



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

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 8, 1892.

NUMBER 35.

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.

CONCERNING the demand for the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, the Spokane, Wash., *Chronicle* says:—

It is the old fight of the hyper-puritans upon opening libraries, museums, art galleries, parks and gardens on Sunday. It is nothing short of social tyranny, and is the more intolerant, because it assumes to stand for absolute right in the matter.

And it is in this assumption that the danger to liberty of conscience lurks. If an arrogant and aggressive minority can dictate to the majority in this matter, what may we not expect when by success in this they shall have added to their numbers those who are always to be found on the winning side, if they can only find out which side it is, and so shall have become the majority? Will not their intolerance increase with their numbers and power?

THERE is nothing more dangerous to religious liberty than the assumption by powerful organizations of a divine right to rule their fellow men. It is for this reason that the National Reform Association and the American Sabbath Union are a most serious menace to freedom of conscience in this country. They assume to be the divinely authorized interpreters of God's law; and they aspire to be its administrators. They are simply imitating the Papacy, and no doubt the likeness will be true throughout. By the Supreme Court decision of February 29, 1892, and by the act of Congress closing the World's Fair on Sunday, the Government has virtually pledged to these organizations the support of the civil power. But such a use of civil power is illegitimate, and is to

be opposed by all who are not prepared to surrender their soul-liberty.

—o—

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL does not believe in anarchy. It is a patriotic and religious duty to yield cheerful obedience to civil rulers in civil things. By the very act of making men social beings, mutually dependent upon one another, and under mutual obligations each to respect the equal rights of the other, God ordained civil government, that the weak might be protected against the aggressions of the strong, that unlawful greed and oppression might be restrained, and that civil order might be maintained. But the ordinance of civil government gives man no authority in spiritual things.

—o—

It is evident that inasmuch as civil government can not by any possibility free any man from the obligations which God has laid upon him, and can abate nothing from the penalty of the divine law, it can rightfully exercise no authority whatever over any man touching his duty toward his Creator. Let government once invade the domain of conscience and it will surely dominate it, thus setting God aside and usurping his authority. Indeed the mere assumption by any man or by any set of men of the right to dictate in matters of religious faith or practice is a denial of the moral sovereignty of the Creator.

—o—

CHRISTIANS of all ages and of all creeds have claimed for themselves religious liberty; but sad to say very many professing to be followers of Christ have not been willing that others should enjoy equal freedom; while some not Christians have clearly seen and fully recognized the principle that the moral sovereignty of the Creator renders absolutely essential the free moral agency of the creature. No man ever stated this principle more clearly than did the deist, Thomas Paine; and his clear vision on this subject ought to put to shame those who, while calling themselves Christians,

are afraid to trust God with the administration of his own moral government. Paine said:—

There is a single idea which, if it strikes rightly upon the mind, either in a legal or a religious sense, will prevent any man, or any body of men, or any government, from going wrong on the subject of religion; which is, that before any human institutions of government were known in the world, there existed, if I may so express it, a compact between God and man, from the beginning of time; and that as the relation and condition which man in his individual person stands in toward his Maker can not be changed by any human laws or human authority, that religious devotion, which is a part of this compact, can not so much as be made a subject of human laws.

—o—

PAINE was an infidel, and his name is cast out as evil because of his denial of the Christian religion; nevertheless he fully recognized the moral sovereignty of God. What then should be thought of those who, while claiming faith in Christianity, deny that sovereignty which Paine acknowledged and which is the very basis of Christianity? Are they better than Paine? Are they not worse? for do they not by their intolerance so misrepresent Christianity as to turn men away from it and cause them to become infidels? Before the Christianity of Christ, even infidelity stands with uncovered head; it admires even though it does not embrace. But in the presence of the miscalled Christianity that would coerce all that it can not convert, unbelief is hard and defiant. Whose is the responsibility? and whose the final retribution?

—o—

THE worst infidelity is that which betrays our Lord in the house of his friends; that under the guise of friendship misrepresents his teachings, and in his name seizes power which he himself refused, and which he never authorized his followers to exercise in his behalf. Christ now, as of old, hides himself from those who, instead of crowning him sovereign in their own hearts, and introducing him to others as "the chiefest among ten thousand, the one altogether lovely," seek to

take him by force and make him king, in order that by placing him on an earthly throne, they may compass their own aggrandizement.

Christ's word to his followers is, "Who-soever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." And the only commission or authority he has given is: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." He plainly declared: "My kingdom is not of this world;" and yet in every age his professed followers have aspired to temporal power in his name, and professedly for the furtherance of his cause and the promulgation of the gospel! Is it any wonder that judging Christianity by such Christians, thousands have rejected it as no better than Mohammedanism, which was also promulgated by fire and sword?

C. P. B.

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

THE Edict of Milan, March, 313, named "the whole body of Christians" as the beneficiaries, without any qualification or any sectarian designation. Before the expiration of that month the provisions of the edict were confined to "the Catholic Church of the Christians" alone. In the autumn of the same year when the emperor wrote to the bishop of Rome, appointing the first council, he defined the established church as "the *holy* Catholic Church." The following summer, 314, when he called the second council, he referred to the doctrine of the Catholic Church as embodying the "*most* holy religion." And when it had been decided which party represented this "most holy religion," then in 316 his letter and commission to Cæcilianus defined it as "the *legitimate* and most holy Catholic religion."

Nor was this all. While this was going on, also about the year 314, the first edict in favor of Sunday was issued, though it was blended with Friday. It ordered that on Friday and Sunday "no judicial or other business should be transacted, but that God should be served with prayers and supplications;" and in 321 Friday observance was dropped, and Sunday alone was exalted by the famous Sunday-rest law of Constantine, all in furtherance of the ambition of the ecclesiastics to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves.†

Now there was another thing. When the Catholic Church had forced this decision in favor of itself in the matter of imperial favors, and the getting of property into their hands, then it sprung right back to the other part of that edict, and held Constantine to this point: that as it was the Catholic Church in the latter part of that edict, then it was certainly the Catholic Church in the first part of the edict. And that came in direct order, and in this way: In 323 by the direct and officious aid of the Catholic Church Constantine succeeded in defeating Licinius and making himself sole emperor. No sooner was this accomplished than the "*religious liberty*" assured to "the Chris-

tians" by the Edict of Milan, like the provisions of the same edict restoring confiscated property to the Christians, was by a public and express edict *limited to Catholics alone*. This portion of that decree runs as follows:—

VICTOR CONSTANTIUS MAXIMUS AUGUSTUS TO THE HERETICS: Understand now by this present statute, ye Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians, ye who are called Cataphrygians, and all ye who devise and support heresies by means of your private assemblies, with what a tissue of falsehood and vanity, with what destructive and venomous errors, your doctrines are inseparably interwoven; so that through you the healthy soul is stricken with disease, and the living becomes the prey of everlasting death.

