



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

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 11, 1892.

NUMBER 31.

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 United States has claimed to be an example to the world of the success of free institutions. The fundamental theory of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States is the acknowledgment of the natural rights of all mankind. To secure to its citizens the full enjoyment of these natural rights this Government was instituted.

To have succeeded in securing the practical application of this, the only true theory of civil government, and to have placed every citizen in the possession of his absolute rights, and have protected him in their enjoyment, would have required a greater internal revolution, within the thirteen colonies, than the outward revolution which freed them from the burden of English rule.

THE Puritans had felt the heavy hand of religious intolerance placed upon themselves, and had escaped from it. But this had not taught them the first principles of civil equity in religious matters,—no, not even tolerance. The colonies had felt the weight of civil oppression, and had rebelled. From their experiences they learned the correct theory of human rights. They expressed this theory in a governmental formula, but they did not fully apply it.

To govern their own spirit and deal righteously among themselves is a greater and a more difficult thing for the people of a nation than to take the cities of their enemy. Where a people do not deal right-

eously, each man with his neighbor, civil conditions of internal dissension must soon arise more dangerous than foreign war. Those who sigh for justice and equity, and those who go about to do injustice and inequity can not live always together in peace. If the constitutional theory of a government upholds civil equity, and civil and religious freedom unalloyed, and the government in its statutes and judicial practice is false to its principles, either it will utterly fail, or revolution must purge it.

THE general Government of the United States was established upon the principle that all men are born free. The individual colonies had previously decided differently, and in statehood retained the fatal difference. This direct antagonism between the social custom of negro slavery and the civil laws upholding it in certain of the States, and the expressed principle of the possession of inalienable rights by all men equally, continued to be more and more of a disturbing element in the social system and body politic of this Nation, until the Proclamation of Emancipation was signed, and the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution adopted.

THE first century of national existence saw that governmental error expiated in blood and fire. But parallel with it had existed another error, as fundamental and even more deeply entrenched in human prejudice, and appealing with greater subtlety to the popular mind for support. That was the fallacy of the support of religion and the enforcement of religious forms and doctrines by the civil law. This found its expression in legislative decrees maintaining previously existing laws, drawn from old English statutes enacted under Church and State rule, for the enforcement of Sunday observance, the punishment of blasphemy, etc., the public maintenance of chaplains for the army, legislative assemblies, and State institutions, the exemption of church

property from taxation, and other less prominent legislation respecting religion.

THIS the Constitution had distinctly forbidden to the general Government. The different States, however, were not prohibited from legislating in respect to religion, yet they inserted clauses in their respective bills of rights which mirrored, in almost every case, the spirit of the restriction put upon Congress. At the same time the States permitted the same discrepancy to exist in this regard between their bills of rights and their statute and municipal law, which some of the States had previously permitted to exist between the assertion of the right of all mankind to freedom and natural equality before the law, and the legalizing of the enslavement of the colored race.

The theory of the Government of the United States was based upon the equitable principle of equality before the law for all men. The practice of a portion of the States was based upon the assumption that a part of their population had no civil rights which the remainder was bound to respect. Where such antagonistic conditions exist revolution is a necessity. In this case revolution did result.

THE Government of the United States was founded upon the correct theory of complete non-interference in questions of religion; the only possible basis upon which civil equity can be maintained. The State governments tacitly accepted this for themselves but permitted sections inconsistent with it to creep into their constitutions; and laws, in direct contravention of it, to be placed and remain upon their statute books. The first great error, the physical enslavement of men was expelled from the body politic before the first century of its existence was past; the second great error, the assumption of the right to hold in bondage men's minds, is now, in the second century of the Republic, just beginning to be openly and generally asserted. The Congress of the United States, both Houses, has traitor-

ously joined hands with those who assail the right, both divine and constitutional, of untrammelled freedom in religious matters. The boom of the first gun fired upon Sumter sent a chill of prophetic dread through the Nation. The fifty-second Congress has fired upon the Constitution, has attacked the bulwark of constitutional religious liberty, and overthrown it. Are the citizens of the United States unaware of the onslaught, or are they all traitors? Does history raise its warning voice in vain? Does prophecy speak to heedless ears? They both speak the same words, and their speech is not uncertain. By them, that which lies at the end of this road upon which Congress has just entered is made clearer than noonday. Where is the end, and what is it that is there?

W. H. M.

The Gospel; What It Is, and Its Work As Opposed to the Mystery of Iniquity.*

*Text: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28:18-20.

THAT which they were to teach all nations is spoken of by Mark as "the gospel," going into all the world and preaching the gospel to every creature. He that believes and is baptized shall be saved; he that believes not shall be damned. But according to Luke, the Saviour at the same time said unto them, "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." Luke 24:49. Then in Acts 1:5-8:—

For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.

All these verses are essential for us to know the full force of the commission which the Lord gave his disciples at that time. They were to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, teaching that to all nations; and yet they were not to go until they were endued with power from on high. It would have been useless for them to go until that time; because the gospel is itself the power of God unto salvation, and the preaching of the gospel is the preaching of the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes. And for them to go forth thinking to preach the power of God when they themselves were not acquainted with that power, and were not connected with that power, would have been simply to preach empty words; it would not have been the gospel, because the gospel is the power of God. This is what the Lord himself has called it,—the power of God unto salvation. And to preach that gospel, I say again, is to preach the power of God. Any professed preaching of that gospel, which is not the preaching of the power of God, is not the preaching of the gospel of God at all, it is

not the preaching of the gospel of Christ. It may be preaching about the gospel, or it may be preaching another gospel; but it is not the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Therefore he would not have them go at all to say anything about this, to attempt to preach it, until they were endued with the power of that gospel itself, the power of God, the power from on high. Then when they should receive power, the Holy Ghost coming upon them—then he said they should bear witness in Jerusalem, in Judea, in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.

In the first chapter of 1 Corinthians, beginning with the 17th verse, is Paul's record of his connection with this gospel, and what he was called to preach: "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect." Then with Paul the preaching of the gospel was the preaching of the cross of Christ. Next verse: "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God." Then the preaching of the gospel is the preaching of the cross of Christ, and that is the preaching of the power of God; for *Christ is the power of God*, as he says in a further verse, and the wisdom of God. So I read on:—

For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness.

The Greeks sought after wisdom, and the Lord sent them that which they counted only foolishness. The Jews required a sign, and the Lord gave them that which they turned only into a stumbling-block. The Greeks sought after wisdom, and God gave it; but they would not take it, for they counted it only foolishness. The Jews required a sign, and God gave it; but they would not receive it because it came not just as they wanted; therefore they turned it into a stumbling-block, and got no good out of it. "The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified" "unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, *Christ the power of God*, and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men."

Now notice, "We preach Christ crucified." Unto them who are called, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God. That is what men are sent to preach; because that is the gospel. And the weakness of God is stronger than men, and the foolishness of God is wiser than men. But notice, they were not sent to preach *weakness*; they were sent to preach *power*, even the power of God and they preached it. But even if they had been sent to preach the weakness of God, it would have been stronger than anything men can do or know. Then the thing for men to do is to accept it when God sends it—accept it; for even though it be counted the weakness of God, it is stronger than anything men can get hold of, or create anyway.

