course of the sermon quotes him as saying:—

We have spoken of the abolition of the Sabbath in California. One reason for its abolition there is the wrong views which are scattered broadcast in California. The Seventh-day Adventists have their stronghold there. They insist that the seventh day must be observed, or no day, and so are hand in glove with the infidel in destroying the Sabbath.

This is an illustration of the power of wrong views, and of the church defeating itself because of wrong views. There is no proof, and, consequently, no certainty, that the seventh day of creation, which Adventists claim, and the seventh day of our almanac are one and the same day. Besides this, the whole controversy about the seventh and the first day can be settled in a simple way. Here is a man who believes in the first day of the week as the Sabbath, and here is a man who believes in the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath; let them turn themselves back to back and start around the world. When they meet at the point opposite the starting point on the other side of the world, they will find that one has lost half a day, and the other has gained half a day and that they are keeping precisely the same Sabbath. Let them turn around and come back the same way and they will have the same Sabbath when they get home. Simply crossing over what is known by navigators as the Sunday line at 180 degrees changes the day, either backward or forward.

Certainly there is a greater than Joshua among us, for while at his behest the sun stood still, it yet continued to be the measure of the day, but Dr. Gregg is able to ignore the office of the sun in day-making entirely.

In the whole paragraph there is not a single correct statement, as applied to the Sabbath or Seventh-day Adventists, and on every point mentioned any intelligent man could set himself right with a moment's thought, or a few moment's investigation. Such "scholarship" as this reminds one of the wise remark of the humorist, that he would rather not know so much, than know so many things that weren't so.

Which Side?

THE *Voice* "straddles the fence" on the question of Sunday newspapers in the following ingenious but not wholly uninteresting manner:—

The Sunday newspaper might be put to considerable inconvenience if the ruling of Judge Clark, of Atlanta, Ga., holds good throughout the courts. The decision was that advertising in a Sunday newspaper is not legal and contracts for it can not be enforced. The Sunday newspaper lives on its advertising. Bereft of an income from this source, it would be snuffed out of existence too quick to preach its funeral sermon, or sing its requiem. But we don't believe that it is predestined to die that way. A ruling of this kind, if it prevails in the higher courts, would cause some inconvenience, and probably some loss, but newspaper publishers would probably meet the case by requiring cash in advance for all future advertising. It has always been a marvel to us, by the way, to see the enemies of the Sunday newspaper trying to starve it out by refusing to buy copies of it. The only way to starve it out would be by refusing to trade with those who advertise in Sunday newspapers. It would be an interesting thing to find out how many pillars of the Church such a boycott would hit! But if carried out on an extensive scale, how it would set the fires of indignation and apprehension to glowing in the offices of the daily newspapers!

It would be interesting to know just what the *Voice* thinks about laws that countenance dishonesty in the interests of Sunday sacredness; but the foregoing is all that it has to say upon the subject.

SUNDAY reformers are accustomed to say, that the keeping of any day in seven meets the demands of the divine law. Those who observe the seventh day meet all God's demands according to this logic. But these same Sunday reformers add that "the civil law can not recognize two days," and hence it must compel the minority to refrain from work on Sunday, and it can not protect them in observing the Sabbath. Such a position is inconsistent and un-Christlike. It measures the duty of the State by the choice of the majority.—*Sabbath Outlook*.

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 *Christian Statesman* has discovered that Wyoming has a Sunday law. This leaves only Idaho and California without such statutes.

THE Des Moines, Iowa, Conference of the Evangelical Church, at its session just closed, passed a strong resolution against opening the World's Fair on Sunday.

THE *Mail and Express* remarks that "all the States will undoubtedly sooner or later direct that their exhibits at the World's Fair be closed on Sunday in obedience to the Christian and law-abiding sentiment of the country.

BAKERS' Union No. 90 has reported to the New York Federation of Labor that the bakers in one of Dennett's coffee and cake saloons were compelled to attend prayers or pay fifty cents fine for each omission. Such things as this are but a natural outgrowth of the fast growing determination to enforce religious observance.

THE Idaho World says: "The preachers of Idaho have formed a combination and will circulate their petitions asking that the World's Fair be closed on Sundays." The *World* adds: "No true American citizen who has any conception of what kind of a link for a proposed long and strong chain he will be helping to forge by signing it, will put his name to such an un-American and unpatriotic request."