Forasmuch, then, as it is no longer possible to bear with your pernicious errors, we give warning by this present statute that none of you henceforth presume to assemble yourselves together. We have directed, accordingly, that you be deprived of all the houses in which you are accustomed to hold your assemblies: and our care in this respect extends so far as to forbid the holding of your superstitious and senseless meetings, not in public merely, but in any private house or place whatsoever. *Let those of you, therefore, who are desirous, of embracing the true and pure religion, take the far better course of entering the Catholic Church, and uniting with it in holy fellowship, whereby you will be enabled to arrive at the knowledge of the truth.*

It is an object worthy of that prosperity which we enjoy through the favor of God, to endeavor to bring back those who in time past were living in the hope of future blessings, from all irregularity and error, to the right path, from darkness to light, from vanity to truths, from death to salvation. And in order that this remedy may be applied with effectual power, we have commanded (as before said) that you be positively deprived of every gathering point for your superstitious meetings; I mean all the houses of prayer (if such be worthy of the name) which belong to heretics, and that these be made over without delay to the Catholic Church; that any other places be confiscated to the public service, and no facility whatever be left for any future gathering; in order that from this day forward none of your unlawful assemblies may presume to appear in any public or private place. Let this edict be made public.

Thus in *less than eleven years* from the issuing of the Edict of Milan, the Catholic Church stood in full and exclusive possession of the authority of the empire, both in the rights of property and the right to worship, under the profession of Christianity; and with a specific and direct commission to use that power and authority to compel the submission of "heretics." Thus was made the Papacy—the beast of Rev. 13:1-10; and all that ever came in its career from that day to this, has been but the natural and inevitable outgrowth of the power and prerogatives which were then possessed and claimed by the Catholic Church.

And it all came from the *Edict of Milan, bestowing governmental favors upon "the Christians."* No man can fairly deny that in the Edict of Milan and the religious-political intrigue that lay behind it, there was contained the whole Papacy. No man can successfully deny that the Edict of Milan, though appearing innocent enough upon its face, contained the whole Papacy; or that the things that followed in the ten years up to 323, which we have sketched, were anything else than the logical and inevitable development of the evil that lay wrapped up in that. All this came out of that edict, and nothing came out of it that was not in it. Nothing could come out of it that was not in it.

Now I call your attention to the thought again, that all of that, the whole Papacy, and every step from that day forward, came out of that edict in favor of Christianity. Didn't it? Now when the Supreme Court of the United States has issued a decree in favor of Christianity, what is coming out of it? What is in it?

What was in the edict of Constantine's

in favor of Christianity?—The beast, the whole Papacy, from that day to this. Then what is in this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in favor of Christianity as the religion of this Nation?—The image of the beast, the image of the Papacy, from this day and forward for all that will ever come. That is what is in it.

Just as certainly as that edict of Constantine in favor of Christianity there, produced the Papacy with all that it is; just so certainly this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in favor of the Christian religion here, as the religion of this Nation, has in it the image of the beast, and will produce all that the prophecy has in it, or tells about. All this will come out of this decision, just as certainly as all that came out of that edict.

Disputes will arise here as to what Christianity is indeed, just as they arose there. Disputes will arise, I know not precisely in what form; it may be between Catholicism and Protestantism, or it may be between the different sects of Protestantism. But these disputes will certainly come. I know not how soon; but just as certainly as that decree of the Supreme Court of the United States that this is a Christian Nation has been made, just so certainly a disagreement will arise one of these days, and the Supreme Court or some one else will have to decide who are Christians, and what class of Christians it is that is meant in that decision. That will have to come. And it will come.

(Concluded next week.)

Protected by the Constitution.

NOT content with sending "the five leading members of the Springville Adventist Church" to jail for doing honest work on Sunday, some of the officers of Henry County, Tenn., would like to make paupers of them by stripping them of their property to pay unjust fines and costs. Article 11, Section 11, of the Constitution of Tennessee provides that:—

A homestead, in the possession of each head of a family, and the improvements thereon, to the value of, in all, one thousand dollars, shall be exempt from sale under legal process during the life of such head of a family, to inure to the benefit of the widow, and shall be exempt during the minority of their children occupying the same.

In addition to the real estate exempted by this article of the Constitution, the Legislature has by law exempted certain articles of personal property, necessary farming implements, etc., and that the specified property "shall be exempt from seizure in criminal as well as in civil cases." (See code of Tennessee, chapter 4, article 1, section 2,933.) But these exemptions do not extend to property levied upon for the payment of taxes. Anything that a man has can be taken for taxes, except what he has upon his person.

The position taken by some of the officers of Henry County in the Adventist cases is that the portion of costs accruing to the State is in reality a State tax, and that *any* property can be taken to pay it. This was the position taken by the deputy sheriff who assured the imprisoned men that he could if so disposed take anything that he could find to pay the "State tax," as he called it. It is doubtful, however, if he believed it himself, for while he searched diligently for chattels out of which he could make the costs, he seized only one piece of property, a spring wagon, an article not exempted by the

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

†Since this sermon was delivered, Congress has enacted a Sunday law, closing the World's Fair that day. Thus and now the parallel is complete, and the likeness perfect. All that remains now is for those who have so long been grasping for the power, to go ahead in the use of the power which they now have.

statute. But whatever the deputy's view of the law may be, it is certain that State costs are not in any sense a State tax. "Taxes," says Judge Cooley, "are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes." But the Constitution of the State of Tennessee provides that,—

All property shall be taxed according to its value, that value to be ascertained in such manner as the Legislature shall direct, so that taxes shall be equal and uniform throughout the State. No one species of property from which tax may be collected shall be taxed any higher than any other species of property of the same value.

The Legislature has provided that all taxation shall be by assessment of the property taxed. It is evident, therefore, both by the Constitution and by the statute law of Tennessee, that State costs are not in the nature of a State tax, and can not be collected by distraining property exempt from execution. The Tennessee persecutors may imprison the Adventists under the wicked Sunday law which the courts of that State have made for that very purpose, but they can not rob them of their property and beggar them under the Constitution as it now stands; for it is incredible that any court would so stultify itself as to hold that State costs are in the nature of a State tax. Let the Adventists see to it that those who invoke the law against them, confine their persecutions to the law, and that neither the bigoted religionist, zealous for the dogmas of his sect, nor the avaricious official, greedy for fees, goes beyond the law which he invokes. C. P. B.

Origin of the Doctrine of Church and State.

SOME there be, who, while asking from the Government a recognition of the Christian religion in a national Sunday law, at the same time deny that such a law would be a union of Church and State, and even claim to be opposed to such a union. Yet it is simply nothing else. Any recognition of religion (on the part of the State), or religious institutions, is nothing short of such union. Let the Nation, through Congress, enact such a law, and all the authority and power of the Nation would be invoked to enforce it; and this would be persecution for conscience' sake. Paganism is the greatest system of false worship that was ever invented. And we find it is religion and the State united. In every nation or tribe, the laws written or unwritten, have been made in the interest of religion; indeed, had it not been for the religion of the people, the laws would never have been made. The chiefs, rulers, or heads of the nation, have been the guardians of the religion of the people. There was a time when Rome was a republic. But with wealth came the gratification of every lust. Laws were made against these things, only to be broken. Cæsar, who was guilty of almost every crime, was made "the guardian of the public morals."

