



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

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 24, 1892.

NUMBER 46.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 48 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.

It is worth serious inquiry as to what will be the effect upon the churches of taking the Government of the United States in their hands, as they have done.

WHEN we find what will be the effect upon the churches, it can easily be seen what the effect will be upon the State. And seeing the effect on both Church and State, it will be easy to know what the effect will be upon society, as a whole.

NOR is this at all difficult. The results of this procedure have already begun to appear in such measure as to present a perfectly safe criterion. The outcome may be known without any theorizing at all. All that is necessary is candidly to consider *facts* as they stand before the people at the present moment.

THE manner in which the churches succeed in getting the Government into their hands—this in itself contains a volume of instruction as to what the effect will be upon those churches. The complete history of this has already been given in these columns. We shall not repeat this any further than to print again the resolution that was sent up to Congress from the “evangelical” churches in all parts of the country, which, after prescribing what Congress should do with respect to the World’s Fair, runs as follows:—

Resolved, That we do hereby pledge ourselves and each other, that we will from this time henceforth refuse to vote for, or support for any office or position of trust, any member of Congress, either senator or representative, who shall vote for any

further aid of any kind for the World’s Fair except on conditions named in these resolutions.

As is now universally known these threats succeeded, and both Senate and House yielded to this demand rather than to risk the threatened loss of votes and jeopardize their “coming back again.” It is likewise well known that those who thus secured this legislation have repeatedly announced since that this demonstrates that they can have anything they want, if they will only stand together in demanding it; and that they do intend to make such demands for further favors and further subjection of the Government. Now here are some questions worthy of the candid attention of every honest church-member in the land. If those who are already in Congress will thus play into the hands of the churches in order to “come back” there, then will not those who want to go there play likewise into the hands of the churches in order to get there? When, from this universal advertising, it is understood that the churches hold within their gift the offices and places of trust of the Nation, then will not these same churches become the chiefest objects of the courtship and solicitation of the office-seekers of the land, and especially of the most unprincipled ones? Everybody knows that the only fair answer that can be made to these questions is, *Yes, they will.*

THEN, in order to make their courtship and solicitation for office most effectual, these men will become church-members themselves. And having joined the Church for political purposes they will use their membership for political purposes. And so far as they are concerned the churches will be but so many political clubs and coteries to be “worked” for all that can be made out of them. This is not theory, nor is it far-fetched. It is the plainly stated calculation of the leaders of the Sunday-law movement. For years it has been one of the standing principles of the

National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union that “now when it is a question of preserving the Sabbath itself, and guarding the homes which are the sanctuaries of Christ’s gospel, we women believe that *no day is too good*, no place too consecrated, for the declaration of principles and the determining of votes.” And in an editorial notice of a Sunday-law meeting in this city, *The Examiner* (Baptist) said:

Congress may change its mind; the present is no time for jubilation; but is (and we beg pardon for the phrase) a time for wire-pulling and hard fighting.

Now when it is so openly and so brazenly announced by those who are occupying the leading positions in the churches, that their “holy day” and their sacred places shall be turned into political hustings, and that they will devote themselves to “wire-pulling and hard fighting”—when these take the lead in this, is it not inevitable that the office-seekers who would court their influence and votes will do the same thing? In fact what else are these declarations of theirs but an open bid for such procedure on the part of just such classes as those?

NOR is political favor the only bid which these same churches hold out for the purpose of securing Sunday observance. The churches have financial as well as political gain at their disposal. In congratulating himself and his followers upon the success of their threatening efforts upon Congress, the president of the American Sabbath Union exclaimed:—

The form of the law is happy. It gives a premium of \$2,500,000 on doing right. It proves in a concrete way that godliness hath great gain.

As these churches have it in their power thus to put a money premium upon doing the will of the Church, it is self-evident that in the nature of things they will speedily secure large accessions to their numbers in such “right” doing. When the Church is enabled thus to prove so readily in a concrete way, to her own

satisfaction, that "godliness hath great gain," it is inevitable that there will be speedily added to her numbers those who will be able to prove just as readily to their own satisfaction that "gain is godliness." And the deduction of these latter will be just as true and as honest as is this boast that the Church has already made.

NEITHER have they stopped with this attempt upon Congress, and the World's Fair Directory. They are applying the principle in general practice. Witness the financial bargain—to give their moral and financial support—which the churches of Englewood, Chicago, made with the Marlowe Theatre to secure Sunday observance by the theatre; and the boycotting combination which the churches of the West Side, in the same city, entered into to secure Sunday observance by the dealers. This latter effort speedily bore living fruit which is significant of the whole line of things which we are here pointing out. This boycotting resolution to deal with nobody that opened on Sunday, was passed September 25. On October 11, another meeting of the same kind was held in another part of the city. The announcement and programme were printed on a large leaflet which was about half filled with advertisements, among which we find one put up in this style:—

MILLINERY	A—————& B—————
FURNITURE	Clothing, Dry Goods, Hats, Caps, Boots, Shoes
CARPETS	Ladies' and Gents' Furnishing Goods.
TRUNKS	4— to 4— M—————Avenue.
BAGS	
ETC., ETC.	We believe in the closing of shops and stores on Sunday, and have always practiced it.

Another one runs thus:—

PIONEER ADVOCATES OF SUNDAY CLOSING.

Z————— & CO.,

CLOTHIERS,

Hatters and Furnishers,

NORTHWEST CORNER ——— AND ——— STREETS.

—NOT OPEN ON SUNDAY.—

MORE than this; we know of an instance wherein only last month, a money bribe was actually offered by the churches in a certain place, and the proposition was conveyed through a preacher, to secure the closing of a certain institution on Sunday. And in perfect consonance with this, if not actually suggestive of it, the *Union Signal* of October 20, 1892, publishes editorially, from Joseph Cook, the statement that "there is more wealth behind the churches and the respectable portion of society than behind all the opponents" of Sunday closing. The statement is worth reprinting in full as it is made in the very connection in which we have used it. It is as follows:—

In view of the vigor with which the right of petition is exercised by the opponents of Sunday closing [of the World's Fair], we believe that it should continue to be exercised vigorously by the friends of Sunday observance, especially if there should prove to be the slightest danger of the reversal of the action of Congress. We urge alertness at all points of the compass, for our opponents are not likely to sleep, and portions of the press of the country favor them from obvious mercenary motives. So does the immense wealth behind the saloon. *But there is more wealth behind the churches and the respectable portion of society than behind all the opponents.* The forces of the churches are in this case substantially united, and are already triumphant in the preliminary contest.

YET more than this; they are actually coddling the saloons to secure Sunday observance by them. The *Michigan Sabbath Watchman* (local organ of the American Sabbath Union) for October, 1892, reprints an article from the *American Sabbath Union* (the national organ of the association of that name), entitled, "The Rochester Experiment," in which the Sunday observing saloon is flatly declared to be "reputable" and even of "good repute." It seems to be a report to the paper, from Rochester, in this State, giving a flattering account of the progress of Sunday observance by the saloons. The article is long, and we can present only a few extracts. Here is one:—

If liquor sellers can make as much, or nearly as much, by working six days as they can in seven, they will be foolish to deny themselves that extra day of rest.