Then they sought after wisdom, and the Lord sent them wisdom; he sent them

Christ, the wisdom of God. He sent them his own wisdom, the wisdom of God himself; but they counted it foolishness. Yet even though they did, they should have accepted it, for the foolishness of God was wiser than anything they knew or could know otherwise. Then when God sends a message, no difference how we view it, we are to accept it. When God sends a message, men are to accept it, even though we count it weakness; for it is stronger than anything men give. It comes from God, it will not hurt anybody. Even though it be counted foolishness, that has nothing to do with it; accept it. Not that it is foolishness on God's part but men may count it foolishness. Well, as it came from God, then why not accept it? Coming from God, it is wiser than anything man ever got hold of, or ever could. Then I say again, when God sends a message, no difference how men view it, or what they think it is, it is their duty to accept of it; and then they will find out it is something different than they thought it was; because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men.

Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty.

He has chosen the weak things of the world to confound those that are mighty, because the weakness of this world can have the power of God; and that will bring to naught the things of the mighty, and confound the things of the world. "And things which are despised hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are, *that no flesh should glory in his presence.*"

"For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." That is all any one can know who preaches the gospel—Jesus Christ, and him crucified. That is the whole story; that is all the gospel; that is all there is of God. "And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

Now, any faith that stands in the wisdom of men will fail. Any faith that rests upon the power of argument will fail. Every faith will fail but that which rests upon the power of God, and stands in the power of God. Now, when the power of God is received, when our faith stands upon that, and in that, then the argument will always come with it; there will be an argument that is stronger than all things else. But the argument is derived from the power, and not the power from the argument. Therefore, any faith that stands in the strength of argument and the power of theoretical demonstration, will never stand the test that will be brought upon those who are to enter the kingdom of God.

(Continued next week.)

WHILST we assert for ourselves a freedom to embrace, to profess and to observe, the religion which we believe to be of divine origin, we can not deny an equal freedom to those whose minds have not yielded to the evidences which have convinced us.—*James Madison.*

*From a sermon delivered by A. T. Jones, at Battle Creek, Mich., July 9, 1892, as reported and published in the *Review and Herald.*

The Postmaster and the Adventists.

A GENTLEMAN in Kansas having read in THE SENTINEL the account of the persecution of Adventists in Henry Co., Tenn., found himself unable to believe such things possible in the United States in the latter part of the nineteenth century; and, that he might know of a surety concerning the facts, he wrote to the postmaster at Springville, Tenn., asking if the things which he had read were true. The postmaster's letter has been sent to us, and here it is *verbatim*, without even a letter added to it, or taken from it, with the exception of the omission of the name of the gentleman to whom the letter was written:—

Springville July 11 1892

MR ———— Sir yours of the 7th Received I Cannot tell why I am Cold on to answer the questions in your note But I will anser them as Correctly as I Can and I am persanely acquainted with all of the Jentlemen now in Jale or pretended to Be But I doubt very much wheather the Jale doore has Been locked Since they have Been put in there or not But I think not But I dwo no that they was put in Jale for a strict violation of the Sunday law and I no when a pore Boy is prosecuted for a violation of the law for Carryin a pistol or playin Cards they ar put in Jale and locked up and they have to stay untel they ar paid out But I only charge this to the Jalor for lack of his duty according to law Well I will now give ther names J. H. Dortch W. D. Lowry J. Moon and James Stem they all Live within 2 miles of this post office and dwo ther maling and Receiving of male at this place ther church is wethin 2 miles of this place and it is very Demarlizten to the young and Rising people of this Settiment they call themselves Seven day adventist they pretend to keep Saturday and Work on Sunday at all kinds of farm work plow Role logs hall Cross ties and in fact there bigest days work on Sunday when they no that it is Strictly against the State law to work on Sunday there is a little nest of them in this Settiment and have been trying hard to Increase there church for about 10 years and I think they have in that time got in there church about 12 white male members and 1 negro man and Wife and about the Same amount of white ladys and Sum 12 or 15 Childer But there is no other church of the kind in this County nor adJoining Countes there has Been 3 Jentlemen of this Church Indted in this Cort Sum 2 or 3 years ago for working on Sunday they was fined 25 dollars Each they appeled to the Supreem Cort of the State and the Judgment of the Circuit Court was Confermed But they yaul not pay fine nor Cost and of Corse according to law had to go to Jale But they was walking about over town the most of ther time these fore Jentlemen was tried Befor Judg Swigart and the Judg Red the law and the Desisions of other Corts all a gainst the Sunday working But Said Jentlemen I will onley fine you one dollar Each and the Cost But they will not pay Either fine or Cost and I learn that them of that Church that is at home is -Still at work on there farms on Sunday Just Shur as Sundry Cums there is Sum of these Jentlemen that is Very Clevor men But I think Every good Citizen aught to observe the laws of his Cuntry and I think that if a man Violats the laws of his Cuntry wilfully and nonly and Cannot Be made Suffer for it he mite Be Coled an outlaw for which I Suppose there is a Remady or at least aught to Bee they ar like the Rest of us only Commen talent I Belive I have in all the Information Cold for

Respectfully Thos Riggs P M

This letter confirms all that has been said in THE SENTINEL concerning the Springville persecutions. The writer of the letter is one of the worst enemies of the Adventists, yet it will be noticed that he has no evil thing to say of them except concerning their faith. Their church, he says, has a very demoralizing influence in the community. The sense in which it is "demoralizing" will be explained by the following dialogue between a Methodist and an Adventist in that neighborhood shortly before the recent persecution was inaugurated:—

Methodist.—"You people are doing a great deal of harm in this country."

Adventist.—"Why, how is that? We are quiet, inoffensive people."

Methodist.—"Yes, but were it not for your

church we would have regular meetings here at Springville, and all the young people who now go to your meetings would be working members of the Methodist church."

Adventist.—"Well, show us our error and we will all be Methodists."

Methodist.—"That's just what we're going to do; we're going to prosecute every one of you."

The "great deal of harm," and the "demoralizing" influence consist in teaching things contrary to the doctrines of the Methodist, Baptist and Presbyterian churches, and principally in denying that Sunday is the Sabbath.

The postmaster at Springville has considerably underestimated the membership of the Adventist church in his neighborhood. One of the editors of THE SENTINEL has spent a number of weeks at Springville and is personally acquainted with twenty-seven male members of the Adventist church there. The number of female members is somewhat larger. It is the most prosperous church in the neighborhood; and the only one having regular weekly services. This fact makes it a thorn in the side of members of other churches. The persecution is designed to weaken it and turn the tide toward the other churches.

The statement made in the letter that Adventists do their biggest day's work on Sunday is absolutely false. As has been previously stated in THE SENTINEL, they avoid on Sunday all work that could possibly be a real annoyance. Only the more quiet kinds of farm work are done in the Springville neighborhood on Sunday. The postmaster there may not know personally just how this is, for none of his immediate neighbors are members of that church and none of the Adventists live in the village. They are all farmers and the postmaster knows of their work only as he hears of it or else goes out of his way to see them at work. C. P. B.