Constantine the Great is regarded as a Christian emperor; but history testifies that, even after his professed conversion he waded through seas of blood, putting to death his nearest relatives, decreeing the death of some while on his death bed. Being a pagan by birth and education, and following in the steps of his predecessors as a "guardian of the public morals," what more natural than that after adopting, as a matter of policy, the

Christian religion, he should at once become its protector, and self-constituted guardian, and make it the religion of the people. This he did, and from that time the cross was the banner that led his armies, as whole nations were made Christians (?) by the power of the sword. Soon, instead of the emperors, it was the popes that ruled the nations. There, with increased powers, and a more relentless rule, were the self-constituted "guardians of the public morals." All history furnishes abundance of proof that whole nations were converted to the Catholic Church, by the force of arms; or in case of a refusal, were only food for her armies, and their wealth made to fill the coffers of Rome. Thus we see that the idea that the State is, in anyway, to be the conservator of "public morals," and the power of the State to be wielded in the interests of the Church, is of pagan origin and of papal culture. And so it is, that the Protestants in this country are following unwittingly in the steps of paganism and papalism, in that they are seeking the aid of the State in making this a Christian Nation and securing a recognition of the Christian religion. And Justice Brewer, in his late decision, has, unwittingly perhaps, made the Supreme Court the "guardian of the public morals." —*Publius, in the Protestant American.*

The Beast and Its Image.

[In view of recent events, particularly the Supreme Court decision of February 29, 1892, and the act of Congress closing the World's Fair on Sunday, the following article from the *Signs of the Times*, a Seventh-day Adventist paper, of Oakland, Cal., is of interest.]

It has been known by many ten thousands in our land and in the world at large that for the last two score years Seventh-day Adventists have held with Protestant commentators generally that the beast with ten horns and seven heads, of the thirteenth chapter of Revelation, symbolized the Papacy, a system clothed with civil power, or the dogmas of which were recognized and enforced by civil government. It is *not* the ecclesiastical system of the Papacy which the prophecy presents. It is *not* the civil governments of the Roman Empire as such which the beast symbolizes. It is the governments (indicated by the ten horns) into which that empire was divided *as dominated* by the Papal Church that are portrayed so graphically before us. In other words, it is the recognition on the part of the State, at the demand of the Church, of certain religious dogmas and claims.

The Church in the first centuries of the Christian era enunciated her dogmas and her claims, and made her demands. The State in the first centuries acknowledged those dogmas as divine, those claims as just, and acceded to the demands of the Catholic Church by crystallizing those dogmas into statute law. This formed the beast.

Seventh-day Adventists have also held for the last two score of years, logically held, they believe, that the two-horned beast of the same chapter (verse 11) represents this Government of the United States, the lamblike horns symbolizing the principles of the Government which gave it its power and greatness, the dragon voice showing that this Government is yet to become a persecuting power. This is further shown in the following expression in verses 14, 15:—

Saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they

should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword and did live. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed.

The word "image" in both the English and original means "likeness." An image to the first beast would mean such a combination of Church and State as would make this Government virtually what Rome was. In other words, the Church (whether one or many does not alter the principle) will enunciate her dogmas, put forth her claims, and demand that these claims be recognized, and the Government will, contrary to the principles on which it was founded and which gave it greatness, recognize these dogmas of the Church by crystallizing them into fundamental or statute law.

Among the claims of the churches of this country, put forth on every possible occasion, is that this is a "Christian Nation," and that Christianity should receive recognition by the Government, especially in its oaths, its schools, its courts, its offices, and its postal service. Among the dogmas and institutions which the churches, both Protestant and Catholic, hold as Christian is that of the Sunday, or so-called "Christian Sabbath." All the great churches, as represented in the American Sabbath Union, and in various other ways, have committed themselves to the Sunday institution and are united in demanding its recognition by law. Their demand is based on the claim that this is a "Christian Nation," and that Sunday is the "Christian Sabbath," and that, this being so, it is but logical, just, and proper that the State should recognize both of these claims.

This places the matter in a narrow compass and so plain that all can see. The above claims and demands on the part of the churches as a whole no one will deny; they have been too obvious, too often put forth, too strenuously insisted upon, to be denied. It will also be obvious to all that just as soon as these claims are recognized by the Government of the United States just so soon we have produced before us the *image* to the papal beast; for that beast was formed by the recognition of the claims and demands of the Church on the part of the State.

For one hundred years the Government of this country kept right on in the even tenor of its way, recognizing the claims or religious dogmas of no church or combination of churches. It expressly declared in the Tripoli treaty and in reports of both Houses of Congress in 1829 and 1830 that this was not a "Christian Nation," that it recognized no religion and no Sabbath, and that to do either would be the first step, against which the history of nations in the past stood like a beacon warning.

But recently a change has come. The prophetic words of Hon. Richard M. Johnson have proved true, that "extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are always dangerous," and that, if such combination becomes strong and persistent, this civil power, with all that it means, will eventually bend under it, and be controlled by it. (See article entitled "Warnings from the Past," in *Signs* of Aug. 8.) We now have the beginning of the sequel. On the 29th of last February the Supreme Court of the United States, through Justice Brewer, decided in so many words that

“THIS IS A CHRISTIAN NATION.”

This decision seemed to be demanded, “because,” in the language of the court, “this is a religious people,” a statement which our readers all know to be without foundation. The decision then declares that “from the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation;” and it cites in proof of this the Roman Catholic commission of Ferdinand and Isabella to Columbus, the Episcopal grant of England’s “Defender of the Faith,” Queen Elizabeth, to Sir Walter Raleigh, the Puritan compact of the Pilgrims in the *Mayflower*, the grant to William Penn, the laws of Massachusetts for the support and maintenance of religion by public taxation, and the declaration of faith required by the Constitution of Delaware, in 1776. The decision then quotes from the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States the following:—

Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,—

an utterance in fundamental law which was designed to forever *shut out* from the fair land of America, the *religious intolerance* of the Old World governments, from which emanated all of the above utterances on which the decision was based. The religious declarations from Columbus down to the adoption of the Constitution are all diametrically opposed to and by the First Amendment to the Constitution. The Amendment is put there for the *purpose of opposing* the *entering* of any such sentiments into this Government. Yet in the face of all this this Supreme Court decision of February 29, 1892, declares:—

There is *no dissonance* in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious Nation. . . . They speak the voice of the entire people.

The decision then cites the declaration of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, that “Christianity is, and always has been, part of the common law.” This it accepts as authority, as it does also the decision of Chief Justice Kent, of New York, which “assumes that we are a Christian people.” From this it proceeds to consider the form of oath prevailing, and from that to “the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath.” “*These*,” says the court, “and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the *mass of organic utterances* that

“THIS IS A CHRISTIAN NATION.”

Here is the decision of the highest branch of the Government that *Christianity is the religion of this Nation*, and this is just what the Constitution, the fundamental law of this Government, is made to mean. It matters not how the common mind may understand the Constitution, and the First Amendment thereto, designed by our forefathers as a safeguard against the encroachment of religion, the Supreme Court has decided the matter, and that settles it. Congress might pass a law to that effect. Congress and three-fourths of the State Legislatures might change the Constitution so that it would declare this to be a “Christian Nation,” but we do not see how all that could make the matter any stronger than this decision of the Supreme Court, which, in the matter of law, is above both Congress and president.