And here is another:—

A more important and controlling consideration is that the liquor closing movement is an effort to place this business under the protection of law instead of making it contraband, as the opposite policy has done. It is incredible that reputable men, as the large proportion of liquor sellers are, shall prefer voluntarily to place themselves under the ban of legal as well as popular disapproval.

And here is yet another, and stronger, too:—

The effect of Sunday closing has been to sharply discriminate the reputable from the disreputable saloon, and certainly to the advantage of the former. How many of the reputable liquor sellers would wish to weaken the good repute of their establishments for the paltry patronage that disregard of their license obligations might secure?

True he states that "there is considerably more liquor sold Saturday night and used at home on Sunday than before the saloons were closed on that day." Nevertheless he declares, "It is better every way for these customers to get their supplies the day before, and keep their business closed."

AND all these things are being done by the leaders and managers of the churches in the United States—and professed Protestant churches at that. How much worse could they do if they made no pretensions to religion at all? But when these things are all being done, not only by professed religionists, but by the very ones who set

themselves forth as the representatives of Christianity itself, how infinitely worse it is than if done by persons making no pretensions of religion! This is where the opposers of Sunday laws and Sunday observance are at a disadvantage. These Sunday law workers can, and do, and will, employ measures and resort to means that no man of any principle would ever think of. They will literally stop at nothing. With them the end justifies any and every means. The observance of Sunday, however secured, sanctifies every possible means that can be employed to secure it. This is evident from the facts which we have here set down—and that they are facts is patent to the whole people of the United States.

How exactly do these declarations and actions of these churches fulfill the prophecy that was spoken concerning them long ago—that they, as fallen Babylon, would "become the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird!" Rev. 18:2. That hold is now prepared. That cage is set. Its doors are open. And she is to-day holding forth the luring baits that will inevitably draw into her every foul spirit and every unclean and hateful bird. And how much longer can the Christians stay in these churches and under these leaders and managers without being partakers of their sins. There are Christians in these churches who are sighing and crying because of the evil and the abominations that are being wrought in them. And to these now God sends the call, "Come out of her my people that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. 18:4. There is but another step to take before her sins shall reach unto heaven and God shall remember her iniquities. Rev. 18:2, 5.

THERE is another scripture that describes this whole situation and system of things as it exists to-day. It is 2 Tim. 3:1-5 and runs as follows:—

This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away.

Think of it: a list of nineteen such dark iniquities as these, and all carried on by people having a form of godliness, a people making pretensions to Christianity. And, horrible to tell, they "shall wax worse and worse deceiving and being deceived." Verse 13. And the things which are to accomplish it are being done before the eyes of the people to-day. Is it not high time that whosoever would fear God should "from such turn away?" May Heaven help the people to see.

A. T. J.

Is This the Shadow of Coming Events.

THE *Post-Intelligencer*, of Paris, Henry County, Tenn., has in its issue of the 4th inst., this item of news:—

REPAIRS ON JAIL.

Messrs. A. H. Lankford, N. S. Hicks and W. R. Collins, committee, have contracted with Messrs. Ed. C. Bates & Co., Clarksville, Tenn., to make needed repairs for the sum of \$880.75, the county furnishing wood, nails, etc.

The contractors are to tear down the two old cells partially destroyed by fire, tear out the old

joists and floor as far as the side of cells and replace same with new joists. Replace cells with new iron as before, cut doorway through wall and put in new door and frame. Also to furnish and put up an iron stairway. The hall is to be covered with No. 12 iron. The work began November 1.

Is this the shadow of the fulfillment of the threat of Attorney-General Lewis that he will "prosecute every man, woman, and child of them [the Adventists] until they stop" their private work on Sunday? The Springville Seventh-day Adventist Church has a membership of about fifty, if we mistake not. Fourteen of the number are understood to be under indictment now for the heinous offense of doing private work on their own farms on Sunday—work seen only by members of their own families or by their brethren in the church. Is it for the accommodation of these Adventists that Henry County is enlarging its jail?

The Mormon Question Again.

THE result of the recent election which placed the Democratic Party in possession of every branch of the Government, except the Supreme Court, has revived to some extent the agitation for the admission of Utah to the family of States.

The Mormons are largely Democrats, and it is thought by some that the leaders of that party will seek to entrench themselves in power by speedily admitting Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah, regardless of their fitness to become sovereign States.

Each of these Territories has in it a considerable Mormon population, though it is very doubtful if either Arizona or New Mexico has enough Mormons to even hold the balance of power between the two great parties, to say nothing of themselves becoming a party powerful enough to seize the reins of local government.

But be the case as it may with the other Territories seeking admission to the Union, the "Mormon question" is certainly a live issue in Utah; and Congress would do well to move very slowly in the matter of conferring Statehood on a people who have shown themselves so out of harmony with republican institutions, and so wedded to two hateful relics of barbarism, namely, polygamy and a union of Church and State.

The right of the Government to prohibit polygamy can not be successfully disputed; and yet, strange to say, it has seldom been defended on correct grounds. The right of the State to forbid the practice of plural marriages has been asserted almost entirely on moral grounds, rather than for civil reasons—because polygamy is immoral rather than because it invades and destroys inalienable human rights, and is of necessity a negation of the equality of the sexes and the equal rights of man and woman.

It is very true, as has been maintained, that polygamy is in violation of the moral law—the law of God—but that is not the reason that the Government should prohibit it; it should be prohibited because it is destructive of natural human rights. The Government is not the judge of the divine law, and can never become such except by usurpation—the sure forerunner of tyranny. Congress should see to it that polygamy does not become entrenched behind the Constitution and statutes of a sovereign State; but it should also see to it that this question is not made the occasion of further committing the Govern-

ment to an attempt to define and administer the law of God.

But while civil government has no right to prohibit any thing simply because it is unchristian, Christianity has nevertheless a very marked and a perfectly legitimate influence upon legislation. It is true that the State may not forbid anything simply because it is morally wrong; but it by no means follows that it may not forbid that which in the light of Christian civilization is seen to be an invasion of inalienable rights. Christianity has had an influence in the world such as no other religion has ever had; its influence is to civilize and to Christianize; it civilizes all with which it comes in contact; it Christianizes all who accept it, and who from the heart obey its teaching. As a nation becomes civilized through the influence of Christianity upon the people who compose that nation, its laws become more humane and the rights of the people are more fully recognized and adequately protected. As men become imbued with the principles of Christianity they will the more readily perceive and acknowledge the rights of their fellows; and this change will be speedily manifested by more liberal laws and by a more equitable administration of justice. But true Christianity never leads to a disregard of the rights of others. Those who are made free by Christ never seek to enslave their fellows.

C. P. B.

A Stupid Forgery.

WE have received several copies of what purports to be a letter from the Pope of Rome to the Jesuits of the United States, or rather of two separate letters similar in character, and doubtless of common origin. Copies of these "letters" are being widely circulated throughout the United States, though for what purpose it is difficult to say since they are evidently clumsy forgeries. A sample paragraph from one of these "letters" runs thus:—

Moreover, we proclaim the people of the United States of America to have forfeited all right to rule said republic, and also all dominion, dignity and privileges appertaining to it. We likewise declare, that all subjects of every rank and condition in the United States, and every individual who has taken any oath of loyalty to the United States, in any way whatever, may be absolved from said oath, as also from all duty, fidelity or obedience, on or about September 5, 1893, at the convening of the Roman Catholic Congress at Chicago, Illinois.