Sunday Closing, Who Asks it, and Why?

THERE is very much more to this question of Sunday closing of the World's Fair than most people are aware. Who are making the demands for the closing of the Fair on Sunday? Why do they make these demands? It is the churches, and the foundation reason is because Sunday is an institution of the Church. If it would do violence to their convictions to attend on Sunday, can't they stay away? Or, do they ask a law, fearing that they will be unable to resist the temptation of open gates? Do they need closed gates so they can keep a Sabbath? Why not ask for a law compelling them to stay away on Sunday, and leave others to exercise their freedom? The Jew, Seventh-day Baptist, and Seventh-day Adventist, observe the seventh day of the week; why not close the gates on the seventh day? The Mohammedan keeps Friday; why not close the gates on Friday? Which is the true Sabbath, any way? Who will tell us?

Only a small portion of the people of this Nation keep a Sabbath. Do the Christian people of this land of liberty, desire to resort to force to compel others to do as they do? Do they think these will attend church service if the gates are closed? Do they not know that closed gates mean more patronage to the saloon, more liquor drank, more debauchery, more crime? Do they not know that, if Congress shall take action in the matter, it will be an unwarranted assumption of

power, and class legislation? And do not they know that such action of Congress, would be but the beginning of a union of religion and the State that would never be checked till almost every institution of the Church would be incorporated into law, and enforced by the civil power? Are they ready to assume all the consequences of such legislation? Are they?—*Publius, in McIntosh Times.*

Despotism of the Church.

[The following extracts are from the speech of Senator Palmer of Illinois, in the Senate, July 12; the subject under discussion being the sundry civil appropriation bill, and the World's Fair appropriation with the Sunday closing proviso.]

THE State of Illinois has never assumed to require the actual observance of any of the Sabbaths, either the Jewish or the Christian Sabbath. The people of the State of Illinois, so far as I know their opinions, and they are best expressed in their statutes, treat the observance of the Sabbath as a personal duty to be determined by each individual for himself. The theory upon which our laws rest is that men are responsible to the Supreme Being for their own conduct, and that the State is in no wise responsible for them; that the State has no right to control the personal opinions or conduct of men on any day, subject to this limitation:—

Whoever disturbs the peace and good order of society by labor . . . shall be fined, etc.

It has been held in Illinois, and, I think, it has been held in most of the States, that the State has no right to determine that men shall observe the first day of the week in any particular method; but the object and function of the State, as we maintain, is that each citizen shall have the right without disturbance to observe the Sabbath in such manner as seems to him in point of conscience to be his duty and that no person shall disturb him in the exercise of his conscientious right. I know that is the theory which has been enforced by judicial decision. It has been held that the State has no right to prescribe obedience to any mere moral requirement that does not disturb others, leaving each man to determine to discharge his own duty to that Infinite Being who rules the universe, regarding each man as his own priest, and to this extent his own king. We have never recognized the authority of the States to prescribe moral duty. We simply understand that the obligation of the State is to protect us, every one of us, in the exercise of our own rights, leaving it to each individual to determine the matter of conscience according to his own degree of enlightenment or according to his own sense of obligation.

I venture to say that whatever may be said to the contrary, that is the practical law of every State in the Union. There may be vestiges yet of ancient requirements, but the courts have modified them, and to-day in New England, where at one time the Sunday was regarded with great reverence and where Sunday laws were enforced with despotic force, it is no longer the case. Illinois is like the other States in that respect.

Still in respect to this matter I should hope that the Senate would be satisfied with the rule of the Illinois Legislature that each man should be left undisturbed to serve God in his own way, to keep the Sabbath in his own way, free from disturbance. The Senator from Maine says

that there are theaters open in Chicago on Sunday; I have no doubt it is true; but I had not supposed when they were not disturbing others, that it was a ground of legal censure, whatever might be said, I agree, in moral censure of acts like that. But in Maine, in populous cities, I have no doubt amusements are indulged in, not perhaps to the same extent; but amusements are no doubt permissible on Sunday according to the customs of the Senator's own State.

However, there is another view of this case. Mr. President, this is to be an international exhibition. We speak of it as a mere show. It is to be a great national event. Do I say national? It is an event that is to be far more than national. The word "international" does not express it. It is to be the celebration of an event which has had a larger influence upon the destinies of mankind than any other which has occurred within the history of our race since the resurrection of the Lord on the Sabbath—the discovery of this vast continent, now inhabited by perhaps nearly a hundred millions of inhabitants—and we are inviting men from all countries on earth. There will be at Chicago the representatives, I was about to say, of every civilized government; there will be representatives at the Exposition of men of noncivilized races, the Mohammedans, with their peculiar observances, and the continental nations of Europe, and England, and Scotland, and the islands of the sea, and the Indians. It is to be a gathering of all the races of the earth at one spot celebrating the grandest event in the earth's history.

I maintain that therefore the law that each man shall be allowed to pursue his own views of duty, being compelled to be regardful of the rights of others is a proper law applied to this subject. In reverence for the Sunday of the Christians, I do not mean to allow it to be believed that I have no sufficient regard for that holy day, but I have never yet felt that it was my right to impose my opinions upon other people. I have insisted that you shall on this day leave me undisturbed, and leave Christian men undisturbed; that you shall leave the sanctuary undisturbed; that wherever men assemble themselves together for devotion, or I may say amusement, on that day they shall be undisturbed. What more can be asked? If I could be clothed with any portion of the power of the Almighty perhaps I might do otherwise, but I do not believe myself authorized to denounce all that may be deemed enemies according to the law of the Supreme Being.

Let that occasion be national, international, universal. I think the narrow rule insisted upon here is unwise; but if it shall be the sense of the Senate that it shall be done, it is the business of the country, not mine.

I have been told, and I have no doubt it is true, that many of the Christian people of Chicago resist this proposition; but not all of them. There are a large number of seventh-day people who believe that Sunday is not the holy day. There are a great many people who agree with me that the Legislature has no right to dictate to others what day shall be kept as the holy one. There are many who think that way. There are thousands again who think that this opportunity afforded to the laborer, to the toiler, and to his wife and his children, ought not to be thrown away.

But I am told that there is another element who are quite as earnest as the good people. I understand that all the saloon-keepers in Chicago are in favor of closing this institution on the Sabbath day. I can understand why it should be so. The multitudes that will go to Chicago at that time, instead of going into the Fair, and witnessing the Exhibition, being there alone, strangers, will go about the saloons and places of that sort on Sunday. I understand that there is a perfect agreement on that point, and that the whisky-sellers are in favor of closing the Fair on the Sabbath.

I have one thing to say in conclusion. There are gentlemen who talk about the American Sabbath. Mr. President, I reverence American institutions. I have no sympathy with the foreign sentiment; I have no eagerness to adopt anything foreign; but I do believe that American sentiment has undergone a change under the influence of broader views of individual rights. New England sentiment at one time actually required a very close observance of Sunday, but that was the despotism not of God, but of church, and it is a remarkable fact that in another portion of the Union, where more liberal views are indulged in, the morality of the people was as complete and as perfect as it was in New England.