We have, then, the claims of the

Church that “this is a Christian Nation,” and the demand that it be recognized by the Government. We have the decision of the Supreme Court, the highest branch of the Government, the final arbiter in the matter of law, recognizing the demand of the Church and crystallizing it into organic law; and with that decision sanctioning laws against blasphemy, and in favor of the support and maintenance of religion by public taxation, Sunday laws, etc. Is there anything more that is necessary to constitute an image to the beast? This Government has done just what the civil power of Rome did. From the recognition of the demands of the Church in the first centuries of the Christian era the *beast* was formed in the Old World. From the recognition of the demands of the Church by this Government,

THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST

was formed in this country when the Government recognized the demands of the Church by the Supreme Court decision, on February 29, 1892.

The next step in the prophecy is to *give life* to the image. This must be by the action of the law-making power of the Government. Has this step been taken?—It has, in the action of Congress August 5, 1892, in the recognition of the Sunday dogma of the Church by closing the World’s Fair on that day. This was the logical step for the Government to take. If this is a “Christian Nation,” and if Sunday is the “Christian Sabbath,” it logically follows that the “Christian Nation” ought to enforce the “Christian Sabbath”—a dogma upon which the Christian Church as a whole, both Catholics and Protestants, agree.

This is logically the first step to follow the making of the image. It has been taken. Life has been given to the image. The next step is to enforce by oppressive laws and penalties what it has now recognized. The Government has now taken its stand, it has declared its position, and the clamors of a backslidden Church and the “honor” and “dignity” of the Nation will force the civil authorities to do just what the prophecy has said they would do. It has declared that Sunday is the Sabbath of this “Christian Nation,” and its next step will logically be to see that its declarations are respected.

We no longer walk by faith in the fulfillment of the prophecy of Revelation 13. We are seeing its fulfillment before our very eyes, and louder than ever would we lift a warning voice to our fellow-countrymen, in the language of inspiration: “If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation.” Rev. 14:9,10. “Fear God, and give glory to *Him*; for the hour of *His* judgment is come; and *worship Him* that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.” Verse 7.

Who Will Hear the Voice?

A CORRESPONDENT from the city of the World’s Fair, who has read THE SENTINEL, quotes the last paragraph of an article in a late issue, in which the final sentence is, “Where is the voice that will sound the truth so loud that it will ring in the ears of every man?” and says: “If you need wisdom to find the voice

you have called for you can find it in St. Luke, 9:35.” The voice that spoke from the cloud which overshadowed the mountain where Peter and James and John and the Master were at prayer, was the voice of God. The utterance was a command of God—the entreaty of a Father. “This is my beloved Son: hear him.” God had spoken to men often since that afternoon in Eden when at the sound of his voice Adam and Eve hid themselves; but they had hidden and stopped their ears, now he both pleads and commands, “Hear my Son!” Christ the Son of God preached to man the gospel of peace and good-will to all, the gospel of salvation from sin—the hope of eternal life. The cry of this voice is, to him who hath ears, let him hear, and whosoever will, let him come. Again, in this afternoon of the world, as the voice of God is heard, by his Son, they hide and they stop their ears. If this be true is there any voice that can sound the truth in the ears of every man, however loud it may speak, until that day when the Lord himself descends from heaven with a shout, and every eye shall see him and every ear hear him?

W. H. M.

Some Scraps of New England History.*

THE SUFFERINGS OF THE QUAKERS.

In July, 1656, Mary Fisher and Anne Austin, two Quaker women, landed in Boston. By some means, news of their coming had preceded them. Before they were allowed to land at all, Richard Bellingham, the deputy-governor, Governor Endicott being absent, sent officers aboard the ship, “searched their trunks and chests, and took away the books they found there, which were about one hundred, and carried them ashore, after having commanded the said women to be kept prisoners aboard; and the said books were, by an order of the council, burnt in the market-place by the hangman.” The women were soon taken from the ship, however, and at once “shut up close prisoners, and command was given that none should come to them without leave; a fine of five pounds being laid on any that should otherwise come at or speak with them, tho’ but at the window. Their pens, ink, and paper were taken from them, and they not suffered to have any candle-light in the night season; nay, what is more, they were stript naked, under pretense to know whether they were witches, tho’ in searching no token was found upon them but of innocence. And in this search they were so barbarously misused that modesty forbids to mention it. And that none might have communication with them, a board was nailed up before the window of the jail.” August 18, the following order was issued to the jailer:—

To the Keeper of the Boston Jail:

You are by virtue hereof to keep the Quakers formerly committed to your custody as dangerous persons, industrious to improve all their abilities to seduce the people of this jurisdiction, both by words and letters, to the abominable tenets of the Quakers, and to keep them close prisoners, not suffering them to confer with any person, nor permitting them to have paper or ink.

Signed, EDWARD RAWSON,
August 18, 1656. Sec. of the Boston Court.

They were not only denied food by the authorities, but “liberty was denied even to send them provisions.” “Seeing

* Condensed from “Two Republics.”

they were not provided with victuals, Nicholas Upshal, one who lived in Boston, and was a member of the church there," bought of the jailer, for five shillings a week, the privilege of furnishing them with food. September 7, another order was issued to the jailer, commanding him "to search as often as he saw meet, the boxes, chests, and things of the Quakers formerly committed to his custody, for pen, ink, papers and books, and to take them from them."

"After having been about five weeks prisoners, William Chichester, master of a vessel, was bound in one hundred pound bond to carry them back, and not suffer any to speak with them, after they were put on board; and the jailer kept their beds . . . and their Bible, for his fees." During the imprisonment they were frequently examined by the ministers with a view to getting some hold on them by which they might be dealt with for the heresy of schism, or some such crime, but all in vain. It was well for the two women that they happened to be sent away when they were, for not long afterward Endicott returned, and was not a little displeased with Bellingham, the deputy-governor, for dealing so gently with them, declaring that if he had been there, he "would have had them well whipped," although as yet the colony had no law at all concerning Quakers.

These two women had not been long gone before eight other Quakers arrived in Boston. They were subjected to the same sort of treatment to which the other two had been. In the same month of September, the Commissioners of the United Colonies met at Plymouth, and the Boston court called upon them to stir up Plymouth Colony to vigilance, especially against the Quakers. The letter ran as follows:—

Having heard some time since that our neighboring colony of Plymouth, our beloved brethren, in great part seem to be wanting to themselves in a due acknowledgment and encouragement of the ministry of the gospel, so as many pious ministers have (how justly we know not) deserted their station, callings, and relations; our desire is that some such course may be taken, as that a pious orthodox ministry may be restated among them, that so the flood of errors and principles of anarchy may be prevented. Here hath arrived amongst us several persons professing themselves Quakers, fit instruments to propagate the kingdom of Satan; for the securing of our neighbors from such pests, we have imprisoned them all till they be dispatched away to the place from whence they came.

"The commissioners gave advice accordingly," but Bradford, who was governor of Plymouth, would not take any such steps. After his death, however, severe measures were adopted.