This is enough to brand the production as a forgery, but the next paragraph contains a literary blunder which at once shows that it never came from the Pope, or from any authorized to speak for him; for the Pontiff and all who are associated with him in the management of the church are masters of language, while the author of this production is a blunderer of the first order. The paragraph runs thus:—

When the feast of Ignatus Loyola occurs in the year of Our Lord 1893, as we shall exonerate them (or our successor) from all engagements, as we expect to deprive Protestants of all pretended claims in the United States.

No modern Pope ever wrote, "We shall exonerate them (or our successor) from all engagements," etc., meaning thereby, "We (or our successor) shall exonerate them," etc. Nor is this the only glaring structural error in the Pope's (?) letter.

The other and longer "letter" contains even more extraordinary things than the one from which we have quoted. It is addressed, "To our beloved children in

the faith;" and among other absurd things contains this paragraph:—

We are opposed to any system of schools that teaches the youth more than the Roman catechism, or that teaches the young to think—it is unnecessary, a waste of time and money, when the holy father has been deputed by God to do the thinking for this world. Therefore we call upon our subjects to do all possible to break down and destroy the free public schools of this heretical Nation, which have compelled us to set up and maintain at great expense parochial schools to defend our faith, thus greatly lessening the income of the clergy.

Anybody who can believe that the crafty Leo XIII. ever sent out such stuff is quite capable of believing anything. Rome is the foe of civil and religious liberty, but her Pope and her bishops are not fools in worldly things, as they must have been had they sent out such letters as those attributed to them.

Our object in referring to these so-called "letters" is not to defend the Catholic Church nor the Catholic faith; we have no sympathy with either; but to warn our readers against that false Protestantism, so-called, which, to unprincipled Jesuitical trickery and falsehood (doing evil that good (?) may come), adds such monumental stupidity as that exhibited in these forged "letters" from the Pope. B.

Religious Persecution in Austria.

THE *London Daily News* seems surprised that there should be violent religious persecution in this day of enlightenment and liberality, even in a city like Vienna. Then the surprise is increased by the fact that the particular religious denomination made to suffer in this case is that of the Methodists, with all their primitive plainness and patience.

It was not until as late as 1869 that the first pioneer Methodist preacher arrived in Vienna. He began his work under the auspices of the Stuttgart Wesleyans, and soon collected a body of about one hundred Austrian and German coreligionists, who at once responded to the "higher spirituality" quality of the new movement. From the very start, however, they were subjected to the most offensive forms of government interference and restriction. A persistent and systematic persecution of this small body of earnest seekers after the "higher life" was inaugurated by the police authorities, amounting practically to the prohibition of all their religious rights.

Their congregations were broken up, their more private prayer services were interrupted and finally interdicted, and even their Sunday schools were closed. One instance is given in this connection, as follows:—

A little girl who attended these Sunday classes on one occasion quoted a text of Scripture in the hearing of a priest. "Where did you learn that?" he sharply inquired. The child returned a truthful answer, and the result was that very shortly afterward the school was summarily shut up by the police, acting under the instructions of the Roman Catholic authorities.

When the police authorities are asked for the reason of this forcible suppression of these Methodist churches, schools, and missions, their only answer is that the Methodist religion is not recognized in Austria. The courts of appeal, when resorted to by these persecuted people, declared that the meetings of the Methodists were too large to be tolerated under the right of private worship. Baron Gautsch, the Austrian Minister of Education, when appealed to, decided, on the other hand, that the Methodist body was too small to entitle it to State recognition.

Thus on all sides the Methodists are persecuted and proscribed. They dare not gather even for a service of prayer, the minister dare not give public religious advice to the living, nor private spiritual consolation to the dying, and if even a member of the flock calls upon the clergyman, he does so under police surveillance.

This is the true picture of religious liberty in Austria, and that, too, in the midst of our glorified nineteenth century civilization. It is evident that Austria has not taken one step in advance of that savage system of religious and political despotism which Kossuth so graphically pictured, so eloquently condemned, and so heroically combatted nearly half a century ago. Austria can never grow in true greatness, nor elevate her people in the elements and principles of useful, virtuous and prosperous citizenship, until she rejects the dim light of Roman candles, and accepts the clear, open sun-light of God's universal truth and justice.—*Mail and Express.*

Shall the Pilgrim Papacy Survive?

THAT Boston paper, which carries the lengthy title of *Our Country and the American Traveler*, in its issue of November 10, says editorially, in reference to the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday:—

In the United States there is no one custom more fixed and distinctive than the almost universal regard for the Sabbath. The most industrious people in the world—perhaps the most avaricious—by common consent suspend their worldly toil, and millions of them resort to the temples of religion and their children to the Sabbath school. It has been so from the settlement of the country and the existence of our Union. One of the principle reasons assigned by John Robinson, the pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers, for his little flock resolving to quit Holland, their adopted country—whither they had fled ten years before from England—for America, was “that they could not bring the Dutch to observe the Lord's day as a Sabbath.”

One of the chief cares of both the Pilgrim and the Puritan Fathers on their arrival here was the observance of the “sacred rest.” In the earliest records of the Dutch colonists in New York there are decrees of the most stringent character, intending to guard the infant community against the demoralizing tendencies of Sabbath profanations. There are still earlier records of attention on the part of the English settlers to this subject.

Whether they established themselves in New Plymouth, Salem or Cambridge, they alike felt the sanctification of the Lord's day to be an important matter.

Seeing then, that this sentiment of reverence for the Sabbath is recognized in every State of the Union, and on our statute books laws embodying this same sentiment have ever had a place, the question is not whether these convictions are well or ill-founded, not whether the Sabbath is or is not a divine institution, but whether the Sabbath, thus entrenched in the affections, usages and laws of the American people, shall not be respected by the directors of the World's Fair. America invites the world to examine her institutions. One question is, shall she deliberately abolish one of the most fundamental of these, impelled by the greed of gain? It is a great question, and one which appeals as directly to patriotic pride as to religious principle.

That was a very suggestive admission from John Robinson, that his Pilgrim flock resolved to quit Holland because “they could not bring the Dutch to observe the Lord's day as a Sabbath.” By quoting it does *Our Country* wish to call attention to the fact that a similar escape from the uncomfortable evidence of a similar inability is still open? Although there are no more worlds to conquer there are still unoccupied lands in plenty where those may go, who, like John Robinson and his fellows, can not bring all with whom they are associated to observe the first day of the week as a Sabbath. But

will those who have the love of their kind in their hearts desire to so separate themselves from their fellow-men? What is the natural conclusion to be placed upon these words of John Robinson, especially in the light of the decrees and statutes which we are here told his followers established? Is it not that where they were in the minority,—did not make the laws, and could not coerce others to conform to their religious practices,—they were not contented? Does it not show that in their stern pride of opinion they could brook no difference of views in others? They could tolerate no failure in others to observe the religious forms which they observed? Consequently, when they could not “bring the Dutch” to think and do as they thought right, and were unable to compel them, they resolved to quit Holland for a country where there were none to withstand them, and they could set up a theocracy of their own without opposition, or at least with none that they could not overcome. The “decrees of a stringent character” which were immediately adopted show this to be so. Seeing that this is so, and that these statutes and decrees, and others embodying the same sentiment, are now recognized in almost every State of the Union, on their statute books and in their local laws,—what follows? Does it follow that the question is not whether these statutes and laws “are well or ill-founded, not whether the Sabbath is or is not a divine institution”? If the Pilgrim and Puritan Fathers stood to this country, and its citizens forever, in the place of God, that would follow. If they did not, it would not follow.