THE pertinacity with which the advocates of enforced Sunday closing of the Exposition mean to continue their efforts is shown by this from the *Christian Statesman*: "It would not be too late even if Congress or the Commission should decide adversely, for the decision might be reversed. It would not be too late even if the Fair had begun with Sunday opening, for a sufficient protest would close the gates."

There will be no truce offered by these people, and by and by no quarter given.

SAM SMALL has been expressing himself, in Chicago, on the Sunday-closing of the World's Fair. He threatens it with bankruptcy if it opens on Sunday. He also said: "In 1888 the Republican Party, in its first convention in Chicago, placed in the first paragraph of its platform a recognition of Almighty God, by thanking him for what he had done for the country in general, and for the

Republican Party in particular, and the 5,000,000 of people who voted that ticket voted for that clause as well as the rest. Submit the question whether or no this is a Christian people to a general vote and it will carry by an immense and overwhelming majority. At the Paris Exposition America, England, and Canada had their exhibits closed on Sunday, and had marines stationed to enforce the national respect to God's law."

What can be expected from one who holds as superficial a view of religious life and truth as this?

LONG ISLAND CITY has opened its baseball season with a police raid on the players who had gathered to the number of several hundred, Sunday April 11, in the vacant lots between Astoria and Hunter's Point. Sunday baseball is to receive special attention from the authorities of Long Island City this summer. It will soon be found throughout the whole country that zealous police attention to Sunday desecration is an easy way to gain approbation and conceal the lack of enforcement of legitimate law.

THE Directors of the World's Fair have been memorialized on the Sunday-closing question by the International Federation for the Observance of Sunday. The document begins:—

To the Directors of the World's Exposition at Chicago:

Mr. President and Gentlemen: Permit us, Continental Europeans, to address you in the name of the Association which we represent and their numerous adherents, in favor of closing, on Sunday, the great Exposition which you are preparing for next year.

The memorial is quite long and takes the remarkable religious ground that enforced freedom from labor on Sunday is religious liberty.

THE *Christian Statesman* thus welcomes an assistant in the advocacy of religion. "Do our subscribers think it square dealing for the former editor of the *Christian Statesman*, after signing a promise not to issue a rival paper, to bring one out, of almost the same name, in the same place, through his son? One of our mailing lists, a most valuable part of our property, was not turned over to us, being "among the missing" when the transfer was made. If our subscribers are generally getting samples of the above or any other paper we ought to be so informed. The new paper is not authorized by the National Reform Association."

The management of the *Christian Statesman* seems to find it true, that uneasy lies the head that wears the editorial quill behind its ear.

At the Methodist Conference recently held at Chillicothe the following was passed regarding the World's Fair:—

Should said Exposition be opened on the Sabbath day, contrary to the solemn protest of the Christian citizens of this country, we pledge each other that we will not attend said Exposition on any day of the week, and will induce our people to follow our example in this regard.

That is to say if we can't have things our own way, we will resort to boycott. We wonder if Christ ever used any such methods in his work while upon earth? If not, then, is the boycott a method that it is proper for Christians to use? Of course it is the privilege of any one to stay away from the Fair, but why should Christians resolve so much about it? Why not depend on winning the world to Christ, relying upon his power for aid, and let the United States run its Fair to suit itself?

AN additional \$50,000 has been appropriated for the American Museum of Natural History on condition that it be open to the public Sunday afternoons and two evenings each week. The *Mail and Express* thus bewails this action:—

"The condition requiring the Museum to be kept open on Sunday afternoons is pernicious in tendency and the offspring of an unwise and unsound

public policy. The Sabbath of Continental Europe, with its fetes, its theaters and operas, its parades and concerts, its public galleries and varied places of general entertainment, is a very different day from the Sabbath contemplated and preserved under American institutions. Here it is a day of consecrated rest and worship. There it is a day devoted to frivolity and hilarity, to say nothing of the baser forms of vice which its customs generate and foster. Any step which tends to change the sacred character of the day with us is a step in the wrong direction. This condition of the additional appropriation does this very thing; it tends to secularize the Christian Sabbath, and it is to be deplored that it has received legislative sanction. It would have been practicable to get the appropriation without this wretched selling of Sunday. Has it got to this, that Christian institutions will be obliterated for money?"