October 14, 1656, the general court of Massachusetts enacted the following law:—

Whereas there is an accursed sect of heretics lately risen in the world, which are commonly called Quakers, who take upon them to be immediately sent of God and infallibly assisted by the Spirit, to speak and write blasphemous opinions, despising governments, and the order of God in the church and commonwealth, speaking evil of dignities, reproaching and reviling magistrates and ministers, seeking to turn the people from the faith, and gain proselytes to their pernicious ways: This court taking into consideration the premises, and to prevent the like mischief as by their means is wrought in our land, doth hereby order, and by the authority of this court be it ordered and enacted that what master or commander of any ship, bark, pink, or catch, shall henceforth bring into any harbor, creek, or cove, within this jurisdiction, any Quaker or Quakers, or other blasphemous heretics, shall pay, or cause to be paid, the fine of one hundred pounds to the treasurer of the county, except it appear he want true knowledge or information on their being such, and in that case he hath liberty to clear himself by his oath, when sufficient

proof to the contrary is wanting. And for default of good payment, or good security for it, he shall be cast into prison, and there to continue till the said sum be satisfied to a treasurer as aforesaid. And the commander of any catch, ship, or vessel, being legally convicted, shall give in sufficient security to the governor, or any one or more of the magistrates, who have power to determine the same, to carry them back to the place whence he brought them, and on his refusal to do so, the governor or any one or more of the magistrates, are hereby empowered to issue out his or their warrants to commit such master or commander to prison, there to continue till he give in sufficient security to the content of the governor, or any of the magistrates as aforesaid. And it is hereby further ordered and enacted, that what Quaker soever shall arrive in this country from foreign parts, or shall come into this jurisdiction from any parts adjacent, shall be forthwith committed to the house of correction, and at their entrance to be severely whipped, and by the master thereof to be kept constantly to work, and none suffered to converse or speak with them during the time of their imprisonment, which shall be no longer than necessity requires. And it is ordered, if any person shall knowingly import into any harbor of this jurisdiction any Quaker's books or writings concerning their devilish opinions, he shall pay for such book or writing, being legally proved against him or them, the sum of five pounds; and whosoever shall disperse or sell any such book or writing, and it be found with him or her, or in his or her house, and shall not immediately deliver the same to the next magistrate, shall forfeit or pay five pounds for the dispersing or selling of every such book or writing. And it is hereby further enacted that if any person within this colony shall take upon them to defend the heretical opinions of the Quakers, or any of their books or papers as aforesaid, being legally proved, shall be fined for the first time forty shillings; and if they persist in the same, and shall again defend it the second time, four pounds; if they shall again defend and maintain said accursed heretical opinions, they shall be committed to the house of correction till there be convenient passage to send them out of the land, being sentenced to the court of assistants to banishment. Lastly, it is hereby ordered that what person or persons soever shall revile the person of magistrates or ministers as is usual with the Quakers, such person or persons shall be severely whipped, or pay the sum of five pounds.

When this law was published, Nicholas Upshal, the kind and Christian old gentleman who had bought the privilege of feeding Mary Fisher and Anne Austin, when they were in prison, "publicly testified against it." The next morning he was summoned to answer before the general court. He told them that "the execution of that law would be a forerunner of a judgment upon their country, and therefore in love and tenderness which he bare to the people and the place, desired them to take heed, lest they were found fighters against God." He was fined twenty pounds, although a member of one of the churches. And then, having absented himself from church on account of these things he was fined three pounds, and banished, although winter was now come, and he "a weakly, ancient man."

Not "Sufficient Justification."

THE *Pittsburg Commercial Gazette* of August 11, referring to members of Congress voting for the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, says:—

Patriotism and fidelity to their official obligations, no less than a desire to fully represent the popular will, were sufficient justification for those who voted in favor of Sunday closing.

Whatever an obsequious cringing to the loud clamors of what may be styled "the popular will" may have led our national legislators to do, "fidelity to their official obligations" would most surely have prevented them from voting in favor of any measure to enforce Sunday observance; for, according to Section 3 of Article VI. of the Constitution of the United States, every senator and representative, both of Congress and of the several State

legislatures, is "bound by oath of affirmation to support this Constitution," the First Amendment of which says, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This would have been sufficient justification for every one of them to have refused to have anything whatever to do with the Sunday-closing measure, and fidelity to their "official obligations" would have compelled them to thus refuse. But because of the popular clamor for religious legislation they thought it not wise statesmanship to refuse the demand of the churches, and so passed the measure, and thus committed the United States Government to a course of religious legislation, the end of which will be, as was the like course of the Roman Empire, national ruin.

W. A. COLCORD.

The Genesis of Sunday.

HOW A PAGAN HOLIDAY BECAME A PART OF OUR CIVILIZATION.

How can Sunday be such a day as is claimed in our times by believers in the Bible, when those very Scriptures show that in the apostles' age it was put to secular uses? The arguments taken from Scripture to show that Sunday was a secular day and the instances of its secularization could be multiplied, if need be, but the reader is asked to pass at once from the biblical to the historical consideration of the subject, since the Bible in the hands of theologians is a very flexible book, being, as some one has said, "A fiddle on which any tune can be played." Sunday was never declared to be sacred by any biblical writer nor by any writer for several centuries after the apostolical period. It was made sacred, using that word in a narrow sense, by civil law and custom. There is no historical proof in controversy. On the 7th of March, 321, Constantine issued his famous Sunday edict, commanding that there be no labor, except in the fields, on the venerable day of the sun. This edict contained no allusion to any Christian sentiment. With the pagans comprising the largest portion of the empire, Sunday was already the chief day of the week. It was the day they had consecrated to the worship of the sun. Being already in the habit of abstaining from labor on that day, they were obliged to abstain from secular pursuits on their conversion to Christianity on the Sabbath or sacred day, which the newly adopted religion brought with it. But as the pagan converts became more numerous than the Jewish, and finding the abstinence from labor on two days—the Sabbath of the Bible and Sunday of pagandom—irksome, they amalgamated the two, and thus Sunday became the sacred day.

Again, to blend as far as possible into one harmonious whole the discordant systems of paganism and Christianity was the height of Constantine's ambition. As a result, it is charged by Protestants that Christianity was corrupted, and all history and candid scholarship sustains the charge. In order to unite the young and rising faith with the old and waning one, compromises were effected, but theologians are loath to face the fact, and, often being in possession of it, are loath to make it known, that one of these compromises resulted in the overthrow of the Sabbath of the Bible in favor of the Sunday of

pagandom. Years afterward, when in a controversy the Puritans of England charged inconsistency on the part of the Episcopalians because they, claiming to be anti-papists, yet observed without scriptural warrant the holidays of the Roman Church, the Puritans were met with the countercharge of similar inconsistency because they observed Sunday, since it, too, was clearly an ecclesiastical institution of papal-pagan origin, with as little foundation in Scripture as the various saints' days and holy days of the Papacy. To extricate themselves from these straits, scriptural reasons had to be given for their practice. Necessity, which so often has proved to be the mother of invention, found a way out of the dilemma, and one Nicolaus Bound, promulgated the theory that Sunday had rightly taken the place of the Sabbath, basing his theory on false and unscriptural ground. In the process of time additional supposed arguments were added to this, among which the one that Jesus met his disciples after the resurrection on the first day of the week in honor of that event, and hence thereafter that day became the day of Christian assembly and worship. One of these appearances took place after the disciples had fished all night and caught nothing, which, according to the Jewish division of the day, was the night of the first day of the week, conceding the claim to be correct that it was that day. Jesus that morning himself commanded them to cast their nets into the sea again, which, according to the story, they raised so full of fish that with difficulty only could they lift them. In time a few irrelevant scriptural texts were perverted and pressed into service, so that Sunday might seem to have a Bible basis.