This Pilgrim and Puritan papacy was really abolished by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Whether it shall survive is then truly a great question and one which appeals “directly to patriotic pride.” Much more forcibly does it appeal “to religious principle” whether the American people shall yield religious allegiance to the Pilgrim and Puritan Fathers, or to God. This Boston paper seems satisfied that the question is solely one of ancestor worship. Will that suffice to satisfy the mind and conscience of intelligent American citizens? W. H. M.

An Injustice.

[From the *Christian Patriot*, Morristown, Tenn., Sept. 15, 1891. For comment see last page.]

THE Sunday laws are not at all religious. They have two objects: first to secure everyone his right to a weekly day of rest; and, secondly, to prevent the disturbance by worldly noise and business of those who rest on Sunday. Even infidels must admit that a weekly rest day is promotive of health and intelligence, and that it is just that those who wish to worship should be protected from annoyance.

Mr. R. M. King, of west Tennessee, is a Seventh-day Adventist. We regret his errors; but if reason can not convince him of them persecution will not. He is a farmer. He rested on Saturday and ploughed on Sunday. He was arrested and fined under the statute. He paid his fine and ploughed again. He is now prosecuted under the common law. The Seventh-day Adventists took his case up. It has gone through the State courts and has just been decided against him by the United States Circuit Court. It is to be appealed to the Supreme Court. We hope

Mr. King will gain his case. For, first, he has complied substantially with the objects of the Sunday laws. He and his household rest one day every week. And his ploughing at a distance from any church is not an annoyance to worship. It is a shame that he should be punished while railroad companies and daily papers rob thousands of a rest day and disturb the Sabbaths of large sections and great cities.

The case calls attention to the importance of carefully amending the Sunday laws. They should forbid the employing of men to work on Sunday. No one except an idiot will work on Sunday unless compelled to do so. The penalty should rest wholly upon the employer. And secondly, those who conscientiously and really observe any other day as a Sabbath should be exempted from the law, provided they do their Sunday work in such a way and at such a place as not to disturb the Sabbath quiet of the first day of the week. The exemption would only apply to those who do rest on Saturday, and it would permit them to employ on Sunday only those who have rested on Saturday. Such a law should have the support of Seventh-day Adventists, Jews and infidels.

What Kind of a Christian Nation?

EVERY thoughtful person, on reading the recent decision of the Supreme Court to the effect that “this is a Christian Nation,” well knew that the next step would be to raise the controversy as to what kind of a “Christian Nation” this “Christian Nation” is. As sure as like causes produce like effects, and as sure as Constantine's adoption of “Christianity” as the religion of the Roman Empire demanded an official decision as to which of the contending sects were entitled to be called Christian, so sure will the question now have to be settled in this country, what kind of a “Christian Nation” this “Christian Nation” is.

The movement to determine this has already begun, and begun by opposing elements. The *Christian Statesman* is contending for one kind of Christianity, the *New York Independent* for another. The *Christian Statesman*, the paper which has so long been working to make this a “Christian Nation” by national law, was the quickest to catch the decision of the Supreme Court and publish it to the world and to rejoice in the accomplishment of its long sought purpose. But now, just as was expected, this paper complains editorially, that notwithstanding this is a “Christian Nation,” made so “by the highest authority in the land,” nevertheless it is not a “Christian Nation” because *Christian Statesman* Christianity is not in control of the Government. Here are its words:—

You certainly believe that Christ is the king and head of this Nation. It has been declared, by the highest authority of the land, to be a Christian Nation. Of course it can be a Christian Nation only by virtue of a real relation to Christ as its king. No man or body of men is Christian that is not in subjection to him as Lord. . . . On next Tuesday you will cast the deciding ballot. And in view of the personal character of the great majority of the present rulers, is there not a solemn call made upon you to pause and seriously consider the whole question before you cast another vote? . . . And is it not a matter for very serious consideration, in determining the question of casting your vote, on next Tuesday, that in neither of the platforms of principles put forth by the two great parties, which ask for your suffrage is the name of God mentioned, or the slightest deliver-

ance given with reference to any of the great moral questions that are pressing to-day for solution.

What a Babylon of contradictions! "This is a Christian Nation." "No man or body of men is Christian that is not in subjection to him as Lord." The "great majority of our present rulers" are not subject to him, therefore "turn the rascals out" and put third-party-Prohibition-Christians in and thereby make this a "Christian Nation." This is a Christian Nation now because it has been so declared "by the highest authority in the land," but it is not a Christian Nation and can not be until the Christianity we have nominated is elected.

The New York *Independent* does not endorse *Christian Statesman* Christianity, that is, third-party-Prohibition-Christianity, but electioneered for Republican Christianity, exhorting "Christian voters" to "rise early and pray before you vote" and "cast a ballot in approval of solid Christian character"—vote the Republican ticket. In the eyes of the *Christian Statesman*, Republican Christianity is anti-Christian. In the eyes of the *Independent*, *Christian Statesman* Christianity is anti-Christian. With this difference of opinion among Protestants as to which kind of "Christianity" should be professed by this "Christian Nation," and with the greater difference of opinion between Protestants and Catholics on the same point, which kind of "Christianity" shall this "Christian Nation" adopt? One thing is sure; the "Christianity" which this "Christian Nation" shall decide to endorse will not be Christianity any more than that was Christianity which was adopted by Constantine as the religion of his Empire, and which drenched the earth in blood.

A. F. BALLENGER.

Why Not Tax Church Property?

FOR the first time the United States census has secured the statistics of churches. There is a great deal of credit due to the census bureau, as it must have been very difficult and laborious work to obtain the accurate figures. There is much more than this which the census bureau has done; it has exposed an evil, and shown the injustice that is being done to every property owner in every State in the Union.

But the question, "Why not tax church property?" has been sadly neglected. There have been only a few men who have advocated it, and the press has been absolutely silent. If there was a State church and a national belief, it would be different, but as the United States recognizes no church, and has no belief, I hold that it is absolutely unconstitutional to exempt any church or churches from taxation. A church is a religious corporation, can own and acquire any amount of property, real or personal, without bearing the burdens of taxation. Why I call a church a religious corporation is, because in law it is called a private corporation, and "private corporations are such as are created for the private benefit of the collective members of the corporation, and are designed to regulate and promote their religious, social, or financial interests."

There are churches in every city of the United States that own property that is not used for religious purposes, but is used for various purposes which pay a good interest.