It is said by a late writer that it is very remarkable that in New England where theoretically popular rights were most regarded, the government was most despotic, while in another quarter, where aristocratic ideas were to some extent recognized, actual, personal liberty was better protected than in New England. The change has taken place and we can not resist it. We may talk about it, we may speak about the American Sabbath, and it deserves reverence, but it is for me to revere the Sabbath and it is not for me to impose upon another that obligation.

Their Own Testimony.

THE *Christian Statesman* and the *Union Signal* have denied that the brewers and saloon-keepers of Chicago are in favor of Sunday closing of the Fair, but they are contradicted by the brewers and the saloonists themselves and by the testimony of those who have taken pains to learn their views. The following interview is from the *Washington Post*:—

"I can state from actual personal knowledge that the brewers of Chicago are to a man in favor of Sunday closing of the World's Fair," said S. R. Keogh, a well-known attorney of the Lake City, at the National Hotel. "The brewers and saloon men," he continued, "are delighted at the action of Congress in requiring the Exposition to be closed on that day, and if necessary they would raise a big amount of cash to have that pernicious piece of legislation enacted. They know that the hordes of people, if debarred from inspection of exhibits, would seek solace and amusement in the bar-rooms, that will not be closed Sundays, and augment the revenues of the proprietors by many thousands of dollars. The sporting fraternity, also, advocates the proposition from the same spirit of self-interest that actuates the whisky-men. The drinking element would not exhaust all their means in the rum shops, but would, after spending part of the day in imbibing, be ready for tempting fortune in almost any way that was convenient.

If we can only get the appropriation from Congress on the condition of Sunday closing I would say let the Government keep its money. It would be the worst thing possible to accept the money under such circumstances, for it is a miserable concession to a puritanical and illiberal spirit out of harmony with an era of boasted progress and freedom."

The promise of any appropriation on

condition of Sunday closing is simply in the nature of a money bribe to the Managers of the Exposition, offered by the Government at the instance of a portion of the Church faction of the United States. The purpose of the bribe is to secure enforced observance of a particular religious tenet. The Congress of the United States is certainly in a very peculiar position in the matter.

A School of Conscience.

UNDER this heading appears the following editorial in a recent number of the *Churchman* of this city (New York):—

Certain gentlemen in the vicinity of Paris, Tennessee, believing that Saturday is the day on which men ought to worship, not only claim the right to observe that day religiously, but also claim the right to carry on their usual farm and other business on Sunday, in violation of the State Sunday law. In the exercise of their first claim they have been unmolested, but in the exercise of the second they have been arrested, convicted, fined \$25 apiece, and, in default of payment, have been lodged in jail. One of them who has previously served three months in jail for similar offenses, writes to the National Religious Liberty Association of Chicago, complaining that it would take all their small property to meet the demands of persistent fines, and that the judge, in answer to the protest that they were conscientious in this matter, replied: "Let them educate their consciences by the laws of Tennessee."

At first blush this judicial fiat seems oppressive. . . . But there would seem to be a distinction to be drawn between a law which violates conscience, and a law which simply limits conscience. Unless these seventh-day religionists take the clause, "Six days shalt thou labor," as literally as, "The seventh day is the Sabbath," they can hardly complain that the State Sunday law violates their consciences. A law compelling them to work on Saturday might be open to that objection, but the Sunday law only abridges their liberty to toil and get gain, to five days in the week, which is the price they are called upon to pay for having a peculiar conscience. . . . The Tennessee Sunday law being what it is, the Sunday earnings of seventh-day Tennesseans would seem to be liable to confiscation in the shape of fines, and the judge gave good advice, when he said, in this particular, "Let them educate their consciences by the laws of Tennessee."

The *Churchman* does not usually much concern itself with matters outside of the Episcopal Church, the would-be "Catholic Church of America." And when it does indulge in any comment upon external affairs, it is wont to do so in a very modest, benevolent way; as the foregoing extract bears witness. Yet, "it would seem" that it were hard for our esteemed *Churchman* to disguise the self-satisfied, supercilious composure with which he regards the judicial crime against "these seventh-day religionists" who have consciences sufficiently "peculiar" to dare obey God rather than man. It is in vain that this organ of a church which is synonymous with formal, legalized ecclesiasticism, attempts to conceal its satisfaction over the occurrences mentioned, and its complete indorsement of the tyrannical laws which caused them. And it takes this attitude without a blush, "first," last, or anywhere.

Observe the gracious admission that a law compelling these "gentlemen" to work on *Saturday night* be open to the objection that it would violate their conscience; still it would be only an "objection"—nothing very serious, to the *Churchman*. If one of these "seventh-day Tennesseans" should happen to be in the neighboring State of Georgia, and were "compelled to work on Saturday" in the chain-gang under the penalty of bloody stripes and lifelong scars if he re-

fused, doubtless it would seem to the *Churchman* an exceedingly proper thing for the humane officers of civil law to interpret that clause; "Six days shalt thou labor," very literally. And the poor violator of the "venerable day of the sun" would scarcely be given his choice of "one day in seven" for rest.

But "the Tennessee Sunday law being what it is," "a law which simply *limits* conscience" in that it "only abridges their liberty to toil and get gain, to five days in the week," as a matter of course, "the Sunday earnings of seventh-day Tennesseans would seem to be liable to confiscation in the shape of fines and "good advice." Shame upon the unworthy subterfuge that these poor farmers who have to toil for their daily bread could earn \$25 apiece every Sunday! Shame upon America's four hundred years of vaunted civilization that compels the victims of religious intolerance to lie in filthy jails until their fines shall be fulfilled at twenty-five cents a day!

It is true that one or two who were able to pay their fines, refused to do so because they would not acknowledge the jurisdiction of the court. "At first blush" it always seems that a man who puts himself in this position deserves his fate. The law must take its course. So long as it remains on the statute books, good or bad, it must be enforced. No man has the moral right to urge a claim of conscience in defense of an act which violates *the equal civil rights of every other man.*

Let us apply this logic: There is to-day in this year of grace, 1892, upon the statute books of Maryland, in the city of Washington, D. C., unrepealed by our enlightened nineteenth century Congress, a civil law which requires that any man who shall publicly deny his belief in, or blaspheme, the Holy Trinity, shall be bored through the tongue; and if he repeatedly persists in this course he must suffer death. Is this law enforced now? Bless you, no; because that law, you know, was intolerant, destructive of the rights of conscience, you know, and was derived from the old Church and State establishment of colonial days. My dear friend, we have *progressed* since then.

Probably, in certain directions. But this description is every whit true of the Tennessee Sunday law. Like the other, it was designed as an instrument of religious persecution under civil auspices, and is enforced in no other way. In the testimony in the cases referred to by the *Churchman*, not one of the neighbors of these "seventh-day Tennesseans" could be persuaded to say that his *civil rights* had been violated because another had quietly plowed his corn, away from the public road, on Sunday. No one had been disturbed, nor was it shown according to the indictment that these "seventh-day religionists" had created "a public nuisance." Yet there was not found wanting a jury that could be influenced by religious bigotry to convict them, nor a judge who was not ready with his "good advice."