This is the history of Sunday sacredness, and shows what a shallow institution it is for us to make so much ado about in our day. The civil laws in its behalf are as much a disgrace to our civilization as they are contrary to our national Constitution and subversive of the principles Jesus of Nazareth taught, even if they were in favor of the Sabbath he observed. His teachings, until the time of the pagan butcher Constantine's "conversion," had no help from civil powers, yea, rather the powers of this world opposed the Nazarene. These laws not only breed crime and hypocrisy among the irreligious, but also engender intolerance and hypocrisy among the religious. By what principle of Americanism or Christianity is one man to be forced to observe any particular day according to the notions of another, so long as he does not interfere with that other man's rights?

The State's province is in things civil; let the churches look after the conduct of its own members in things religious. So far as religious organizations and individuals avail themselves of those relics of former and darker times, civil laws to enforce religious obligations and practices, so far do they confess to their own inability to do the work devolving upon them, and they proclaim to the world that religion can not stand on its own merits but must have the aid of civil powers.

The moral natures of both the friends and foes of Sunday laws are impaired by their existence; the former because they must invent all sorts of hypocritical pretenses and shams for their enforcement and continuance, and the latter because they are also constantly planning devices by which to evade them.

When the falsity of the claims for Sunday is shown, and that holy day is shown to be an unholy fraud, then its friends begin to whine about the poor laborer, in whose behalf they want the laws enforced. It is true that the laborer needs more rest. He ought to have more than he gets. But who is to determine when he is tired—he himself or the ministers, many of whom have six days of rest and one of labor? In justice, I have as much right to demand that one man shall work on Sunday as he has to demand that I shall rest on that particular day. If laws we *must* have to give men one day's rest in seven, let them be such laws as shall protect each in his day of rest, but not such as shall compel a man to rest against his will. But why should the efforts of Sunday law advocates be confined to rest on Sunday only? Is Sunday rest the only rest the laborer needs? Under the very eyes of the clergy car drivers work sixteen hours a day, shop girls toil through long, weary hours, seamstresses are, by midnight oil, pricking the blood from their fingers and tearing hope from their hearts. Let the clergy attend more to the amelioration of the condition of these and others like them, and more credit will be given them for sincerity.

It is to be hoped that soon the day will come when we shall have a separation of Church and State, when each will attend to its own business, and when every citizen will enjoy his own rights without interfering with another. This is American and Christian.—*H. B. M., in Commercial Advertiser.*

A New Book.

"Paganism Surviving in Christianity." By Abram Herbert Lewis, D.D., author of "Biblical Teachings Concerning the Sabbath and the Sunday," "A Critical History of the Sabbath and the Sunday in the Christian Church," "A Critical History of Sunday Legislation," etc., etc., 12 mo., gilt top, \$1.75: G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London.

THIS, the latest of Dr. Lewis' works, is in some respects at least, the ablest that he has yet given to the public. The book is a perfect mine of well-arranged facts told in a most happy, interesting, and forcible manner. The aim of the book is to throw light upon the history of the first four centuries of the Christian Church; and to the average reader, at least, the work seems to leave little to be desired in this particular line of research. The author does not profess that his work is exhaustive, but it is certainly thorough and satisfactory.

In the outset Dr. Lewis warns the reader that—

He who judges the first century by the nineteenth will fall into countless errors. He who thinks that the Christianity of the fourth century was identical with that of the New Testament period, will go widely astray. He who does not look carefully into the history of religions before the time of Christ, and into the pagan influences which surrounded infant Christianity, can not understand its subsequent history. *He who can not rise above denominational limitations and credal restrictions can not become a successful student of church history, nor of its present tendencies, nor future developments.*

We have italicized the concluding sentence in this quotation from the author's preface, to call special attention to a most important truth clearly expressed, and yet, we think, not fully comprehended even by our author.

The book deals less in the theoretical and speculative than in the practical and

demonstrable. It shows that in corrupting Christianity paganism struck at its very root by applying to the sacred Scriptures that system of Oriental philosophy in which were the seeds of what in later times came to be known as gnosticism. "This claimed to hold within itself," says our author, "the knowledge of God and of man, of the being and the providence of the former, and of the creation and destiny of the latter." "In Oriental religions all external phenomena expressed a hidden meaning. Applying this doctrine to the Scriptures, the Jewish Gnostics taught that a hidden meaning was to be found in all the laws, ceremonies and rituals. They invented the theory that a secret tradition had been handed down from the time of Moses; the interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures had been greatly perverted in this way."

It was by this means that much of paganism was very early injected into Christianity. It was in this way that pagan water-worship corrupted Christian baptism, that pagan sun-worship and holidayism well nigh supplanted Christian Sabbath observance, and that Church and State union—a system of pagan origin—came to be regarded as essential to the highest development of national and social life.

Chapters nine, ten, and eleven are devoted to a discussion of the relations which *have* existed between Church and State, and to those relations which *should* exist. The two are very different. These chapters are especially valuable.

Our author ruthlessly tears the mask from the Sunday institution and shows that it has no just claim to be regarded other than as a pagan holiday; and that if the tide of modern "holidayism" is to be stayed, if the evils of the "Continental Sunday" are to be averted, it must be by a return to the Sabbath of the Bible, and to voluntary Christian Sabbath observance instead of compulsory Sunday keeping, which always has, and ever will, result in vicious idleness rather than in hallowed rest.

That such a return, not only to the true Sabbath and its voluntary observance, but also to the primitive simplicity of the gospel will yet be made, our author believes. "In that better day," says the doctor, "the civil law will give all religion full protection and full freedom, without regard to majorities or creeds. It will neither oppress by persecution, nor control under the name of protection." It is here that our author violates the principle which he himself so clearly lays down, namely, that he who would become a successful student of church history so as to be able to judge both of present tendencies and of future developments, must rise above denominational limitations and credal restrictions. There is a "better day" coming, but history gives us no reason to expect it. Quite the contrary. History repeats itself; and already signs are not wanting which indicate that modern civilization is about to crumble under its own magnificence, even as Rome crumbled a millennium and a half ago. And the Scriptures plainly declare that instead of growing better, "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse," that "all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution," and that until destroyed by the brightness of Christ's second coming, the "mystery of iniquity," the "man of sin," the Papacy, that great corrupter of true religion, that seducer of

the people of God, shall continue his wicked work and sustain his blasphemous pretensions. "That better day" will come, but it will be ushered in not by human reform, but by the coming of our Lord, by the dashing in pieces of all earthly powers, and by the setting up of the everlasting kingdom of God.

However, on the whole, "Paganism Surviving in Christianity" is one of the best books with which we are acquainted, and we wish that everybody would read it.

C. P. B.

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

Baptists Appeal to Civil Law.

THE Baptist Church and the Young Men's Christian Association of Englewood, a suburb of Chicago, have determined that the managers of the Marlowe theater, of Englewood, shall give no Sunday night entertainments. This suburb has recently been annexed to the city of Chicago, and the theater has paid its license to the city, and claims to be subject to the ordinances of the city to which it pays license; but the church people of Englewood are determined to enforce upon the theater the Sunday closing laws which existed before the annexation. The Baptist church is next door to the theater, although it is claimed that the construction is such that neither is a disturbance to the other. Services or entertainments in progress in one can not be heard in the interior of the other building. Sunday, August 21, the church faction secured the co-operation of the police, and succeeded in so intimidating the actors that they refused to go upon the stage, and the considerable audience which had gathered was disappointed. The theater management returned all admission fees, and prepared to contest the question both by civil injunction against the local authorities and by public argument. On the evening of Sunday, August 28, the theater was thrown open for the discussion of the Sunday closing question. The advocates of Sunday closing by law apparently preferred, however, to carry on their agitation where they could not hear the voices of opponents, or meet with any dissenting views or arguments uncomfortably difficult to answer. They, therefore, gave out in their forenoon services that there would be no mass-meeting at the theater in the evening, as there would be no speakers present, and appointed a union meeting of the churches in a more godly place.