It was under the Spanish domination that the Catholic Church laid the foundation of its riches and power in Mexico. The small value placed upon land in Mexico enabled the church to become at an early day the possessor of vast tracts, which it acquired by various donations. The Inquisition, too, flourished during that period, and the lands of heretics who fell under its discipline were confiscated. The best agricultural estates belonged to the church, and in every town and hamlet it owned houses of every description. It also came in for a share of the products of the mines without incurring the risk of mining operations. But at last the rule of Spain became unendurable, and the people revolted.

When Maximilian was shot and Juarez came into possession, he and his government began at once to execute the laws of reform. The value of the church was estimated to be \$300,000,000, and its revenues were greater than those of the Mexican Government. When the property of the church was placed upon the market, its actual value was sufficient to pay the national debt several times over. Most of it changed hands, but to what purposes the proceeds were applied is a mystery. The spiritual power of the church, however, remained, and it has resulted in restoring the church to its former position of wealth. Before the reform laws this wealth consisted principally in land. Now it is money.

"Concentrated capital is, in time of need, the most available species of wealth."

There are about one hundred and fifty denominations, besides many independent congregations. It is hardly possible for any one denomination in the United States to acquire so much wealth, although the Catholic Church owns property amounting to \$118,000,000, but if ever there is church unity it would not only be possible, but quite probable for this unity to become a power, and the people should awake from their slumber and stop exempting church property from taxation.

In France the Catholic Church controlled and owned two acres of the best land out of every five, prior to the French Revolution. It was Henry VIII. who broke up ecclesiastical institutions and secularized their property, that is, stopped exempting it from taxation.

In Europe to-day a man is taxed either directly or indirectly to help support a State church, whether he be a Christian, infidel, or Jew. And where the church has the strongest hold, as in Spain and Italy, education is comparatively unknown. Italy is waking up and beginning to confiscate ecclesiastical property.

Observe the conditions of Canada: and the church is one of the principal causes of the deplorable state the country is in. We do not want Canada until the hives of those ecclesiastical drones are destroyed.

Generals Grant and Garfield recognized the monstrous evil, and in their messages to Congress pointed it out. James A. Garfield said in Congress, June 22, 1874:—

The divorce between the Church and State ought to be absolute. It ought to be so absolute that no church property any where in any State, or in the Nation, should be exempt from equal taxation; for if you exempt the property of any church organization to that extent, you impose a tax upon the whole community.

The United States is not a secular Government as long as it favors the institution of religious fanaticism.

General Grant in his message to Congress in 1875 said:—

In connection with this important question, I would also call your attention to the importance of correcting an evil that, if permitted to continue, will probably lead to great trouble in our land before the close of the nineteenth century. It is

the acquisition of vast amounts of untaxed church property. In 1850 I believe the church property of the United States which paid no tax, municipal or State, amounted to \$87,000,000. In 1860 the amount had doubled. In 1870 it was \$354,483,587. By 1900, without a check, it is safe to say this property will reach a sum exceeding \$3,000,000,000. So vast a sum, receiving all the protection and benefits of the Government without bearing its proportion of the burdens and expenses of the same, will not be looked upon acquiescently by those who have to pay the taxes. In a growing country where real estate enhances so rapidly with time as in the United States, there is scarcely a limit to the wealth that may be acquired by corporations, religious or otherwise, if allowed to retain real estate without taxation. The contemplation of so vast a property as here alluded to, without taxation, may lead to sequestration without constitutional authority, and through blood. I would suggest the taxation of all property equally.

—James E. Larmer, Jr., in *American Journal of Politics*.

Civil Liberty.*

THE general impression is that civil liberty and religious liberty are (as it were), twin sisters, both animated by a common purpose and actuated by a desire to aid each other in securing and maintaining those equitable rights which are the natural heritage of all, without regard to differences of opinion on matters political, economical or religious. The twin sister representing religious liberty, however, has not had the same regard for the rights of its twin sister representing civil liberty as is supposed. While *civil* liberty recognizes the equal rights of all, irrespective of opinion, *religious* liberty (for its votaries), limits these rights to those who adopt the religion which religious people have "liberty" to profess and practice; in other words, the advocates of religious liberty deny civil liberty to all those who decline to accept any of the tolerated religions, claiming that such persons "have no rights which 'religious people' are bound to respect." Thus we have *religious* liberty, but *not civil* liberty.

Noah Webster defines "civil liberty" as "exemption from arbitrary interference with person, opinion or property on the part of the government under which one lives." Taking this as its true meaning, the question may be seriously and anxiously asked—have we civil liberty in this country?

Have we that civil liberty which claims exemption from "arbitrary interference" with our persons when we are compelled to "observe" (as religious fanaticism calls it) a certain day of the week and abstain from occupation, recreation or pleasure on that day?

Have we that civil liberty which demands exemption from arbitrary interference with our opinions when our children in the public schools (supported by general tax) are given religious instruction which their parents regard as so much useless or baneful superstition? A further arbitrary interference with our opinions is shown where testimony of a witness is rejected because he refuses to believe in the inspiration of a certain book, or in a future state of punishment.

Have we that civil liberty which grants exemption from arbitrary interference with our property when we are compelled by law to contribute our money (through the tax levy) toward appropriations for sectarian institutions; for payment of chaplains in our prisons, in Congress, in

* By Henry M. Taber, in *Freethinker Magazine*. For editorial comment see the last page of this paper.

the army and navy; and to supplement the amount rendered necessary by reason of the exemption of church property from taxation?—Surely not.

It would be quite as proper and as just had the opponents of Sunday observance the power, for them to enact a law fining and imprisoning people for preaching or praying on Sunday, as it is now to likewise punish for working or playing on that day. The arrest and imprisonment of citizens who (though thoroughly religious and many of them Christians) do not believe in Sunday observance is as arbitrary and tyrannical as any act that history records. Three Baptists (who observe religiously the seventh day of the week) have been for months languishing in a prison in Tennessee for the crime (!) of attending to their gardens or performing some ordinary farm duties on Sunday. Think of this in this land which boasts of civil liberty!

There is no greater denial of civil liberty than the exclusion from the World's Fair of millions of our citizens on the only day of the week they can visit it, because, forsooth! certain religious fanatics regard it as a sacred day.

The danger to civil liberty in the matter of religious teaching in our public schools is recognized even by the clergy. The late Rev. Howard Crosby, D. D., said: "There is no safety for our country but in non-sectarian (elementary) education."

The sentiment of all intelligent, reflecting and just persons is that of a firm opposition to contributing, either directly or indirectly, by the State, in support of any religious institutions. The system of exempting church property from taxation is an indirect method of appropriating money for the support of places of worship. Many of the clergy who believe in civil liberty as a *principle* boldly denounce this exemption. Rev. Dr. Shipman, of Christ Church, New York City, says: "That which is protected by government may justly be compelled to maintain it. I would like to see all church property throughout the land taxed to the last dollar's worth. The Church may fight this question, but sooner or later the battle will go against it, and its retreat will not be only with dented armor but with banners soiled."

Judge Story of the United States Supreme Court says (in the Girard will case): "The Constitution of 1790 and the like permission will, in substance, be found in the Constitution of 1776, and the existing Constitution of 1838 expressly declares that no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect or *support* any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent. . . . It must have been intended to extend equally to all sects, whether they believe in Christianity or not, and whether they are Jews or infidels."