As a sequel to the hearings before the World's Fair committees, in the House and Senate, on the Sunday-closing of the Chicago Exposition, some account of which is given in another column, there appeared among the church notices of the *Washington Evening Star* an advertisement of the presence of Rev. Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Chicago, in the city, and that he would preach in two different churches on the following Sunday. The notice continued, "Dr. Johnson visits Washington by the request of the American Sabbath Union, to urge the importance of united effort for the sanctity of the Sabbath, especially in view of its threatened desecration at the Columbian Exposition."

THE story will be remembered of the careful father who flogged his son severely for profanity, but the son afterwards proved that he had actually said nothing at all, whereupon the father assured him that it didn't make any difference for he thought damn anyway and he ought to be whipped for that. This has found its parallel in the decision of a Washington Judge, as reported in the *Post*, Washington, D. C.:—

You haven't any right, even in conversation, to repeat profanity. It is just as much an offense against your Maker and the law as if you originated the oath, said Judge Kimball yesterday in passing sentence upon William Lyddane. Mr. Lyddane endeavored to excuse himself for using certain words of profane nature on the ground that he was engaged in a religious discussion and had simply quoted them. He was fined \$5.

Beyond this it is not more than half a step to that paternal oversight which would discern the thoughts and intents of the heart.

A CORRESPONDENT in Vermont sends us the following:—

Rev. Mr. Bates, pastor of the Congregationalist church at Randolph, Vermont, after preaching a sermon on the "Sabbath question," April 3, 1892, made the following remarks in substance:—

"I have spoken upon this subject because I have been requested to, as also have the other ministers of our denomination throughout the land.

The object of bringing up the subject is to put before the people the importance of a day of rest, and the need of our exerting our influence in favor of closing the World's Fair on Sunday. I am inclined to think that this is a needless precaution, as I do not believe that the people of this enlightened land will allow such an outrage. But if it is decided against us, next summer will witness one of the greatest revolutions which our country ever saw. We will have a new set of congressmen, and if need be, a ruler over them, as in ancient times, who will order and compel them to enact such laws as are for the interest of the people."

And this minister only expresses the general sentiment of the ministers of the leading churches. They are determined to rule or ruin. Possibly they will yet do both.

WHEN the Italian troops took possession of Rome the percentage of illiteracy in the papal city was ninety per cent. Now it is forty-five.



NEW YORK, APRIL 21, 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 Anti-Poverty Society of this city, about which so much was said and written three or four years ago, still holds its meetings on Sunday evenings at Cooper Union.

A FEE of ten cents is charged for admittance to the Anti-Poverty meetings, and to secure a really good seat requires an additional fifteen cents. In this the Anti-Poverty Society is not singular; the entirely unique feature of these meetings is, that, notwithstanding the charge made at the door, a collection is regularly taken up in connection with the opening exercises.

DR. EDWARD MCGLYNN, the excommunicated priest, stands at the head of the Anti-Poverty Society, and at the regular meeting Sunday evening, April 10, seeming to see the incongruity of taking a collection after charging for admittance, he remarked that the collection was the "one feature of the meetings which entitles them to the character of semi-religious gatherings, and justifies the holding of them on the holy day."

DR. MCGLYNN'S subject on the occasion of the meeting referred to, was the proposed Sixteenth Amendment to the national Constitution, which provides that no State shall—

use its property or credit, or any money raised by taxation, or authorize either to be used for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding, by appropriation, payment for services, expenses or otherwise, any church, religious denomination or religious society, or any institution, society or undertaking which is wholly, or in part, under sectarian or ecclesiastical control.

The speaker did not confine himself very closely to his subject; but enough was said to make it clear that he was opposed to the proposed amendment, as it now stands; but only, he said, because it was not broad enough.

DR. MCGLYNN said that he would propose an amendment to the amendment making it provide that no State shall "use its property or credit, or any money raised by taxation, or authorize either to be used for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding, by appropriation, payment for services, expenses or otherwise, any insti-

tution or undertaking not wholly under governmental control."