It is always thus when civil law usurps jurisdiction over religious questions. Civil law never did, never does, do this of its own will; but as Judge Hammond said in the King case (another laurel in the crown of Tennessee), "by a sort of factitious advantage the observers of Sunday have secured control of legislation, and persistently adhere to that advantage." The motive is purely religious, the judge and

jury are its tools. The *Churchman* is obliged to admit that the Sunday law abridges liberty of action to one man in matters wherein he does not "abridge," nor "limit," nor "violate" the liberty of his fellow man. Where is the warrant for this abridgment, either in the Bible, the Constitution of the United States, or in the sublime declaration of Jesus Christ: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's"?

In an adjoining editorial, the *Churchman* sheds forth this complacent dictum: "The great error in the Puritan theology was the abandonment of the truth of a common corporate fellowship . . . in the brotherhood of Christ and the fatherhood of God." The reflecting mind can scarce repress the sentiment that there is possibly as much of pious cant coupled with Pharisaic intolerance in modern formalism as in any variety that flourished four hundred years ago. Occasionally it is well to take a look in the direction we are drifting.

F. W. HOWE.
Ann Arbor, Mich.

No Constitutional Authority.

HON. WM. C. OATES, of Alabama, speaking upon the Sunday closing proviso attached to the World's Fair appropriation in the sundry civil bill, said: "But, sir, Congress has no police power which it can exercise in the State of Illinois. Suppose that the money is voted in its present shape, accepted, and used by the Fair Association or Commission, and afterwards the conditions be not observed, would the United States have any recourse? None whatever. It absolutely has no power to enforce either of the conditions proposed. This is but another illustration of the utter want of constitutional authority for this proposed legislation. The Supreme Court in the case of *United States vs. Dewitt*, 9 Wallace Reports, held that an act of Congress, which is a police regulation, is without legislative authority except when it excludes territorially all State authority, as in the District of Columbia. Within State limits it can have no constitutional operation."

"Religious Sentiment."

HE insisted that it was due to the *religious sentiment* of the country that the World's Fair should be closed on Sunday.—*From report of Senator Colquitt's speech on the sundry civil bill.*

WHAT does the senator mean by "the religious sentiment of the country?"—that's the question. So far as we can learn, the only expression of sentiment in favor of Sunday closing that has been heard thus far comes in the form of petitions from about two million religionists belonging chiefly, if not altogether, to the so-called evangelical churches. Assuming that these petitioners represent the entire body of their several churches there still remain the Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Protestant Episcopalians, Unitarians and Universalists who have either not declared themselves at all on the subject or else have spoken in favor of open Sundays. The numeral strength of these communions, according to the census of 1890, is as follows:—

Roman Catholics.....	8,277,039
Lutherans.....	1,086,048
Protestant Episcopalians.....	480,176
Unitarians (est).....	20,000
Universalists.....	42,952
Totals.....	9,906,215

This is nearly half of the 21,757,171 recorded communicants of all the churches in America. If these be added to the large body of persons of "religious sentiment" who are not communicants of any church and the larger number of evangelical churches who do not favor closed Sundays, it will be seen that Senator Colquitt has spoken loosely in speaking for "the religious sentiment of the country." The "religious sentiment of the country" is *not*, so far as the record shows, in favor of closing the Fair on Sunday.

But suppose it were. Do we understand Senator Colquitt to say that 55,000,000 of citizens are bound to surrender their consciences into the keeping of the remaining 10,000,000? That is bad democracy and worse republicanism. The majority rules in republics.—*Chicago Evening Post.*

Neither Gospel Nor Temperance.

THE *Union Signal* has quoted from the pen of John G. Woolley a definition of gospel temperance, which the editors pronounce "the best definition" they have heard. The first part of this definition is perfectly proper; but the last sentence discloses the fact that the "undying enthusiasm" which has for some time been displayed in an effort to force the gospel upon people by law, is not yet dead. Mr. Woolley says:—

And when a Christian man stands up and votes the will of God touching drink into the ballot box, and does it for His sake and in His name, though he stands alone among a million, and against overwhelming odds of policy or politics or worldly wisdom, I call that gospel temperance.

Mr. Woolley and the *Union Signal* may call this gospel temperance as much as they please, but the fact is, it is neither gospel nor temperance. It may be the gospel of some people, but it is not the gospel of Christ. That gospel does not require the aid of civil law. It can succeed without it. Says the Apostle Paul: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

The gospel is not the power of the State; it is the power of God; and in order for any one to be able to be saved by it, it is necessary for him to believe. As human laws can not force men to believe, the State can never force any one to be benefited by the gospel.

To undertake to force the gospel, or any part of it, upon people by law, is to undertake to substitute the power of the State for the power of God's Spirit. And as no one could make such an attempt until he had first lost his faith in the power of God, it is a virtual declaration that the power of the State is more efficient than the power of God. It is, in short, a denial of the power of God.

The work of Christianity is to be accomplished, "not by might [margin, army], nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts." This shows that the power of God's Spirit and the power of the State are distinct and separate powers, and that they are opposed to each other, in the sense that they do not co-operate in religious work. The gospel is to be applied to men's hearts by the power of the Holy Ghost; instead of having its outward forms forced upon them by the power of civil law. No government ever did or ever can, by enactment, help Christianity in the slightest degree. All seeming help which has come from

that source has sooner or later been turned into a curse. This truth is written in letters of blood on every page of history.

The apostle declares that the gospel is the power of God. Consequently when the power of the State is substituted for the power of God to enforce an observance of the outward forms of the gospel upon men, it is not the gospel at all which is enforced, but a counterfeit of the gospel. Paul speaks of those who are "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof"; which shows that "godliness" consists of two things—form and power. Some people seem to think that if they only get the "form" from the Bible, it matters little where they get the power; and so they petition and vote for power of the State to enforce gospel temperance, and gospel morality, and anything and everything that they think is gospel. But as the gospel is the power of God and is not the power of the State, or of its armies, it is impossible to vote gospel temperance, or anything else pertaining to the gospel, into the ballot box. The gospel never went into the ballot box, and there is no power on earth that can put it in. The gospel goes into men's hearts when it goes anywhere, and it does not go by "the gateway of politics."

As there is no gospel in Mr. Woolley's definition, so also, there is no temperance. Temperance is self-control, and not external legal control. A man who does not drink simply because he can get no liquor is no more temperate in the sight of God than the man who lies drunk in the gutter. Temperance is a Christian grace to be acquired through the working of God's Spirit; and you may as well talk about legislating faith, virtue, knowledge, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity into an individual as to talk about legislating temperance into him. But you say "there are some people who are temperate while they do not believe in the gospel at all." This seems to be true; just as many persons appear to possess the other Christian graces without believing in Christianity. Our only explanation for this is, that God is so merciful that he helps even those who disregard his claims, and does not permit them to fall under the complete control of Satan, that his goodness may still lead them toward repentance. Some persons have more natural force of character and self-control than others; but the forlorn and helpless wrecks of humanity which we see all about us at the present time, should shake our confidence in the moral power of man when separated from his Creator. God only is good, and all goodness proceeds from him. The gospel is the medium through which he proposes to impart his power to fallen men—that power which alone can give them the victory over the forces of evil in the world. There is no safety outside of God's plan. "Without me," says Christ, "ye can do nothing."