To the honor of those branches of the Christian Church known as Baptists and Methodists, be it known, that they have declined to accept the money appropriated by the general Government for religious instruction among the Indians, on the ground that the Government has no business whatever to make such appropriations.

Sunday laws, appointments of religious and fast days, and of chaplains; the requirements of oaths and religious teachings in our public schools; sectarian appropriations of money and exemption

of church property from taxation—all are clearly interferences with that civil liberty which grants equal privileges and imparts equal justice to all—to the religious and to those who make no profession of religion.

The Constitution of the United States says: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion," and yet, in the face of this section and in utter disregard of it, there is a virtual *establishment of the Christian religion*, as is shown, for instance, by its recognition in the religious services had at the opening of each day's session of Congress.

The Constitution also says: "No religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office," and yet no person will be permitted to fill certain offices, unless they take a prescribed oath *as a test of belief in a particular religion*.

The State of New York (among other States) has a law positively prohibiting appropriations of any money for sectarian purposes, and yet such appropriations are annually made in addition to indirect contributions for the support of churches by exempting church property from the operation of a uniform tax law.

What a mockery to claim that we have civil liberty in this country! Christianity, by its intolerant spirit and its impudent assumption of superior knowledge and superior goodness, has robbed us of this boon.

When I speak of Christianity and of Christians, I make an exception in favor of many unpretentious, tolerant, liberal-minded and justice-loving believers in that faith. From such come honorable protests against invasions of civil liberty.

Rev. I. L. Wilkinson, D. D. (Baptist), says: "Ours is a civil Government, strictly and exclusively; its jurisdiction extends only over civil affairs. A Christian government implies a State religion. Religious liberty does not mean liberty for the Christian religion alone."

Bishop Venner says: "The mixing up of politics with religion, under any circumstances, is fraught with manifold and multiform dangers. There is no tyranny so cruel, no yoke so intolerable, as priestcraft when vested with temporal authority. More political atrocities, butcheries, crimes and enormities have been committed in the name and on account of religion than have arisen from any and all other causes combined."

Advocates of civil liberty in all ages and in all lands have uttered their protests against the domination of the Church.

Christ's injunction—"Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's"—is a precept which the Christian Church daily repudiates.

Edward I. of England caused taxes to be levied on the clergy on the true principle that those who are protected by the State should share its burdens.

J. L. M. Curry, in Johnson's Encyclopedia (article "Religious Liberty") says: "Unfortunately, Constantine, in 313, established Christianity by law, and since that time Christians, when they have obtained power, have allied their religion with civil authorities."

The *Jewish Times*, in a recent article on sectarian enactments (such as Sunday, oath and blasphemy laws) and of the religious intolerance and fanaticism which has injected them into our politics, says: "There is not one of these enactments that may not on any day be invoked against citizens who do not profess the

Christian religion. The Adventists, Jews, Agnostics and the great body of rationalists at large have *not* the equal rights guaranteed by the Constitution that Christians have."

John Stuart Mill says: "Mankind could no more be justified in silencing the honest opinion of one person than that one person would, had he the power, be justified in silencing the opinion of mankind." And yet, here in this country, where civil liberty is supposed to abound more extensively than in any other, there are *millions* of people whose opinions are silenced by the noisy, dogmatic, bigoted, persecuting upholders of the Christian Church.

Civil liberty exists in this country to a *very limited* degree and it will so continue as long as this domineering, tyrannical and unjust Christian Church is permitted to rob us of our civil rights.

The late Rev. Henry J. VanDyke, D. D. (Presbyterian), had the courage to say: "If we can not have liberty *and* orthodoxy, *let orthodoxy go*." And so let us say that if we can not have religion *and* liberty, let religion go. If religious liberty endangers civil liberty let religious liberty go *by all means*, for we can easily dispense with the latter, but will be remanded to dark and barbarous ages if civil liberty be denied us.

Mrs. M. A. Freeman, Corresponding Secretary American Secular Union, writes: "The people have permitted various privileges to the Church. It has become arrogant with the granting of them and follows but the course of bigotry in all ages. It is not satisfied with the various priestly perquisites it enjoys but, throwing aside all disguise, demands for its divinities the Nation itself."

The granting of religious liberty, at the expense of civil liberty, in the days of Thomas Paine, had this effect, says Colonel Ingersoll: "All kinds of Christians had the right—and it was their duty—to brand, imprison and kill infidels of every kind."

There has been no greater enemy of civil liberty than the Christian Church, from the fourth century (when it became ascendent) even to the present time, during which period it has caused the shedding of rivers of human blood, in its hatred of, and conflict with, civil liberty.

We boast of civil liberty in this country, seeming to forget that we are denied *every* civil right except such as the Church permits.

How long is this condition of things to last? Will the Church grow wise enough, in the near future, to recognize our rights and cease its opposition thereto? or will the time come when the lovers of civil liberty will demand the possession of those rights *at whatever cost?* for the spirit of the age *insists* that we have true, pure, unmingled civil liberty.

"In the Chain-gang."

READER, have you done anything to assist in circulating that excellent tract, "In the Chain-gang for Conscience' Sake," noticed in this paper a few weeks ago? If not, be sure to send at once to the National Religious Liberty Association, Battle Creek, Mich., for a good supply, and then scatter them among your neighbors. This tract is a brief history of the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists in Tennessee; it costs only fifty cents per hundred, and will surely be read by everyone who sees it.

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

THE *Mail and Express* says of the continuance of violence at Homestead, on Sunday, November 13: "The strikers violated the laws of both God and man by making an attack Sunday on seven colored men employed in the Carnegie mills."

It follows, then, that if the attack had been made on Monday only the law of man would have been violated. Does this mark the limit of comprehension of the *Mail and Express* as to the scope of the law of God?

THE *Christian Cynosure*, in reference to the action of the World's Fair Board of Directors in asking Congress to remove the Sunday closing restriction, says:—

So far as the opening of the Fair on Sundays is concerned, it will require an act of Congress—the same Congress, too, that enacted the Sunday closing law—to remove the restriction. That august body may be cajoled into rescinding its former action, but no sane man can discover any reason why it should so signally disgrace itself.

That which is really difficult to find out is why it should have so signally disgraced itself as to have passed the proviso in the first place.

ON Monday, November 14, two women and fourteen men were brought before Justice Duffy charged with having violated the Sunday law by sewing in Jacob Taylor's tailor-shop on Pelham Street. The report says that Justice Duffy discharged them with an "admonitory lecture for having violated the Sabbath law." This is the second wholesale arrest of this kind. Does it mean that systematic persecution for Sunday work has begun in New York City? These arrests have been entirely of Hebrews who respect the seventh day Sabbath of the commandment and not the first day American Sunday. There is something more than a coincidence in this.

In the Maryland Code, Volume 1, article 27, page 538, is this paragraph:—

SECTION 247. No person whatsoever shall work or do any bodily labor on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday; and no person having children or servants shall command, or wittingly or willingly suffer, any of them to do any manner of work or labor on the Lord's day (works of necessity and charity always excepted), nor shall suffer or permit any children or servants to profane the Lord's day by gaming, fishing, fowling, hunting, or unlawful pastime or recreation; and every person transgressing this section, and being thereof convicted before a justice of the peace, shall forfeit five dollars, to be applied to the use of the county.