THIS wording would accomplish all, and more, the Doctor thought, than was claimed for the amendment as it has been proposed by the Association for the Protection of American Institutions. As it now reads, the speaker suggested, it has the appearance of hostility to all religion, while at the same time it leaves a loophole for so-called "unsectarian religious instruction," under Government patronage and support; and in the latter suggestion Mr. McGlynn was clearly right. It is certainly not the design of the promoters of this proposed amendment to make any wider separation between Church and State than now exists. On the contrary, their amendment is aimed at Roman Catholics, and is designed to exclude from the public crib all the institutions of that church, without in the least interfering with the giving of "unsectarian religious instruction" at Government expense.

UPON this matter of "unsectarian religious instruction," the *Catholic Review* of the 10th inst., says:—

Indian Commissioner Morgan has purchased Protestant hymn-books and copies of the Protestant version of the Bible for the "non-sectarian" public schools which he has established for the Indians. Rev. Father Van Gorp, S. J., of Spokane, was in Washington, D. C., a few days ago, and he is reported to have said: "The Indians in the Northwest are better cared for, so far as rations are concerned, since the late uprising which cost the Government so much money. The cause of Indian education is not so bright as could be wished for, owing to the many difficulties the missionaries are compelled to encounter. Even the Indian Bureau, in spite of its advocacy of non-sectarian schools, seems to realize the necessity of some kind of religious education as among the articles purchased for what are called "non-sectarian" Indian schools are Bibles and hymn-books. The purchase of the latter justifies the conclusion that religious services form a part of the curriculum of the Government schools, especially as the superintendents are generally ex-Protestant preachers." Morgan's "non-sectarianism" is of the sort that would satisfy John Jay, Elliott F. Shepard and the other bigots of the proposed Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

The fact is, there is and can be no such thing as unsectarian religious instruction. When Commissioner Morgan puts Protestant Bibles and Protestant hymn-books into the hands of the Indians, and instructs them in accordance therewith, he is, from a Roman Catholic standpoint, giving them sectarian instruction. The proper course for the Government to pursue would be for it to give the Indians a purely secular education, and leave the rest to be done by missionary enterprise, and by anybody who would do it, putting no obstacles in the way and offering no inducements to the work, simply affording equal protection to all from violence. The only real service that civil government can render the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ is to let it alone, merely affording those who profess and teach it

the same protection that it affords to other citizens. When civil government does less than this it comes short of the purpose of its institution, namely, the protection of the natural rights of the individual; when it attempts to do more, it invades the sacred domain of conscience and corrupts the religion which it fosters. To be pure the religion of Christ must be absolutely separate from, and independent of, civil government.

In the recent Pittsburg Sunday Convention, Mr. Crafts dramatized quite effectively, and greatly to the disadvantage of the butt of his ridicule, the boast that "the Sunday paper has come to stay." The incident suggested to the writer, who was present, another drama, in two scenes, thus:—

SCENE I.

Mr. Crafts on the "reform" lecture platform exhibiting an oriental saw, and saying: "It was such a saw as this that Christ laid down at the close of his week's work on Saturday evening, saying, 'The Sabbath was made for man.'"

SCENE II.

Mr. Crafts in the editorial chair of the Christian Statesman: "Reformers should be accurate."

Accurate in what? In statements of fact? or in counting the cash received for Sunday evening "reform" lectures? The editor of the *Statesman* has quite a reputation for accuracy in the latter particular. Scene I. is a sample of his performances in the other matter. This great apostle of compulsory Sunday-keeping would gladly have the people think that Christ worked on Saturday, the seventh day of the week, and rested on Sunday, the first day of the week, but he himself knows better; and, unfortunately for his cause, the people also know better. The oriental saw and the designedly careless statement are to that extent a failure. They are, however, valuable as a sample of "reform" methods as exemplified by the founder of the American Sabbath Union, its whilom Field Secretary, and now boomer-in-general of "the whole circle of reforms."

It is stated that Rev. G. W. Todd, of Topeka, Kansas, has taken the initiatory steps for the organization of what he calls a People's church. It is said to be Mr. Todd's idea to organize, in the large towns, People's churches, at which laboring men can assemble and discuss what he terms, "moral and political questions."

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.