But the Scripture says in plain words that temperance is a fruit of the Spirit of God (Gal. 5: 22, 23); and Mr. Woolley admits that it belongs to the gospel when he calls it "gospel temperance." It is just as impossible to have the fruits of the Spirit in an individual who has not the Spirit as it would be to gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles. The carnal mind does not bear the fruits of the Spirit; hence it is worse than foolish to talk about forcing people by law to be temperate. If these people would search their Bibles with the right spirit, they

might find out what kind of a tree temperance grows on, and then they would give up their effort to compel a corrupt tree to bear spiritual fruit. And if the energy that is consumed in the effort to influence legislation and secure the aid of the civil power to force the gospel upon men, were put forth in proclaiming the gospel as God directs, the Holy Spirit would attend their efforts in such measure that they would not need to be ashamed of the results. Paul said, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God;" but when he spoke about those who were "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof," he said, "from such turn away." A gospel which denies the power of God by entreating the civil power to establish its claims, we have need to be ashamed of, for it will never succeed. Its supporters may succeed in securing control of the civil power; they may succeed in persecuting to the death every one who disagrees with their notions of religion; but they will not succeed in converting any one to God, or in making the world any better.

If the prohibitory movement has no other end in view than to aid temperance, then the sooner it goes down the better; first, because the State has no right to meddle in any way with that which belongs to the gospel; and, second, because it is impossible to force people to possess the fruits of the Spirit of God. The only legitimate object which the movement can have is the protection of peaceable citizens from the incivilities of the drinker. This is on the principle that the Government should prohibit that which experience has shown to be a necessary and almost invariable cause of crime. The prohibition movement can properly have no more relation to temperance than it has to faith, charity, or patience. And the sole object of government is the protection of each citizen against the incivilities of others.

A. DELOS WESTCOTT.

Only an Engine of State.

No instance can be produced of pure Christianity attempting to subvert civil government; on the contrary, it is intrusted with a conciliating plan of universal peace between secular and sacred things by Jesus Christ. The corrupters of Christianity deprived it of this noble plea; they bartered purity for power, exchanged argument for authority, and made scandalous truck of all the truths and virtues of religion for the seals of a prince and the keys of a gaol. They invented words of inexplicable mystery, and inflicted penalties upon those who could not interpret their dreams—they cast innumerable canons, and with these destroyed the lives and liberties and properties of their peaceable brethren—they armed priests with secular power, and covered the barbarous use of it with infinite pomp—they excited princes to hate, persecute, banish, and burn, their subjects for matters of conscience—they thought lay subjects beneath their notice, kings above law, and themselves above kings. To their conduct it is owing that most great men consider religion as nothing more than an engine of State.—*Robert Robinson. 1823.*

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

IN Keyport, N. J., a citizen's protective association has been formed to defend the Sunday cases brought by the Sabbath Union committee in their effort to enforce the Sunday laws.

THE Mayor and the ministers of Freeport, Ill., are at swords' points on the Sunday observance question. The Mayor has permitted Sunday baseball and other Sunday diversions, and the ministers are denouncing him from their pulpits.

THE *Church Bulletin*, of South Chicago, has in its issues of June 24 and July 1, a very accurate statement of the facts connected with the arrest and imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee, together with a sound exposition of the principles involved, and an earnest plea for civil equity, pure and undefiled.

It seems that the president of the American Sabbath Union is summering in Bar Harbor. A special dispatch to the *World* says: "The non-observance of Sunday at Bar Harbor shocks Mr. Shepard, and it is rumored that he is going to bring the old neglected Blue Laws to the front again, and have things closed up on the Lord's day. An excursion of over fifteen hundred people was in town to-day (Sunday) from all along the Maine Central Railway, and it hurt Mr. Shepard's feelings to see them."

THE *Mid-Continent Magazine*, for June, contains an article on "Religious Liberty," in respect to which the magazine says editorially:—

"In the days of our fathers there existed only one opinion as to religious liberty, but civilized human nature finally rebelled against compulsion in religion, as well as other matters, and to-day we enjoy much greater freedom from the tyranny of the Church—thanks largely to societies, such as the National Religious Liberty Association, the secretary of which, Mr. A. O. Tait, has treated us to a very able article on the subject in this issue."

It has not been heretofore understood that this country had a national religion, but instantly, upon the legislation by Congress which shows that to be a fact, there are found those who not only realize it but do not hesitate to say so, in so many words. The *Christian Standard* says: "And, indeed, that which is precious in our national heritage centers in our national religion." That religion is the religion of which Sunday observance is the distinguishing mark, and that mark all its followers must receive. A careful study of the tenth chapter of Revelation is of much value in this connection.

THE *Register*, Red Bank, N. J., publishes the following in reference to the Sunday law crusade now in progress at Atlantic Highlands:—

"The people of Atlantic Highlands have formed a Law and Order League to put down all Sunday traffic which is in violation of the Sunday laws of the State. If the Law and Order League mean business, let them begin their work by having the officials of the Central railroad arrested for Sunday traffic. Let them arrest the captains and officers of the steamboats that ply between New York and Atlantic Highlands. Let them arrest all the travelers who use the boats and trains on Sunday, for such traveling is against the law. If they really believe in what they say, they will do this, and they won't arrest the poor Italian fruit sellers, and barbers, and newspaper dealers, until they have made examples of the rich and powerful corporations. If they allow the rich corporations to violate the law while they seek to punish poor and unimportant people for doing the same, they will prove themselves to be arrant humbugs, and to be without moral courage. If the Sunday Blue Laws are to be enforced, enforce them against everybody, rich and

poor alike, the man who rides out with his team as well as the man who hires a livery rig; the man who sells railroad tickets as well as the man who sells bananas. If the Law and Order people mean to carry out the law, let them carry it out impartially and treat everybody alike."

THE Mankato *Ledger* says of the passage of the Sunday closing proviso: "It will be a fine victory for the ultra wing of the church people. Their success in this direction will only embolden them to take more active steps toward the enactment of religious legislation having for its object the recognition of Sunday and an enforced attendance by every person of a suitable age, upon Sunday worship. This to be sure is antagonistic to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and a direct contradiction of the claim that Church and State are independent of each other in the United States. It remains to be seen if the church people who comprise only a fifth of the sixty-five millions of people that make up the population of this Nation, can control and dictate a certain line of policy to the other four-fifths of the population."

That they are already thinking of following up the advantage gained is shown by the words of Rev. J. D. Sand, of Pittsburg, who says of the action of Congress in the World's Fair matter that it "suggests to the Christian's mind that if this may be done so may other needful measures. The Church is gaining power continually and its voice will be heard in the future much oftener than in the past."