To this there is no exemption for those who observe another day. Under this section of the Maryland Code Mr. John Judefind, a farmer, and a Seventh-day Adventist, living near Rock Hall, Md., has been arrested for husking corn on Sunday, and fined five dollars and costs, the extent of the penalty provided.

The prosecuting witness in the case was a Methodist minister named Roe, of the village of Rock Hall. Mr. Judefind was quietly husking his corn, several hundred yards from the road, when this Methodist minister, seeing him, went immediately before a justice and swore out a warrant for his arrest for "husking corn on this day (Sunday)."

The case has been appealed to the spring term of the Circuit Court, and will come up again in April.

THE *Mail and Express* has this to say in regard to the expressed wish of the Board of Directors to open the gates of the Exposition on Sunday:—

The World's Fair Directors, in passing at their regular meeting yesterday, a resolution favoring the opening of the World's Fair gates on Sunday, have but bid defiance to public opinion. This action will be repudiated by the American people, and those who have been selected to represent them in this important matter will resolutely re-

sist its consummation. This is a question that so vitally involves all that we cherish as most essential to our happiness and prosperity as a people, that to compromise in the least degree would be turning recreant to every dictate of duty and every obligation of honor.

What does the *Mail and Express* think is "public opinion"? Who does it think are "the American people"? What does it think is "duty" and "honor"? Such imperfect, erroneous, and arrogant ideas expressed with a simplicity which shows that they are the natural product of a mind where there is no room for anything else, it would seem, could only come from that poor man before whom both gods and men are powerless.

By a vote of twenty-six to four the Directors of the World's Fair have passed resolutions expressing their views upon Sunday closing. So far as they relate directly to this subject they are as follows:—

We believe that while the period of the Exposition is limited by law, the people should not be prohibited from visiting the same Sundays during the life of said Exposition.

It is our judgment that the Exposition should be open Sunday, under such rules and regulations as will prohibit the use of machinery, unnecessary manual labor, and all merchandising, and at the same time give opportunity for the study of the highest standard of artistic and mechanical science; that the Art Gallery, the Horticultural Building, and all other buildings in which exhibits of mechanical art are exhibited should be thrown open to the public on each and every day during the entire time of the Exposition; also that each employee should be given one day of each week for rest, study, or recreation.

We believe that the study on Sunday of such exhibits of science and art and of the skill and genius of the artisan, will not only be of inestimable educational advantage, but that the thoughts of the visitors will be lifted above these creative agencies to the great Creator of things useful and beautiful.

We further believe that on each Sunday afternoon there should be held within the Exposition grounds religious services so arranged that each of our religious organizations may have a Sunday set apart for its particular service, under the control and direction of its most prominent clergymen, with songs and anthems in the best form of sacred music. Our original plans embraced a large hall capable of seating 7,000 people for this use Sunday.

We believe that the closing of the Exposition Sundays will deprive millions of our people of these advantages.

We believe that the closing of the Exposition Sunday would, in many instances, be in violation of the spirit of hospitality which has characterized our invitation to foreign nations.

We further believe that the citizens of the several States should have the privilege of visiting, Sunday, the temporary buildings or homes within the Exposition grounds, erected by their respective States, for the free interchange of thought and social amenities. Therefore, be it—

Resolved, That the foregoing preambles and recitals be and are adopted by the Board of Directors as expressing its best judgment upon the matter of Sunday closing during the Exposition.

In the course of the discussion of the resolutions it was stated that of seven hundred replies to letters upon this subject, from the Directory to prominent people in the larger cities of the country, five hundred and fifty were in favor of Sunday opening.

In reference to the question, in its present situation, the *Chicago Tribune* says:—

As the matter now stands the Fair can not be thrown open to visitors on Sundays except by action of Congress. Some of the directors said yesterday that if Congress were invited to take such a step it was not improbable that antagonistic members would make a motion looking to the repeal of the entire appropriation bill. Other directors think, however, that Congress would not be so foolish as to vote in such a way. The appropriation already granted is regarded as a contract, and the Supreme Court, they say, would not uphold a law which would abrogate the obligations entered into because of the appropriation bill.

Already petitions have been circulated extensively asking for the repeal of the Sunday closing clause. Exposition officials of both the Directory and National Commission think that the last Congress did not act on conviction, but voted in accordance with the petitions of a vast number of

Christian workers. Subsequently it has been shown that less than 25 per cent. of the people of the United States were represented in these petitions. The majority of citizens did not think it worth while to memorialize Congress, believing it would not take the step it did. Friends of Sunday opening say that the mistake in such a belief having been demonstrated, the people who did not act before are asserting themselves, and that the next Congress will receive petitions bearing millions of signatures, all asking that the Exposition be opened Sundays.

The question of the vitiation of contracts previously entered into is one which Congress and others should have thought of before ever considering the Sunday closing proviso at all. However, the first and necessary principles upon which this whole matter rightfully rests are totally ignored in these resolutions; as they are also by the association which has been formed in Chicago with the avowed object of promoting Sunday opening. It can not be possible that these men are unaware of the correct principles upon which they should take their position. Why do they avoid them?

On Which Side Are You?

THE editorial expressions reprinted beneath have all had their origin in a consideration of the cases of persecution in Tennessee, which THE SENTINEL has recounted from time to time.

This is a matter upon which none can avoid the responsibility of an opinion. Sooner or later all must take sides, and will. It is a pertinent question, "On which side are you?"

LIBERTY.

It is a piece of Sabbatic legislation and of religious persecution of which even the Dark Ages and the Spanish Inquisition might have been ashamed. That it could have taken place in America and in the last decade of the nineteenth century seems almost beyond belief.—*The Golden Rule, Cincinnati, Ohio, October 8.*

It seems incredible that at this enlightened age such fanaticism should be allowed to exist. Religious conviction is a matter in which only individual conscience is concerned. No matter what faith a man may choose to worship, or if he chooses none at all, the responsibility rests alone with him. If a man chooses to observe a certain day in the week as his Sabbath and works on other days, it is no one's business except his own, and such a law as they have in Tennessee is an outrage against the Constitution of the United States.—*The Pioneer Grip, Alliance, Nebr., September 29.*

It is hard to believe that in this day and age there should be such religious persecution tolerated in a free country, and the sooner an appeal is taken to the highest tribunal and the liberty of conscience defined and supported, the better for all, and especially the State of Tennessee. It would be but an act of justice for the imprisoned men to sue for damages, and heavy ones, for false and unconstitutional imprisonment. And they should be able to recover them, and the people of the State would learn that they can not go beyond certain limits in making their laws.—*The Republican, Clinton, Ind., September 30.*

PERSECUTION.