Despite this misrepresentation, the theater was crowded to hear the principles of civil liberty in religious matters presented. The auditorium which seats fifteen hundred was filled and the aisles and lobbies packed to the doors. A series of resolutions was adopted protesting against Sunday closing by authority of law, and also this in reference to the World's Fair:—

A mass-meeting of the citizens of Englewood, bearing in mind the policy of the American Republic that there shall be a perpetual separation of Church and State, look with alarm upon the tendency of the times in seeking legislation to advance merely religious interests; therefore be it

Resolved, That we protest against the act of Congress providing for the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, and we urge that such act in so far as it relates to Sunday be repealed.

The Chicago *Times*, reporting the meeting, says:

The first speaker was A. T. Ballenger, secretary of the National Religious Liberty Association. He had been sent to Englewood under the information that the Marlowe theatre managers were persecuting the Baptist Church. When he looked over the ground he found the shoe was upon the wrong foot. He said he had never witnessed a more flagrant example of church bigotry and intolerance than is being manifested in Englewood and backed up by a mayor and chief of police who were too cowardly to close Garfield park race track. [cheers.] It was the old, old story of religious bigotry which

compassed the crucifixion of Christ, which stoned Stephen, which cast the early martyrs to the wild beasts, which maintained the Inquisition, which caused a Protestant judge to sentence Michael Servetus to be burned at the stake, which prompted the Boston magistrates in Gov. Endicott's time to hang three "heretics" and sentenced two Quaker women to be publicly whipped and driven from the colony. It was the same religious bigotry that burned the Salem witches. It was the same religious intolerance which drove Roger Williams from home in the dead of winter to take shelter with Massasoit, the Indian chief, and caused that red "heretic" to exclaim: "What a God have the English that they persecute each other so!" It was the same kind of religious bigotry which sent four honest farmers of Tennessee to jail a few weeks ago for observing the seventh day of the week as a day of rest and working on Sunday. It was the same religious but unchristian bigotry which threatens to close the World's Fair on Sunday. It was time to rise and repel such tyranny. [Cheers.]

COMPULSION NOT THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST.

It is this bigotry and intolerance that the National Religious Liberty Association is fighting. It is an attempted union of Church and State. "I am a Christian," concluded the Rev. Mr. Ballenger, "but not the kind of a Christian that invokes a policeman's club to his assistance in converting the world. Compulsion is not the spirit of Christ. It is the result of the union of Church and State. Matters are approaching a grave crisis when a church can dominate the civil power, and call out a platoon of police to enforce the edicts of the so-called Christians. If the Baptist church in Englewood can close up this place it can close up your place, and it would be just as consistent if they would call out the police and close up all other churches and compel everybody in Englewood to worship at the Baptist church. It would come to pass that the church having the strongest pull with the police department would have the biggest congregation. I tell you, my hearers, that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." [Prolonged cheers.]

The chairman then introduced the Rev. A. T. Jones, editor of THE AMERICAN SENTINEL, New York. Mr. Jones talks as emphatically as a piler-driver, and every time he came down the audience applauded. He said the question was simply whether the civil power should be dominated by the religious power. The question concerned not only Englewood, but the whole people of the United States. The speaker read extracts from the Constitutions of the United States and the various States showing that the cornerstone of republican institutions was complete religious liberty. "The action of the Englewood fanatics," he continued, "is indorsed by neither civil nor divine law. Jesus Christ was the author of free thought and religious liberty. It was the Master who said: 'If any man hear my words and believe not I condemn him not.' If Christ had been fashioned after the Englewood fanatics, he would have called for a squad of police and clubbed his enemies into subjection." [Cheers.]

Mr. Jones spoke nearly two hours.

AFTER THE OTHER THEATERS.

It appears that the Young Men's Christian Association of Englewood, puffed up by its recent victory, is going to close all the Sunday night theaters in Chicago. The Englewood *Eye*, the organ of the closing faction, says:—

Secretary T. P. Day, of the Englewood Young Men's Christian Association is organizing a movement which is being entered into by the churches and Young Men's Christian Associations all over the city to close every Sunday theatre in Chicago. Six days in the week is enough for business and play-house employees, and actors ought to have a rest one day in seven the same as other folks.

The Englewood *Call* contains the following, which is given as the sentiment of the closing faction:—

From the agitation of the question of opening the Marlowe theatre Sunday evenings will spring a movement for the suppression of Sunday theatrical performances all over the city. The plans are already laid and many prominent people are enlisted in the cause. It will be inaugurated by the emphatically expressed sentiment of all the churches, and a united and systematic movement will then be carried on.

The church people of Englewood are thoroughly determined to close all theatres and places of amusement on Sunday. They have appointed a committee of five to employ counsel and take measures to attain this end.

A CORRESPONDENT for the *Daily News*, of Moorhead, Minn., speaking of the organized effort to secure religious legislation in this country, says:—

"We might console ourselves with the idea that these were only a few misguided individuals, and therefore no harm could come of it, did we not

know that the Association is legally incorporated, having a publishing house and its own literature, a president and one hundred and twenty vice-presidents, representing thirty States, with our country divided into districts, over which presides a district secretary; that among these may be found some of the leading men of the land, including college professors and doctors of divinity; and that allied with them are some of the strongest and most influential organizations in the country. In fact, they form one of the most potent religious combinations, and that for a political purpose. They are aiming at nothing less than the control of the civil arm for the furtherance of the interests of the Church. Now is there danger in such a combination? From the Senate Report, 1829, we read: 'Extensive religious combinations, to effect a political object are, in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous. . . . All religious despotism commences by combination and influence; and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it, and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequences.'

"Will the people of this generation take heed to the warning before it is too late?"

Sixteenth Annual Congress of the American Secular Union.

THE Sixteenth Annual Congress of the American Secular Union will be held at Chicago, October 23, 24 and 25.

This society was organized in Philadelphia, July 4, 1876, to oppose the encroachments of the National Reform Association upon religious liberty.

The action of Congress in closing the World's Fair on Sundays, at the dictation of a Christian minority, demonstrates that the existence of an active, secular society is a necessity. It also shows how much may be done by thorough organization.

That the Exposition has been ordered closed in accordance with the demand of the people, no one pretends. It has been done by an inferior faction in spite of the people's protest. It is a legend in this Republic that "government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed."

This principle underlies the very existence of the Republic. Through its practical acceptance the United States of America has become the ideal of the world. It represents no king, no priest, no religion, but the people only. The National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Association, the Prohibition party, combining with other less prominent organizations, have ignored the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States by declaring that God, and not the people, is the immediate source of all political power, thus indorsing the fundamental principle of a theocracy.

With this claim they have succeeded in securing governmental recognition of what they claim as "God's day."