THE propriety of Sunday bicycle riding has become a matter for the decision of the courts in Connecticut. The following special dispatch appears in the New York *Sun* from Bridgeport, Conn.:

"At Fairfield to-day a case came before Justice John L. Morehouse, which not only interests thousands of wheelmen in Connecticut, but also will be watched closely by those who are in favor of enforcing the old Blue Laws. On complaint of Grand Juror J. D. Toomey, a young crockery merchant of this city, who resides in Fairfield, was arrested charged with several offenses, one of them being that on July 17, the same day being the Sabbath and the Lord's day, the said Osborne did indulge in the vain sport and recreation of riding a certain vehicle known as a bicycle, greatly to the disturbance of the peace, and contrary to the statute in such cases made and provided."

"Osborne was riding from his store to his home when arrested."

"Stratford residents are also interested in the suit, as the good and quiet old town has recently been invaded by a horse railway, over which cars are run on the Sabbath, greatly to the annoyance and disturbance of the remnants of previous generations. Thousands of Bridgeport working men and their families patronize the line every Sunday, and wander for hours on the broad streets, which are shaded by magnificent elms. The Stratford authorities have succumbed to the influence brought to bear, until all the ice cream saloons, cigar stores, and drug stores have been closed on the Lord's day."

"Yesterday one of the old-time residents, whose wife was seriously ill, tried unsuccessfully to induce a druggist to open his doors in order that a necessary dose of medicine might be obtained. As the applicant for drugs had been one of the foremost in compelling the druggist to take a rest on the Sabbath, he was allowed to take one of the horrid horse cars to this city."

THE *Christian Union* says of the proposed congressional appropriation for the World's Fair:

It remains to be seen, however, whether the Fair Managers will accept the condition that goes with it. This condition consists of a proviso, introduced in the Senate, amusingly enough, by Senator Quay, of Pennsylvania, ordering that the Fair shall be absolutely closed on Sunday. The proviso of Senator Peffer, of Kansas, that no intoxicating liquor should be sold within the Fair grounds, was defeated in the Senate. It may fairly be considered a

matter of doubt whether it is the province of Congress to determine anything more than the economic expediency of such an appropriation. But if provisos are to be made, Senator Peffer's seems to us wiser and more conducive to good morals than Senator Quay's. For, as the *Christian Union* has all along contended, the effect of the absolute closing of the Fair on Sunday would be to swell the attendance upon, and profits of, the beer saloons, theaters, and vicious resorts of the city; while, with the machinery stopped and the commercial features and incidental attractions of the Fair closed, the grounds and art galleries might be open, even at a cheap price, with positive benefit to Sunday visitors.

This would be a compromise which the advocates of Sunday closing by act of Congress, have again and again declared they would not accept, and, on the other hand, it would not meet the principle involved, namely, that of entire non-intervention in a religious matter.

Whether he shall show his exhibit or not on Sunday should be a matter of choice with each exhibitor, as it would be any other day of the week. And with those who attend, whether they do or not should be a matter of personal choice, and, properly, no legislation of any kind could interfere. The only positive authority having jurisdiction would be the corporation representing the stockholders and owners.

THE little State of New Jersey seems anxious to make for itself a reputation in the strict enforcement of Sunday laws. A dispatch from Atlantic Highlands says:—

"Most of the people here are greatly incensed over an attempt to enforce the old Blue Laws of New Jersey. Last Saturday all the ice cream saloons, restaurants, news stands, barber shops, fruit stands, and cigar stores were ordered to close on Sunday. Even the butchers and fish dealers were requested not to open Sabbath morning, or to deliver goods ordered the day before."

"On Sunday most of the small dealers were closed, not a cigar sold to strangers. But one ice cream dealer adopted the New York liquor dealers' practice, and kept his back door open."

"All the drug stores were open, but sold no cigars, and scarcely any soda water. The news dealers were permitted to deliver papers to customers, but not to sell on the streets."

"There are fifteen thousand people here, and this law does not please them."

"Another ordinance passed by the mayor and commissioners is that no Sunday bathing be allowed after 9 A. M. Last Sunday all but one of the bathing establishments were closed, and the hundreds who went down to this one place could not be accommodated. Many walked a mile and over along the beach to Neversink Park, where they could bathe, but had no bath houses to disrobe in."

THE *Washington Post* under the title "District Blue Laws," has the following:—

Some of the queer old Blue Laws in the District of Columbia will soon receive a raking over in a memorial to Congress which is being prepared by Mr. Edward Ramsay. He said:—

"Another old law, with hoary and aged whitened whiskers, is one that makes it a crime in the District of Columbia to deny belief in the Holy Trinity. The penalty provided is imprisonment without fine. I imagine that should this obsolete law be suddenly enforced, the Washington penal institutions would soon be overcrowded in a most alarming manner. While President of the United States, John Quincy Adams violated this law daily. You know he was a Unitarian, and attended that service every Sabbath day."

"The old Blue Law here in reference to the observance of Sunday is also very strict. Under its operations should it be enforced, there would be no gas or electric lights on Sunday nights, no street cars running, newspapers circulated, nor drug stores open. For the first offense the penalty provided is a heavy fine, and for each succeeding one imprisonment without fine. Like General Grant," concluded Mr. Ramsay, "I believe in enforcing these laws to the letter, and then their repeal would certainly be brought about. The law-makers themselves would suffer thereby, and they would quickly disappear from the statute books."

Yet, notwithstanding, Congress hastens to pass "Blue Laws" for the World's Fair.

JOHN GRIFFITH, Founder of the Hankow Mission, Central China—By William Robson, of the London Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

JOHN BRIGHT, the Man of the People—By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson," "Samuel Crowther," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

ROBERT MOFFAT, the Missionary Hero of Kuruman—By David J. Deane, author of "Martin Luther, the Reformer," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

BISHOP PATTERSON, the Martyr of Melanesia—By Jesse Page. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

FAVORITE BIBLE STORIES FOR THE YOUNG—With numerous illustrations. 16mo, handsomely illuminated board covers, 50 cents.; cloth extra, 75 cents.

THE POCKET ATLAS OF THE WORLD—A comprehensive and popular series of maps, illustrating physical and political geography, with geographical statistical notes, 54 double maps, cloth, \$1.00.

JOHN WILLIAMS, the Martyr of Erromanga—By Rev. J. J. Ellis. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

CRUDEN'S CONCORDANCE—A dictionary, and alphabetical index to the Bible. Cloth, \$1.25. Sheep, \$2.50.

WILLIAM CAREY, the Shoemaker who became a Missionary—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

HENRY M. STANLEY, the African Explorer—By Arther Montefiore, F. R. G. S. Brought down to 1889. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

JAMES CHALMERS, Missionary and Explorer of Raratonga and New Guinea—By Wm. Robson, of the London Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

THOMAS J. COMBER, Missionary Pioneer to the Congo—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, price, 75 cents.

THE NEW BIBLE ATLAS AND GAZETTEER, with 16 colored maps by W. and A. Keith Johnson, and a very elaborate gazetteer, giving information about nearly every place which is marked upon the maps, with scripture references. 4to, cloth, \$1.50.

ROBERT MORRISON, the Pioneer of Chinese Missions—By Wm. J. Townsend, Sec. Methodist New Connexion Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

MEMOIRS OF EDWIN BAINBRIDGE.—The subject of this memoir is the young English tourist who met his death at the dreadful volcanic eruption of Tarawera, New Zealand, on the 10th of June, 1886. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75c.