In every case the majorities rule, and we trust in this one the helpless minority will abide by the decision of the mighty majority, and that we all may come together in Christian love and fellowship as laid down by Christ in his teachings, "If you love me, keep my commandments."—*The Milford Nebraskan, October 6.*

Man is allowed, in this country, to worship God as he chooses, provided he does not violate a statutory law in doing so. The Sunday law does not force him to work on Saturday any more than any other day, and he who works on Sunday violates a civil law and should therefore suffer its penalties; not in the light of religious persecution, but because the Sunday law is made for all alike, irrespective of religious convictions. Down with the idea that the Sunday law in this country has anything to do with religious liberty.—*The Troy Times, Troy, Ind., October 8.*

We have received from the National Religious Liberty Association, letters and circulars wanting us to condemn the action of punishing men for violating the Sabbath by working in the fields and elsewhere. When a man pretends to become a Christian, he knows what nine-tenths of the Christian world regard as the Christian Sabbath, and when he tries to defy the majority of nine to one, he is most likely seeking notoriety, and if he attains that notoriety by being sentenced to the chain-gang, let him serve out his sentence and then turn to be a Christian in deed and in truth.—*Macclenny Sentinel, Macclenny, Fla., October 5.*

It is impossible to attempt the defense of religious laws without a display of either ignorance or bigotry, or both. This fact is made plainer than ever by these extracts. A most excellent purpose is served by this agitation. Those who express themselves bigotedly or ignorantly may sometimes see their own errors when presented clearly before their eyes in cold type. Again, while they themselves may not, others will. Cry aloud, and spare not.



NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 24, 1892.

NOTE.—Any one receiving THE AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered THE SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

In another column of this paper mention is made of the arrest in Kent County, Md., of a Seventh-day Adventist for quietly husking corn in his own field on the first day of the week.

THIS man was arrested on complaint of the Methodist minister who has, during the past year, lost a number of his members by the organization of an Adventist church at Rock Hall, in Kent County.

THE Adventist church at Rock Hall has a membership of over eighty. Some of these were formerly Methodists, but quite a number made no profession of religion until they became Adventists. Some of the men were addicted to the immoderate use of liquors, and nearly all were slaves to the tobacco habit. Now all are free from both these hurtful things, and tongues formerly used to blaspheme God, and to curse their fellowmen, are now employed in sounding his praise for deliverance from the bondage of sin. The power of God to save from sin has proved more attractive to the people of Rock Hall than the ministrations of the Methodist preacher, hence the arrest of Mr. Judefind and threats of other arrests for Sunday work.

BUT while Methodists are persecuting Adventists in this country by means of the civil law, Roman Catholics are persecuting Methodists in Austria,—and in both cases, both with Adventists in Tennessee and with Methodists in Austria, the civil law is simply being enforced. An article from the *Mail and Express* printed in another column, gives the facts in the persecution of Methodists in Vienna.

It is a little strange, however, that while the *Mail and Express* is so quick to cry out against religious persecution in foreign lands, it apparently knows nothing of the outrages being perpetrated upon God-fearing men in the United States under the color and forms of civil law. Is Mr. Shepard opposed to persecution from principle, or does he oppose it only when it is directed against those whose favor he would curry for political purposes—the Jews, for instance, or with whose religious views he is in sympathy? It looks very much as though the latter is the truth.

THE article on another page of this paper, "Civil Liberty," by Henry M. Taber, in *Freethinker's Magazine*, while couched in very mild and considerate terms, is a stinging, and withal a fitting rebuke to the professed Church of Christ for its bigotry and intolerance.

EXCEPT for the selfishness of professed Christians, all the world would long since have been compelled to admit the mild and benign character of the religion taught by the Lord Jesus Christ. But for centuries the course of the Church, both Protestant and Catholic, has been such as to fasten upon the minds of men the idea that intolerance exists as the legitimate fruit of Christianity, instead, as is really the case, in spite of the beneficent teachings of its Author, and in utter disregard of the plainest principles and precepts of his gospel.

INFIDELS have in the past acknowledged that the Inquisition and the spirit that prompted it were alike foreign to the religion promulgated by Christ. Yet failing to discern in the gospel any power to soften the cruel heart and to subdue the natural impulse of man to lord it over his fellows, they have jumped to the conclusion that Christianity is no better than any other religion, that it is simply an ethical system without originality and without power to transform its disciples or to make them better and nobler men, filled with more generous impulses. And for this, "Christians" of the National-Reform-American-Sabbath-Union type are responsible. It is a fearful responsibility; but they must one day meet it at the judgment seat of Christ whom they have so grossly misrepresented.

Two weeks ago we said: "Among the so-called orthodox religious papers we know of but one, the New York *Independent*, that has really entered any protest against the action of the State of Tennessee in the matter of the persecution of Seventh-day Adventists." And now the editor of the *Christian Patriot*, published at Morristown, Tenn., writes requesting a correction of the statement, and sending as evidence that his paper is also an exception, the article, "An Injustice," which we print on page 364. We do not agree with the *Patriot's* views of Sunday laws, but we cheerfully give place to this article as simple justice to our contemporary. The *Patriot* is entitled to define its position. We shall have more to say on this subject next week.

THE *Christian Advocate* boasts that "one person in three, not only in Baltimore, but in Maryland, is either a member or an adherent of some branch of Methodism." That being true they ought to be able to make it very uncomfortable for the few Adventists in that State, and

undoubtedly they will, especially as the Sunday law of that commonwealth affords them the means of so doing, and one of their ministers has set them the example by inaugurating the persecution. But what would Wesley say? Would he own such degenerate sons of Methodism as his disciples?

WE are not sure after all but that the term "American Sabbath" is properly applied to Sunday. It is certainly not the Sabbath of the Lord, neither is it the Lord's Sabbath. It is true that as a holiday, Sunday is very ancient; but as a rival of the Lord's day—the true Sabbath—it is comparatively modern. As a first-class fraud it is indebted more to America than to any other country in the world, and America ought to have the credit. There is also a fitness in the term "American" used in this connection, for it is a confession that Sunday is not *the* Sabbath. The very use of the terms, "American Sabbath," "Christian Sabbath," "Weekly Independence Day," etc., mark the contrast between the day to which they are applied and that which inspiration designates simply as the Sabbath.

THE *Christian Statesman* approvingly quotes Col. Elliott F. Shepard, as follows, on the Sunday paper:—

The preparing, selling, buying and reading of the Sunday papers breaks and leads to the breaking of every one of God's laws, and keeps people away from church, so that it is as true now as it was when our glorious Lord was upon the earth, that the people can not come to him because of the press.

It is nowhere stated in the Bible that "the people could not come to Him because of the press." We have, however, this record:—

And they come unto him, bringing one sick of the palsy, which was borne of four. And when they could not come nigh unto him for the press, they uncovered the roof where he was: and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed wherein the sick of the palsy lay.

The "press," which, however, was not the Sunday paper, but a multitude of people, did not prevent those who wanted to reach Jesus from gaining his presence. Neither will those who now desire to come to the Lord as earnestly as did the poor paralytic be hindered by the press even though it be the *Mail and Express*—"press." The Colonel's quotation is inaccurate, and so misleading; but his pun is accurate. It is the correct measure of the man.

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, - - - \$1.00.

In clubs of	5 to 24 copies to one address, per year,	- - - 90c.
"	25 to 99 " " " " " " " "	- - - 80c.
"	100 to 249 " " " " " " " "	- - - 75c.
"	250 to 499 " " " " " " " "	- - - 70c.
"	500 to 999 " " " " " " " "	- - - 65c.
"	1000 or more " " " " " " " "	- - - 60c.
To foreign countries in Postal Union,	- - -	5 shillings*

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
48 Bond Street, New York City.