Not only have they captured the executive, but the judiciary. The Supreme Court has been seduced to decide in favor of the proposed theocracy, by declaring that "this is a Christian Nation."

Accordingly, people who are not acting in accordance with the Christianity which is recognized by the authorities, are fined and imprisoned, their property confiscated, and although the vast majority believe in freedom of speech and press, and in religious liberty, yet so undisciplined are the loyal forces that no combined resistance is made to this unconstitutional invasion of individual rights.

We hope that every Secularist who can do so, whether liberal or Christian, will attend the Congress, October 23. We desire especially that the lecturers should be present.

At the coming convention the advisability of holding an International Congress in 1893 will be considered. The Board is merely representative, and can go no farther than the members of the organization enable it to go. It is the members, then, and not the Board, that must decide this question.

As the dedication of the Columbian Exposition immediately precedes the Congress, the reduced rates on the railroads at that time will enable liberals throughout the country to attend. Trusting that advantage will be taken of this opportunity, we extend to you, one and all, a cordial invitation to be present, and aid us with your wisdom and advice in outlining the future work and policy of the organization.

CHARLES B. WAITE,

President Am Secular Union.

Chicago, Aug. 22, 1892.



NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 8, 1892.

THE SENTINEL of September 22 will be a number of special value and should be put into the hands of tens of thousands of new readers. For this purpose it will be furnished at one dollar per hundred, or eight dollars per thousand. **Order Early.**

THE Baptists, after having made in the early history of this country an enviable record as defenders of religious liberty, are now, to some extent at least, proving recreant to the principles which a century ago they so ably advocated. This is most noticeable in their advocacy of Sunday legislation.

THE *Examiner*, a Baptist paper published in this city, in its issue of September 1, thus defends Sunday laws:—

The State recognizes the right of man to a Sabbath, or day of rest. The need of such a day is indelibly written in the physical and moral constitution of man. The law of periodic rest is imperious and is not to be broken without suffering, therefore "the Sabbath was made for man." The daily waste of reserved strength is not quite repaired by nightly rest, and there is need of such additional periodic rest as Sabbath observance supplies. Careful physiological study shows that the Sabbath is an institution essential to the physical and moral well-being of man, and that its preservation is more than ever demanded in these days of intense activity and grinding competition. It is on this theory that the State legislates, not to further any religious end.

CERTAINLY "the State recognizes the right of man to a Sabbath, or day of rest;" and it also recognizes the right of man to a great many other things which it does not undertake to guarantee to him, and, above all, which it does not undertake to force upon him. The State recognizes the right of man to sleep, but it does not for that reason provide that all men shall sleep at the same time. It simply provides that any man who wantonly and maliciously disturbs another at any time may be punished for breach of the peace, or for noisy and boisterous conduct. If some men choose to work at night and sleep in the day time, as thousands do, there is no law to prevent them from so doing. Why is not the same freedom of choice permitted in the matter of Sunday rest?

THE oft-repeated claim reiterated by the *Examiner*, that a regular seventh day of rest is essential to the physical well-being of man, is by no means well-established. Peoples, who, like the Chinese and Japanese, have no regular, weekly rest day, enjoy, other things being equal, quite as good health and live quite as long as do people in the United States and England. "The Sabbath was made for

man;" but inasmuch as it was made and given to him before the fall, before the sentence: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," it is evident that its primary purpose was not physical rest but spiritual felicity. That this is so is evident also from the fact that in the redeemed state, the new earth, spoken of in 2 Peter 3:13, the Sabbath is still to be observed as a day of joy and worship: "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Isa. 66:22, 23. The Sabbath is God's memorial, made for man, not that he might rest from physical toil, but that by its constant recurrence the creature might the better keep in mind the Creator. Sunday does not, however, serve this purpose, hence the necessity of finding some other reason for its observance.

THE *Examiner's* denial that Sunday laws are for the furtherance of religion, avails nothing in the light of evident and well-established facts. The claim is modern and disingenuous. Our Sunday laws are derived from English law, and nobody pretends that English Sunday laws were for any other purpose than in the interests of religion. Blackstone treats of Sunday legislation under the heading, "Of Offenses against God and Religion." The civil Sunday for civil reasons was unknown in his day, and it is still unknown to the courts of several of the States of the American Union. The Supreme Court of Minnesota has decided (8 Minnesota Reports 13) that "the Sabbath laws of the State can have no other object than the enforcement of the fourth of God's commandments." The Supreme Court of Texas held (Texas Reports 524) that "the disregard of the Sabbath, the refusal to recognize it as a day sanctified to holy purposes, constitutes the offense." Similar decisions could be cited in the Reports of many other States, notably Pennsylvania, Alabama, Georgia, Connecticut, and Tennessee. Indeed it is only in comparatively recent years that anybody has denied that the purpose of Sunday laws is to protect the day in the interests of religion and because of its religious character.

IN an unofficial utterance following his decision in the well-known King case, Judge Hammond, of the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, said:—

It is a somewhat humiliating spectacle to see the Sunday advocates trying to justify the continuance of Sunday legislation . . . upon the argument that it is not in conflict with the civic dogma of religious freedom. *It surely is.*

Yet in the face of this declaration Judge Hammond argues that,—

The bare fact that the mass desires Sunday as the public day of rest, is enough to justify its civic sanction; and the potentiality of the fact that it is in aid of the religion of that mass might be frankly confessed and not denied.

IN his decision of the King case the same Judge said:—

By a sort of factitious advantage, the observers of Sunday have secured the aid of the civil law, and adhere to that advantage with great tenacity, in spite of the clamor for religious freedom. . . . The religion of Jesus Christ is so interwoven with the texture of our civilization, and every one of our institutions, that it is impossible for any man or set of men to live among us and find exemption from its influences and restraints. Sunday observance is so essentially a part of that religion that it is impossible to rid our laws of it.

If the Baptists propose to prove recreant to the principles for which their forefathers suffered persecution, some of them even to the death, let them do it candidly and openly, and not by taking refuge behind a falsehood. "The civil Sunday" is a figment of a bigoted and intolerant imagination. It is no more civil than was infant "baptism" when required by civil law in Massachusetts two centuries ago. Have Baptists forgotten the history of colonial times and their proud record as defenders of soul-liberty? The *Examiner* certainly has.

THOSE Tennessee bigots and persecutors who insist that Seventh-day Adventists might be compelled by law to work on the Sabbath, are respectfully referred to art. 11, sec. 15 of the Constitution of Tennessee, as follows:—

No person shall in time of peace be required to perform any service to the public on any day set apart by his religion as a day of rest.

This provision covers all the ground. It fully protects every citizen of Tennessee in his right to choose his Sabbath, and that, whether he is at liberty or in prison. It protects the observer of the seventh day from jury duty and road work upon the Sabbath; and should protect him from the lash of the overseer's whip for refusal to labor upon that day even when imprisoned for his faith, as Seventh-day Adventists have been imprisoned in Tennessee.

WE publish on another page the call for the Sixteenth Annual Congress of the American Secular Union. It is to be hoped that the present Congress will confine its efforts to the objects for which the Union was originally organized, and not make it an occasion for waging war upon Christianity. Under the administration of a former president, the Secular Union was operated largely as an infidel club. Nothing could be more out of place in an organization inviting the co-operation of Christians. "Liberals" should be liberal indeed.

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.