GINN'S CLASSICAL ATLAS—4to, cloth, \$2.50. This work contains 23 colored maps, which were projected and executed by the late A. Keith Johnson, with a complete index.

The above named books will be sent post-paid on receipt of price.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY
12th & Castro Streets, OAKLAND, CAL. | 43 Bond Street, NEW YORK.



NEW YORK, AUGUST 11, 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 Senate, on July 14, and the House, on July 19, adopted the following, which, on Aug. 5, received the signature of the President of the United States:—

And it is hereby declared that all appropriations herein made for, or pertaining to, the World's Columbian Exposition are made under the condition that the said Exposition shall not be open to the public on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday; and if the said appropriations be accepted by the corporation of the State of Illinois, known as the World's Columbian Exposition upon that condition, it shall be, and it is hereby made, the duty of the World's Columbian Commission, created by the act of Congress of April 25, 1890, to make such rules or modification of the rules of said corporation as shall require the closing of the Exposition on the said first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.

This is now the law.

THE Congress of the United States, both Houses, supposed to be composed of the picked intellect of the country, men of broad education, trained intelligence, the choice of the statesmanlike ability of the forty-four States of the Union, have, by a large majority, adopted a measure respecting the establishment of religion.

THESE men sworn to a solemn trust, to support the Constitution of the United States, have been threatened, cajoled, persuaded, into proving false to that trust and the shameful achievement is hailed by the *Christian Statesman* as "the greatest moral victory since emancipation." The truth is that as emancipation gave freedom from physical enslavement to eight millions of blacks so this marks the beginning of the governmental enslavement of the consciences of sixty-five millions of all colors and races now resident in the United States, and the millions yet to come. Instead of the two things—emancipation of the colored race and the passage of religious legislation by Congress—being parallel moral measures, they are complete antitheses. The first echoed the constitutional principle of the natural freedom and equality of all men and established civil liberty; but the last contravenes the Constitution and natural right, and establishes civil inequity and religious despotism. The first removed from the Constitution its only inconsistency and did away with the shame of the Nation; the last is an irremediable blot upon the proceedings of the national Legislature, and puts disgrace upon a free people.

THIS legislative ignominy has been

brought upon the Nation,—and those of its citizens who know what has been done, and they are not few, stand abashed before the world, with arms reversed and the colors of civil liberty trailing in the dust. Care will be taken that from this humiliation they shall know no release, neither as it is thrust upon them in this form nor as it will be in other shapes. The *Statesman* says:—

The victory is won but *the war is not over*. The World's Fair management threaten to secure a reversal, next winter or before, of the Sabbath-closing action just taken by both Houses of Congress. We must therefore keep up the agitation and education which will make such a reverse impossible.

Several generals in our great war were dismissed because they did not know how to follow up a victory. Let not the friends of the Sabbath neglect to follow up our great victory by local attacks on Sunday toil and traffic and turmoil. This is the very time to attack Sunday saloons and suppress Sunday ball games and Sunday excursions, and to urge those engaged in Sunday traffic to move for their own emancipation.

Yes, in this emancipated country to use the tyranny of misapplied civil law to "urge," Christian men and patriotic citizens "to move for their own emancipation." And this is "the greatest moral victory since emancipation."

—o—

THIS is the threat which this arrogant minority described by the *Statesmen* here as "three score thousand preachers and a thousand religious papers" holds out to Chicago, the World's Fair management, and the calm minded and patriotic intelligence of the country which may assert its divine right of dissent from their fatal religious folly and political error:—

To refuse the half million would be to cancel the Government exhibit and so black ball the Government. Chicago can not afford to give the "bluff" to the United States. In that case not only would Christians boycott the Fair because of Sunday opening, but patriots also, because of its discourtesy to the Government.

If the Management are wise they will discover in the more than two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress against Sunday opening, that Chicago is not the United States, and in the matter of Sabbath observance does not represent American sentiment; and they will not further endanger the financial success of the Fair by proposals to override the wholesome laws and customs of our country, but will promptly accept the people's verdict as to the Sabbath. Financially, as well as morally, it is a blunder to give three score thousand preachers and a thousand religious papers so many causes to condemn rather than commend the Columbian Exhibition.

Here is again heard the voice of the "Pittsburg preachers" which has been before raised to cry,—Boycott, and let loose the dogs of war, if Congress or Commission shall fail to accede to our demand. We shall rule or we shall ruin.—The Pittsburg preachers are not alone in that cry. It is heard to-day at Homestead, at Duquesne, at Cœur d'Alene, and in the Anarchist halls where Most, and Berkman, and Mrs. Parsons, and Emma Goldman are accustomed to give tongue like the wolves of society that they are.

—o—

It is the Chicago Directory that has authority rightfully in this matter, and this both Congress, and Commission, and *Statesman* all well know. But if this Directory should dare to exercise its right-

ful and lawful authority! But if,—and what then?

If the Chicago Directory should seriously propose such a folly as the refusal of the conditioned appropriation, the national Commission, representing the United States, which would be thus insulted, would veto such madness, as it has the power to do, at its autumn meeting, on whose second day, October 6, a hearing on Sabbath closing has been appointed, which it may be well to utilize in order that the rule for the Sabbath closing of the gates, which Congress has required its Commission to make, may be promptly and strongly made; and also, if possible, a further veto, that logically follows, of the opening of the World's Fair grounds in advance of the Fair for Sunday picnics.

This is a new theory of the prerogative of Congress and the committees of its appointment. It seems when Congress makes an appropriation, saddled with whatever obnoxious or destructive provisions, it is not only "folly" and "madness" for the unfortunate recipient to refuse its acceptance, but a committee, appointed by Congress, may veto this refusal and compel its acceptance, proviso and all. Certainly under such a theory it would be a terrible thing to fall under governmental favor. And so it is, and will be from this time on,—for the Government has taken sides in the Great Controversy, and it has taken the wrong side.

THE August *Arena* contains the second installment of Mr. Reed's Brief for the Plaintiff in the interesting discussion of Bacon vs. Shakespeare. Whatever may be said of the abstract merits of the case, no one can fail to be impressed with the ingenious and powerful array of evidence thus far adduced in behalf of Lord Bacon as the author of the plays. Perhaps the most startling as well as the most interesting disclosures, however, are yet to come. In the September number Mr. Reed will answer objections, not only those that have been brought forward in previous public discussions of the subject, but others advanced in his own private correspondence with scholars and literary men on both sides of the Atlantic. Other leading papers in the August *Arena* are by United States Senator James H. Kyle, Hon. Geo. Fred Williams, M. C., Hon. Wm. T. Ellis, M. C., Gail Hamilton, Mary A. Livermore, Louise Chandler Moulton, Helen H. Gardener, Frances E. Willard, Mrs. Gen. Lew Wallace, Frances E. Russell and the editor of the *Arena*. In addition to these papers, there is a brilliant symposium on Women's Clubs in America, to which eleven leading American women contribute.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL,

A WEEKLY PAPER

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore 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 less than 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.